THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume VI, No. 6 † Sept. 1, 1985

Scandalous Doings In Conciliar "Catholic" Schools

John Kenneth Weiskittel

Archbishop Edward A. McCarthy of the Conciliar "Catholic" Archdiocese of Miami, Florida, is usually perceived as a "moderate" among the "new Church" prelates. Although he recently issued a joint statement with Florida's other bishops condemning the death penalty as immoral, his name is never mentioned in the same breath as the Geretys, Gumbletons and Hunthausens. