THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of
Traditional Catholics of America, Inc.
Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL

Vol. III, No. 1
January 15, 1982

ROMAN CATHOLICS AND THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

— John Kenneth Weiskittel

As this article goes to press America has approximately six months to decide the fate of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA). The controversial amendment's supporters have until June 30, 1982 to achieve its ratification in three more states, but opponents of the measure have sworn to continue their battle against it.

The National Organization for Women (NOW), the most vocal and visible of the pro-ERA forces, has recently vowed to make an all-out effort to pressure state legislatures to ratify the amendment. At a rally held near the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, NOW leaders, joined by former First Ladies "Lady Bird" Johnson and Betty Ford, stated their intention of spending between $6 million and $10 million on a television commercial blitz to assure ERA ratification. (Such an expenditure of money for TV spots hardly seems necessary when one considers the large amount of free coverage that the networks - and the secular media in general - give to the activities of NOW and other feminist groups).

The stated goal of the ERA, it will be recalled, is to secure a constitutional guarantee that "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." One problem with the ERA lies in its language. The phrase "on account of sex" has been criticized by leading legal authorities as being open to multiple interpretations. ERA foe Phyllis Schlafly, who appears to be the only representative of the anti-ERA forces that the mass media are willing to acknowledge, in her book, *The Power of the Positive Woman,* gives an idea of the judicial significance of such unclear terminology:

> ...It is precisely "on account of sex" that a state now denies a marriage to a man and a man, or to a woman and a woman. A homosexual who wants to be a teacher could argue persuasively that to deny him a school job would be discrimination "on account of sex". (1)

Also to be noted in the language of the amendment is the term "equality". And here again we are discussing the *legal* use of the word, a distinction that is by no means irrelevant. *Black's Law Dictionary,* a reference work that has been used by countless judges, attorneys and law schools for the past 90 years, defines equality as "the condition of possessing the same rights, privileges, immunities, and being liable to the same duties." (2) We ask that the reader keep this definition of equality in mind throughout the article, since equal rights inevitably require equal duties.

Any study of the ERA calls for an examination of the leaders, methods and goals of the feminist movement because the Equal Rights Amendment is a natural development of that movement. The ERA was penned by a militant feminist named Alice Paul over fifty years ago. Once, a near-riot condition erupted during a demonstration she led; whereupon she was arrested and later sent to a psychiatric ward. Miss Paul was aware of her actions, however, as she had journeyed before that to England in order to study with Emmeline Pankhurst the mechanics of revolutionary socialism.

If the disruption of social order was Miss Paul's goal, she could scarcely have chosen a better teacher. Mrs. Pankhurst, a radical Socialist who once belonged to the Fabian Society (for more on the Fabians see the September 1, 1981 issue of *The Athanasian),* along with her daughter Christabel formed a revolutionary group known as the Woman Social and Political Union (WSPU). Her activities have been described as follows:

> In 1908 Mrs. Pankhurst declared that the suffragettes would either convert the ministry by force or see "the

continued on next page

cont. from page 1

> Government themselves destroyed." Soon the WSPU surpassed all other dissident movements, if not in rhetoric, in its violence and its disruption of public life. The suffragettes organized campaigns of window smashing in London, burned letters in mailboxes, defaced paintings, and burned unoccupied buildings. Mrs. Pankhurst called this escalation "guerilla warfare" against property "to make England and every department of English life insecure and unsafe." She stopped short only of endangering human life. (3)

However zealous Mrs. Pankhurst was in the cause of radicalism seems almost slight when compared with that of her other daughter, Sylvia. Sylvia Pankhurst's most notable activity along these lines was in her association with the Russian dictator Lenin and her establishing of a Communist Party in England. (4)

Back in the United States support for the illegal methods proposed by Emmeline Pankhurst was considerable, including many of the prominent women of her day. In an article printed in the New York Times of May 6, 1913, we learn that:

> Helen Keller is a militant suffragette. She believes in the smashing of windows, hunger strikes, anything that will bring publicity to the cause. In an interview (5-5-13) given here (Philadelphia) to-night (sic), the blind girl announced that she was a suffragette because she believed the cause eventually would lead to Socialism. "I believe the women of England are doing right", said Miss Keller. "Mrs. Pankhurst is a great leader. The women of America should follow her example. They would get the ballot much faster if they did. They cannot hope to get anything unless they are willing to fight and suffer for it..."
> "But I am a militant suffragette because I believe suffrage will lead to Socialism, and to me Socialism is the ideal cause." (5)

Socialism was the "ideal cause" Helen Keller espoused throughout her adult life, a fact often obscured in "Liberal" adulation for her.

Another feminist living in America at roughly the same time was the Russian-born Anarchist Emma Goldman. She advocated free love, "voluntary communism", and rioting to achieve her goals. Her "philosophy" may have helped cause an American tragedy for, as the May 14, 1940 New York Times noted:

> On Sept. 6, 1901, Leon Czolgosz shot President McKinley in Buffalo. In his confession the assassin said that he had been influenced by the writings of Emma Goldman and by some of the speeches which he heard her make in Cleveland. (6)

Today Emma Goldman is considered something of a heroine by the leaders of the feminist movement. In *The Feminist Papers* editor Alice Rossi, writing an introductory essay to the 16-page section devoted to the anarchist's words, gushes forth praise by calling her "a feminist visionary who speaks to the mood and the goals of feminism in the 1970's far better than she did to the women of her own day." (7) One who seems to be listening closely to "Red Emma", as she was called, is radical feminist Gloria Steinem. Three years ago "Ms." Steinem, in discussing the reluctance of states to ratify the ERA, threatened:

continued on next page

THE ATHANASIAN
Published by Traditional Catholics of America, Inc.
— Fr. Francis E. Fenton, Editor
— Mrs. Marcia A. Fields, Secretary

Eight issues a year: (Jan. 15, Mar. 1, Apr. 15, June 1, July 15, Sept. 1, Oct. 15, Dec. 1)
Subscriptions: $8.00 per year (via First Class Mail) for the USA, Canada and Mexico
$12.00 per year (via Air Mail) for all other countries
Additional copies: single copy - $1.00
10 copies - $8.00
40 or more to same address - 70 cents each
Mailing address: P.O. Box 6827, Colorado Springs, CO 80934-6827
Telephone: (303) 636-1575

cont. from page 2

> The lawful and peaceful stage of our revolution may be over. It's up to the legislators. We can become radical, if they force us. If they continue to interfere with the ratification of the ERA, they will find every form of disobedience possible in every state of the country. (8)

