

# CATHOLIC CHURCH: WHERE ARE YOU HEADING?

Theologian Dániel Fülepi's interview with  
Bishop Athanasius Schneider  
Auxiliary Bishop of the  
Archdiocese of Saint Mary in Astana

Astana, Kazakhstan, July 2018



# CATHOLIC CHURCH: WHERE ARE YOU HEADING?

Theologian Dániel Fülepi's interview with

**BISHOP ATHANASIUS SCHNEIDER**

Auxiliary Bishop of the  
Archdiocese of Saint Mary in Astana

---

2018

Private edition, Budapest

CATHOLIC CHURCH: WHERE ARE YOU HEADING?

© Athanasius Schneider, Fülep Dániel

ISBN 978 615 00 3223 8

Translator: Gábor Sallai

Private edition, Budapest, 2018

Editor and responsible publisher: Dániel Fülep

Contact: [fulep@newman.hu](mailto:fulep@newman.hu)

*The texts can be freely copied, distributed or otherwise used,  
subject to proper acknowledgement of the source.*

# Contents

Introduction	9
Pope Benedict and <i>Dominus est</i>	18
About the possibility of papal invalid elections	25
The Bull of Pope Paul IV	25
The St. Gallen “mafia”	27
Kazakhstan Catholic Bishops’ statement on <i>Amoris Laetitia</i>	32
Conference “Catholic Church: Where are you heading?” (Rome, 7 April 2018)	36
Cardinal Brandmüller	37
Cardinal Burke and the formal correction	39
Papal chair as the “ <i>cathedra veritatis</i> ”	42
Papal oath of fidelity to the Tradition	43
Roman conference — reactions	44
About the message of Our Lady of La Salette	46
John XXIII and the Second Vatican Council	50
About the new rite of ordinations	53

Marxism and Communism	56
The consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary	61
Revolution and the Republic	65
The policy of “ralliement” of Leo XIII	67
The very essence of modernism: separating of doctrine from practice	70
Freemasonry	72
The Church as a perfect society and the State	78
<i>Ecclesia Militans</i> (Church militant)	82
About the priesthood and female ordination	84
About the scandal of intercommunion with Protestants	89
About the upcoming Synod on Youth, the Pan-Amazonian Synod and priestly celibacy	92
Migration problem in Europe	100
About Liturgy	103
Latin and vernacular in the liturgy	103
Beauty in liturgy and interior participation	104
Celebration ad orientem	106



His Excellency Athanasius Schneider — Auxiliary Bishop of the  
Archdiocese of Saint Mary in Astana





# Introduction

*“Master, do you not care? We are lost!”* (Mark 4:38), the disciples in alarm woke Jesus sleeping in the boat tossed about by huge waves on Lake Genezareth.

The Catholic Church is facing difficult and extraordinary times these days. If ever, now is the time to declare that, according to the Catholic faith, not even a pope is entitled to spark off a revolution. This dramatic situation, however, is still largely ignored or not taken seriously enough by Catholics.

It is partly because the mainstream Catholic media tend to conceal obvious problems. Painful details are simply left out. Reality is whitewashed or rewritten. It is not only that anomalies are glossed over or even promoted, but false doctrines are propagated, with the secular media gladly joining in. The world exults over any departure from tradition, secularization, changed and “modernized” doctrine with any negative phenomena making the headlines.

It is also true that many Catholics lack sufficient knowledge or – what is even worse – do not care about their faith. Modernist religion is subjectivist, emotionalist, separating faith and reason, ultimately leading to agnosticism, which reduces the truths and demands of faith to subjective feelings and to the current ideology of the world. That's why the predominance of the heresy of modernism is largely ignored, although the symptoms of the current crisis of the Church already manifest themselves even in the most remote parish. Many Catholics, and even not a few priests and bishops are indifferent or even approve the crisis and they become appalled if someone tries to get them out of their comfort zone.

Painfully enough, the faithful are also ignorant because of the prevailing deep silence on the part of cardinals, bishops, and priests. It is only a few critics and those who practise papolatry, defending evidently erroneous decisions of the current Pope at all costs, that voice their opinions.<sup>1</sup> Reasons for the silence: some warmly welcome the “change of paradigm,” others are quiet or confused due to insuffi-

---

<sup>1</sup> Father Thomas Rossica, English-language assistant to the Holy See Press Office, says: “*Pope Francis breaks Catholic traditions whenever he wants because he is ‘free from disordered attachments.’ Our Church has indeed entered a new phase: with the advent of this first Jesuit pope, it is openly ruled by an individual rather than by the authority of Scripture alone or even its own dictates of tradition plus Scripture.*” Source: <http://saltandlighttv.org/blogfeed/getpost.php?id=72516>.

cient knowledge or information or are personally interested in protecting their careers or positions, still others are at a loss, apathetic, indifferent, or fearful, tortured by the obvious contradictions. All in all, the faithful listening to sermons or receiving pastoral care are hardly ever confronted with reality, so they are not duly motivated to pray, fast, and do penance for their own sins and those of the world. Abandoned Catholics are like sheep without a shepherd, and they will understandably rejoice to find a bishop somewhere from the USA, Guinea, or Kazakhstan, who provides them with authentic Catholic guidance.

To help the dear reader better understand the questions put to Bishop Athanasius Schneider during the following conversation, I think I'll first need to present the current state of affairs in the Church.

The Vicar of Christ on earth can be judged by nobody but God. Formally, a pope can only be corrected by himself or by his successor.<sup>2</sup> The content of his teaching, however, can be objectively assessed and he can freely be asked questions by anybody. False doctrine must be called false doctrine and, as such, it must be dismissed. And if the pope proves to be a tyrant rather than a guardian of faith, if the pope

---

<sup>2</sup> Formal correction by the cardinals can be nothing more than an emphatic indication for the Pope that there is every indication that he has made erroneous or ambiguous statements. Erroneous or ambiguous papal teaching must be formally corrected by the pope himself.

and the papal office come into conflict, if pastoral care is separated from doctrine, and relativism and situation ethics are gaining ground, we must step forward and act.

Pope Francis calls all people children of God irrespective of justification and baptism, distorting thereby the true meaning of faith, love, and peace, suggesting equivalence of all religions,<sup>3</sup> giving his approval to a practice which admits divorced and civilly remarried people, that is, adulterers, to Holy Communion<sup>4</sup>. He redefines the ritual of foot-washing on Holy Thursday,<sup>5</sup> speaking highly of Luther and his intentions,<sup>6</sup> approving the reception of

---

<sup>3</sup> An illustrative example of this is Pope Francis's video message of January 2016 with a syncretic approach that is incompatible with the Catechism and is very much like Masonic doctrines.

<sup>4</sup> According to the formal interpretation, Pope Francis' Apostolic Exhortation *Amoris Laetitia* has opened the way for the divorced and civilly remarried to receive Holy Communion without an obligation to practice sexual abstinence. The concession offered by some episcopal norms of application of AL constitutes sacrilege against the sacraments of marriage and confession as well as Holy Communion.

<sup>5</sup> It is a custom established by Pope Francis to wash the feet of only lay men and women on Holy Thursday, including not only Catholics but – as far as we could see – also Hindus and Muslims. This practice is against the very liturgical norms issued by the Pope himself on 6 January 2016. By this, Pope Francis significantly modifies the theological meaning of feet washing, breaking its close relationship with the institution of holy orders and the apostolic mission.

<sup>6</sup> Pope Francis said that “*the intentions of Martin Luther were not mistaken*” but “*perhaps some methods were not correct.*” Martin

Holy Communion by Protestant spouses of Catholics,<sup>7</sup> tolerating homosexual propaganda,<sup>8</sup> and changing the teaching of the Catechism in a way that is in direct contradiction to Tradition.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, he will not answer un-

---

Luther “*was a reformer,*” who “*made a medicine for the Church.*” The Vatican issued a commemorative stamp featuring the excommunicated Luther kneeling together with Melanchton at the foot of the Cross, and the Holy See formerly called him “*a witness to the gospel.*” Pope Francis calls the Lutheran communities “*churches.*”

<sup>7</sup> Ten of the dioceses in Germany are formally authorised by their bishops to administer Holy Communion to the Protestant spouses of Catholics. The initiative by Cardinal Marx and the German Bishops’ Conference was approved by Pope Francis in person.

<sup>8</sup> Several persons who openly propagate the homosexual lifestyle were appointed by Pope Francis to hold high offices. The Pontiff makes false and ambiguous statements about homosexuality. At Christmas 2017 the Vatican’s Christmas Nativity scene on St. Peter’s Square included homoerotic statues, some cardinals and bishops can openly endorse the blessing of homosexual relationships, the World Meeting of Families 2018 will include LGBT propaganda, and there is the scandal around Cardinal McCarrick, where 30 American bishops, including Cardinal DiNardo, president of the bishops’ conference, request clarification of Pope Francis’ role, based on Archbishop Viganò’s testimony.

<sup>9</sup> As from 2 August 2018, Pope Francis had the Catechism of the Catholic Church rewritten (point 2267 on capital punishment). The modified point directly contradicts the perennial teaching of the Church, which declares the death penalty morally acceptable under specific conditions as a way to protect the community. The modification bears significance not only on account of its subject matter but also as a precedent.

equivocally any doctrinal questions asked by cardinals, bishops, priests, and laymen.<sup>10</sup> This list of anomalies, which is not exhaustive at all,<sup>11</sup> only illustrates the serious crisis primarily of faith that we are facing now.

It is important to note that the Pope has primary but not exclusive responsibility: the current papacy is not a stand-alone phenomenon but grows out of a chronic crisis – that is to say, the problem is even greater and deeper than what

---

<sup>10</sup> Pope Francis will not enter into dialogue with the main critics of *Amoris Laetitia*. For nearly two years, he hasn't answered the questions asked by Cardinals Walter Brandmüller, Raymond Burke, Carlo Caffarra† and Joachim Meisner† on 19 September 2016 (Dubia). Neither does he respond to the Filial Correction issued by a group of priests on 23 September 2017 (Correctio Filialis) or the Kazakhstan Bishops' Statement of 31 December 2017. One and a half years ago the Dubia Cardinals also requested an audience, which was not granted by Pope Francis either.

<sup>11</sup> Pope Francis acts weird in political terms, too. He often points out the rights of migrants, refugees, and immigrants as well as the obligation to welcome them, but he seems to be ignorant of the consequences of the flood of illegal immigrants and the impossibility of integrating Muslims. The Pope does not raise public awareness of the threat of illegal immigration, the Islamic invasion of Europe, the obligations of migrants (e.g. respect for the law), or the right of the target countries of migration to defend themselves. All in all, when it comes to defend ourselves against the illegal and aggressive immigration and the alarming Islamic invasion, this Pope cannot be counted on. Clearly, his rhetoric favours politicians of the liberal left, who like to quote him with regard to illegal migration.

it may look at first sight. And as the enemy is already embedded in the highest circles of hierarchy, the current situation requires unflinching self-defence by faithful Catholics. We must be aware that “*the wickedness and snares of the devil*”<sup>12</sup> are to rob us of our eternal salvation.

First and foremost, this must make us even more determined to live a saintly life with a special focus on prayer, fasting and doing penance for the sins committed by ourselves and others.<sup>13</sup> Facing the current trials, all of us will soon reach a crossroads: we must be strengthened to adhere steadfastly to the entire deposit of faith (*depositum fidei*). We must avoid being deceived by manipulations and false teaching. Thus, we must not only pray and receive the sacraments, but we also need teaching, guidance, and exhortation by bishops. That’s why I visited Bishop Athanasius Schneider and asked him again<sup>14</sup> to clarify the current state of the Church and the world by answering highly relevant questions.

---

<sup>12</sup> “*nequitiam et insidias diaboli*” – invocation of Saint Michael added by Leo XIII to the Leonine Prayers

<sup>13</sup> Cf. “*This is the kind that can be driven out only by prayer and fasting.*” Mark 9:28.

<sup>14</sup> I first interviewed Bishop Schneider in March 2016, when – accepting my invitation – Bishop Schneider visited Hungary. For the Bishop’s presentations, his homily at the Pontifical Mass on Laetare Sunday and my exclusive interview with him, see the Hungarian and English language book entitled REGNUM

In the presence of his Excellency and listening to his words, I am filled with hope and certitude that the Lord Jesus is always with us in the boat of the Church just as he was once with the disciples on the stormy lake. Being close to the Lord, we will always be safe because He is the real and absolute master over the stormy sea of history. Jesus Christ is the head of the Church, who has the power to rescue us from calamities that, in human terms, seem to be beyond our control.

Let every dear reader of this interview be filled with strength, clarity, and courage provided by the wise, true, and pure words of his Excellency Bishop Athanasius Schneider.

The Lord Jesus got up and calmed the storm. Then he said to the disciples, “*Why are you so frightened? Have you still no faith?*” (Mark 4:40)

Budapest, 21 August 2018

Dániel Fülep  
*theologian*

---

EUCCHARISTICUM. For the E-book version, see <http://mek.oszk.hu/15500/15547/15547.pdf>



# CATHOLIC CHURCH: WHERE ARE YOU HEADING?

Theologian Dániel Fülep's interview with

**BISHOP ATHANASIUS SCHNEIDER**

Auxiliary Bishop of the  
Archdiocese of Saint Mary in Astana

Astana, Kazakhstan, July 2018

**Mr. Fülep:** Your Excellency, Bishop Schneider! Accepting your precious invitation, I am glad to be here with an open mind and heart to meet you in the Archdiocese of Astana. With vivid memories of your unforgettable visit to Hungary in 2016,<sup>15</sup> I kindly present the best wishes and prayers of many from Central Europe. Please, allow me to ask you again for guidance and instructions regarding some relevant questions of interest.

