

Fr. David Hewko – May 17th, 2014 – Conference – Toronto, ON

In the Name of the Father the Son and the Holy Ghost, amen.

So, tomorrow morning there'll be Mass bright and early at 7:00 – is it 7:00 or 7:30? Oh okay, 7:30. 7:00 confessions, 7:30 Mass, and then I have to rush off down to Saint Catherine's, they have an 11:30 Mass, and then Syracuse, New York at 6:00pm.

So, I'd like to introduce you to one of the champion bishops at the time of the Council who was from Brazil, and he was really one of the great traditional Catholic bishops, resisting the modernism. He was a good friend of Bishop de Castro Mayer, and he worked together with Archbishop Lefebvre. And that is Bishop Gerard de Proença Sigaud. Bishop Sigaud. And thanks to Hugh Akins, this has been republished, this is a letter written in 1959 at the request of Cardinal Tardini, who requested the bishops to write their ideas on what the Council needs to cover. And it's an excellent, excellent letter – this is Vatican III. This is all they need to do right here, it's Vatican III. Maybe add a few more things of, the list of things to condemn, but as far as the consecration of Russia, the errors to condemn, to reorganize the Catholic, the Church Militant to battle for the reign of Christ the King, that's what he wrote about, that what the Vatican II should be, should do, and how to deal with the modern errors.

So, I'd like to just introduce you to him by reading a few things. And please help yourself to any food, this is not so formal.

He speaks about, let me just say again by way of introduction, Hugh Akins – how many of you are familiar with Hugh Akins? He's a good Church Militant Catholic, he organizes the apostolate, and he understands the Resistance position and he's certainly promoting it. You can find him on Hugh Akins at comcast dot net, also www dot Catholic Action Resource Center dot com. And as you know he has many good books available on the Kingship of Christ, Father Dennis Fahey works, he was able to reprint some of the great works of Cardinal Pie Poitiers, which was a treasure for us. Saint Pius X called Cardinal Pie: my master.

So, he also has of course the famous work he just came out with, Synagogue Rising, and he gave that title thanks to this bishop here, Bishop Sigaud, who said that Vatican II needs to reveal the Judeo-masonic efforts to destroy the faith. He speaks about freemasonry. He speaks about the worldwide conspiracy and the new world order. This is what Vatican II was supposed to condemn. He talks about the United States and the new world order, and he draws attention to the dollar bill, where there's no shame in flagging the masonic ideal, which is to build a new world order on freemasonry. And that's what the American republic is built on. That's why it's falling to pieces now. And modern democracy, modern separation of Church and state, the modern liberty of the press, liberty of teaching what you want, the liberty of conscience, the liberty of promoting whatever religion you want. All that has been so clearly condemned by the Church, that we Catholics got to relearn what the faith really is about. And many Catholics don't realize the popes have actually clearly condemned, for example, freedom of the press. And a lot of Catholics say: well how can you be so bigoted? How can you be so narrow minded? Well let me ask you this: how many of you, every day, even the most liberal and atheist people, censor what their family eats? They censor what their stomach consumes. They're not going to put rat poison out, they're not going to put bleach, they're not going to take and put out sweet poison that tastes sweet and looks sweet. They're just not going to do that because they want to nourish their family, so the mothers and fathers censor what they eat. And even more, some of them censor junk food, and too much sugar.

So, if, for the sake of their stomach they censor, all the more what feeds our mind and our soul needs to be censored, especially for the young. And especially for everybody, because we're all diseased with Original Sin, and man because of Original Sin tends toward the lower things, tend toward evil.

So, in addition to condemnation of the freedom of the press, Vatican III have to also add, condemn freedom of the internet, freedom of the video, and that means to censor it. That means – I think in Russia they censor all pornography, I think, I think – but a normal Catholic society would censor rock and roll music, censor immodest fashions, censor pornography, and censor all the false religions would not be allowed to spread their heresies by propaganda, and books and videos. And the internet in a normal society would censor out false doctrines.