Along similar lines feminist leaders continually insist that under their calm exteriors American women seethe with rage. "In almost any woman you can unearth an incredible fury", states Marxist-feminist Bernardine Dohrn. "It is often not even conscious, a threshold thing. But it's there, and it's an anger that can be a powerful radicalizing force..." (9) Other feminist tributes to Emma Goldman include an Emma Goldman Clinic in Iowa, and "American Women in the 20th Century", a propaganda film pretending to be a documentary, which is to be narrated by TV personalities Alan Alda and Marlo Thomas -- both raised in Catholic homes -- and to be produced by *Ms.* magazine for Home Box Office, the nation's largest pay cable TV network. (source of film news: *Ms.* staff, "Feminist Notes", *Ms.*, July '81, p. 15)

The movement for the ERA has had a good deal of success because the vast majority of Americans have been kept in the dark about the real motive force behind it: International Communism and its "non-Communist" allies. While most of the leaders of the feminist movement are not, strictly speaking, Communists, nearly all have at one time or another expressed their contempt for the free market system and their desire to replace it with one form or another of Socialism. Typical is NOW co-founder Betty Friedan's analysis of the United States' economic system as "rotten old capitalism, which may or may not have the power to regenerate itself." (10) Despite her thoroughly bogus, but carefully nurtured, media image as a moderate, or even conservative (!), feminist, Mrs. Friedan has always appeared to be willing to accept a Marxist or semi-Marxist interpretation as the most accurate view of the world. In her writings she has all but said that she was some form of Bolshevik during her college years in the late 1940's. In fact, she writes that she and her closest college friends spent a good deal of time "going to Marxist discussion groups and rallies at Madison Square Garden", and considered themselves "part of the vanguard of the working class revolution" ("vanguard" is a Communist term used to describe the leaders or indoctrinators of the workers - JKW) who were "feeling only contempt for dreary bourgeois capitalists like our fathers." (11) Nowhere, in reading her writings, have we ever found a repudiation by Mrs. Friedan of her Marxist past.

What we *have* found in the works of Betty Friedan, however, suggests quite the opposite. Her call for a Women's Strike for Equality in 1970 threatened "revolution" if political leaders refused to "dialogue" with her on *her* terms; President Nixon, New York Governor Rockefeller and New York City Mayor Lindsay all obediently signed proclamations hailing its "significance". (12) Far more revealing than this was the way she handled the march down New York's Fifth Avenue. She candidly admits to having deceived countless non-radical women into marching for a Marxist cause when she wrote how she got together before the march with Socialist Workers Party organizer Ruth Ann Miller to inform her that "the young radicals (such as SWP members - JKW) looked like they were scaring away all the most respectable middle-class, middle-aged elements - including NOW members..." (13) But the worst was yet to come. After the march Mrs. Friedan spoke to the assembled marchers, reminding them of the purpose of their strike:

> We serve notice, in our strike here tonight, that any senator who dares to trifle in any way with the Equal Rights Amendment trifles with his political future, for women will not forgive and will not forget. There is no way any man, woman or child can escape the nature of our revolution, of this great moment as it manifests itself here and in other cities where women are marching. What we do here will transform society, though it may not be exactly what Karl Marx or anyone else meant by revolutionary. *We are all the Karl Marxes of this revolution.*" (14) (emphasis added)

The Karl Marxes?!? Does Mrs. Friedan's name-dropping here seem a bit peculiar to you, dear reader? We confess puzzlement over the usage. First, in modern times there have been countless revolutions (e.g., American, French, Russian, Mexican, and Cuban, to name but a few of the more noted), and there have been many people who have advocated revolution of one sort or another, with Karl Marx simply being the most famous - or, rather, infamous - of the theorists. The question here is: Why would a woman born and bred in the U.S. select someone such as Marx with which to compare herself and her feminist compatriots when such logical choices would be American revolutionaries, men with the character of a George Washington or a Thomas Jefferson? Why indeed? Since we do not read minds we can only guess, and our guess is that a person chooses someone with whom they identify, someone for whom they feel an affinity. Second, she mentions that her revolt is not "exactly" what Marx or someone else may have meant by the term. Elsewhere, she is more direct about the similarities and differences. Specifically, in her conversation with a United Nations delegate from Red China, who argued that women's liberation was not needed in a capitalist system since a total workers' "liberation" was needed first, Mrs. Friedan recalled:

continued on next page

cont. from page 3

> I said it was necessary, and good, for women to liberate themselves, no matter what the system, and our movement was one of the things now changing the capitalist system (into a socialist system? - JKW). And wasn't it possible that, in advanced industrial societies like the U.S. today, the women's movement might be the same kind of revolutionary force as the working class, or proletariat, in the days of Marx and Lenin? (15)

We must confess that we hate to agree with Betty Friedan about anything, but in this case we are forced to say she is absolutely correct in the drift of her thought: yes, the feminist movement in our country will - if we do not take immediate steps to prevent it - help to transform our country into a godless, humanistic, socialist state. Why? Because it will help to bring about what Marx and Engels described in their pamphlet, *The Communist Manifesto,* as the "Abolition of the family"! (16)

When we look at modern American society we can certainly see the work of those who seek the destruction of the family. Today, the divine origins of marriage are widely ignored, with civil marriages and easy, socially sanctioned divorces opening the way for temporary, self-serving unions. Abortions outnumber all other operations performed and represent a national disgrace. Inflation tears not only at the economic security of families; it attacks the institution of the family itself because it forces the mother out of the home and into the work force. This compels the parents to send their pre-school children into child-care centers to be attended by strangers, unless they are among those fortunate enough to have either relatives or friends willing to baby-sit. In any case, the ideal mother-child relationship is frustrated. Another indication of the anti-family mentality is the rampant use of contraceptives. Still another is the repeal of many laws prohibiting homosexual practices. And all of the above attacks upon the family are in one manner or another endorsed by the feminists.