---

<sup>15</sup> On 4-6 March 2016 Bishop Athanasius Schneider visited Hungary at the invitation of the Newman Center in Sümeg, Hungary, giving a few talks and celebrating Pontifical High Mass in the *usus antiquior* on Laetare Sunday.

## Pope Benedict and *Dominus est*

**Mr. Fülep:** Dominus est! [It Is the Lord!],<sup>16</sup> the famous work of your Excellency, is a great martyrologic and patristic witness of receiving Holy Communion on the tongue and kneeling as the most worthy gesture. Few know that you took the manuscript of the book to the synod on the Eucharist in 2005,<sup>17</sup> in which you participated as an auditor, and that it had a direct impact on Pope Benedict XVI.

---

<sup>16</sup> The Bishop's book *Dominus Est* [It Is the Lord!] was published in the spring of 2008 in Italian by the publishing house of the Holy See (Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 2008) and was soon translated into English, German, Estonian, Lithuanian, Polish, Hungarian and Chinese. The book is martyrological and patristic evidence of, and witness to, the Catholic Church's ancient practice and principle of receiving Holy Communion, indicating that administering and receiving the Sacrament cannot be separated from the adoration of the Lord. Receiving Holy Communion on the tongue and knees, where reception and adoration are inextricably interwoven, is the most worthy manner of taking the Sacrament. The general modern practice of receiving Communion in the hand is related to the Lord's Supper of the Calvinists, who deny the Real Presence.

<sup>17</sup> The *Year of the Eucharist* announced by Pope John Paul II was

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** During the Synod of Bishops on the Eucharist in 2005, where I participated as an auditor, they discussed the manner of receiving Holy Communion, and also the problematic mode of receiving Holy Communion directly in the hand; the so-called communion in the hand. I prepared in 2005 my future book, *Dominus Est*, as a manuscript. I had a short audience with the Holy Father, Pope Benedict, during the synod, and I expressed to him my concern about the situation created by communion in the hand. The Pope answered me that already other bishops had spoken to him about this problem. I said to him: *'Holy Father, I prepared*

---

opened by the 48<sup>th</sup> International Eucharistic Congress in Guadalajara, Mexico on 10-17 October 2004. The Year of the Eucharist was closed by the 11<sup>th</sup> General Synod of Bishops on 2-29 October 2005. The theme of the synod was chosen by Pope John Paul II: *"The Eucharist is the source and summit of the life and vocation of the Church."*

Following the synod, Pope Benedict XVI issued an apostolic exhortation entitled *"Sacramentum Caritatis"*, summarizing the reflections and recommendations formulated at the last general assembly of the synod of bishops, including a wide range of documents from *Lineamenta* [Outline] to *Propositiones* [Recommendations], taking into consideration the *Instrumentum laboris* [Working Document], *Relationes ante et post disceptationem* [Reports before and after the debate], the comments of the Synod Fathers, the observers and the lay delegates, to determine some basic directions in which new Eucharistic initiatives and zeal are to be promoted in the Church. (cf. SC 5)

*a manuscript for a book about this topic. Would you like to have it and to read it?*’ He answered me: ‘Yes, please give it to me.’ However, I had forgotten to bring the text with me and to this audience. And so I said to the Holy Father: ‘*I apologise, I forgot the text.*’ The Pope said: ‘*There is no problem. You can give the text to my secretary tomorrow.*’ It was providential that I have forgotten the text, because in the evening I could still write an accompanying letter. I wrote this letter in which I expressed a specific request to the Pope: ‘*Most Holy Father, I beseech you in the name of Jesus Christ, please, yourself no longer give Communion in the hand, but make it so that when people come to you to receive Holy Communion from your hands, that they will receive it only kneeling and on the tongue.*’<sup>18</sup> So I asked him, and then the next day I gave to the secretary the text of my future book and the accompanying letter.

---

<sup>18</sup> Even today the general rule is that the faithful must receive Holy Communion on the tongue and kneeling, cf. RS 90. Administering Communion in the hand is an “*indult*” or concession granted by Pope Paul VI under the conditions specified by the Holy See. (*Memoriale Domini*, the Instruction on the Manner of Administering Holy Communion; The Congregation for Divine Worship on May 29, 1969. AAS LXI (1969) 541–547.)

**Mr. Fülep:** What impact did the book have on Pope Benedict?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** After a couple of weeks I got a letter, on the envelope was written: *‘Confidentially and personally.’* When I read this on the envelope, I suddenly felt in my soul that it was the answer of Pope Benedict to my letter. When I opened the letter, I read these words of Benedict XVI: *‘Your arguments are convincing. But as you know, there are in the Church powerful groups who resist what you have asked me to do.’* He only described the situation and gave me his blessing. Honestly speaking, I did not believe that the Pope would do what I asked him to do. Then I published my book *“Dominus Est”* (*“It is the Lord”*) some years later in the Vatican publishing house in the beginning of 2008, first in Italian. Some months later, on the feast of Corpus Christi in 2008<sup>19</sup> Pope Benedict XVI did what I had asked him to do. He did this until the end of his pontificate<sup>20</sup>. Since that day, Pope Benedict XVI distributed Holy Communion exclusively in this mode, that peo-

---

<sup>19</sup> Thursday, 22nd May 2008

<sup>20</sup> On 11 February 2013 Pope Benedict XVI unexpectedly announced his resignation from papacy to the council of cardinals due to his diminished strength, so *“as from 28 February 2013, at 20:00 hours, the See of Rome, the See of Saint Peter, will be vacant and a Conclave to elect the new Supreme Pontiff will have to be convoked by those whose competence it is...”*

ple had to kneel down on a kneeler, and then received the Holy Host directly on the tongue. I did not believe that he would do this. When some days later I saw some pictures on a liturgical website, I could not believe it, I was so happy. There was a commentary below saying that from this moment on, Pope Benedict will distribute the Holy Communion in this mode.<sup>21</sup> I was so happy that I suddenly knelt down before my computer and prayed the *Te Deum*. Some weeks later, I was in Rome and participated in the general audience, and in the end of the audience I approached Pope Benedict<sup>22</sup> and greeted him.

---

<sup>21</sup> At a Pontifical Mass in Leuca during his visit to Apulia on 14-15 June 2008, *Pope Benedict XVI* administered Communion only on the tongue of the kneeling faithful. From that day on the Holy Father has set a good example of distributing Communion in the *most worthy* manner. In an interview of 25 June 2008 to the newspaper *L'Osservatore Romano*, Master of papal ceremonies, Msgr. *Guido Marini* said that from then on the faithful would have to receive Holy Communion on the tongue and kneeling at papal masses as the general rule, which had often been the case before. *Guido Marini* said: “*It is to be noted that, in legal terms, administering communion in the hand is still subject to special permission, which has been granted only to bishops of some bishops’ conferences. The procedure of the Pope is aimed to highlight the legal force of the general rule to be applied in the whole Church.*”

<sup>22</sup> Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger says: “*Holy Communion will only attain its real richness if it is sustained and surrounded by adoration*” (Der Geist der Liturgie. Eine Einführung, Freiburg 2002, p. 78). In the Apostolic Exhortation “*Sacramentum caritatis*”, Pope Benedict XVI states with regard to the reception of Holy Communion:

I said to him literally ‘*Most Holy Father, may God reward you because of the miracle, which happened on the feast of Corpus Christi.*’ He suddenly understood the meaning of what I spoke, and said to me: ‘*Yes, this mode of giving Holy Communion kneeling and on the tongue is more appropriate.*’ It was for me really a deep spiritual joy. I had this deep spiritual joy not because of my ideas, but because of the Lord, since He has the right to be defended in the surest way, to be adored and to be respected even in the exterior manner in a most sacred manner, which is the traditional form to receive Holy Communion kneeling and on the tongue.

**Mr. Fülep:** Can we say that it is because of *Dominus Est* that Pope Benedict definitively became a committed follower of the effective general rule of administering Holy Communion as a model to follow?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** I don’t know directly but at least it was a consequence. I don’t know if he did this because of my letter or because there were other people who asked him to do so. At least it was for me really a deep joy.

---

“*Receiving the Eucharist means adoring him whom we receive.*”  
(SC 66.)

**Mr. Fülep:** The synod of 2005 on the Eucharist was attended by Protestant observers, too.<sup>23</sup> Your Excellency had a painfully memorable meeting with a Lutheran ‘bishop’ from Norway.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** I had my place close to the ecumenical delegation, and there was a Lutheran bishop from Norway. At the coffee break, I spoke with him, and asked him about the manner the Lutherans were receiving Holy Communion. He answered me that maybe until ten years ago almost all received Holy Communion kneeling and on the tongue, but nowadays the rite changed. I asked him in which way they changed the rite of Communion. He answered me: *‘Now we introduced the manner to receive Communion standing and in the hand.’* I asked him why they changed the rite. He answered, saying literally: *‘Because of the influence of our Catholic brothers.’*

---

<sup>23</sup> That second synod of the new millennium was attended by 256 Synod Fathers from 118 countries of the world, including 55 cardinals, 8 patriarchs, 82 archbishops, 123 bishops, 36 presidents of bishops’ conferences and 12 religious brothers and sisters as well as 12 representatives of the Eastern Catholic Churches.



# About the possibility of papal invalid elections

## *The Bull of Pope Paul IV*

**Mr. Fülep:** On 15 February 1559 Pope Paul IV<sup>24</sup> issued a Papal Bull entitled *Cum ex apostolatus officio*, codifying the explicit invalidity of any papal election where the man ascending to the throne of Saint Peter has fallen into heresy or committed the sin of schism or become alienated from the Church, even if only once or temporarily. The provision “*shall be valid for all times.*” Those abandoning the Catholic faith, the apostates and the schismatics shall be deprived of office and suffer other severe punishments, too, while their supporters shall be *eo ipso* excommunicated. Clearly, Paul IV aimed to protect partly the hierarchy, especially the papal office, from Protestant heterodoxy, partly the faithful from corruption and eternal damna-

---

<sup>24</sup> Giampietro Caraffa (1476–1559) became successor of Marcellus II under the name of *Pope Paul IV*. Despite his old age, he was determined to fight for reforms (the elimination of abuses) and against the spreading Protestantism and its infiltration into the Church all through his papacy (1555–1559).

tion.<sup>25</sup> This Bull has never been withdrawn. Moreover, some of its elements appear even in the latest papal and canonical provisions<sup>26</sup>. How is this document to be interpreted correctly in light of the current state of the Church?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** There are some disciplinary norms and papal bulls, which were not explicitly revoked, but whose norms nevertheless are no longer valid in the Church. It is not always necessary to revoke explicitly a norm. By time and by new laws the older ones become obsolete and no longer valid. I have not studied this papal bull carefully. According to the Code of Canon Law, a candidate for the papacy must be a baptised Catholic man.<sup>27</sup> Even a layperson could be elected. He is not even required to be a priest or a cardinal. The basic requirement is to be a Catholic, and that means not to be heretic, it is evident from the context. The candidate for

---

<sup>25</sup> “*The abomination of desolation, which was spoken by Daniel the prophet as he was standing in the holy place, should never reach Us; desiring, as much as possible with God to do what We can, for the sake of Our Pastoral duty, to seize the foxes, who sow destruction in the vineyard of the Lord, and to keep the wolves at a distance from the sheepfold, lest We seem mute dogs, unable to bark, and be destroyed with the evil farmer or like the hireling.*” Source: <http://www.todayscatholicworld.com/cum-ex-apostolatus-officio.pdf>

<sup>26</sup> Cf. John Paul II: *Universi dominici gregis*, 1996, AAS 88 (1996) 305–343; CIC 332; 1024; 1025; 1031 etc.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. CIC 332; 1024; 1025.

the papacy has to be Catholic, he cannot be a half Catholic or 1/3 Catholic. He has to be a full Catholic, who professes the entire Catholic faith.

### *The St. Gallen “mafia”*

**Mr. Fülep:** In a television interview on 23 September 2013, Cardinal Godfried Danneels, Archbishop Emeritus of Mechelen-Brussels, admitted that he had been part of a secretive group within the Church that wanted to remove Pope Benedict XVI. “The group wanted Bergoglio to immediately follow Karol Wojtyla as the head of the Church.”<sup>28</sup> The cardinal says that the St. Gallen mafia<sup>29</sup> including several members<sup>30</sup> did exist from 1996 to 2006, and in 2013 it became active again. As per a 1996 provision by John Paul II, any organizing or consultation activity influencing papal elections entails excommunica-

---

<sup>28</sup> <https://nieuws.vtm.be/binnenland/159605-danneels-zat-soort-maffiaclub>

<sup>29</sup> Cardinal Danneels says: “*The Sankt-Gallen group is a sort of posh name. But in reality we said of ourselves, and of that group: ‘The Mafia.’*” In: <https://nieuws.vtm.be/binnenland/159605-danneels-zat-soort-maffiaclub>

<sup>30</sup> Among the alleged members of this secretive group were Belgian Cdl. Godfried Danneels, Dutch Bp. Adriaan Van Luyn, Cdl. Walter Kasper and Cdl. Karl Lehmann from Germany, Cdl. Achille Silvestrini of Italy and British Cdl. Cormac Murphy-O’Connor.

tion,<sup>31</sup> which is also true for any secret negotiation on the election of the successor.<sup>32</sup> What, if Cardinal Bergoglio was part of this group?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** To my knowledge, in the ancient times even an excommunicated cardinal had the right to vote. The excommunication itself was not an impediment to vote, and to be voted for. Because canon law only requires that the candidate be a man, baptised and Catholic. Even in this case, if these cardinals, who made a pre-conclave machination, did incur an automatic excommunication, they could still vote, in my opinion. Even if one of them was elected Pope, it did not affect directly the validity of the election, in my opinion. There have been many such cases in History, specifically in the Renaissance times or in the so-called dark ages, in the “*saeculum obscurum*.”<sup>33</sup> Such elections with mafia meth-

---

<sup>31</sup> “The Cardinal electors shall further abstain from any form of pact, agreement, promise or other commitment of any kind which could oblige them to give or deny their vote to a person or persons. If this were in fact done, even under oath, I decree that such a commitment shall be null and void and that no one shall be bound to observe it; and I hereby impose the penalty of excommunication *latae sententiae* upon those who violate this prohibition.” *Universi dominici gregis*, Nr. 81., 1996, AAS 88 (1996) 305–343.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid. Nr. 79.