To us liberals, the liberal west, this sounds so – oh this is the Inquisition again. Well bring back the Inquisition. Blessed be God. Bring, bring back such a glorious institution that the Inquisition was. It's far better than this inquisition, which is so cruel, which says: anything can go, any immodesty, any belief, but anyone who speaks the truth? They get jailed, they get put in prison. So, either way, someone has to be punished, someone has to be put in jail, someone has to be watched. And in a Catholic society, it's the bad guys that are kept in line. In a liberal masonic society, it's the truth that's censored. It's the truth, it's the good guys that are punished, the good guys that are put in jail.

And one recent example, perfect example, is the insane attack against Bishop Williamson by the press for just saying, on a historical matter, his opinion on a historical matter. Since when has any bishop or priest or anyone in the western civilization been arrested, been taken to court over an opinion on a historical matter? And not only is it an opinion, he has, there's tons of evidence that's coming out more and more, proving the hoax that the holocaust really is. But in this world, in this system, even teachers have lost their jobs because they just said – certainly in the United States, I know this – because they said, you know, there's another opinion on the holocaust. For example. And I'm just giving you an example.

So, this good Bishop, in his letter to Cardinal Tardini, he brings up that the Vatican Council needs to re-condemn freemasonry. And it's a short but powerful letter. He speaks about the condemnation of communism, and he also says we need to condemn all the persecution of Jews for their religion or for ethnic reasons. The Church is against anti-Semitism, which it always has been. You don't just persecute the Jews, and that's obvious, for being Jewish, but: the Church cannot ignore the facts of the past, and the clear affirmations of international Jewry. The heads of this Jewry have for centuries conspired methodically, and out of an undying hatred against the Catholic name, and the destruction of the Catholic order, and for the construction of a worldwide Jewish empire.

So, he's saying this, the masonic-Judeo international Jewry needs to be revealed, and exposed, and condemned. And that's what Vatican II should've done. And now we got Pope Francis, I'm told now he's going to go wail at the wailing wall in the, Jerusalem. To his shame. It's not even the walls of the temple. It's not even the walls of the temple. It's the walls of Emperor Hadrian's, one of his forts.

Also, he speaks of the totalitarian tyranny in the order of the Antichrist. He talks about how Catholics must organize against the enemy. Now this is what's been lacking for, for years. Saint Pius X did some organization of the Catholic troops, but now more than ever, we need to hear from the mouth of the pope – which is not going to happen with this pope, I doubt – but we need, he says: the pope, and the Rome, needs to organize the Catholic resistance to the worldwide onslaught against Jesus Christ the King. It's really powerful.

And he lists a number of principles. Here's a few of them. Certain principles must be remembered, he says: one, the condemnation of perverse doctrines is necessary, but not sufficient. It is very important because, you know, Leo, Pope Leo XIII condemned many errors, but he didn't do too much about it. And that's why some Catholic thinkers say that Leo XIII was kind of liberal. He wasn't liberal at all in his doctrine, he was very solid. But when it came to putting it in action, he really didn't do much. And the proof is right after him, who had to smash out the modernists out of the seminaries and universities? Who? Pius X. He had to clean house, and that was after Leo XIII. So, Leo XIII was very good on doctrine, but under him the snakes took, entered into the Church. He didn't clean them out. Plus, with Cardinal

Gibbons, he condemned Americanism and the liberalism over here, but with Cardinal Gibbons, he just kind of slapped him on the hand. He didn't do too much. He didn't remove him, which he should've.

So, it's not enough to condemn perverse doctrines. Condemnations, he says: are not lacking in the struggle against Protestantism, Jansenism, modernism and communism. They often yielded good results. Some came too late. But, number two. He says: what is really necessary is an organized fight against the errors, against the originators and promoters of error. This sort of organized combat, like a well ordered and methodical army – have you heard this language before? This is what Vatican II should've been, organizing all the Catholic troops throughout the world, to battle for the Kingship of Christ. And that's, I've always said this about Bishop Sheen, as much as I admire him, and as much as I really do think he'll probably be canonized someday. He was truly a holy man, and, but he did go along with Vatican II unfortunately. He did himself express the desire to see women more in participation in the liturgy, so he kind of got a little poisoned at the end. So maybe he won't be canonized.