Not surprisingly, many Establishment figures have announced that the family is near death and must be replaced. New Deal economist and author Ferdinand Lundberg, for example, maintains that "the family as an institution is in fact near the point of complete extinction." Nancy Lehmann and Helen Sullinger, in a feminist statement entitled "The Document", contend:

> The nuclear family (i.e., two parents with dependent children - JKW) must be replaced with a new form of family where individuals live and work together to help meet the needs of all people in the society. New space must be found to house this family and new collectivized work must prevent members from being exploited and isolated from each other. (sic) (18)

This, they tell us, is necessary because the family is "slowly disintegrating". Sociologist Alvin Toffler, he of *Future Shock* fame, has an even more radical vision of tomorrow:

> Given affluence and the existence of specially-equipped and licensed professional parents, many of today's biological parents would not only gladly surrender their children to them, but would look upon it as an act of love, rather than rejection. (19)

Not to be outdone, Dr. Margaret Mead, the anthropologist, feminist and constant supporter of far-left causes, proposes the formation of communal "cluster group families", since, she argues, traditional families "overvalue personal autonomy and independence", and are thus "incongrous with our new expectations." (20)

Such opinions as these are all agreeable to the Communists and - either directly or indirectly - are derived from the Marx/Engels demand for the destruction of the family and from other Communist ideological sources. Marx' collaborator Friedrich Engels has detailed the Communist position on women in his book, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.* In that volume, praised by today's American feminists as essential reading, Engels states that liberation for women is liberation *from* the family and *into* the work force:

> Woman can be emancipated only when she can take part on a large social scale in production and is engaged in domestic work only to an insignificant degree. And this has become possible only in the big industry of modern time, which not only admits of female labor on a grand scale but even formally demands it...(21)

Why these pioneer Communists insist that women merge into a collectivized labor group as a step towards abolishing the family is seen in the following quote from Marx' work, *The German Ideology*: "That the abolition of individual economy is inseparable from the abolition of the family is self-evident." (22)

This contempt for the family carries over quite clearly in so many of the American feminists who support the Equal Rights Amendment. Roxanne Dunbar, in her essay, "Female Liberation As the Basis For Social Revolution", pays homage to the Communists, stating: "...we (women's liberation - JKW) have taken the basic tools of Marxist analysis (dialectic and historical materialism) and expanded the understanding of the process of change." (23) She elaborates:

continued on next page

cont. from page 4

> Our analysis of women as an exploited caste is not new. Marx and Engels as well as other nineteenth-century socialist and communist theorists analyzed the position of the female sex in just such a way. Engels identified the family as "the basic unit of capitalist society, and of female oppression. The modern individual family is founded on the open or concealed domestic slavery of the wife, and modern society is a mass composed of these individual families as its molecules." And "within the family, he (the man) is the bourgeois and the wife represents the proletariat."
> (Frederick Engels, *Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*). (24)

Her perception of the situation sounds altogether like that of her feminist "sisters" that we quoted earlier:

> The new sense of collective action among women is fast destroying the decadent family ideology along with its ugly individualism and competitiveness and complacency. Our demand for collective public child care is throwing into question the private family (or individual) ownership of children. (25)

It is only proper that Roxanne Dunbar, operating as she does from a "Marxist analysis" of the problem, would reach the Marxist "solution" - the abolition of the family. She does not disappoint us:

> How will the family unit be destroyed? After all, women must take care of the children, and there will continue to be children. Our demand for full-time child care in the public schools will be met to some degree all over, and perhaps fully in places. The alleviation of the duty of full-time child care in private situations will free many women to make decisions they could not before. But more than that, the demand alone will throw the whole ideology of the family into question, so that women can begin establishing a community of work with each other (sic) and we can fight collectively. Women will be freer to leave their husbands and become economically independent, either through a job or welfare. (26)

Now let us remove this proposal from the regions of the purely abstract and return it to the real world; otherwise we could perhaps lull ourselves into a false sense of security by dismissing these as merely the rantings of a wild-eyed revolutionary. Would ratification of the ERA in any way bring such ideas to life and, if so, what would be the resultant changes in U.S. society? If passed, ERA would *mandate* the creation of such public child care centers, as it would be argued that women cannot compete on an equal basis with men unless they can turn their children over to be watched. All taxpayers would be required to help finance this subversion. The real danger to the youngsters would be that they would be given heavy doses of Humanism. Already, Humanism is being taught with devastating effects to children in public grade schools. It is atheistic, socialistic, internationalist. (If that sounds like Marxism to you, you are not alone. Alan Stang has done an excellent job of unmasking Humanism in his article in the September, 1981 issue of *American Opinion*.). For pre-school children to be subjected to it could go a long way towards fulfilling Khrushchev's assurance to Americans in the late 1950's that their grandchildren would be communists.

While the Communists we have cited pertaining to the family were theorists who never lived to see Communism actually assume power in any country, it should be shown that those Communists who later enslaved nations actually did carry out the earlier ideas with amazing faithfulness. In Soviet Russia, just after the first World War, the First All-Russian Congress of Worker and Peasant Women was formed in November, 1918. A year later the group met in Petrograd (now Leningrad) and formulated a program that, read today, does not sound at all that different from the program proposed by the feminist backers of the ERA. Included in the 1919 plan were: collective child-rearing (i.e., "child-care") institutions, State-controlled maternities, the commitment to introduce women in ever greater numbers into the economy (including jobs in factories and shops), communal living arrangements, wherever possible, to eliminate "individual economy", and, in general, efforts to make men and women "equal". The slogan adopted by that group clearly underlined its total support for the Marxian aim of the destruction of the traditional family structure, as it maintained that "the separation of the kitchen from marriage is as vital as the separation of the church from the state". (27)

Five years later the Communist International in a plenary session, seeing that the perpetuation of the family was a major stumbling block hindering its plans for a Communist world, issued this statement: "*The Revolution is impotent as long as the notion of the family and of family relations continues to exist.*" (28) (emphasis added) Then, in 1936, the Communist Caesars revealed their "Constitution". Article 122 of

continued on next page

cont. from page 5

that document reads as follows: "In Soviet Russia woman enjoys the same rights as men in all respects of economic, cultural, public, and political life." (29) Does this sound familiar? Let us not be deceived by such lofty language, since such widely held beliefs as "peace", "freedom", "justice", and "human rights" have, when spoken by a Communist, radically different meanings from the ordinary senses of the words. In order to know what they mean we have to look elsewhere. To find out exactly what the statement means, what the term "the same rights" involves, we turn to another statement from the Comintern:

> Social equality of man and woman before the law and in practical life. Radical transformation in conjugal rights and the family code. Recognition of maternity as a social function. Making a social charge of the care of children and adolescents. The organizing of a civilizing struggle against the ideology and the traditions that make woman a slave...(30)

Again we are confronted with goals not at all unlike those of U.S. feminists. Because of the similarity of goals it might prove instructive to take the Comintern declaration point by point and observe how each has been put into practice in the U.S.S.R. In such a manner we can see what the ERA holds for America.

(1) *Social equality of man and woman before the law and in practical life.* Vladimir Lenin has provided us with the clearest exposition of what equality means in the Bloshevik scheme of things. In the text of a speech intitled *The Tasks of the Working Women's Movement in the Soviet Republic,* given on September 23, 1919, we read:

> As long as women are engaged in housework their position is still a restricted one. In order to achieve the complete emancipation of women and to make them really equal with men, we must have social economy, and the participation of women in general productive labor. Then women will occupy the same position as men. This, of course, does not mean that women must be exactly equal with men in productivity of labor, amount of labor, its duration, conditions of labor, etc. But it does mean that women shall not be in an opressed economic position compared with men. You all know that even with the fullest equality, women are still in an actual position of inferiority because all housework is thrust upon them. Most of this housework is highly unproductive, most barbarous and most arduous, and it is performed by women. This labor is extremely petty and contains nothing that would in the slightest degree facilitate the development of women. (31)

How were these "equal rights" actually implemented? In his book, *Worker's Paradise Lost,* journalist Eugene Lyons explored the subject at length:

> A few words are in order about the living conditions of Soviet women, whose supposed new "equality" is always touted in communist propaganda. Actually, they have no more privileges, in law or in the economy, than their sisters in the West - unless employment on hard and dangerous jobs normally reserved for men can be rated as a privilege. Back in 1931, I remember, the young Jack Howard, new head of Scripps-Howard Newspapers, wrote a series of articles after a visit to Soviet Russia. The first of them (I quote from memory) began something like this: "No sooner had I crossed the border than I saw Russian women enjoying their new equality - they were carrying logs."
>
> Thirty-six years later (now, in 1981, fifty years later - JKW), they are still carrying logs, digging ditches, sweeping streets, laying bricks, carrying hods, scrubbing decks of ships, tending furnaces in steel mills and doing other "men's work". The employment of women in coal mines was prohibited in England in 1842; a century and more later the Soviet press was boasting of the high output by women's brigades in coal pits. (Latest industry estimates now show women to hold 11% of all jobs as coal miners in the United States.)
>
> Nearly 50 per cent of the wage-earners in the U.S.S.R. are women, compared with less than 25 per cent in the United States (the U.S. ratio in 1976, only a decade after Mr. Lyons had written these words, had become more Sovietized. According to the *World Almanac* of 1979 the male/female ratio was almost exactly 60/40. The three surgical tools of subversion in this case - feminist lobbying, government employment regulations, and inflation - are being

continued on next page

cont. from page 6

> used by the Master Conspiracy's doctors to perform a major operation on the patient, that is, victim - the American family. The doctors' prognosis for the patient: terminal. - JKW). The principal reason for this, of course, is that the male head of a family rarely can support it by his own labor. The pretense that women prefer outside work to what Lenin once called "the primitive and deadening tasks of the household" is largely a progaganda myth.
>
> The truth is that working class women have no choice. Though they work in a factory or office, they still carry their responsibilities as wives and mothers, doing the cooking and washing and housecleaning at home. They still must combine care of their children with the outside employment. Those who have an old mother or mother-in-law living with them and helping with the chores are the lucky ones. Soviet men have no more appetite or talents for household tasks than men elsewhere. (32)

(2) *Radical transformation in conjugal rights and the family code.* The marital and familial subversion which took place in Russia after the 1917 Revolution has been concisely enumerated by Fr. Newman C. Eberhardt, C.M. in his *Summary of Catholic History*:

> Libertine excess was allowed and even encouraged; "bourgeois morality" was ridiculed; civil marriage introduced, conbinage condoned, parental rights unrecognized, illegitimate children placed on a par with legitimate, and "postcard divorces" sanctioned. (33)

The U.S.S.R. has never fully carried out its concept of the "nationalization of women", and it has allowed the monogamous family to exist in an embattled sort of way. In *Masters of Russian Marxism* Thornton Anderson has remarked that "Rudolf Schlesinger (author of *The Family in the U.S.S.R.* - JKW) has made the shrewd suggestion that the retention of the private family in the Soviet Union is connected with the problem of incentives to work: the support of children in the home provides a powerful spur to the parents." (34)

Another reason for the decision involves the degree of social intimacy found in the traditional family. Because the family has this to a far greater extent than any communal arrangements possibly could, the dictatorship observed it could use this very closeness as a weapon against the family by pitting family members against one another. Children are used as informants against their very own parents!

A fair question some readers might be asking at this moment is whether the fact that the Communists allow the family to exist in some form in Russia while at the same time are doing everything in their power to wreck the family in the U.S. represents a contradiction. It may seem that way, but actually there is no contradiction here because we are discussing two entirely different countries. In the U.S.S.R., we are discussing a nation that has been under totalitarian rule for over 60 years. The leaders of that unlawful regime have come to realize that the preservation of some semblance of a family is actually desirable as it helps them maintain order. On the other hand, America is a prize that has up to now eluded - thanks be to God - their grasp. Since part of the Red battle plan against us has been the attack from within (i.e., internal subversion), it follows that a chief target of that attack would be that very same cornerstone in the maintenance of the social order - the family.

To anyone reading this article who may still doubt the premise or who does not quite see the application, consider the following: The late Fr. Bernard A. Kunkel, founder of the Marylike Crusade (to battle the immodest fashions of our day), wrote an article in the Conciliar Catholic - and sometimes excellent -tabloid, *Divine Love,* that exposed Communist connections in the immorality which is rampant in our land. In the article, "Certain Fashions Will Be Introduced That Will Offend Our Lord Very Much" - that title taken from Our Lady's prophetic utterances at Fatima - Fr. Kunkel reveals that Dr. Bella Dodd (the leading U.S. woman Communist who renounced the Party and provided Congressional committees much valuable information on activities of Communists in our country) stated that the Communists are financing the majority of pornographic literature in the United States. (35) Similar studies in other countries have shown similar subversion. However, when we observe life in the Soviet Union we notice the censorship of such obscene materials. Why is this? Simply because the nation that has already been captured needs to be held by the preservation of civil society...otherwise, the conquerers may well find *themselves* being overthrown. So, the Communists are certainly not interested in upholding any moral principle here (in Russia); rather they are interested only in what will sustain and strengthen their power.

(3) *Recognition of maternity as a social function.* In the matter of maternity in the U.S.S.R. we find perhaps the clearest example of the Communist claim that the individual was created for the State in contrast to the Christian position that the State was created for the individual.

When we as Catholics discuss motherhood we should, of course, reflect on the sanctity of life. And it is because of that sanctity that we do well to consider

continued on next page

cont. from page 7

abortion as an offense so abominable as to cry out to Heaven for retribution. Naturally, the Communist's materialistic view of human life precludes any acknowledgement of the sanctity and profound dignity of human life. Lenin has been quoted as having said, for example, that he would rather see 99 innocent people hang than for one guilty person to go free.

It is with that sort of background that we examine Soviet abortion policy. *Encyclopedia Britannica,* in writing on the history of "birth control", has given us this account:

> Although most religions have condemned induced abortion, the application of severe criminal sanctions to deter its practice became common only in the 19th century; induced abortion was usually illegal but was sometimes permitted or tolerated to preserve the life of the mother. The first important departure from the 19th century pattern came in the U.S.S.R. in 1920, when the post-revolutionary government authorized abortion at the request of the mother; in 1936 another decree restricted legal abortion practice, but in 1955 abortion on request was restored. (36)

So, the model that Western governments have selected for their abortion laws is Soviet Russia, though this should come as little surprise to informed students of the Communist conspiracy. What is most interesting in the Russian policy is the *change* policy. In 1920, three years after usurping power, the Reds repealed prohibitions on abortions; certainly they must have seen that by legalizing them they would dramatically reduce future population growth, thus aiding them in their "redistribution of the wealth". In 1936, with the prospect of a major war - and thus a sizable loss of citizens - imminent, the Soviets under Stalin moved to make abortions again illegal, in hopes of assuring that the war would not take too great a toll on the people. In 1955, the concern was over de-populizing rather than re-populizing Russia. The decade following the end of the Second World War was one of a rapid growth of population in the U.S.S.R., similar to the "baby boom" taking place in the U.S. Therefore, the ban on abortions was again lifted in order to curb the rate of growth.

We see, then, that the considerations made by the Communists were made totally out of expedience. Such pragmatism is called situation ethics in America. Say what you will of the Soviet abortion plans, they are entirely effective. Entirely effective -and entirely evil. It should be noted that American feminists have time and again expressed their contempt for the traditional attitudes towards marriage and maternity. Representative of this thinking is Betty Friedan, when she remarks that motherhood has had "a kind of false sanctity attached to it." (37)

(4) *Making a social charge of the care of children and adolescents.* As we have mentioned already, this is one of the most insidious of the proposals as it strips authority from the parents and places it in the State. In the Soviet Union, the Ministry of Health operates nurseries for young children, from ten weeks to three years old. (38) It has been observed that the state nurseries care little if the mother is given her own baby at the end of the day, and even condone such mix-ups on the grounds that it helps to break parents of the "bourgeois" custom of caring for one's *own* child.

No one has defended such practices with as much vigor as Simone deBeauvior, the French Marxist-Existentialist who was the lifelong mistress of the late playwright Jean-Paul Sarte. Her *The Second Sex,* in which she argues that "the fate of women and socialism are intimately bound up together", is on probably every feminist "suggested reading" list in the United States. (39) One admirer is ERA promoter Betty Friedan, who credited Miss deBeauvior for having "started me on a road on which I'll keep moving." (40) Regarding the choice between state-operated child care (Miss deBeauvior's model is Red China) and private care, Miss deBeauvior insisted:

> No, we don't believe that any woman should be authorized to stay at home to raise her children. Society should be totally different. Women should not have the choice, precisely because if there is such a choice, too many women will make that one. It is a way of forcing women in a certain direction. (41; to this, Mrs. Friedan has taken slight exception, saying she is "at the moment" against the coercive aspect of the proposal, though not against the child care program in general - JKW)

(5) *The organizing of a civilizing struggle against the ideology and the traditions that make woman a slave.* The Communists have always realized that women have always had the ability to play a great role in stabilizing a culture; as a nation's women go, so goes that nation. It was with this in mind that Lenin told German Communist Klara Zetkin that:

> The Communist women's movement must itself be a mass movement, a part of a general mass movement...There can be no real mass movement without

continued on next page

cont. from page 8

> women...Unless millions of women are with us we cannot exercise the proletarian dictatorship, cannot construct on Communist lines. We must find our way to them, we must study and try to find that way. (42)

Could today's feminist movement be part of that mass movement? Again, please remember that we are speaking specifically about the leaders of this movement. The vast majority of ERA supporters are sincere people who are supporting it because it sounds like it is a noble cause. They should not be attacked but rather should be enlightened as to the real goals of their leaders. Lenin said that Communism must be made with non-Communist hands, so we should do all in our power to deprive them of those hands by alerting as many of our fellow citizens as possible about the very real danger threatening our country.

We have spent a good deal of this article showing what the Marxist-Feminist professes as her beliefs. Let us now turn to authentic Catholic teaching to get some idea of just what the differences are between the two. Various pontiffs have felt obliged over the past century to remind the faithful of these differences and to remind them as well of their moral obligation to oppose such anti-Christian ideologies as feminism. The first encyclical to challenge the false teachings of feminism was *Arcanum Divinae Sapientiae,* written in 1880 by Pope Leo XIII. In the early Church St. Paul and St. Augustine both spoke often and eloquently on the true Christian relationship of the sexes. A quote from Leo XIII's *Arcanum:* "The man is the ruler of the family, and head of the woman; but because she is flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone, let her be subject and obedient to the man, not as a servant but as a companion, so that nothing be lacking of honor or of dignity in the obedience which she pays. Let divine charity be the constant guide of their mutual relations, both in him who rules and in her who obeys, since each bears the image, the one of Christ, the other of the Church." Pope Leo also condemned the "boldness and wickedness of men (who would) change and disturb this order of things." (source: *Five Great Encyclicals*; p. 85, p. 107)

Fifty years later, Pope Pius XI added his *Casti Connubii* in which he directly addressed the problem:

> The same false teachers who try to dim the luster of conjugal faith and purity do not scruple to do away with the honorable and trusting obedience which the woman owes the man. Many of them go even further and assert that such a subjection of one party to the other is unworthy of human dignity, that the rights of the husband and the wife are equal; wherefore, they boldly proclaim, the emancipation of women has been or should be effected. This emancipation in their ideas must be threefold, in the ruling of the domestic society, in the administration of family affairs and in the rearing of children...
>
> This, however, is not the true emancipation of woman, nor the rational and exalted liberty which belongs to the noble office of a Christian woman and wife; it is rather the debasing of the womanly character and the dignity of motherhood, and indeed of the whole family, as a result of which the husband suffers the loss of his wife, the children of their mother, and the home and the whole family of an ever watchful guardian. More than this, this false liberty and unnatural equality with the husband is the detriment of the woman herself for, if the woman descends from her truly regal throne to which she has been raised within the walls of the home by means of the Gospel, she will soon be reduced to the old state of slavery (if not in appearance, certainly in reality) and become as among the pagans the mere instrument of man. (43)

Pope Pius also condemned feminism in his encyclical on Communism, *Divini Redemptoris.* (44)

His successor to the Throne of Peter, Pope Pius XII, also took a firm stand against this kind of subversion. In 1956, the *New York Times* made mention of Pius' speech before several thousand Italian women in an article entitled "Pope Pius Calls Woman Creation's Masterpiece". The article noted that the Pope's message included the idea that "the physical and moral make-up of woman demanded discrimination in the kind and amount of work that she should do." (45) His Holiness went on to say:

> The concept of the woman in the shipyards, of the mines, or heavy labor, as it is exalted and practiced by some countries that would want to inspire progress is anything but a modern concept. It is, on the contrary, a sad return to epochs that Christian civilization buried long ago... (46)

Pope John XXIII broke from the traditional Catholic viewpoint with a pro-feminist passage in *Pacem in Terris.* The true position of the Church is "pro-feminine but anti-feminist".

continued on next page

cont. from page 9

Equally sad is the turning away from Catholic social principles by those in the Conciliar Church who have embraced the heretical beliefs of feminism or who have been tainted by them. John F. Kennedy, as U.S. president, for a case in point, was praised by the humanist head of Planned Parenthood, Dr. Alan F. Guttmacher, for warning Americans about the severity - or, rather, *alleged* severity - of the population growth. (47) President Kennedy also formed a 1961 Commission on the Status of Women, a group working for the breakdown of the family, as is attested by the fact that the commission was headed by the hyperradical Margaret Mead. (48) JFK's younger brother, U.S. Senator Edward Kennedy, is a consistent voter for ERA and abortion. His charisma (?) apparently keeps the American hierarchy from excommunicating him (what's stopping Rome?). Conciliar feminists like Dr. Mary Daly denounce true Catholic teaching as "anti-feminist" (which it is). Radical nuns "demand" that "sexist" parts of the Bible be changed. Even worse was Pope Paul VI's meeting with revolutionary Betty Friedan at the Vatican. During her private audience with him, Mrs. Friedan was awarded a medal for her feminist activities, and was told by Pope Paul: "We wish to thank you, and congratulate you on your work". The meeting took place in late October 1973, the very month of the infamous Humanist Manifesto II. (49) Thankfully, some Conciliar groups have opposed ERA (e.g., National Council of Catholic Women, Catholic Daughters of America, and Knights of Columbus), yet U.S. Catholic bishops say the ERA is a matter of personal choice for Catholics. (50,51) Just last month Pope John Paul II indicated that the Conciliar Church would continue to ignore the authentic teaching of Catholicism when he told an estimated 30,000 people at St. Peter's Square: "The problem of legal equality between men and women should be resolved with social legislation that recognizes the equality of men and women workers". (Note that this is exactly the opposite of the position taken by Pope Pius XII. We can't help wondering if the answer may lie in the fact that John Paul II has spent well over half his adult life in a Communist country; apparently he has assimilated much of their alien thinking. But what excuse did John XXIII and Paul VI have to explain their actions?) An odd footnote to the speech by John Paul II occurred in his statement the following day that no government has the authority to legalize abortions. Apparently, he does not realize that "equal rights" laws can be a legal blank check for state-authorized abortions. This is the belief of Notre Dame Law School Professor Charles Rice among others. And the opinion of Professor Rice is not to be easily dismissed. He is one of the leading pro-life spokesmen in the U.S., and is considered a strong contender for a Supreme Court nomination. Professor Rice, a Conciliar Catholic, has stated: "If the ERA were adopted, it would make clear beyond any doubt that the states would be disabled from prohibiting or even restricting abortion in any significant way...I believe that the adoption of the ERA would jeopardize, at least with respect to public institutions and personnel, the so-called conscience clauses which give hospitals and medical personnel the right to refuse on grounds of conscience to perform abortions." Not surprisingly, Betty Friedan and other feminists back the ERA for this among other reasons." (source: Schlafly, op. cit. pp. 110-111.)

We have really just brushed the surface of this issue in this article but the facts are there for any reader ambitious enough to dig deeper. It should be evident by now that our country is in real peril and that we must oppose in every morally acceptable way this evil disguised as good. With this in mind, THE ATHANASIAN urges all readers, both Catholics and non-Catholics of good will, to resist the passage of the ERA by informing family, friends, business associates, newspapers and, especially, their congressmen of the truth about ERA. Lenin said that, for the Communist, ideas are more deadly than guns. But, as we Christians have the light of God on our side, let us bravely do battle against these forces of darkness and fight the good fight.

(The footnotes for this article are found on page 13)

†††††††††††††††††††††††

TCA BUMPER STICKER

In red and black lettering on a white background, it reads: "Traditional Catholics of America — Save the Traditional Mass". Also included is our TCA address. The cost of these bumper stickers is two for $1.00 (minimum order). The price covers postage, and payment must accompany order.

†††††††††††††††††††††††

pray the rosary daily

A Comment And A Request

The article by Mr. Weiskittel in this issue of the newsletter, "Roman Catholics and the Equal Rights Amendment", is a most timely one. Well researched and documented, it leaves no doubt of the close affiliation of the radical feminist movement with Communism. This article deserves a far, far wider readership than it can receive from the relatively small circulation of *The Athanasian* with its approximately 1150 subscribers. Hence, it is urgently requested and fondly hoped that many of those who receive this newsletter issue will see fit to order extra copies for distribution to their relatives and acquaintances (bulk order prices listed elsewhere in these pages). Mr. Weiskittel's article will thereby be given at least a small portion more of the far greater circulation it so justly warrants.

P.S. Another thought: why not send a copy of this issue of *The Athanasian* to the Conciliar Church bishop in the confines of whose diocese you happen to reside? He might even read the entire issue, including the article on the bishops of the American Conciliar "Catholic" Church!

A Three-Fold Task For 1982

Traditional Catholics of America (TCA) conducts three important projects simultaneously. The first and most important of these, of course, is the task of bringing the traditional Latin Mass and Sacraments to as many Catholics as possible. To date, TCA serves eleven chapels and Mass centers around the country. The search for truly traditional Roman Catholic priests to help TCA in this effort will continue with increased vigor in 1982.

A second task of Traditional Catholics of America is that of providing information to Roman Catholics through the printed word. The major instrument for accomplishing this is *The Athanasian.* An important goal for 1982 is to sharply increase the number of subscribers to this newsletter. Just before Christmas, some of our readers helped us get *The Athanasian* into a few more homes through gift subscriptions. While we sincerely appreciate the help of these readers, the aid of many more is needed if the efforts of our TCA in the field of traditional Catholicism are to make a significant impact on the American scene. We continue to urge the purchasing of gift subscriptions for relatives and friends, but we realize that for many this is not possible on a grand scale. It may well be that some of our readers may prefer to simply send us a list of the names and addresses of those who might be responsive to *The Athanasian* and the work of TCA. We will send information on our work and an invitation to subscribe to *The Athanasian* to all names submitted.

Christ the King School in Colorado Springs, Colorada is the third important project of Traditional Catholics of America. The school opened September 1, 1981 with the purpose of accomplishing three vital goals: 1) to provide an excellent traditional Roman Catholic education for children from kindergarten through high school; 2) to offer training in traditional methods to teachers; and 3) to provide information to other groups wishing to open traditional Roman Catholic schools.

Since its opening, the school *has* provided an excellent educational program conducted by well qualified traditional Roman Catholic teachers and it has been of some help in providing information to the organizers of other schools. Throughout 1982, and beyond, Christ the King School intends to continue its fine educational program and to keep all who are interested informed of the school's progress. Copies of the school brochure and periodical news of the school will be sent to subscribers of *The Athanasian* in 1982. Christ the King School is not - and never was intended to be - "provincial" or the property of any *one* chapel. It exists to serve traditional Roman Catholics everywhere.

Traditional Catholics of America pledges itself with continued dedication to the achievement of these three projects. The success of each of them depends on the grace of God, to be sure, and on the willingness of the readers of *The Athanasian* to lend their wholehearted support throughout 1982 to our TCA apostolate.

†††††††††††††††††††††††

PLEASE NOTE

Following is the address and telephone number of Christ the King School. They should be used for all correspondence and telephone calls relating to the school.

Christ the King School
P.O. Box 6428
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80934-6428
(303) 635-9183

†††††††††††††††††††††††

Those Bishops of the American Conciliar Church - Again

- *Fr. Francis E. Fenton*

It was a former General Secretary of the Communist International, Georgi Dimitrov, who said that "a university professor or writer who defends or lends himself to the interest of the Soviet Union is worth more that a thousand party members." If that statement be true of a professor or author or actor, how much more applicable it is to a clergyman, say, a bishop or priest? More and more of late these words of Communist Dimitrov come to mind as I behold the sorry spectacle of the bishops of the Conciliar "Catholic" Church in this country aiding and abetting the Communist cause by their widely publicized declarations and positions relating to El Salvador, nuclear weapons, sex education in the schools, etc. Are any of these bishops actually Communists? I don't know - but I do not discount the possibility. If any one of them were known to be, then, of course - in line with the Dimitrov statement above - his efforts in promoting the Communist cause would be ineffective. A bishop or priest in the USA - even though in fact he be a Communist - must retain a public image of respectability and preserve an aura of goodness and holiness so as not to alienate those whom he wishes favorably to impress.

In 1955 a former member of the French Communist Party, Albert Bassart, stated that "in 1936 Moscow sent out an order to have sure and carefully selected Communist youth enter the seminaries and become priests." (*The Techniques of Soviet Propaganda,* Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, 1960, p. 7). Although isolated cases have come to light (such as that of the Jesuit "Father" Alighiero Tondi in the 1950's), it is anybody's guess how many hundreds or thousands of those handpicked Communist youth of years past are today masquerading as clergymen around the world - including Conciliar Church bishops and priests. (Back in the 40's and 50's, because there were genuine Roman Catholic seminaries in those days, it must have taken quite a bit of doing for a Communist to complete the arduous seminary routine and to get himself "ordained". In the country club seminaries now in vogue, that is a much simpler undertaking). For a number of years I subscribed to the position that priests don't become Communists but that Communists become priests, and bishops. I'm now inclined to think that the first part of that statement is no longer true. In other words, I believe that it is not at all unlikely today that some very liberal, leftist priests and bishops may in due time become, or have become, Communists. Of course, I also believe that an increasing number of men coming out of today's Conciliar Church seminaries and being "ordained" aren't priests at all.

The situation in Latin America offers perhaps the best example of "Catholic" bishops and priests who are either out and out Communists or who are openly and brazenly advancing the Communist cause in word or deed. Some of the top positions in the Communist Sandinista government in Nicaragua are held by "priests" ("Father" Miguel d'Escoto, for example). It is common knowledge that "priests" are working with the Reds in El Salvador. Throughout Latin America the pro-Communism of various bishops of the Conciliar Church is beyond question. Perhaps the most notorious of these is Mexican Bishop Mendez Arceo who, if he is not a member of the Communist Party, is, as the saying goes, certainly cheating the Party of his dues. Need it be said that all of these "bishops" and "priests" are in good standing with the non-Catholic Conciliar "Catholic" Church?

But there is no need for us in the USA to look beyond our nation's borders to find so-called Catholic bishops and priests who in one way or another are, humanly speaking, destroying the Church and who are more and more openly doing their part to bring down the country. Limiting my comments for the remainder of this article to the bishops of the American Conciliar "Catholic" Church, I find it difficult to believe - even in this crazy world in which we live - that these bishops are actually saying and doing what they *are* actually saying and doing on such subjects as El Salvador, abortion, ERA, sex education (including "Catholic" schools), the possession of nuclear weapons, etc., to say nothing of such silly antics of theirs as the removal of the "sexist" language in their Novus Ordo service. One of them has made the statement that even the mere possession of nuclear weapons is immoral. I wonder where he learned his moral theology. Another has declared that the USA, if attacked by Soviet Russia, should "surrender to the invader"! Many scores of examples could readily be presented of the pitiable state of the Conciliar Church episcopate.

The National Council of Catholic Bishops is the official body of bishops of the American Conciliar Church. There is, of course, not a truly traditional bishop in the whole lot (over 300). Indeed, if there is even a solidly conservative bishop among them, I haven't the slightest idea who he might be. (The "conservative" Pope John Paul II has occupied the papal throne for some three years now and has yet to appoint a conservative, much less a traditional, bishop in this country). As a body, the National Council of (so-called) Catholic Bishops is a scandal and, more and more, a laughingstock among honorable inform-

continued on next page

cont. from page 12

ed Roman Catholics and others. To excuse them, as some people honestly attempt to do, on the score that they mean well is, I submit, an unacceptable explanation. To contend that they mean well is to say, by implication, that, among other things, they are deficient in moral theology, that they are unpatriotic, and that they lack common sense - all of which may be true enough. It is my contention, however, that a far more accurate analysis of the National Council of Catholic Bishops would hold that some of them are hopelessly brainwashed, some are cowards, and some are on the side of the Church's enemies. And could it be that some, if not many, of them have simply lost the Faith? I think it could very well be.

†††††††††††††††††††††

SUBSCRIPTION RENEWALS

The date on the envelope address label indicates the month and year in which the recipient's subscription is due for renewal. At the proper time, a subscription envelope will be enclosed with the newsletter. One may enter a new subscription at any time, of course, and will then receive the eight following newsletter issues.

†††††††††††††††††††††

Footnotes

Roman Catholics and the Equal Rights Amendment
- John Kenneth Weiskittel

1) Phyllis Schlafly, *The Power of the Positive Woman,* (New York: Jove Books, 1978), pp. 113-114

2) Henry Campbell Black, *A Law Dictionary,* 2nd ed., (St. Paul: West Pub., 1910), p. 431

3) *The McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of World Biography* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), V. 8, p. 275

4) Eugene H. Methvin, *The Rise of Radicalism* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1973), pp. 370-372

5) Elizabeth Janeway, *Women: Their Changing Roles* (New York: Arno Press, 1973), p.88

6) IBID, p. 10

7) Alice Rossi, ed., *The Feminist Papers,* 2nd ed. (New York: Bantam, 1974), p. 508

8) *The Review of the News,* August 2, 1978, pp. 57, 59

9) Janeway, op. cit., p. 389

10) Betty Friedan, *It Changed My Life: Writings on the Woman's Movement* (New York: Random House, 1976), p. 384

11) IBID, p.8

12) Janeway, op. cit., p. 395

13) Friedan, op. cit., p. 147

14) IBID, p. 153

15) Friedan, ibid., p. 355

16) Karl Marx & Friedrich Engels, trans. Samuel Moore, *The Communist Manifesto* (NY: Washington Square Press, 1971), p. 87

17) quoted in Gary E. McCuen & David L. Bender, ed., *The Sexual Revolution* (Anoka, MN: Green Haven Press, 1972), p. 3

18) IBID, p. 5

19) McCuen & Bender, ibid., p. 12

20) IBID, pp. 17-18

21) quoted in Simone de Beauvior, trans. & ed. H. M. Parshley, *The Second Sex* (NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953), p. 55

22) Robert C. Tucker, ed., *The Marx-Engels Reader* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1972), p. 121, note 3

23) from Robin Morgan, ed., *Sisterhood is Powerful: An Anthology of Writings from the Women's Liberation Movement* (NY: Random House, 1970), p. 486

24) IBID

25) Morgan, ibid., p. 487

26) IBID, p. 488

27) Carol R. Berkin & Clara M. Lovett, ed., *Women, War, And Revolution* (NY: Holmes & Meier, 1980), p. 147

28) de Beauvior, op. cit., p. 127

29) IBID, pp. 126-127

30) de Beauvior, ibid.

31) Stefan T. Possony, ed., *Lenin Reader* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1966), pp. 73-74

32) Eugene Lyons, *Workers' Paradise Lost* (New York: Paperback Library, 1967), pp. 239-240

33) Fr. Newman C. Eberhardt, C.M., *A Summary of Catholic History; V. 2* (St. Louis: Herder, 1962), p. 706

34) Thornton Anderson, *Masters of Russian Marxism* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963), p. 169, note 13

35) Fr. Bernard A. Kunkel, "Certain Fashions Will Be Introduced...", *Divine Love,* Volume 20, Number 4

36) *Encyclopedia Britannica,* Volume 2 (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1974), p. 1069

37) Friedan, op. cit., p. 312

38) see, for example, Kenneth R. Whiting, *The Soviet Union Today: A Concise Handbook* (NY: Praeger, 1962), p. 238

39) de Beauvior, op. cit., p. 55

40) Friedan, op. cit., p. 306

41) IBID, p. 312

42) Mary R. Beard, *Woman As A Force In History* (New York: MacMillan, 1946), p. 3

43) *Five Great Encyclicals* (New York: Paulist Press, 1951), p. 198

44) see IBID, p. 181

45) Janeway, op. cit., p. 250

46) IBID

47) Janeway, ibid., p. 371

48) Ishbel Ross, *Sons of Adam, Daughters of Eve* (NY: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 250

49) Friedan, op. cit., p. 287

50) Schlafly, op. cit., p. 291

51) *National Now Times,* February, 1981

COLORADO

AURORA (Denver area)
OUR LADY OF VICTORY CHAPEL
2566 Sable Boulevard
(303) 364-8040
Masses at 9 & 11 a.m. (every Sunday)
Weekday Masses at 8:00 a.m.

COLORADO SPRINGS
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY CHAPEL
815 South 25th Street
(Christ the King School)
(303) 636-1575 - Call between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday-Friday
Masses at 8:30 and 10:00 a.m. Feb. 7, Feb. 21

DURANGO
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY
Durango Savings and Loan
1101 E. Second Ave.
(303) 884-2878
Mass at 10:00 a.m. Jan. 17

STRATTON
OUR LADY OF FATIMA CHAPEL
(303) 348-5454
Call for time of Mass Feb. 28

FLORIDA

PORT RICHEY (Tampa area)
ST. JOSEPH'S
Gulf Highland Club House
900 Gulf Highland Drive
(813) 868-0166
Mass at 7:00 p.m. on 3rd and 5th Sundays of month

LOUISIANA

OPELOUSAS (Lafayette area)
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY CHAPEL
Route 1, Box 195
(318) 942-9053
Mass at 6:00 p.m. on 2nd and 4th Sundays of month

MINNESOTA

ROCHESTER
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY CHAPEL
5820 Viola Road, NE
(507) 282-5163 or 289-8522
Mass at 11:00 a.m. Jan. 24, Feb. 21

MONTANA

GREAT FALLS
IMMACULATE HEART OF MARY CHAPEL
2020 Second Avenue North
(406) 452-8826
Mass at 11:00 a.m. Jan. 24, Feb. 14, Feb. 28

PENNSYLVANIA

ESSINGTON (Philadelphia area)
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY
Ramada Inn
Airport South, Route 291
(215) 876-8737
Mass at 10:00 a.m. Jan. 17, Jan. 31, Feb. 14

UTAH

SALT LAKE CITY
OUR LADY OF PERPETUAL HELP
Hilton Inn
154 West 600 South
(801) 278-7501
Mass at 11:00 a.m. Jan. 31
Feb. 28/Call for time of Mass

VIRGINIA

RICHMOND
OUR LADY OF FATIMA CHAPEL
5217 Futura Avenue
(804) 737-8211 or 262-4354
Mass at 11:00 a.m.
Jan. 24, Feb. 7, Feb. 28