<sup>33</sup> The “*saeculum obscurum*” (Dark Age) was first named and identified as a period of papal immorality by the Italian cardinal and historian *Cesar Baronius* in his *Annales Ecclesiastici* in the

ods are, of course, rare. For instance, before the election of Alexander VI in the Renaissance time there was propaganda in his favour. Alexander VI<sup>34</sup> committed even the crime of simony, he paid to be elected. However, no one considered and considers till now Pope Alexander VI an invalid Pope. The Church had already had several occasions where popes were elected in such doubtful circumstances. However, their election was not subsequently declared invalid. This is for me a very wise norm. Otherwise, there would arise a huge confusion. How you can prove exactly and juridically, that before the conclave there were manoeuvres and so on? Even if we accept the hypothesis that the election of Pope Francis was invalid because of these alleged machinations, he is now nevertheless the true Pope. For according to the age-old praxis of the Church an invalidly elected Pope becomes valid, when the entire Church accepts him *de facto* as a Pope. So it was in the moment when all cardinal electors paid him obedience first in the Sistine Chapel and then publicly during the Mass of his enthronement. They all recognised him publicly as the Pope. The entire episcopate and the entire Church names the Pope in the Mass. It is a *de facto* acceptance of the Pope. In the hypothetical case of an invalid

---

sixteenth century. This period in the history of the Papacy begins with the installation of *Pope Sergius III* in 904 and lasts for sixty years until the death of *Pope John XII* in 964.

<sup>34</sup> Pope Alexander VI, born *Rodrigo Borgia*, was pope from 1492 until 1503.

election of Pope Francis, such a general acceptance would be a *de facto* healing of the defects of the election. In such a case, one could speak of a kind of *sanatio in radice*.<sup>35</sup> This is a very wise tradition of the Church, because it helps to avoid schisms, which the Church experienced so many times, and sometimes there was a real anarchy and people did not know who is the true Pope. To avoid such an anarchy, the more constant tradition of the Church says, that in virtue of a general acceptance of an invalidly elected Pope, his election becomes valid. It is very wise tradition and corresponds even to common sense.

**Mr. Fülep:** It's been five years since Cardinal Godfried Danneels announced this, but several alarming questions haven't been clarified ever since. Does membership of this group entail excommunication? Was Cardinal Bergoglio part of this group? Why did Cardinal Danneels speak about it? Was he afraid of something? It is appalling that no one has ever denied the fact and the Holy See and the Cardinals have not issued any official explanation to date.

---

<sup>35</sup> Marriage Law Concept. "*Sanatio in radice*" (Radical sanation) is the curing of an invalid marriage in accordance with CIC 1161 §1 so that marriage may become a recognized marriage in accordance with the canon law of the Church.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** I hope that in the future in order to avoid doubts, the more common tradition, which says that an invalid papal election will be healed by the general acceptance of this Pope by the entire Church, should be codified. In this way everyone will know this, it would be written in the Code of Canon Law, or in a papal document about the election of the Pope.

**Mr. Fülep:** Bishop Rene Gracida,<sup>36</sup> among others, believes that the activity of the St. Gallen mafia is canonically illegal under the laws of the 1996 Apostolic Constitution *Universi Dominici Gregis* promulgated by St. John Paul II. If this is true, the validity of the papal election may be in doubt.<sup>37</sup>

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Such arguments have no foundation, even if this opinion is affirmed by one or more bishops. It is not the case who speaks and how many speak, one has to examine the common tradition of the Church concerning an alleged invalid papal election.

---

<sup>36</sup> Bishop René Henry Gracida (\*1923), Emeritus of Corpus Christi, Texas, USA.

<sup>37</sup> It was written by Bishop Gracida on his blog “abyssum.org” on 2 June, and already in April he stated that he considers Francis an anti-Pope. According to Gracida, some cardinals, including Jorge Bergoglio, violated Canon law by plotting what became known as the “St Gallen mafia,” and they are therefore now excommunicated.

## Kazakhstan Catholic Bishops' statement on *Amoris Laetitia*

**Mr. Fülep:** On 31 December 2017, the Feast of the Holy Family, in the year of the centenary of the apparitions of Our Lady at Fatima, the Catholic Bishops of Kazakhstan published a statement on *Amoris Laetitia*. Your Excellency has invited all the bishops to declare publicly their support or issue a similar text.<sup>38</sup> As far as I know, only 10 signatures have been collected.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> In conversation with LifeSiteNews on 15 January 2018, the auxiliary bishop of Astana, Kazakhstan, said that all of the world's bishops who have an email address in the *Annuario Pontificio* were sent the text of the profession via email. "It is up to each bishop to declare publicly his support or to issue a similar text," Bishop Schneider said. "The public reaction of Cardinal Eijk from Utrecht could be a first example of this kind." In: <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/exclusive-athanasius-schneider-invites-worlds-bishops-to-sign-profession-of>.

<sup>39</sup> Archbishop Tomash Peta; Archbishop Emer. Jan Pawel Lenga; Aux. Bishop Athanasius Schneider in addition to Cardinal Emer. Janis Pujats; Archbishop Emer. Carlo Maria Viganò; Archbishop Emer. Luigi Negri; Bishop Emer. Andreas Laun; Bishop Emer. Elmar Fischer; Bishop Emer. Rene Henry Gracida; Aux. Bishop



**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** I had been in contact with some bishops, who had not signed the statement, but who, nevertheless, agreed with its content. Because of some reasons, they could not give their name publicly.

**Mr. Fülep:** I know two Hungarian bishops who have reservations against *Amoris Laetitia* but will reveal them only confidentially, if at all. There must be many more like them. The Church has 5,507 bishops at present.<sup>40</sup> It is impossible that, out of the whole College of Bishops, there are only ten signatories of the Kazakhstan statement. We can also see that Pope Francis doesn't even like questions and punishes anybody who speaks up for traditional teaching. Is this great silence due to fear?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Yes, many bishops are afraid. In the introduction of our Statement we said that we regret the fact that there are several norms of application of AL, issued on several levels, which permit Holy Communion for divorced, and that unfortunately some of these norms got the approval of the supreme authority of the Church. It was a kind of an implicit criticism of Pope Francis, who approved the norms of the bishops of

---

Marian Eleganti.

<sup>40</sup> <http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/bishop/ll.html>

the region of Buenos Aires.<sup>41</sup> Maybe also because of this phrase, some bishops were afraid to sign the Statement in order not to be labelled as critics of the Pope. I think even if we had not mentioned these words about the supreme authority of the church, a couple of bishops would nevertheless not have had the courage to sign, because in the general opinion such an act would be understood as a criticism of the Pope. These bishops are afraid of being even in the slightest way labelled as critics of the Pope. In my opinion, this is, unfortunately, not an authentic position of a bishop, who is a doctor of faith by Divine law, and not only by the Church's law. The bishops are not employees of the Pope, they are also brothers of the Pope. A brother must be able to say to the Pope when his own conscience says to him, that there is in the behaviour of the Pope something which damages the integrity of the faith, when there is an abuse tolerated by the Pope, which contradicts the constant teaching and the constant practise of the Church in a very important issue, for instance the sacraments, the indissolubility of the marriage, the

---

<sup>41</sup> Pope Francis declared that his private letter of 5 September 2016 to the delegate of the Buenos Aires region of the Argentine Bishops' Conference and the regional bishops' interpretation of *Amoris Laetitia* are "*part of the Church's magisterium*" (AAS 108 (2016) 1071–1074). Hence, there is no doubt that Pope Francis's Apostolic Exhortation *Amoris Laetitia* opened the way for the divorced and civilly remarried to receive Holy Communion without practicing sexual abstinence.

holiness of the Eucharist. In these cases, I think, a bishop should speak openly, of course in a respectful way, even asking the Pope to correct the abuse, which the Pope regrettably himself in some way supports. I think that such a behaviour of bishops towards the Pope should be considered as normal. Unfortunately, we have not yet this climate in the Church. I hope that in the future there will be given a norm in the Code of Canon Law, that states that in really exceptional cases, when a Pope by his words, his deeds and by his omissions in some way contradicts the constant teaching of the Church or weakens it, that in such cases the bishops have not only the right, but the duty to make an admonition to the Pope, a fraternal respectful admonition, either privately, or when it is necessary, even publicly. In my opinion this has to be stated in the future as a norm in the Code of Canon Law. Such a canonical norm will change the entire atmosphere in Church. This will be a benefit for the entire Church, and will be an efficient help also for the Pope himself, so that he will not do things, which will cause confusion in doctrine and in sacramental practice. It should be stated, of course, very carefully and limited only to doctrinal issues or to the sacramental praxis, which was always without interruption observed in the entire Church.

## Conference “Catholic Church: Where are you heading?” (Rome, 7 April 2018)

**Mr. Fülep:** Cardinal Raymond Burke, Cardinal Walter Brandmüller, Cardinal Joseph Zen and Your Excellency were key speakers at a conference in Rome on 7 April 2018. The conference on the Catholic Church: Where are you heading? Only a blind man can deny that there is great confusion in the Church, adopted a declaration highlighting the “contradictory interpretations” of *Amoris Laetitia*, Pope Francis’s apostolic exhortation on the family and the confusion over doctrine and pastoral practice that they say has ensued.<sup>42</sup> The conference drew great attention worldwide. How do you assess the atmosphere of the meeting?

---

<sup>42</sup> The conference, organized by Friends of Cardinal Carlo Caffarra, was one of the last wishes of the archbishop emeritus of Bologna, who died last September. In: <http://www.ncregister.com/blog/edward-pentin/declaration-of-faith-released-defending-church-teaching>.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** The atmosphere was for me very positive. There participated unexpectedly a great number of people. There were even no more sitting places in the conference hall. I heard that there were more than 400 people. It was an atmosphere of family, of a family, in which all members are aware of the common danger. This was for me a gathering of a family, from the little ones to the old ones; all had the sense of responsibility and of concern about the current situation in the Church. In the same time, it was a joyful atmosphere, because the majority were lay people, and they realized that they are not abandoned by the shepherds, because there were two cardinals: Cardinal Brandmüller and Cardinal Burke, and myself, a bishop, and Cardinal Zen joined the conference via a recorded speech. There was an atmosphere from one side, of consolation and of joy and of family. From the other side one could state from the questions and talks that the people were aware of the great confusion, which currently reigns in the Church. These good and simple people were thirsty for clarity in doctrine. This was my impression.

### *Cardinal Brandmüller*

**Mr. Fülep:** The first speaker of the conference was Cardinal Brandmüller, focusing on the right interpretation of the sense of the faith (*sensus fidei*) on the part of the

faithful in connection with John Henry Newman's 1859 essay *On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine*. Amidst the current doctrinal confusion, that is an issue of particularly great relevance. What is the main lesson to be learned from Newman's teaching?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Cardinal Brandmüller quoted in the main part of his statements Cardinal John Henry Newman. Cardinal Newman researched the situation of the Church in the 4th century, when there was the big Arian crisis. Cardinal John Henry Newman formulated in his researches a phrase, which became famous. He said, in the 4th century the Catholic faith was saved more on behalf of the '*ecclesia docta*' than on behalf of the '*ecclesia docens*'.<sup>43</sup> It means that the faith was preserved more on behalf of the simple faithful, rather than by the hierarchy. Cardinal Brandmüller explained further this thought of Newman, and stated, that in matters of faith a majority vote is inadmissible. Even if there is only a numerical minority, but with the true faith, this minority constitutes the true majority, since this minority preserves the immutable faith of all times. Cardinal Brandmüller said, that issues of faith cannot be submitted to some referenda or to the media polls. We have to be careful and

---

<sup>43</sup> *Ecclesia docta* – the Church taught; *Ecclesia docens* – the teaching Church

be independent of the opinions of the media and of other forms of pressure. As I remember, these were the main points of the statement of Cardinal Brandmüller.

### *Cardinal Burke and the formal correction*

**Mr. Fülep:** In an interview<sup>44</sup> of 14 August 2017 of the Catholic magazine *The Wanderer*, Cardinal Raymond Burke confirmed that some of the teachings by Pope Francis “must be” formally “corrected.” As yet, however, this has not been realised and Cardinal Burke did not even refer to it at the conference.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** I think we have to see the finality of formal correction of the Pope in our circumstances. Until now there were made different appeals to the Pope. Before the celebration of the Synod of the Family in 2015, there was an appeal to the Pope from around one million people from all over the world. They asked the Pope not to change the immutable doctrine and praxis of the Church concerning divorced people. Together with Archbishop Tomasz Peta and Archbishop Jan Pawel Lenga I made a public appeal at the beginning

---

<sup>44</sup> <http://thewandererpress.com/catholic/news/frontpage/interview-with-cardinal-burke-discriminating-mercy-defending-christ-and-his-church-with-true-love-2/>.

of 2017 with a prayer that the Pope may clarify the issue of the admittance of divorced and civilly remarried people to Holy Communion, which is indeed the core issue of *Amoris Laetitia*. Then we made a public confession of the truth on 31st of December 2017. And there are still the *dubia* of the four Cardinals,<sup>45</sup> which were not yet answered. It was known all over the world, that the Pope had received the text of the *dubia*, and yet he did nothing. The situation has become worse in spite of all these appeals, the Pope even officially approved last year the norms of the bishops of the Buenos Aires region, which foresee the admittance to Holy Communion of unrepented adulterers in special cases. I think that – humanly speaking – a formal correction will not change the position of the Pope. What is the meaning of a formal correction? One also has to be realistic and prudent, and ask what is the best manner to serve the Church, to help the faithful? When we can foresee that the correction will not have

---

<sup>45</sup> In a letter of 19 September 2016, Cardinals Walter Brandmüller, Raymond L. Burke, Carlo Caffarra and Joachim Meisner applied to Pope Francis for an official and public clarification of the ambiguous statements in the Apostolic Exhortation *Amoris Laetitia* following the two synods on the family. The *Dubia* included five questions, which, however, have not been answered by the Pope. “*Dubium*” is a canonical form of petition where the dilemma presented by the petitioner can simply be clarified by saying yes or no. The Pope or the relevant congregation is not bound by this form: if they find it more convenient, they can elaborate on their arguments.



an effect on the Pope, then, I think, it would be meaningless to make a formal correction. On the other side, we have to do all what we can, the cardinals and bishops, to strengthen the faithful. Therefore, we published several declarations in order to strengthen the faithful. I see no other possibilities for the moment. Of course, the basic requirement is to pray, to pray very intensively for the Pope that God may illuminate him. Then of course, we can hold conferences to stress this theme according to the constant Catholic sense. Maybe we could also make and spread a kind of oath against the most dangerous errors of our time. This could be made maybe by a group of theologians, and then spread. Then individual bishops can with their faithful or parish priests in the parishes publicly profess these Catholic truths. This would be, in my opinion, a concrete and efficacious means of help to address the current doctrinal confusion. The ultimate change comes only when God intervenes, when he illuminates the Pope or when He will give us a future holy and courageous Pope.

## *Papal chair as the “cathedra veritatis”*

**Mr. Fülep:** Your Excellency gave a talk about *The Apostolic Holy See of Rome as Cathedra Veritatis* [the Chair of Truth]. Would you sum up the main points of your presentation?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** I spoke about the chair of the Pope – of Peter or of the Pope it is the same – as a ‘*Cathedra Veritatis*,’ as a chair of the truth. The basic Divine mission of Peter and his successors the popes consists in proclaiming the truth, in handing on the truth integrally, and in defending the truth. *Cathedra* means a place from where someone officially delivers the teaching, this applies specifically to the bishops. The Pope is the bishop of Rome and the supreme teacher. My idea was to recall what is the basic mission of the Pope, of the chair of Rome. It is essentially a chair, a *cathedra*, of truth. I gave some examples of the Church Fathers who had similar expressions. Therefore, we have to invoke the spiritual help from heaven to protect the Pope in his basic duty to proclaim the truth.

## *Papal oath of fidelity to the Tradition*

**Mr. Fülep:** In your presentation you quoted the papal oath. This oath, which was made by 180 popes during their coronation, hasn't been used since Pope Paul VI. Since then popes have not had a coronation ceremony, haven't worn a tiara<sup>46</sup> and haven't taken an oath. To ensure the purity of faith and reinforce the papal office, it would be great to reintroduce the solemn profession of faith by the Pope and the papal oath of tenacious adherence to faith.

---

<sup>46</sup> The tiara or – in other words – triple crown (*triregnum*) is an ancient symbol of power. The triple crown carries a manifold symbolic meaning. First, it refers to the fact that the Roman pontiff is “Father of princes and kings, guide of the world, vicar of our Savior Jesus Christ” (Pontificale Romanum, 1596). Paul VI stopped wearing the tiara in 1964, selling it on auction for the benefit of the poor. Today it is exhibited in the Basilica of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington. From then on the coronation ceremony has been replaced by a “solemn ceremony of the inauguration of a pontificate,” where the Pope puts on the *pallium*. The coat of arms of Pope Benedict XVI includes only the *papal mitre*. The *pallium* and the *infula* as well were originally worn only by the Pope and it was only later that the *pallium* became a symbol of every metropolitan archbishop and the *infula* of a bishop, while the specific sovereign authority of the Pope was embodied by the *triple crown*.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Without doubt, it is necessary. Such an oath is not only good, but necessary. This oath of fidelity to the Tradition was made by the popes throughout a long period of time. It would be of course a help for the faithful and for the bishops to be really confirmed in the integral Catholic faith. An oath of fidelity to the Tradition should be done, of course, also by the bishops. I hope that this papal oath will be codified in the future in Canon Law, so that the new elected Pope will have to make a professional faith and the oath of fidelity to the Tradition before the entire Church.

### *Roman conference – reactions*

**Mr. Fülep:** What was the reception of the conference in April and the final declaration? It was ignored by the mainstream Catholic press. Did you notice any reaction on its merits?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** As we spoke already, the general climate and atmosphere in the episcopacy and among the cardinals is characterized by intimidation. They are intimidated because they are afraid to be labelled as enemies or critics of Pope Francis; so, they are afraid. The career of these bishops depends evidently on the current administration staff in the Vatican and also partly from the pressure of the media and of pub-

lic opinion. There is a general atmosphere of fear and intimidation, and therefore we could not expect some public support or positive reaction. The faithful people and simple priests, however, demonstrated good reactions. They wrote to several participants from all the world letters of gratitude. The bishops remained silent. There was a negative reaction from the newspaper of the episcopal conference of Italy. This newspaper used demagogic expressions, saying that this conference was a revolt against Pope Francis. The newspaper used very unfair demagogic rhetoric. Nevertheless, we have to continue to speak the truth regardless of the reactions we can expect.

## About the message of Our Lady of La Salette

**Mr. Fülep:** Maximin Giraud and Mélanie Calvat, two child shepherds at La Salette, France, reported that on 19 September 1846 the Blessed Virgin appeared to them and entrusted them with a message.<sup>47</sup> She said that in the year 1864 Lucifer, together with a large number of demons,

---

<sup>47</sup> On 19 September 1851, Pope Pius IX formally approved the public devotion and prayers to Our Lady of La Salette, referring to its messages of apparition as secrets. On 24 August 1852, Pope Pius IX once again mentioned the construction of the altar to La Salette. The same papal bull granted the foundation of the Association of Our Lady of La Salette, formalised on 7 September. On 21 August 1879, Pope Leo XIII formally granted a canonical coronation to the Virgin Mary's image at the Basilica of Our Lady of La Salette. A Russian style tiara was granted to the image, instead of the solar-type tiara used in its traditional depictions of Our Lady during her apparitions. The message of the visionaries of La Salette focuses on the conversion of all humanity to Christ. John Vianney, John Bosco, and writer Joris-Karl Huysmans were all influenced by La Salette. The spirit of La Salette is said to be one of prayer, conversion, and commitment.

would be unloosed from hell;<sup>48</sup> they would put an end to faith little by little, even in those dedicated to God. They would blind them in such a way that unless they are blessed with a special grace, they would take on the spirit of these angels of hell; several religious institutions would lose all faith and would lose many souls. (...) The Church would witness a frightful crisis. (...) Rome would lose the faith and become the seat of the Antichrist.<sup>49</sup> Etc. These messages are so relevant today. In your talk you quoted the original text of the exorcism written by Pope Leo XIII in 1884, adding that the dramatic sentence “*Where the Seat of Saint Peter*” was later removed by Pius XI to avoid the scandal of truth. Today, however, this clause seems to be really prophetic. The current crisis of the Chair of Saint Peter was practically predicted by the authentic Marian apparitions at La Salette and Fatima. How is it that everybody, even the popes, fails to see these signs (with Leo XIII as an exception)?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** I think that this part of the message of La Salette is very important for our days in view of this confusion of the loss of faith inside the Church. Pope Leo XIII wrote an exorcism, a prayer to St. Michael the Archangel. Originally, it was a longer version,

---

<sup>48</sup> On 1864 September 28 – The International Workingmen’s Association is founded in London by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

<sup>49</sup> <http://www.thepopeinred.com/secret.htm>

not this short version, which we know. In the longer version there is one expression where Pope Leo XIII himself states in the prayer: “in Rome, in this holy city where the Antichrist established his throne.” It was a mysterious expression. Later this longer version was printed in one edition of the *Rituale Romanum*, I think from the end of the 19th century. However, in the subsequent editions of the *Rituale Romanum* under the pontificate of Pius XI that phrase was cancelled. The expression about the throne of the Antichrist in Rome in the prayer of Pope Leo XIII is similar to an expression in the secret of La Salette. There remains also the question, how to interpret this expression in the secret of La Salette and in the prayer of Pope Leo XIII. Maybe Leo XIII meant the Freemason government in Italy that was established in Rome against the papacy. I don't know. It was not said in the text of the secret of La Salette and in the prayer of Leo XIII that the throne of the Anti-Christ will be in the Vatican, but in Rome. In any case, I think we should take seriously this indication of Our Lady of La Salette, and of Pope Leo XIII about the presence of the evil and of the Antichrist in Rome. The presence of the evil in Rome penetrates to some extent even in the Vatican because there is no guarantee that there will be no infiltrations of the anti-Christian powers in the Vatican. In some way, we can state today that there are evidently some anti-Christian powers who are operating inside the Vatican. We can see this in manifest actions and in conferences, which are organised in the Vatican.



There were several conferences where explicit atheists and promoters of abortion and of the homosexual ideology were invited by Vatican authorities to speak. These are already clear signs that there is an infiltration even inside the Vatican of the anti-Christian powers.

## John XXIII and the Second Vatican Council

**Mr. Fülep:** You also quoted Pope John XXIII, who said that “*All evils have one source: the ignorance of truth.*”<sup>50</sup> Unfortunately, there are not many people who really know Pope John XXIII, who is usually praised for opening the Council. Many of his teachings have largely been “forgotten.”<sup>51</sup> To understand the Second Vatican Council correctly, should we possibly start to get acquainted with the real “icons” of the Council, that is, the popes and the prominent bishops and theologians?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** The authentic intention of Pope John XXIII in convoking the Council was of a primarily pastoral character. Hence, he did not intend that the Council would make final doctrinal statements

---

<sup>50</sup> Pope John XXIII, encyclical *Ad Petri Cathedram*, 29 June 1959, 1–2.

<sup>51</sup> Such is John XXIII’s Apostolic Constitution *Veterum Sapientia* on the Latin language (22 Feb. 1962) [https://w2.vatican.va/content/john-xxiii/la/apost\\_constitutions/1962/documents/hf\\_j-xxiii\\_apc\\_19620222\\_veterum-sapientia.html](https://w2.vatican.va/content/john-xxiii/la/apost_constitutions/1962/documents/hf_j-xxiii_apc_19620222_veterum-sapientia.html)

or bring a final solution to theological discussions (such as e.g. the theme of episcopal collegiality). The Council had to explain the Catholic truths in a way that would be better understood by the unbelievers of our time, yet avoiding thereby any doctrinal ambiguity. Unfortunately the group of liberal minded bishops and theologians, who were supporters of a doctrinal relativism, that is of that kind of modernism that was condemned by Pius X, gained such an influence that they practically took over the strategic positions in the commissions and also in the leadership structures of the Council. The famous books of R. Wiltgen "*The Rhine Flows in the Tiber*" and of R. de Mattei "*The Second Vatican Council – An Unwritten Story*" offer plenty documentary proofs. The true Catholic protagonists of the Council were the minority, which was gathered in the "*Coetus Patrum Internationalis*", organized mostly by the efforts of Archbishop Geraldo Sigaud from Brazil and of Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre. Thanks to this courageous minority, many dangerous and ambiguous doctrinal formulations in the texts of the Council could be corrected. The very prominent persons and theologians in the Council were those bishops and theologians who were courageously fighting for the clarity and the integrity of the Catholic truths in the texts of the Council and for the maintenance of continuity with the constant doctrinal, liturgical and disciplinary practice of the Church. It remains enigmatic, how John XXIII and Paul VI could promote to key positions in the leadership struc-

tures of the Council and in its commissions those ecclesiastics (bishops, cardinals, theologians) who were known as sympathizers of a modernist and relativistic theology.

## About the new rite of ordinations

**Mr. Fülep:** Valid and legitimate ordination of priests and bishops is vital for the Church. Validity of the new ordination rites introduced by Pope Paul VI is of primary importance. Leo XIII said that the Anglican rite is invalid because the Anglican rite of ordination does not refer to all the major impacts of ordination explicitly.<sup>52</sup> This is embarrassing because it is true for the new Catholic practice of ordination, too.<sup>53</sup> How are the new ordination rites to be assessed?

---

<sup>52</sup> “...the sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, ought both to signify the grace which they effect, and effect the grace which they signify.” (DH 3315; cf. 3316–3319)

<sup>53</sup> The former practice of ordination clearly reflected the Church’s teaching on priesthood based on offering the Eucharistic sacrifice and the power to forgive sins. In his encyclical “*Ad catholici sacerdotii*”, Pope Pius XI still confirms explicitly: “*Primarily, the priest’s power lies in consecration, offering the Eucharistic sacrifice and dispensing the Blood and Body of Christ, secondarily in forgiving sins and proclaiming the Word of God.*” In the new rite they appear at best vaguely. The priest is seen as a presbyter rather than a sacerdos. A new theological approach is gaining ground: the new texts – like the Novus Ordo Mass, NOM – seem to meet Protestant requirements.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Pope Paul VI changed the sacramental form only of the episcopal consecration. The sacramental form of the priestly and diaconal ordination remained the same. To administer a sacrament validly there is necessary valid matter, valid form, and the intention to do what the Church does. In this case, the question is only of the form. Actually, Paul VI took the sacramental form of the episcopal ordination from of the Byzantine Rite. The popes always through history recognised the validity of the Byzantine episcopal consecration. I don't see a doctrinal problem in the sacramental form of episcopal ordination, introduced by Paul VI. The same Pope took the sacramental form of the sacrament of Confirmation from the Byzantine rite. However, the Catholic Church always recognised the validity of the Confirmation in the Byzantine church. Hence, the theory that says the new rite of episcopal ordination is invalid is without foundation and is not serious.

**Mr. Fülep:** Pope Leo XIII says that Anglican ordinations are invalid because they are incomplete, that is, the very essence of priesthood is not referred to explicitly. The main parts of the new ordination rites seem to be less clear than formerly. Isn't there a fatal similarity between the Anglican ordination rite and that introduced by Paul VI?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** It is not similar at all. The new rite of episcopal ordination is completely Catholic. The Anglicans changed the rite of episcopal ordination in the protestant sense without mention of the Eucharistic sacrifice and the priesthood. Therefore, their ordination is surely invalid, because of the objective defect of the right intention. In the case of the reform of the ordination rites made by Paul VI, there are sufficient references to the doctrine of the Catholic priesthood and the true sacrifice of the Eucharist.

## Marxism and Communism

**Mr. Fülep:** European Commission president Jean-Claude Juncker opened a series of exhibitions in Karl Marx's hometown of Trier on 4th May 2018. They include a huge bronze statue of Marx donated by China. It was officially unveiled on 5 May, the 200th anniversary of the birth of Marx. The sculpture of Marx proves to be somewhat controversial but Jean-Claude Juncker spoke in positive terms about him.<sup>54</sup> China's opinion is understandable, but it is absurd and scandalous that the European Commission president should say that Marx was just a "philosopher" without any heavy responsibility. The first sentence of the Communist Manifesto reads as follows:<sup>55</sup> "A spectre is haunting Europe – the spectre of communism." Within two generations (1917-1987) communism occupied one

---

<sup>54</sup> "Karl Marx was a forward-thinking philosopher with creative aspirations," he said. "Today he stands for things which he is not responsible for and which he didn't have anything to do with, because many of the things he wrote were redrafted to mean just the opposite."

<sup>55</sup> The Communist Manifesto (originally Manifesto of the Communist Party) is an 1848 political pamphlet by German philosophers Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.



third of the world. It was only Christianity and Islam that spread at such a speed before. Undoubtedly, communism led to atheism, persecution of the Church, apostasy, the suffering and death of one hundred million people<sup>56</sup> worldwide. Your Excellency has had plenty of opportunity to experience communism here in Kazakhstan. The Catholic Church has been an ardent opponent of Marxist ideology from the very beginning. While we see documentaries about Hitler, Nazism and the persecution of the Jews almost every day, monuments are erected in commemoration of them everywhere, offenders are called to account, compensations are paid, the hundred million victims of communism are almost completely forgotten, socialists are in power almost everywhere in Europe, and the president of the EU erects a huge statue of Marx.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Yes, to me this behaviour of these politicians you mentioned demonstrates in some way that they outed themselves. The European Union leadership is, basically, neo-communist. By these actions they outed themselves. Before they tried to hide these by changing their names, by giving to their parties other names. The European Union is in my opinion

---

<sup>56</sup> According to the Black Book of Communism (*Le Livre noir du communisme*), Communism is responsible for 100 millions of deaths. Source: Stéphane Courtois-Nicolas Werth-Jean-Louis Panné-Andrzej Paczkowski-Karel Bartosek-Jean-Louis Margolin. *Le livre noir du communisme*. Éditions Robert Laffont, Paris, 1997.

a successive form of neo-communism and neo-Marxism, which in some way continues the ideology, a kind of state ideology, as it was in the former Soviet Union. Now we have a new Soviet Union in the European Union. The European Union is a kind of new Soviet Union with a clear state ideology. Marxism is ultimately an ideology against family. There are some remarks in the writings of Marx and Engels, where they say that the ultimate goal of communism will be to abolish all differences, and even the differences in family, and consequently to abolish family. Because according to Marx the family is the last bourgeois institution. Now, the European Union is fulfilling and realising this goal of Marx and Engels that means to destroy the family, and the last differences inside the family. We have now the new gender ideology, which destroys family and disfigures human nature. In this we can see the last step of Marxism and neo-communism. They give themselves a new name. They will be not so naïve as to name themselves neo-Marxists or neo-Communists. They use other names, maybe “new democrats” and so on. The Communists also used for themselves the name “democrats”. China calls itself a “democratic republic”, but there is no democracy there at all. The Soviet Union and the east bloc countries always spoke that they have true democracy, and that in the capitalist countries there was no democracy. I was in school in the communist time and I remember still that in the 5th grade we had to learn that the true democracy is in the Soviet Union,

in communism. We are now observing by these facts and deeds that we have in the European Union a kind of a new Soviet Union. We have to say this and to spread this in order to unmask them, showing that they are the new and the extreme face of communism and Marxism.

**Mr. Fülep:** Is it then more than the mere survival of Communism?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** I would not say that Communism returned in new clothes, but that there is a further development of Marxism, a further, qualitative development of the degradation of humanity.

**Mr. Fülep:** The most recent phase of Marxism, which has produced feminism and gender ideology, is just as devastating as the previous one. It attacks life indirectly when it challenges the moral and natural basis of marriage and sexuality and directly when it promotes contraception and abortion. The real disaster, however, is that distracting you from eternal salvation it kills your spirit.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> "Do not be afraid of those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul; fear him rather who can destroy both body and soul in hell" (Matt. 10:28.)

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Yes. The communists of course killed the body, but also the soul with materialism and with atheism. The new communism and Marxism of the European Union with gender ideology is spread almost in the entire world. It is directed and orchestrated by world political powers, primarily by the United Nations Organization. This is the case also in United States, not only in Europe. It is a common program and basically a masonic program. Today they do not kill the body, but they do kill the soul in a worse manner than the communists of the Soviet Union. Because they are now perverting the very concept of nature and of the human being. At least in the Soviet communism time there was still in some way recognised the natural law as the difference between man and woman. It was in the Soviet time in the entire East bloc countries and especially in the Soviet Union, that for example homosexuality was unthinkable. It was really officially also said, it is against human nature. Even though they taught us atheism in school, but we were told also that homosexuality is against nature, and it is against reason, it has to be forbidden. Nowadays the neo-communists, neo-Marxists in the world, in the European Union, want really to destroy the meaning of nature itself. We are facing now a direct revolt against God. It is more dangerous than the political revolt by the historical communists.

# The consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary

**Mr. Fülep:** The heavy legacy of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin still casts a dark shadow over the whole world. Russia has managed to spread its fallacies everywhere because, unfortunately, Russia has not been consecrated to the Immaculate Heart of Mary the way the Blessed Virgin wanted<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> “In August 1941 Sister Lúcia wrote her third memoir in which she described the apparition of 13 July 1917. She said that the Virgin told them: *‘God wishes to establish in the world devotion to my Immaculate Heart. If what I say to you is done, many souls will be saved and there will be peace. ...I shall come to ask for the consecration of Russia to my Immaculate Heart. If my requests are heeded, Russia will be converted, and there will be peace. If not, she will spread her errors throughout the world, causing wars and persecutions of the Church. The good will be martyred, the Holy Father will have much to suffer, various nations will be annihilated. In the end, my Immaculate Heart will triumph. The Holy Father will consecrate Russia to me, and she will be converted, and a period of peace will be granted to the world.’*” Source: <https://www.ewtn.com/library/mary/firstsat.htm>

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** I don't know exactly. But one fact is sure, that Our Lady of Fatima did not ask to consecrate the entire world, but only Russia. I think that an explicit consecration of Russia should be done by the Pope, in the form Our Lady asked: by the Pope in the moral unity with the entire episcopate. I think it should be done, and I believe that there will flow then more graces for humanity. Of course, as you said, Russia is not converted. However, we can see that it is converted partly, because the persecutions stopped, and even the state now, the government supports the Church, the Orthodox Church, though it is a Christian Church. One can see a revival of the Orthodox Church. We can speak of partial, not the full conversion. Because the full conversion means to be converted, and to be converted means to have the truth, the full truth, and this is the Catholic faith. As long as the Orthodox are not united with Peter, with the Pope, they are not in the full truth, therefore there is not yet a full conversion.

**Mr. Fülep:** The conversion of Russia can only be its coming back to the community of the only Church of Christ, that is, the Catholic Church.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Exactly. I repeat: to be converted means the full truth. The full truth is to be united with Peter, the Pope of Rome.

**Mr. Fülep:** I wonder what a marvellous role a Catholic Russia could play in the triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary based on its impact on Asia and the Orthodox Church.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** I don't know. It is more a speculation. We have no basis to know exactly this. It could be. We can only speak of a possibility. We don't know how God directs history, and history is depending on the free will of man, on the collaboration with God. There cannot be a prophecy that has a 100% execution in the future. Because there are factors that happen in the future, and that depend on the free will of the people who act in history. This is an important aspect. What does the conversion of Russia mean? It is not only to be converted to Christ in some way, but to be converted to the full Catholic faith. This we have to state, I think. Such a conversion of the Orthodox Russian Church would have without doubt beneficial consequences for the entire Church and for humanity.



*“The full conversion means  
... to have the truth,  
the full truth, and this  
is the Catholic faith.”*



# Revolution and the Republic

**Mr. Fülep:** When the thought is separated from truth, words lose their original meaning. The Catholic faithful must beware. To think rightly, the original meaning of words must be restored. For example, the term “revolution” has been used incorrectly in a positive sense since the Reformation and the French Revolution. Theologically, however, revolution is opposing the order established by God. The first revolutionist is Satan himself, who causes uproar against God. Genuine revolutions are always against order, while battles restoring order are counter-revolutions.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> In this sense, the Protestant revolution (1517), the silent revolution of establishing the Grand Lodge of London (1717), the French revolution (1789–1799) and the Great October Socialist Revolution (1917) were genuine revolutions because they were against Christ and the Church. Nevertheless, the Hungarian uprising of 1956, for example, was started to overthrow the usurping communist dictatorship and is therefore to be theologically considered as a counter-revolution because it was aimed to restore the order established by God. Comrades were actually right to see the events of '56 as theoretically opposed to the communist revolution of 1917.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Yes, of course, it is very important to state this, really. Revolution means to change the order established by God. The first revolutionary was Satan, and he inspired all other revolutions. There is a very good book about this idea, the title is: *Revolution and Counter-revolution by Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira*.

**Mr. Fülepi:** Yes, I must tell you that my question was directly inspired by the excellent book of Correa de Oliveira.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** I would recommend reading this book. The author gave a very deep and clear and convincing analysis of the concept of revolution throughout human history. I think that it would be worthwhile to spread the book of Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> Originally published as *Revolução e Contra-Revolução*, the Brazilian cultural journal *Catolicismo* in April 1959 (Parts I and II) and in January 1977 (Part III). Plínio Correa de Oliveira, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution – If the Revolution is disorder, the Counter-Revolution is the restoration of Order*, the American TFP, 2008, magyarul: *Forradalom és ellenforradalom – Ha a Forradalom rendellenesség, akkor az Ellenforradalom a Rend helyreállítása*, Austrian TFP, 2014. E-book in Hungarian: [https://www.pliniocorreadeoliveira.info/RCR\\_Hungary.pdf](https://www.pliniocorreadeoliveira.info/RCR_Hungary.pdf)

**Mr. Fülep:** By the end of the 19th century, the Magisterium of the Church and the bishops seem to be reluctant to specify the exact nature of revolutions.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** They did, the popes, especially Pope Leo XIII, and other popes till the Second Vatican Council, they spoke very clearly about the wrong revolution, about the meaning of revolution.

### *The policy of “ralliement” of Leo XIII*

**Mr. Fülep:** What I wanted to say is that the same Pope Leo XIII already supports the idea of the republic explicitly.<sup>61</sup> The project of the republic is also revolutionary opposing hierarchy and monarchy. Human demands take the place of the Divine laws as the main point of reference. According to the principle of the sovereignty of the peoples' rule, which is based on Enlightenment, the authority of a state and its government is created and sustained by the consent of its people, who are the source of all political power. How is this to be reconciled with Catholic faith and truth?

---

<sup>61</sup> Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII *Au milieu des sollicitudes* (*Inter Sollicitudines*), 16 February 1892.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Well, it was more a political decision of the Pope, than a spiritual decision. He wanted to have peace with the French government in those times, in the end of the 19th century. In those times that government was very anticlerical, very Masonic. There was a resistance among the political and social Catholic block against this radically anti-Christian French government. The Catholics were mostly organised as the monarchists. They had no real alternative. Unfortunately, the French Masonic government made so much pressure on the Pope that the Pope yielded. In my opinion, it was a mistake on the part of the Pope. It was the so-called “ralliement.” The Pope ordered the French Catholics to accept in obedience the current structure of the French republic and its government. In my opinion, it was an abuse of power of the Pope. He cannot command in something that is not his mission. Christ gave him authority to command the faithful in obedience only in matters of faith and morals and not in matters that are neutral and that belong to the social aspect of public life. He is the teacher of faith first. Of course, he can pronounce himself about social problems, but not to the extent to command people in obedience in matters that are of social and political character. The majority of the French Catholics in those times were monarchists, and, of course, this was legitimate, And the Pope said that one can be monarchist or also republican in general terms. Of course, there could be also a Christian Catholic republic.