But, in his better days, he was good. But I always say, and maybe I could stand corrected, but I always say he dealt with spirituality. He dealt with sociological and psychological problems. For example, he said we're going to need, we're going to need almost a psychiatric building on every street corner, with the number of women that are going to be going crazy with the number abortions, of abortions. And just look how many people in the west are on pills. They've got kids on pills now. An active boy who's normal and just, you know, can't sit still during class – that's normal. He's just got to run around, do pushups, and get sweaty and dirty and he'll calm down a little bit. But now they give them drugs. It's so common now. It's unbelievable. And all, of course the drugs, the birth control, it's just unbelievable.

So, this organized combat that he's talking about, we belong to the Church Militant. And when Bishop Williamson talks about the 1950s, fifties Catholicism, that's precisely what he means. Religion on Sunday, and the rest of the week is just without God, no thought of God, not much prayer. The separation of religion from life, from politics, from economics, and that's the fiftiesism that's so poisonous.

So, listen to what he says, it's really great: this sort of organized combat, like a well ordered and methodical army, has become easier nowadays thanks to advanced means of communication with the Holy See. So just think about if the Holy See was giving good directions on internet. And all the Catholics following this, the leadership, and what to do, how to act, and what to condemn, and what rosary rally is when, when you're going to join the pope with all the bishops to consecrate Russia, for example. How easy it would be to do with internet now. Really. And they call all these synods for the, and ecumenical meetings to mock Christ. How easy it would be to really consecrate Russia.

On the contrary however, there is a lack of organized resistance – there still is – there's a lack of organized resistance against ideas and persons, because neither the clergy, nor the religious orders, nor the schools, nor the lay people are systematically entering in this battle. They don't know what to do, because the priests are cowards, the bishops are lame. And the popes, I think even the good popes, Pius XI and XII, they did not consecrate Russia, and therefore under them there was a lot of disaster, a lot of triumph for the enemy. And I really believe it's because they did not consecrate Russia. Pius XI should have been the Pope to consecrate Russia. He didn't do it. And under him, he made some big mistakes. He condemned Action française in France, which was kind of like smashing the backbone of the traditional Catholic stand in politics. And he also betrayed the Cristeros, ordered them to lay down their weapons, when he should've told them: fight until you have a Catholic government, and you have my blessing.

Number three: the organized combat must also fight the disguises of the revolution – this is important here, this bishop was right on – this combat must also fight not only the revolution, but the disguises of the revolution, together with the errors and spirit which are promoted by it. So, what are these disguises? They have two characteristics, he says one: A. the opinions which are the logical

consequences of errors are opinion, which are the psychological manifestations of false principles applied in a concrete case.

So, in other words, concretely condemn rotary club, oddfellows, shriners, all these masonic masks. They should all be condemned by the bishops. And clean them out. And clean out the movie theatres and warn the Catholic people: you cannot go see these movies. And pester Hollywood and boycott the support of Hollywood until they put out good movies. That's what should be done. But, and it could've been done, as I was saying, had Bishop Sheen focused, like Archbishop Lefebvre, on the reign of Jesus Christ and rallied the Catholic people to promote a Catholic government, a Catholic constitution, the Sacred Hearts on the flag. How powerful that would've been in that time. And of course, he was hated by many bishops. But if he really promoted the social reign of Christ the King, things would've been quite different, I think.

B. So what are the second disguises of the revolution? The disguises presented in such a way that the poorly informed faithful cannot perceive the malice underlying the doctrine. So, all this, these new phrases: pro-choice, alternative lifestyle. Expose all this, this deceitful talk, and expose it for what it is. That's what the bishops should be doing in condemning these things, and therefore save the flock. Although the faithful may not perceive the underlying malice of the doctrine, they tend to retain in dormancy the perverse principles of it, and are, little by little, insensibly penetrated by the principle and the spirit of the revolution. Want a perfect example? We don't want communist presidents, so let's vote for democracy. And so many Catholics think democracy is the greatest thing on earth, when it's been condemned many times by the popes. And that's not the answer either. The answer is the social reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ. That's the only political answer for us. And modern democracy has been clearly condemned by the popes, based on false principles that authority comes from the people, and that truth lies in the majority vote. So, if the majority votes for pervert laws in the states, well, they pass these perverted laws of perverted marriages.

