

Michael: Your Excellency, so a it was three years ago almost.

Bishop: A Two, two and a half years, the end of 2010.

Michael: OK, So yah, two and a half years.

Bishop: Two and a half Years

Michael: Um you mentioned there should be a almost a civil list of errors produced a because of the bad interpretations of the second Vatican council. Um so in that context what do you think are some of the biggest most important misinterpretations of the documents of the council?

Bishop: The first I think it's the general perception and understanding of Vatican II in general, because the major interpretation and the understanding of the council itself is an understanding of a rupture. Of either the liberal ones or either the traditional ones. And so they have to, it is, it is necessary to to have an official interpretation that states that the second Vatican council a means not, um, had no intention finality to make a break with the past. And when we carefully read all the speeches which were given by the Pope, John XXIII, in the beginning of the council and then also Pope Paul VI, we can find that they stressed that the council had no intention to pronounce some new doctrines, only to explain the truths of the faith deeper, and even to protect the Catholic truth, the words of John XXIII to protect and to deepen and not to make new doctrines. And this is the key of the interpretation. The words of the magisterium, not the interpretation of theologians or even that of some Bishops, but of the magisterium (which is the supreme-magisterium). And then we know the famous speech of Pope Benedict XVI in 2005 to the Roman Curia where the Pope stated officially that we have to accept and interpret the council in the continuity of all the tradition, this is globally. But of course there are some specific moments in the documents which have to be clarified because they are somehow open to different interpretations.

Michael: You are aware back in April this year Cardinal Casper published an article

Bishop: Yes

Michael: In l'observateur romano saying, oh there were compromised formulas written into the documents.

Bishop: Yes

Michael: Many people were surprised that he would say that!

Bishop: Yes

Michael: Some people said that they were surprised he would admit that.

Bishop: Yes he admitted that yes, then so but of course Cardinal Casper is not speaking as the magisterium, No? My intention was that the magisterium himself, it means the Pope, The Supreme magisterium has to pronounce to give some clarifications, or some indications of the misinterpretations because they have to be very concrete because we are living in a situation of much confusion, and so many voices speak about concerns, and so all they have to do is ask the magisterium in his humility to give us clear, very clear interpretations of some specific subjects. Um, well, the first for example, Lumen Gentium this numbers about collegeality, the episcopacy, the relationship with the Pope, even at the counsel the pope himself admitted that the text about

collegiality was not clear enough. Therefore Pope Paul VI ordered the famous *nota explicativa previa*, the previous explanatory note which was added in the end of the document. It is not a text of the council, but an explanation note which has to be the Pope said, has to be read together. It was this kind of statement, to make such a note or notes or better one document, in the same way in which made Pope Paul VI during the council already was this. Perhaps it would be necessary to, to look hard on these 50 years the subject of collegiality and primacy was interpreted. And so I think the Magisterium can make some clear statement about this, this is one example. I mean that to avoid these not Catholic teachings about all the church, the way the church is governed ordinarily by the College of the Bishops, this is not the structure which gave us our Lord. Our Lord gives only to Peter to govern his flock. Peter, a shepherd, a shepherd of my sheep and also of my lambs, and these are the bishops, because the Pope is also a shepherd of the bishops, of all the Bishops. This is John related, the gospel of John 21. St. John tells us and the bishops ok, they are um, the successors of the apostles, and not of um, specific apostles, but in general of the apostles. And so they have to first, um the apostles, um the shepherds of the flock diocese, but of course every bishop by his consecration has also um, I would say have responsibility in some way throughout the universal church, because we are one body, and also when we are one body, the mystical body of Christ, and of course the Pope and the bishops are also in this one body, and therefore there is a unity, and therefore it was good that the council stressed this unity. Collegiality is another word, it is necessary to show this but, and the responsibility of all the bishops for the whole church is extraordinary and all this was in the 2000 years of the church, this form was extraordinary in the councils, the ecumenical councils, the bishops together with the Pope governed the church together, but always under Peter of course, but it was not continuously. It is not the structure which gave us our Lord, and so they have to be very attentive here um, because there are for example some centuries without council, ecumenical council and the church was governed, and sometimes we had a good government. And so we have, I think it would be very helpful that the magisterium give some clarifications specifically about the very correct manner of interpreting the collegiality and the manner of exercising the collegiality, one example. Another example in *Lumen Gentium* #16, there is an expression which, um, to my understanding needs some explanation. That is that saying that we Catholics together with the Muslims, we adore the one God. It has to be clarified, because there is, there are two substantial different levels, substantial different levels, because we as Catholics we can adore, we do adore God always as trinity, God Father, God Son and the Holy Spirit. Our adoration is an adoration of Faith, supernatural Faith, and to worship God as creator only or as one God only, you have not to, there is no need of Faith, it is sufficient the use of your reason. This is a dogma of the first Vatican council, that every human person is able only by his reason, natural light of reason, natural, without the light of faith to recognize the existence of one God as creator and consequently to worship him according to his knowledge of natural reason, and these are the Muslims, they have no supernatural faith and therefore have no supernatural act of worship, and even the Jews, a who rejected Jesus as God, as trinity they rejected Him, have no faith and therefore their worship is also natural, not supernatural.