**Mr. Fülep:** Supposing that people believe in God, obey Christ and the Church, and the state takes the Divine Law as a starting point.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** The radical masonic and anti-clerical French government of those times weakened the validity of the Divine Law and Catholic Faith in society. After the “ralliement”, ordered by the Pope, the united social political block of the Catholics started to be fragmented. This weakened the entire political power of French Catholicism very much, unfortunately. Thus, we see the error in the political decision of Pope Leo XIII. In theory, this Pope was very strong and clear in doctrine, and he even issued an encyclical against Freemasonry, against all the errors of his time, his are very precious encyclicals, we have to state this. On a practical level, however, Leo XIII in some way started already the wrong principle to separate doctrine from practice.

## The very essence of modernism: separating of doctrine from practice

**Mr. Fülep:** What led to the separation of faith and practice?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** The principle of separation of doctrine from practice started, in my opinion, with the “ralliement.” It means the obligation imposed by Leo XIII on all French Catholics to accept the radical anti-clerical French Government. Seventy years later John XXIII again took up this idea and realized it through the program of the Second Vatican Council. John XXIII said that the doctrine is one thing, which is immutable, and the other thing is the explanations of the doctrine and the practical applications, which could be adapted to our time. This is true, of course as a principle. However, the separation between doctrine and practice was developed after the Council until our days to such an extent, that we state now obvious contradictions between the doctrine and the practice in the life of the Church. This is in my opinion not a good approach because since the time of Jesus Christ, Our Lord himself and the Apostles and

the Church always stated that the practice has to conform with the doctrine, always. If a concrete praxis weakens the doctrine, that praxis has to be corrected.

# Freemasonry

**Mr. Fülep:** Today Freemasonry is largely considered a ridiculous conspiracy theory with no major impact,<sup>62</sup> although its specific symbols and ideology often come up

---

<sup>62</sup> The faithful do not take the menace of freemasonry seriously partly because for some time even the Church has kept quiet about it. After it was banned for many centuries, the new CIC does not even refer to it overtly. What's more, even church members maintain explicit relations with Freemasonry. (e.g. the day after Pope Francis was elected, the Grand Orient of Italy /Grande Oriente D'Italia/ issued a solemn declaration, congratulating him and expressing its great expectations.) The emblematic notions of Freemasonry are often used by the Holy See itself.

Freemasonry was explicitly banned by Clement XII, Benedict XIV, Leo XII, Gregory XVI, Pius IX and Leo XIII. As per Canon 2335 under 1917 CIC (*"Nomen dantes sectae massonicae aliisve eiusdem generis associationibus quae contra Ecclesiam vel legitimas civiles potestates machinantur, contrahunt ipso facto excommunicationem Sedi Apostolicae simpliciter reservatam"*), Catholics associated with Masonry or similar organisations were automatically, i.e. *latae sententia*, excommunicated, which could only be lifted by the Apostolic See. The 1983 CIC, however, does not mention Freemasonry, thus excommunication lapsed pursuant to points 6.k. 1. and 3. Nevertheless, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued a declaration on 26 November 1983 confirming



in the world and the Church, let alone other secret societies. Not only Christ but also the devil has his own followers. Next to the city of God, there is the city of the devil. Wheat and cockle grow together. We Catholics may have to take it more seriously that the powers of darkness also have real and efficient worldly structures.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Freemasonry is very much organised in different social and political networks, and it is naïve to deny this. It is against evidence. Freemasonry is a powerful organisation all over the world. In order to close the eyes of the people, Freemasons say that they exist only to do a humanitarian work. Through such a tactic of deceit, they can work more effectively with their Anti-Christian plan; and they do it. Their tactic is to infiltrate organizations and even the Church, rather than to fight directly and frontally against them. Their tactic, their military tactic, is to infiltrate. In a war it is really more intelligent to infiltrate the enemies than to fight them directly. It is a more efficient and intelligent tactic. The Freemasons do this, because they have the prudence of the flesh, and not of God. There were in history, in the 19th century and in other times also, priests and bishops who confessed themselves members of Freemasonry. In other cases, there were very clear indications that a priest

---

that Freemasonry is irreconcilable with true faith and reinforced the ban thereon.

or a bishop belonged to Freemasonry. In our time, we cannot deny the fact that there exist secret clerical groups or cliques, who are in some way linked to Freemasonry and who receive orders from Freemasonry. Such clerical cliques linked to Freemasonry, even if they formally do not belong to it, have a hidden power in the Church, specifically in order to promote their candidates to very high ecclesiastical positions (episcopate, cardinalate) and in order to have in that way more influence. This is the prudence of flesh, and Our Lord said that the children of darkness, the children of the world, are more prudent than the children of the light. Such clerical cliques or networks mask themselves with another name. In case they will be asked if they are Freemasons, they can say 'No' without lying directly. Even though they have another name, they have nevertheless the spirit of Freemasonry. This spirit is naturalism and a complete doctrinal and moral relativism. There are today cardinals, bishops or priests who advocate naturalism and who make the main concern of the work of the Church as consisting in the care of earthly and temporal realities. When the same clerics promote relativism, saying that all religions are in some way equal and all are going the same way, they are advocating clear Masonic ideas. When the same clerics promote the acceptance of homosexuality and of gender ideology, they are realizing the clear Masonic agenda. One cannot exclude the fact that in our time even bishops or cardinals are members of an important real

Freemasonic lodge, which helped them in their ecclesiastical career, which gives them their ideological orders and which provides them with worldly honours and pleasures. Some of these clerics, when they open their mouth, start to speak a typical Masonic language, or in a Masonic spirit at least. The problem with Freemasonry is that it is so cunningly secret, that you cannot have the documentary proofs of all their members. One has no access to their personal files, they will not give anyone access to these archives. We can only, with great probability, assume that a concrete person is a member of Freemasonry. Some of the Freemasons, even some politician, confess sometimes publicly that they are members of Freemasonry, this they can do, because the Freemason authority gave them the permission to do it or because they have nothing to lose.

**Mr. Fülep:** We, Hungarians, who live in the Carpathian Basin in the middle of Europe, have a first-hand experience of the profound impact of freemasonry ideas on international politics mainly in connection with the institutions of the European Union. Freemasonry significantly influences not only the USA but also the EU, strongly controlling legislation and sanctioning policy. By destroying faith, morality and nature it wants to transform fully society.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** I think it is useful for me to speak about Freemasonry, because they are the operators behind the scenes, in order to de-christianise Europe, and to spread naturalism, relativism, and even the new gender ideology. In France for instance, some known Freemasons confess publicly that they are promoting abortion, gender ideology and the new migration policy. It would be important and useful to speak about the real and concrete aims of Freemasonry and to warn people and Catholics from entering a Masonic organization. It would be good to expose the principle ideas of Freemasonry. So, then people will see and say: "Ah, this is very similar to what is now going on inside the life of the Church. There is a predominant influence of naturalism, of doctrinal and moral relativism and of anthropocentrism, since these are the ideological pillars of Freemasonry, in whose centre there is man and not God." These three aspects of anthropocentrism, naturalism and relativism characterise very much the current life of the Church since the Second Vatican Council.

**Mr. Fülep:** Some of the faithful do not know whether Freemasonry is worth dealing with. They find it too complex to assess. For me, however, the real reason why they avoid the question is that they want to spare themselves

the effort of thought. Is it useful for us to identify and name ill-intentioned secret societies and other evil mechanisms in the world?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Yes, and therefore we have to say this, because in our days we can see how Freemason powers or other similar powers inside the Church openly state that Freemasonry and Catholicism can be mutually reconciled. This is an attempt to reach the goal that the Catholic Church also has to be open to the spirit of Freemasonry. Therefore, we have to elaborate and to state the true spirit of Freemasonry and their aims on the base of documents. There exists a very good book, a recent book from last year, written by the Spanish author Alberto Bárcena, who was before a member of Freemasonry. He wrote an excellent book (“Iglesia y Masonería. Las dos ciudades”) with documentations of the spirit, of the rites, of the principles and of the activities of Freemasonry since their foundation until now. This is very solid and serious study. So, I would recommend such studies. It would be good to publish a short synthesis about Freemasonry for the people.

## The Church as a perfect society and the State

**Mr. Fülep:** In legal terms, the Catholic Church is a perfect society (*societas perfecta*): not a branch of the state, but an *entirely independent entity, which has all the necessary resources and conditions to achieve its specific goal*.<sup>63</sup> As a result of the Church' own self-definition, the

---

<sup>63</sup> The Magisterium started to use the term “*perfect society*” in the middle of the 19th century. It was Pope Pius IX (1846–1878), who first referred to the Church as a perfect society in his apostolic letter *Cum Catholica Ecclesia* in 1860. Protecting the rights of the Church, Pope Pius IX calls the Church a perfect society in *Singulari quadam* (1854), *Multis gravibusque* (1860), *Maxima quidem laetitia* (1862) and *Vix dum a nobis* (1874). Point 19 of *Syllabus errorum* (1864) dismisses the notion that the Church is not a perfect society. Pope Leo XIII uses the term in his encyclical letters *Diuturnum illud* on the origin of civil power (1881), *Immortale Dei* on the Christian constitution of states (1885) and *Sapientiae christianae* on Christians as citizens (1890). The First Vatican Council did not use the term, which is, however, probably due to the interruption of the council because it is included in the draft documents on the Church. Although the term “*perfect society*” is not contained in the CIC of 1917, it is part of the first sentence of

Church has indirect power over the state (*subordinatio indirecta*).<sup>64</sup> I hope, I am not very much mistaken to say that the Church exercises all the legitimate forms of government: its main structure is monarchical and hierarchical, corresponding to the Divine order and human nature, it has an aristocracy, it acts as a dictator if necessary and – within specific bounds – it is democratic.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Yes, the perfect society is the spiritual, not temporal one. There is nature and grace, we have to distinguish these, the Church is a supernatural organisation. She is a supernatural reality to live in Christ and guide all the people in the body of Christ to their final aim, to heaven, to eternity. I would say that nature itself has a monarchical structure. These are the laws of the nature. When you see all the organisms, the living organisms, they are completely hierarchical, in some way monarchically structured. You are a qualified biologist,<sup>65</sup> you know better, nature is organised and structured from the high to low. We have in nature a demonstration for the hierarchical and monarchical principle. Only God is

---

the Apostolic Constitution *Providentissima mater ecclesia* by Pope Benedict XV introducing the Codex. Through its supreme Magisterium, the Church regularly used the term until the time of Pope Pius XII.

<sup>64</sup> Ottaviani, A., *Institutiones iuris publici ecclesiastici*, vol. II, Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis 1947, 140.

<sup>65</sup> The interviewer is a qualified biologist.

in Himself not hierarchical. Monarchy means, that there is a supreme principle or being, who rules the others. God, the Three-personal God, is one who rules all things. Hence, we can see that the entire universe is monarchical, because there is a supreme monarch, and this is the Most Holy Trinity. Only inside the Holy Trinity there is no hierarchy, because the three Divine Persons are equal. Outside God, that means all that is created, is constituted in a hierarchical and monarchical structure, hence not in a democratic structure. All the spiritual realities are hierarchical: the angels in the order of their choirs, and so is the Church. There is the Pope, the bishops, the priests, the lay faithful, they all are hierarchically structured, a structure which ultimately culminates in the monarchical Divinely established structure of the one supreme shepherd with universal pastoral authority even over his brothers in the episcopacy, the bishops. Monarchy means that there is a supreme governor. It is God, who is ultimately the supreme governor. Therefore, from this point of view of the creation we already have a demonstration that the best human form of living together should be a monarchical form. Of course, the monarchy can also be realised in different forms, parliamentary monarchy, constitutional monarchy, a monarchy with the participation of the people through referendums or consultations. The monarchical principle and structure itself, should be, in my opinion, realized, if possible, also in the political organization of a nation.



**Mr. Füle:** This should be strongly emphasized again in the social teaching of the Church. Democracy controlled by secular, liberal and generally secret oligarchies won't work. Truth cannot be subject to majority vote and power relations. A healthy society is hierarchical, deriving both truth and power from Christ and the Church.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Of course. This is the question of the social kingship of Jesus Christ. He has to be the king of all societies, even of the temporal society. This was always the conviction since the ancient times. It was especially St Augustine and also the other Fathers of the Church who said that the political authority has to recognise Christ as their Lord, and follow His rules in the realization of temporal society. Until the Second Vatican Council the popes taught very clearly about the social kingship of Christ.

## *Ecclesia Militans* (Church militant)

**Mr. Fülep:** I think we should be more aware that as long as we live on earth, we are part of the Church militant (*Ecclesia militans*). We must be continually struggling with sin and temptation to attain eternal salvation.<sup>66</sup> There is a cruel war between the kingdom of God and the powers of darkness for the salvation of our souls. We must struggle as soldiers of Christ.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** The Church is militant by her nature. Jesus Christ came, says the Holy Scripture, to destroy the power and the works of the devil. The entire existence and mission of the Church has to be also a fight against the devil, against sins. Therefore, every Christian has to be always in the fight. The Apostle

---

<sup>66</sup> The Church is traditionally divided into the Church Militant consisting of Christians on earth who struggle against sin and the devil (*Ecclesia militans*), the Church Penitent consisting of those in Purgatory (*Ecclesia patiens*), and the Church Triumphant consisting of those possessing the beatific vision in Heaven (*Ecclesia triumphans*). Following Christ is accompanied by earthly struggles. “Do not suppose that I have come to bring peace to the earth: it is not peace I have come to bring, but a sword” (Matt 10:34).

Paul said this to the first Christians. It is especially the sacrament of confirmation that arms the Christian souls with the gifts of the Holy Spirit in order to fight the good battle of Christian life and to be a soldier of Christ. We have to develop this truth again very much. We cannot be naïve and let ourselves be conquered by the spirit of the world, who says there is always peace and harmony. There is no peace here on earth, as long there is sin, as long the devil prowls around like a roaring lion. However, we witness in our time the biggest war that humanity ever had. This is the war of the mass killing of innocent babies in their mothers' wombs. This war became worse with artificial fertilisation, where embryos in mass are frozen and then destroyed. Yet, these embryos are human beings, who have an immortal soul. This is an incredible war industry. I think we have to be aware again that the Church is the militant church.

## About the priesthood and female ordination

**Mr. Fülep:** Cardinal Christoph Schönborn has clarified his views on female ordination, saying that women priests would be “*too profound a change*”. However, he signalled his support for the introduction of deaconesses.<sup>67</sup> Shortly afterwards, cardinal-designate Luis Ladaria, Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, wrote a strongly-worded article in Vatican newspaper L’Osservatore Romano, saying that the prohibition on women being ordained to the priesthood is “definitive.”<sup>68</sup> Archbishop Luis

---

<sup>67</sup> In an interview with Austrian news site OE24, the Archbishop of Vienna said that while there were female deacons in the early Church, he did not foresee a female priesthood in the future. “*Ordination [of women] is a question that surely can only be settled by a Council*,” he told Die Presse. “*A Pope cannot decide this by himself. This is too large a question for it to be settled from the desk of a Pope.*”

<https://www.sn.at/politik/innenpolitik/kardinal-schoenborn-im-oster-interview-ein-konzil-fuer-die-rolle-der-frau-26058967>

<sup>68</sup> <http://www.catholicherald.co.uk/news/2018/06/20/cardinal-schonborn-women-priests-too-profound-a-change-for-the-church/> Archbishop Luis Ladaria cites the writings of Pope John Paul II, who taught in *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis* that the Church

Ladaria cites the writings of Pope John Paul II, who taught in *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis* that the Church cannot ordain women, as well as the current Pontiff, who in *Evangelii Gaudium* confirmed the male-only priesthood. This teaching, the CDF prefect said, is “*a truth belonging to the deposit of faith*”. How is it that one who was editorial secretary for the 1992 Catechism of the Catholic Church, *does not understand that this* question is not open for discussion?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** It is very sad that a cardinal of the Church speaks ultimately against the definitive truth of the Church, which Pope John Paul II stated, namely that the Church has no competency to allow female ordinations. This doctrine is definitive and unchanging, declared John Paul II. A cardinal cannot pronounce publicly his doubt about the doctrinal statement of John Paul II. Such a cardinal contradicts the constant teaching of the Church when he says the issue could be again discussed. It cannot be discussed. John Paul II has referred only to the priestly ordination, and inclusively of course to the episcopal ordination, but did not mention the diaconal ordination. The truth of the sacrament of ordination says that there is only one sacrament of or-

---

cannot ordain women, as well as the current Pontiff, who in *Evangelii Gaudium* confirmed the male-only priesthood. This teaching, the CDF prefect said, is “*a truth belonging to the deposit of faith*.” <https://www.catholicculture.org/news/headlines/index.cfm?storyid=37098>

dination, not three sacraments of ordination. The Second Vatican Council stated that the diaconate is also sacramental, it's a part of the sacrament of ordination.

Therefore, the diaconate being a part of the sacrament, it cannot be conferred to women, as there cannot be conferred to women the other two parts of the sacrament, i.e. the presbyterial and episcopal ordinations. You cannot give one part to women, and not the two other parts. It would be a contradiction of the meaning of the sacrament of ordination itself. From this point of view, it is also theologically impossible to ordain women deacons. We have sufficient proofs and documents from the Church history about the so-called female deacons in the ancient Church. They had a special prayer for ordination, not the same as for men. The Church was aware that it is not the same. The ancient formulas of the ordination of deaconesses were not sacramental, they were similar to the formulas of the consecration of virgins or of abbesses in the Roman Pontifical. In some rare cases, mostly in the Oriental churches, the deaconesses could approach the altar or take the Holy Sacrament. Today also women can go during Mass to the tabernacle and to the altar and take the Holy Sacrament and distribute it to the faithful, even without being ordained a deaconess, and without even being an instituted acolyte. There is, therefore, nothing surprising when in ancient times in some cases deaconesses could touch the Holy Sacrament or the altar.

However, even in the Oriental churches they never proclaimed the gospel during the Eucharistic Sacrifice. There existed in the Latin Church a custom with the Carthusian nuns, who could proclaim the gospel in Matins, in the Divine Office, however not during Mass. They could wear the maniple and the stole, so did the prioress of the Carthusians. This was the only exception in the Latin Church. However, this is not a convincing argument in favour of a female diaconate. There was not a prayer of ordination for these Carthusian nuns, and it was not a general use in the Church. The Latin Church has never had deaconesses. When there is something in the Church established by Divine Right, it has to be always and everywhere. So it was the case with the deacons, the male deacons, the priests and bishops; they existed always and everywhere. This is a clear sign of the Divine institution. The prayers of ordination of a deacon and institution of a deaconess were substantially different, and the institute of deaconesses was not everywhere and not always, but only in a limited time and in some specific places.

**Mr. Fülep:** It is important to note that the current terminology of sacramentology is the result of a centuries-long process. The term “deaconess” is clearly found in some documents of the early Church, but it refers to women who assisted in baptising other women or attending female patients and never entailed altar service or ordination.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Of course there are plenty documents, we do not have to enter into these details. I would only mention also the terminological aspect. In Gallia (now France), for instance, in the 6th-8th centuries there was a custom to call the wife of a deacon *diacona*. However, she was not ordained, she was called in this way only because she was the wife of the deacon. The wife of a priest was called *presbytera*, and the wife of a bishop was called *episcopa*. In the first millennium married men were ordained even to priest, to bishop even in the Latin Church; however they were obliged to live in perfect continence from the moment of the ordination. This local custom from Gallia is not a demonstration for the ordination of female priests or bishops.



## About the scandal of intercommunion with Protestants

**Mr. Fülep:** As is known, Protestant spouses of the Catholic faithful may receive Holy Communion “*under certain conditions*” in accordance with a document issued on 27 June 2018 by the German Bishops’ Conference headed by Cardinal Reinhard Marx. The scandalous decision was approved by Pope Francis in person. By 12 July 2018, *intercommunion* with Protestant spouses of the Catholic faithful had been introduced in ten dioceses of Germany. Without listing all the dogmatic, patristic or canonical counterarguments, let me ask one rhetorical question only: is the following canon of the Council of Trent still effective: “*If any one saith, that faith alone is a sufficient preparation for receiving the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist; let him be anathema*”<sup>69</sup>?

---

<sup>69</sup> Concerning the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, First decree, being the third under the Sovereign Pontiff, Julius III., celebrated on the eleventh day of October, MDLI. ON THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST, CANON XI. In: <http://www.thecounciloftrent.com/ch13.htm>

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** It is always valid because this is an infallible decision of the Church. But the practical observance of this canon is unfortunately not realised. The majority of the German bishops started a new movement to allow Protestant people to receive Holy Communion in some cases. But these some cases will soon be a general case. We do not have to be so naïve, they will be a general case. By this action the Church authorities sin against the sanctity of Eucharist. There is a general attack against the sanctity of the Eucharist, and the Eucharist is the heart of the Catholic Church and the highest expression of the perfect of the spiritual union of the members of the Church. When you receive Holy Communion what is required essentially is the full faith not only in the Eucharist but the full faith in all Catholic truths. The Eucharist is the synthesis of all good and of all truth in the Church. One cannot say, it is sufficient that they believe in the Eucharistic presence. They have to believe in all Catholic dogmas, otherwise the reception of the Eucharistic will represent a lie. The Holy Eucharist is the highest expression of the union of the members of the Church, a union in doctrine and in the visible submission to the shepherds of the Catholic Church. The Eucharistic Communion expresses and realises the perfect union of the members of the Church. When Church authorities admit Protestants to Holy Communion, saying you can receive Holy Communion while remaining Protestant or Orthodox, they commit an official public lie regarding the true meaning of the Church

and of the Holy Eucharist. This also constitutes a propagation of indifferentism and relativism, which signifies ultimately that the Catholic truth and the Protestant and Orthodox beliefs are almost the same.

## About the upcoming Synod on Youth, the Pan-Amazonian Synod and priestly celibacy

**Mr. Fülep:** This year will be celebrated a Synod on Youth. Next year will be hold the so-called Pan-Amazonian Synod, which will have the theme: “Amazonia: New Paths for the Church and for an Integral Ecology”. This is the theme chosen by Pope Francis for the synod of bishops dealing with the region of Amazonia to take place in Rome in October 2019. The preparatory council of the synod has 18 members including Cardinal Claudio Hummes, bishop emeritus of São Paulo, president of the Pan-Amazonian Ecclesial Network and Bishop Emeritus Erwin Kräutler, who led the Brazilian diocese of Xingu from 1981 to 2015. Both persons are known to promote the ordination of tested married men (“viri probati”) in the Latin Church, so that is also expected to be on the agenda of the Pan-Amazonian Synod.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** There exists already the working document for the Synod on Youth, and it is very sad that the document uses the propaganda language of

the so-called LGBT.<sup>70</sup> We should not use this expression in a Church document in a positive or in a neutral way. The apparently neutral use of the expression LGBT in that Church document is a sign that the Catholic Church has to be open and to accept the so-called LGBT people and their life style. These people live against the commandments of God, they practice homosexuality and are destroying their own dignity. They put themselves in danger of eternal damnation. It is a very sad phenomenon, that the propagandists of homosexuality are now using the upcoming synod as a tool to promote gender ideology and the legitimization of homosexual activity. That also happened in the past family synods. There were evident manipulations inside the synod leadership. There is a foundation to assume that there could be again tactics and methods of manipulation in the upcoming synod. The goal is to promote moral relativism in the Church and the positive acceptance of homosexuality.

There will be then the so-called Amazonia Synod next year. The goal and the tendency of this synod are already clearly manifested in several statements of those bishops

---

<sup>70</sup> LGBT: Lesbians (women attracted to women), Gays (men attracted to men), Bisexuals (men or women attracted to both sexes) Transgenders (men or women changing gender roles partly or completely and possibly their genitals). LGBT is an umbrella term for these sexual deviances. According to gender ideology, further deviances are to be respected and mainstreamed, so the above acronym is being permanently enlarged, eg. LGBTTTTIQQA.

and cardinals, who are now appointed as members of the next synod. They speak already openly about the issue of celibacy. They say that it will be examined, and that there should be the option of ordaining married men to the priesthood. They call these men *viri probati*. One can fear that they will use the next synod to promote this theme, and ultimately to abolish celibacy, using cunning formulations, for instance limiting to exceptional cases and to special regions. It is for everybody clear that this will be a domino effect in the entire Church, and one can foresee this, we do not have to be so naive. Unless God intervenes next year, the abolition of the apostolic rule of priestly continence and celibacy will probably arrive. Therefore, we have to join all our prayers and efforts in praying and imploring God that He may not permit that a Pope will approve such proposals, which will ultimately and practically abolish priestly celibacy in the entire Church.

**Mr. Fülep:** You often hear even bishops saying that the law of celibacy is nothing but a technical legal means of preventing problems of succession, dating back to the Middle Ages. The truth is, however, that priestly celibacy is already prescribed by the Synod of Elvira in circa 300 AD.<sup>71</sup> It is primarily based on the teaching of the apostle

---

<sup>71</sup> “Bishops, presbyters, and deacons, and all other clerics having a position in the ministry, are ordered to abstain completely from

Paul,<sup>72</sup> the way of life of the apostles after Pentecost, Christ's call<sup>73</sup> and the life of our Lord Jesus totally dedicated to the Father. Following Christ with all your being is the very heart and purpose of priestly celibacy. Essentially, it is supernatural, thus it is always confronted with incomprehension and attacked by the enemies of the Church.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Of course, this is evident. The oldest document, which reminds the clergy to observe the traditional law of priestly continence, was issued by the Council of Elvira in Spain in the beginning of the 4th century. The traditional norm said that bishops, priests and deacons could live with their wives, however in sexual continence. This was the meaning of celibacy in the ancient times and substantially also today. The continence is always the same. St. Cyril of Jerusalem for example affirmed in 380 in one of his catechises, that a good priest should not have sexual relationship with his own wife. Most of the priests in those times still had wives. A Church Father from the 4th century says that a good priest should not have conjugal relations with his own wife. He stated that in an even stronger expression: a *good* priest has no sexual relationships with his own wife. He stressed the word a "*good* priest."

---

*their wives and not have children. Whoever, in fact, does this shall be expelled from the dignity of the clerical state."* (Canon 33)

<sup>72</sup> cf. 1Cor 7:7; 32–34.

<sup>73</sup> Matt. 12:19; 19:12.

In the time of Saint Augustine, in 390, there was a synod in Carthage, which reminded the clergy to observe perpetual sexual continence, saying that this is an apostolic tradition. The Church in the 4th century had better knowledge of what was an apostolic tradition than we today. The Roman Church always kept this apostolic tradition. Only the Greek Church in the end of the 7th century abandoned the apostolic law of perfect continence and allowed deacons and priests to have sexual relationship with their wives; however, this was not allowed to the bishops. We see here a contradiction. Why could bishops not have sexual relationship with their own wives? When later Oriental churches were united with Rome, Rome made an exception or in some way granted an indult for them in order to facilitate their conversion, since the main question was the doctrinal issue about the Holy Spirit and papal primacy. The Oriental churches accepted the main dogmatic questions and the Holy See, in order to facilitate the union, said you can continue your law from the 7th century that priests and deacons can continue to have sexual relationships with their wives. In that law of the Greek Church from the 7th century we see another contradiction. The first contradiction was the episcopacy. The second contradiction is that when a wife of a priest or of a deacon dies, he cannot marry anymore. Why not? This is the question. This is a contradiction. When this law accepts that being a priest and having sexual relationships with the wife is okay, why can he not take a new wife after



becoming a widower? I see here no logic. The only logic is the contradiction to the apostolic tradition. When a celibate man was ordained deacon and priest, he cannot marry anymore, this is valid also today in the Orthodox Church. It shows that the entire question of celibacy in the Orthodox Church is a contradiction.

**Mr. Fülep:** World-famous theology professor Szaniszló Jáki OSB<sup>74</sup> remarked that a profound theological relationship between celibacy and the priesthood manifests itself even in the church discipline of the Byzantine Church: the married priest cannot sleep with his wife the night before offering the Eucharistic sacrifice.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** The Orthodox priest cannot celebrate the Eucharist when in the night before he had a sexual relationship with his wife. To legitimately celebrate the Holy Eucharist the priest has to be sexually continent. However, a priest is always an *alter Christus*, another Christ. Usually a catholic priest has to celebrate Holy Mass every day, and this is another reason why he has to live in perpetual sexual continence in celibacy.

---

<sup>74</sup> Jáki, Szaniszló László (*Stanley L. Jaki*) (1924–2009) is a Hungarian Catholic priest of the Benedictine Order, theologian, physicist, university professor specialized in the history and philosophy of science, recipient of the Templeton Prize. Author of over 50 books, including *Theology of Priestly Celibacy* (Christendom Press, 2004).

**Mr. Fülep:** Sexual activity of a priest (even if validly married) and offering the Eucharistic sacrifice are ultimately incompatible.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Yes, it is a contradiction. Why does he observe sexual continence only the night before? And when he had a sexual relationship with his wife four days before, he can celebrate. What is the difference so much? It is a contradiction as well.

**Mr. Fülep:** Removing the law and theology of celibacy affects the very essence of priesthood. As another grave consequence, the Church will be weakened. Through his wife and family, for whom schooling, doctors, quiet and financial security must be provided, the priest will necessarily be more dependent on the state. In times of persecution or oppression the married priest can be easily blackmailed or silenced. Unfortunately, the history of the Orthodox Church and Communism offers many bad examples.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Collaboration with communism, of course. It is evident that those pastors, orthodox priests who have a family and children, will out of the natural instinct of protection of their children collaborate, when necessary, with the government. This is understandable in some way. In some cases these pastors or Orthodox priests were also martyrs. However, the majority

of martyred priests during the persecution were priests who lived in celibacy. From this point of view it is easier for a priest to resist the government or to resist an unjust and unchristian policy even to the extent that he will be persecuted. It is only one factor, but not the main factor, because the main factor is human fear, which a celibate priest can also have. And there have been also a couple of collaborators amongst the celibate priests. Because of careerism, many priests in our days are as well collaborators with the unchristian political powers. Today we have not a small number of clerics and bishops who because of careerism collaborate with the new dictatorship, with the gender ideology dictatorship. They collaborate in order to have promotion in Church offices. This is human weakness. We have to develop, therefore, the spirit of militancy for Christ. We have to be true soldiers of Christ. This spirituality we have to develop again.

# Migration problem in Europe

**Mr. Fülep:** Regarding illegal mass-immigration, Your Excellency has noted that there is an “*orchestrated plan by international powers to radically change the Christian identity of European populations.*”<sup>75</sup> The Prime Minister of Hungary, Viktor Orbán, and the Hungarian government have held this position ever since the migration crisis started (2015), which is more and more realised by other member states of the EU, too. For us Europeans, this is a real and serious problem. There is every indication that the mistaken interpretation of freedom by the EU, the insanity and recklessness of EU bureaucrats of the Liberal Left, as well as organized forces interested in migration all promote Islamic imperialism.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Yes, it is evident. There are documents already from the 50s from people linked to the United Nations Organisation where one can read about the plan, that Europe has to get a new shape. There has to be created a new European man, which is a mixture

---

<sup>75</sup> *Il Giornale* (June 28) <http://www.ilgiornale.it/news/cronache/dietro-i-migranti-c-piano-cambiare-i-popoli-europei-1545835.html>.

of different races. We are witnessing now the gradual realization of this plan. The transportation of people from the Near East and Middle East who are mostly Muslim people, and then the transportation of people from Africa by boat is clearly an orchestrated operation by a powerful political clique of the European Union, which is operating behind the scenes. The goal is not only that the European Nations will disappear, the nationalities, but to create a common, new European man. What is more, more dangerous is the goal to de-christianise Europe, especially through the orchestrated immigration of mostly Islamic people to Europe. It is a question of time that these Islamic families will gain the numerical majority among the autochthon European population, because of their large families and the decline of the birth rate among the European people.<sup>76</sup> After some years it will be only a question of mathematics that the Islamic population in Europe will be the majority, and the Christians will be the minority.<sup>77</sup> Usually, when the Islamic people are in the majority

---

<sup>76</sup> The proportion of the Muslim population is expected to rise very quickly in the decades to come: from 4,9 % currently to 7.4-14 in 2050, depending on migration rates. Source: [http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/12/04/europes-muslim-population-will-continue-to-grow-but-how-much-depends-on-migration/ft\\_17-12-04\\_muslimpopulation\\_thesize\\_1/](http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/12/04/europes-muslim-population-will-continue-to-grow-but-how-much-depends-on-migration/ft_17-12-04_muslimpopulation_thesize_1/).

<sup>77</sup> There are two reasons for the dramatic growth. The average age of Muslims is much lower, so there are many more women of child-bearing age among them and they have significantly more babies.

and contemporaneously gain political power, they will spread the Islamic style of life and their Islamic convictions in public life and the law of sharia. Subsequently the Catholics and the Christian faith will be marginalised. This is in my opinion a plan of the world powerful political structures who are anti-Christian. They are using in this case the Islamic migrants as helpers to de-christianise Europe. This is evident. It would be naïve to deny this.

**Mr. Fülep:** The right Christian charity has an order of its own (*ordo caritatis*): First, I must love my dependents (spouse, children), then the members of my extended family, friends, Christian brothers and sisters and my nation. In case of emergency, those in greater need are to be preferred, but only within specific bounds.

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** Of course, it is a question of common sense and of natural law. When you are a father and you have a family, and people come into your house, you can receive some people to help them. When there enter a big number of people, which is not proportioned to your family, and will damage your children, morally and physically, you have to defend your family. This is your first duty. You cannot receive imprudently foreign people causing thereby damage to your own children, to your own people. This is a question of natural law, and a kind of self-defence from invasions.

# About Liturgy

## *Latin and vernacular in the liturgy*

**Mr. Fülep:** Communities practicing traditional liturgy often ask the question how both Latin and the vernacular can be used properly at the same Mass. I think the best solution is to have the readings of the Mass and the Propers in the vernacular, too, with some of the church hymns also in the first language. What do you think of this?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** From the debates during the Second Vatican Council one can read that almost all Council Fathers asked that the readings of the Mass could be directly pronounced in the vernacular, even Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre did this. The readings belong to the part of the Mass called the “Mass of the catechumens.” Even though the entire liturgy of the Mass and all its details have the first aim to glorify and adore God, there is nevertheless a part in which the Word of God in the readings is addressed to the ears and the understanding of the faithful. A worthy and solemn proclamation of the readings in vernacular would not diminish the sacred-

ness of the liturgy of the Mass, the rest being celebrated in Latin. In international gatherings, all the readings should be proclaimed, of course, in Latin.

### *Beauty in liturgy and interior participation*

**Mr. Fülep:** Celebrating liturgy and participating in it fruitfully require due preparation on the part of the priest and the faithful alike. Modern practice risks being negligent and unworthy, while the danger of the traditional practice is an aestheticism for its own sake with a “too beautiful” liturgy aimed at perfection at the expense of the spirit. How is this danger to be correctly managed?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** The true Catholic principle is the synthesis of exterior and interior, of exterior beauty and perfection with interior participation. These two aspects should not be separated and should not be played off against one another. The exterior aspect has the aim to proclaim the greatness of God, the author of all beauty and to help and increase interior participation. One has to be always vigilant to avoid any theatrical and self-centred manners in the execution of the rites and songs during the sacred liturgy.



**Mr. Fülep:** Some communities tend to admit only highly qualified musicians to schola cantorum and use Latin exclusively, sometimes dropping the simplified Gregorian chant in the vernacular and Hungarian church hymns altogether. Certainly, the deeply spiritual Latin is the mother tongue of the Church but how is elitism to be avoided so that liturgy can be easily approached by the simple faithful, too?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** We have to state first, that a highly qualified liturgical music in Latin is also spiritually beneficial for the simple faithful, because it easily lifts up their souls to heaven, to God, Who is essentially a mystery. On the other hand, the simple faithful like also to praise God with their own voices and in their mother tongue. In my opinion, in a Latin *Missa cantata* in parishes worthy hymns in the vernacular could also be sung, e.g. during the entrance and during the regress of the celebrant. The same could be done during the Offertory and Holy Communion after the Propers have been sung in Latin. The presence of worthy hymns in the vernacular would not diminish the sacredness of the liturgy. In special occasions, e.g. in Pontifical Masses, the hymns could be done only Latin.

## *Celebration ad orientem*<sup>78</sup>

**Mr. Fülep:** Traditional priests still face difficulties when they want to celebrate Mass *ad orientem*. Despite all arguments to the contrary, celebration *versus populum*<sup>79</sup> is still considered by most bishops and priests to be binding law “introduced by the Council.” Sadly enough, almost all the sanctuaries erected and consecrated eleven years after *Summorum Pontificum*<sup>80</sup> are completely inapt for *ad*

---

<sup>78</sup> “*Ad orientem*” (to the east) is commonly used to describe a particular orientation of a priest in Catholic liturgy, with priest and people looking in the same direction. In this use, the phrase is not necessarily related to the geographical direction.

It is an ancient practice. The earliest known use of the exact Latin phrase ‘ad orientem’ to describe the Christian practice of facing east when praying is in *Augustine’s De Sermone Domini in Monte*, probably of AD 393. The equivalent Latin phrase, *ad orientis regionem* (to the region of the east), was used two centuries earlier by *Tertullian* in his *Apologeticus* (AD 197) to indicate the practice.

<sup>79</sup> “*Versus populum*” (towards the people) is the modern liturgical orientation in which the priest celebrates Mass facing the people.

<sup>80</sup> *Summorum Pontificum* (Of the Supreme Pontiffs) is an apostolic letter of Pope Benedict XVI. The document was dated 7 July 2007. Pope Benedict released an explanatory letter at the same time. Art. I of the *Motu Proprio* and Pope Benedict’s Explanatory Letter to the bishops leaves no room for argument, declaring that the traditional Missal was never abrogated and that no permission was ever needed to use it. “*What earlier generations held as sacred, remains sacred and great for us, too, and it cannot be all of a sudden entirely forbidden or even considered harmful.*”

*orientem* liturgy. What's more, traditional liturgical spaces are being destroyed in the name of modernism. Cardinal Sarah, who spoke up for Mass *ad orientem* in 2016,<sup>81</sup> was silenced by the Pope himself.<sup>82</sup> What can be done in such a situation?

**His Excellency Bishop Schneider:** We should try to spread the theological, historic, and pastoral arguments in favour of *ad orientem* celebration. There are many good studies and comments about this topic (Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, Cardinal Robert Sarah, Father Uwe Michael Lang, Father Stefan Heid, etc.). We should claim the right of the faithful for *ad orientem* celebration. We should try to realize *ad orientem* celebration where and when possible.

---

<sup>81</sup> <http://www.catholicherald.co.uk/news/2016/07/05/cardinal-sarah-asks-priests-to-start-celebrating-mass-facing-east-this-advent/>

<sup>82</sup> <http://www.ncregister.com/blog/edward-pentin/father-lombardi-cardinal-sarahs-ad-orientem-suggestion-misinterpreted>

SANCTE Michael Archangele, defende nos in proelio,  
contra nequitiam et insidias diaboli esto praesidium.

Imperet illi Deus, supplices deprecamur:

tuque, Princeps militiae caelestis,

Satanam aliosque spiritus malignos,

qui ad perditionem animarum pervagantur in mundo,

divina virtute, in infernum detrude. Amen.



His Excellency Bishop Athanasius Schneider and theologian  
Dániel Fülep — Astana, Kazakhstan, July 2018

## REGNUM EUCHARISTICUM

The first visit of  
Bishop Athanasius Schneider  
to Hungary  
Three lectures, a sermon  
and an exclusive interview

©Athanasius Schneider, Fülep Dániel  
ISBN 978 615 80263 6 9

Hungarian and English language e-book version:  
**<http://mek.oszk.hu/15500/15547/15547.pdf>**  
(For the English version, see page 77)