So, he's calling, this is what the Church, and the men of the Church, should've been doing. And then he talks about the Syllabus of Pius IX, he talks about the strategy of the Trojan horse, and how – I like this: number one, with regards to principles, no compromise is permissible. That's our situation right now. Bishop Fellay has compromised on big principles. And everybody's saying: well, there's no agreement. There's no big deal. I don't see the new Mass in my chapel. That's not the point. He's compromised on Vatican II, which is unacceptable. He now says it's ninety five percent acceptable, and surmountable. That's a totally new doctrine. And he has admitted that the document on religious liberty and non-Christian religions is somehow compatible with the Church's Magisterium. It's not. The Church's Magisterium of tradition has condemned this.

So, Bishop Fellay and the leaders of the Society have clearly, in saying the new Mass is legitimate, have clearly compromised on major principles. And that's the problem. And that's enough for every priest to say: please, Bishop Fellay, you've served your time, step down. But that's not what has happened. Bishop Fellay has, Bishop Williamson has been kicked out, all the old champions of Archbishop Lefebvre are being cleaned out and replaced by liberals, and softies, and noodles who are going with the new direction.

And we, we have to stand on this principle. We cannot compromise. It is not permissible. And even if the whole world, and all the Society goes with this false new agreement, the so-called unilateral recognition of tolerance – which is pure baloney – but even if everybody went with this direction, if one person only stood up, that would be enough. The truth stands on, doesn't require numbers. We have to insist on this point, so the faithful will understand there is a necessary contradiction between the world and the Church. Catholics cannot be up to date in a pagan world. And then, there's much more, and I don't want to go too long, but cooperation. And then he talks about the Council needs to talk about cooperating with non-Catholics. Where's the limits? Because many Catholics don't know.

Do you work with Catholics? Do you work at their stores? Do you sell their products? And he talks about good faith, means of corruption.

And let me just close with this. This is interesting. Means of corruption. He talks about dancing: the Council should condemn certain immodest things. Dancing. It seems to me that dances in which the men embrace the women are to be categorically condemned. Slow dances, especially among the young people. Likewise, modern dances, such as rock and roll and all the genre of rock and roll, and other similar dances where they shake their bodies in immodest ways, should be formally and universally forbidden to Catholics. The Church should discourage what are called balls, which are sensual and exclusive cult of the body.

This is 1959. What would he say now? But obviously he's not condemning good dances. There are Catholic dances of Catholic countries. The Ukrainian dance is, is beautiful. It's macho for the men and the boys, and it's very feminine for the girls. And they do jumps and flips, and it's very lively, and those are Catholic things. And the Polish have that too, and many of the eastern countries. And the Italians and the South Americans and the Mexicans have their cultural dances that are inspired by the faith, and all in honor of the Virgin Mary on whatever feast. That's not what he's condemning. Because some Catholics think: well, all dancing is evil, and all dancing is bad. That's not true. That's not what he's saying. But sensual dances, and based on the rock and roll music, yes, and embracing.

Fashions. As far as the countries of the western civilization are concerned, objective norms could be given for feminine attire. What is more, the virtue of modesty must be demanded as necessary and fundamental for the moral health of the nations. So, it affects the common good. If the girls are allowed to dress immodestly, it brings the men down. And bringing the men down, the women get treated like dirt, and like carpets.

Missionaries must be drilled to educate primitive people to observe modesty. The swimsuits for women that are called bikinis should be absolutely condemned – that's in 1959 – the same for two-piece swimsuits that leave their back bare. That's not dancing around. This is really neat. This is a bishop speaking. If only, you know.