Michael: May I ask you Your Excellency then, when a, I don't know if you are aware or not, but last week Cardinal Dolin of New York was visiting a Mosque and he said and it got quoted all over the secular press, hold on - to the Muslims - hold on to your faith and, a, we worship the same god.

Bishop: Yes, yes, therefore I say these expressions of Lumen Gentium that the Cardinal was referring, to this expression of the council, and therefore you are now observing that it is necessary, now really to stress this distinction. This is essential distinction, and we Catholics, I repeat will never worship in the natural level but always in the supernatural level, for one example. Another which has to be clarified, but is only a little examples, thanks be to God, not so much, because we have also to stress the majority of the expressions and the text of the council are very rich and traditional, and often we forget this and only stress the controversial or the ambiguous expressions, which are not so much. I am not so... I would say not so important, but, and in these we forget all the richness of the council. In Germany there exists a book written by one Bishop it think Austrian which the title The Forgotten Council, and there he collected all the beautiful traditional expressions of the council. And so another expression which have to be, how we say, not only explained but, added or how you say, added another expression, another explanation, a developed.

Mike: Clarified

Bishop: Clarified, yes, yes. Besides these Lumen Gentium 16, Gaudium et Spes 12, Gaudium et Spes 12, is saying, all the things which exist on earth are directed and oriented to man, as their aim and supreme, um, end and the culmination. How do you say that,

Bishop: Finis et culmin, in Latin, As finality and the top, how do you say that, his top culmin I don't say it how in English, as a mountain there,

Mike: The pinnacle, the summit.

Bishop: The pinnacle, summit. Exactly, as the aim and summit. I think this is very ambiguous, this expression, all the things on earth are directed, a, to man as the aim and summit. It's not correctly because all the things which exist on earth are in finally have their aim in God, and have to glorify God as the summit, a because, a, we say pleni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua all the things that exist are created for the glory of God, and all the things are created from all of this for Christ, through him and for him. Christ is the aim of all created things, even those on earth. Of course I can understand the aim of this expression was that God created all the non-rational things for the service of man, and the man is the ruler, or the king of this creation, because God gave the man such a dignity. It is not, I think we can not say in this manner, we have to stress even so the created things on earth are created for man but only, a, how do you say, not ultimately for man, but all these things ultimately for God, and he is the summit. And so we have to explain this, otherwise it is anthropocentric, anthropocentrism and this is all I think, one of the problems and the crisis of these 50 years is the very the much the anthropocentric vision and not only vision but a, practice also. Christian life, the liturgy and theology are anthropocentric and this is the biggest a danger of humanity, of church, to be anthropocentric. Because this is the first it was the first sin of Adam and Eve, it was anthropocentric, and this is very dangerous. And such expression of our council text can be used for such things. If we have to correct, not correct but to add something to more explanation for example. And then another text in the document about ecumenism, a Christian unity, ecumenism. There is an expression that God uses even the non-Catholic communities or churches as means of salvation. It could be also interpreted in a wrong manner, in the way of the Anglican branch theory, that there are several

branch of Christianity who are all ways of salvation . We have to also clarify for example, these expression. We have to say perhaps , um, never the less, a, the Christians, the other Christians, God can use them, but individually, because they are baptized and they are united as baptized to the mystical body of Christ, because their baptism is valid. In which, and what St. Augustine said, what the non-Catholics have, they took from the church, the, he even said they stolen, they have stolen them from our house here. Took away from them, what they have is Catholic, not theirs. And therefore we have to explain this otherwise they could be understood wrongly. And then of course, the issue of the religious liberty of the document of Dignitatis Humanae I think has to be clarified and stressed, a, because after, I have to explain also that, for example, about religious liberty, its only declaration, not a decree, even not a constitution, a very low level of yes, the council I think intentionally chose this level and therefore it is open for further addition, therefore we have not to be worried about this. It's open for addition.

Michael: Do you think your Excellency in the west, in the Western Nations, that among churchmen Dignitatis Humanae has been poorly interpreted, and that poor interpretation has been, a, carried out in parishes and chanceries and . . .

Bishop: Yes, of course, of course.

Michael: You have sort of an equality of religions almost.