Beauty contests. These contests should be absolutely forbidden. It seems, and I'm, Father Pfeiffer says – well there's no children here, so I can say this – Father Pfeiffer and Chazal say in Philippines, what a horrible thing, they have beauty contests with men now. Can you believe that? I think, I think Americans still have enough sense that they would take these guys and whip them to a tree, but, beauty contests with men. What a shame. But now, anyway.

It seems to me the candidates, organizers, judges, and those who so generously finance these parades of human flesh should be punished with excommunication. And Vatican III would call for the excommunication of all political leaders who support abortion, who support freedom of false religions, who support all the things that the Church condemns. Can you imagine if the bishops just did their duty? American bishops refuse the sacraments to the Catholic candidates at these gatherings. This should be the case in the whole world for both candidates and participants.

Movies, and the vice of pleasure seeking. It's very interesting what he says here. Now think of the video, and regular TV now when this, and internet: the Church's position with regard to the cinema is expressed in pontifical documents. Pius XII wrote about motion pictures, he says they should promote what's good a virtuous. And you all know there are good movies out there, how inspiring they are, how really, they, they're powerful if they're used for the good.

But he says here: but in practice, certain scandals do happen. One. Documentaries may be used to further studies and to instruct people. Two. Melodramatic movies which are made for joy and amusement are of the same nature as news and novels. They excite without reason the imagination and the passions. These things are normally controlled by mortification, and generally they are harmful for Catholic life, because they dissipate the mind.

Isn't that interesting? So, just pleasure movies for pleasure, just watching movies to pass time, that's not healthy for Catholic people. But, and he says here: the parish theatre is generally a scandal for the faithful. Because in the old days, they used – 1959 – they used to have the parish theatre, where they showed a good movie, and everybody gathers for popcorn, and there was something good about that for sure. But he's raising the flag, saying: it can be a scandal. One. Because, he says, ordinarily immoral or degrading movies are presented in the course of the year. So, they want the taste for movies, the standard to go lower. B. Because by going off into the parish theatre, one develops the vice of pleasure seeking.

That is something to talk about, the vice of pleasure seeking. That's really our modern world. And we Catholics, we're all affected. And then this way, the corrupted faithful will go to any kind of theatre when they, when there is no more parish theatre. So, what would he say about video games? You know, video games, how many children will spend hours and hours, and I'm talking weeks, months. And it's not normal, it's not healthy, it's not virtuous, and instructions got to come from bishops on this, and popes and parents, what to do with this. That's a perfect example of, it's not intrinsically evil, video games. But it can be used very evilly. Just wasting time, and teaching the children when their free time, they can just waste their time on video games. No.

And parents need to be instructed: no, you teach your children to construct their time well. When they got free time, let their first focus be on feeding their soul with good spiritual reading. And then for entertainment, maybe, maybe once or twice a week, an hour or so on the video game. Okay. Okay. But you see what he's getting at. There's a vice called pleasure seeking.

C. Because the theatre dissipates the spiritual life. And then he talks about, 4. the education by means of movies, which is done by false Catholic Action as a diabolical trick, by which the faithful are led to watch lewd scenes under pretexts of technique and art, as if the imagination and concupiscence could be turned off and on at will, like an electric light switch. And then he talks about the printed word and censoring of movies, and not just impure movies, but especially the ones that propagate the ideas of the revolution. Those are more deadly. The movies that promote evolution, the National Geographic films that promote evolution, those are more deadly because they pervert the mind. You see? And atheism, and the freedom of all religions, and ecumenism – these things need to be condemned by the Church and by the bishops. It's really something to hear. I never knew this letter till recently, and I'm glad that Hugh Akins put it out. But it's really something.

And then he talks about books, and how even the clergy and the seminarians and bishops are poisoned with the modern revolutionary ideas.

And I'll close with this. Listen to this: we must develop a real science of counterrevolutionary warfare. The conspiracy of the revolution is one and organic. The enemy's organized. They've got it all together. Similarly, such a conspiracy must be fought in a mode of action that is one and organic. The Catholic faithful expect from the Magisterium a concrete and practical, fundamental and organical description of Catholic society, and of the counterrevolutionary society. And this society that accept all the elements of modern life, together with those of traditional society, which must be kept or incorporated in an organic manner.