Bishop: Yes, this is the nature of equality of religions, and yes we have to correct this. And this is in the hands of so many teachers in theology and religious teachers and so on, the catechesis teaching, I mean. We have to correct this because one aspect of the traditional teaching of the magisterium was always that all human being and all creation and even the human society is also a creation, has to be directed to God not for themselves. And therefore it can't be a human society, atheistic, or without God. They have to pay God the honor. Even as society globally, not only as church but as civil society. Because we have, we cannot separate civil society. I mean, ultimately we have the same goal, the church and the civil life has the same ultimate aim, eternity, eternal life. And not only this but, out of the glorification of God, at least as the creator. And therefore it cannot exist a government atheistic, or neutral to God. It is against our creation, against the plan of God, and must never in the human history give us a government or society, civil society without God. Homo est naturaliter religios. A human being is naturally religious. Or Teurtulina taught homo est naturaliter christianos. This must be Christian, because Jesus he is oriented to be Christian, but to be Christian Catholic. I would say homo est naturaliter catholicos because what means Christianos? It means Catholicos. Because there is only one truth and one true church, there are not many churches, we do confess in the creed every Sunday, I believe on One Church, and therefore it's only one church, and the one church is Catholic. And therefore, Christian means Catholic, and so this has to be, um, added, this, I mean the principles that the human society, civic society, and government has to recognize and to pay God, to recognize God, a, in some manner also. And ultimately to recognize the true God. And not to worship, a, the devil or the false gods. This devil idolatry, no this is not. But the true God, and the true God is the Trinity. And the manner of worship is Catholic worship. Because there is only one church, is very clear. I mean that this is the principle. And another principle, even Pope, this was a development of church teaching about religious liberty, for example, in the ... the beginning was Emperor Constantine, a, there was, or Theodosius the great

Emperor Theodosius the Great established that in all Roman Empire is only one religion admitted the Catholic, in the Catholic, after the Arian crisis, the Arianism. And so it was continuously so, the church was accepting this, that only admitted. But in the first centuries, um, I'm meaning in the Patristic times the church was quite, was against, a, some application of force, of a, to, a, even recognizing that the Catholic Church was the only one true issue. The church for example, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, they were not, um, when there were some punished. Some heretics killed by the Christian, by the Catholic emperor they were not so in favor of this, for example.

But then in the middle ages, it started this great heretical movement as the, in the 12<sup>th</sup> century South France. And then they started the famous inquisition, it was a repression by force of another, and the church, a, recognized this because it was, um, a work of inquisition. But then um, then the time changed, and a, after the French Revolution, there was not more Christian society, a Christian government in general in Europe. And then the church started to find another, a, method, another mode, modality for this religious liberty, or I see, the tolerance of other believers. Even um, in the end of the famous 30 year war. 30 years war, a, between the Catholics and Protestants, and then the famous peace of Westphalia. The Holy See recognized all that can be, yes, other believers have to tolerate that in the same region in Germany, for example, a, de facto not de jure not recognizing the errors, but they have to live together. It was some locations in Germany, some places where they lived together sometimes. And then, lastly Pius XII even spoke about the tolerance of other believers, even of tolerance not only of private cult. It was in the 19<sup>th</sup> century Pope Pius IX said ok, private freedom for other religions, private cult, private worship. But then Pius XII developed also a tolerance of official non-Catholic worship, tolerance. Not that we recognize this as true but we tolerate them. Even in some degree depending on the historical situation. It could be a very great degree of tolerance, depending. And so it was on the eve.

Michael: Oriented to the common good.

Bishop: Yes, of course always this was the peace of common good. And this was on the beginning of the council, this teaching was. And I think we can continue with this principle, that, a, we have to live together so they have to tolerate one another, even official worship, but um, theologically we have to keep the principles ok,, that the Catholic Church is only one, but it is always tried by the church. And thanks be to God, Pope John Paul II and Cardinal Ratzinger, they issued this famous document Dominus Iesus. This is very clear, for example, its horetical implication, of the issue of the quality of all religions. And um, I think we, and another point, that um, it's always for example that I think it is ok, that it is not contrary to the council that there can be, and it is for us to desire for example a Catholic state, why not? Because here the government recognize the only true God and the only true worship, full to worship the Catholic. It is not against the liberty of religious, we can tolerate them, the others, we will not a persecute them or we cannot discrimination of them but we can tolerate them and recognize their human dignity, but stressing that these people, for example these, um nation is majority Catholic and they want to keep this tradition to hand over to their children and grandchildren. We do not want that they change and become, for example, another religious, because we are convicted that there is only one true religion. And therefore in this context, where Catholicism is the majority of course they have to have also some privileges. It is all, I think it is a rule of democracy, because the rule of democracy is the majority. It is not to mean, a, discrimination of others. And so this is, I think just some points could be added, and then together read with such a future document,

together read the document. Like made Paul VI the *nota explicativa previa* during the council such *notae* could be, a, gathered in one document, so.

Michael: Excellent, that's my questions, thank you very much Your Excellency.