Communism gives a clear example. And then he says that the communists got it together. They're organized, they know, their people know what to follow, what not to follow. And then he says we got to be organized like this. And let and tell them what a Catholic society is supposed to be like. Catholics should know that this or that is not compatible with Catholic society. And in this or that domain, society should be such and such to be Catholic. There are wide margins for this, but they are not infinite. The ideal model for a Catholic society should be set before our eyes so that we may know what has to be done. And he's saying it should be the Holy See that should be the center of all this. And the whole effort should be to restore everything in Christ the King.

So, and then he concludes with a few things. And he presents this – this should have been Vatican II. Can you imagine if this was? We wouldn't be in the mess we're in, and there'd be far fewer souls in hell. Okay? So anyway, that's what I wanted to bring to your attention today, and it's a great encouragement. And I think you need to train your children and grandchildren with this spirit of what a Catholic society is supposed to be. And that we have to fight for it. And since ideas have lost their value today, and words, the only language people are going to understand for the next generation is martyrs. Blood. The blood of martyrs. We have to be willing to die for the Holy Roman Catholic faith of all time. That's the only thing that's going to speak and have victory over all the lies that permeate everywhere.

So, I'll take some questions if you wish. I know it's getting late, I'm sorry.

Congregant: just a couple of little things. Just recently I saw a clip of, I don't know if it was on the internet or if I was flipping through a television. Recently Chelsea Nightly, who is a, Chelsea Nightly or Lately, whatever her name is, she's a nighttime talk show host. She had her children, I think she had two or three children, they were backstage, and she brought them up to introduce them to people, and they all had these huge earphones on. She says: well I'm not going to let my children listen to what I say during these shows. Because she's, I guess, quite vulgar during her show, right. And then another thing is, about ten years ago, Bishop Fellay talked about Madonna not allowing her children to watch television. So, it seems like they know that during formative years of their children, they don't allow them to participate or see these things during that time. I guess they would become rebellious against the parental figures. But they do eventually get introduced to vice, like Madonna's got her son, and whatnot. So obviously they recognize that the formative years are very important in order to maintain control over these children. There's also, yesterday I was at the library checking my emails, and there were two guys playing video games, obviously one was Moslem, he was shooting down this thing, but there was this constant, like a mantra, he was going on: allah akhbar, allah akhbar every time he hit a figure or something like that. It was, he was so totally into it, just pro allah. It gave me the creeps. At first, I wasn't sure I was hearing it right, and then I looked over and I could, because I don't have great hearing, so I had to lean in. He was actually saying that, and it was really creepy. But also, Bishop Sheen, he, there's videos on the internet that he was pretty strident against communism in the '50s. I don't know, I don't listen to any videos, or seen any videos where he may have promoted the reign of Christ, but he was quite explicit in his condemnation.

Father: yeah, yeah. He was totally opposed to communism. Absolutely, yeah. Well even Jews, even Jews don't raise their children exposed to the pop culture. The traditional Jews don't want their children becoming --

Congregant: --not the traditional Jews, but the Ashkenazis, they do. I was speaking with a friend recently and he married an Ashkenazi Jew, and I got, I didn't know until he picked me up and was taking me to his house that he had converted as well. And these children, I think were – nobody's recording this – I don't know, I think the children were possessed because some of the things that I saw, I was just blown away. It didn't seem like the vice was allowed from the mother's point of view, but something like, at one point the little boy was angry that the father wouldn't do anything and said to the father: I'm going to poke your eyes out. And the father was like, he's from Columbia, he's Catholic, he converted with this woman. And he was just totally shocked. He was driving the car at the time, and I was sitting in the passenger seat, and it just gave us the willies. Some of the things that I saw, and other more specific things that I can explain that were allowed to happen, but I wouldn't say it in public.

Father: yeah, well, you can tell me. If the parents take God's Name in vain and they tell their kids: don't take God's Name in vain, then obviously what lesson do the kids learn? They learn a total hypocrisy. So, we have to be the example, as well as we have to live what we profess. And, you know, the children aren't that stupid--

Congregant: --No, they're not. They're incredibly intelligent. Even at a young age.

Father: So, they will do what they see, more than what they hear. That's why it's so important that we really love God, really. And pray, and adore Him, and sanctify our life, really. And Mr. Business went to Mass, he never missed a Sunday. Mr. Business went to hell for what he did on Monday. And that's that separation of life from religion which, separation of Church and state promotes that, that schizophrenia. And it's not normal. We should see separation of Church and state like a divorce of mom and dad. And the union of Church and state, as Leo XIII said, is the marriage of mom and dad. The state and Church working together to save souls. That's how it should be. That's normal. But separation of Church and state is absolutely abnormal, produces schizophrenics and bipolar Catholics.

Because in the business world, they have to conform to the business mentality: don't talk about religion or politics. But religion and politics is everything a man is about. The men have to lead the reign of Christ the King, and the political order to Him. That's the man's job, but since the men, we live in this separation of Church and state, they become feminine. The men have become women, and that's why the women have become manly. And that's why they're taking over everything, even in the business world, they're the ones in charge now in many businesses. And the women, you know, the best of them don't to be in charge. They want to be, they're made to be submissive to their husbands, and they're happiest being so. They're too busy changing the diapers and nursing the babies anyway. And that's a good thing.

But the liberal system has demonized the mother at home with children, as you know, and demonized even having children. So, we really got to realize, we don't want to conform to this world. We don't. The world has to conform to Christ the King, as Father Fahey always said.

So, any questions, more? We'll take one more and then we'll close here. I know it's getting late, and you have children. Yes?

Congregant: I was just going to say, that is a tremendous document. And you know, it's shocking but, and brilliant, but I find it kind of sad because it was published in 1959. It seems to be like, I always think of that as they time, like that was the end of at nineteen or twenty-year pontificate, just ended the year before. Now he seems to be saying all these things weren't done, and I always thought of Pius XII as this kind of like, arch-defender of the faith. So, it seems like he's saying: now it's 1959, we better start, we're in, like crisis here, like a massive crisis. That's what I find most shocking about it all. Just, it's shocking. Father: well Archbishop Lefebvre had very high esteem for Pius XII, but, and you know, it's easy for us to say--

Congregant: --I guess that maybe during the last few years of his life there were a lot of cardinals and bishops that were just kind of like letting, he couldn't do it all himself, I guess. And a lot of people were just letting it go, giving up the fight in their own different ways. Maybe that's what it was.

Father: there were already working, they were already working in disobedience to Pius XII, the rats inside of the Church. Plus, he should've consecrated Russia. He saw the miracle of Fatima. The Virgin Mary gave him special graces, and he consecrated, I think he consecrated the world to the Immaculate Heart of Mary--

Congregant: 1942

Father: --But he didn't do Russia.

Congregant: He did Russia in 1952. July 7, 1952. But only by himself, not with the bishops.

Congregant: maybe he was getting lousy advice from some of his inner circle, because he didn't, bishop, rather, one of his secretaries was cardinal, it was Bishop Montini, who became Paul VI. He was one of his inner circle. So, he apparently had negotiations with Stalin behind Pius XII's back. Like he was talking to Stalin, or Stalin's deputy behind Pius XII's back. I remember reading that once.

Congregant: Many people were advising Pius XII to call an ecumenical council, and he refused, because he was afraid of what was going to come out of it.

Father: He said we don't have bishops formed well enough in theology. The only few were this one, and Bishop Lefebvre, and Bishop de Castro Mayer, there weren't many.

Congregant: Seven or eight of them.

Father: So, he knew.

So okay, we'll close there, and persevere, little flock. And keep battling, and try to, try to promote the faith and the reign of Christ's Kingship here in Canada.

We'll end with a prayer.

In the Name of the Father the Son and the Holy Ghost, amen.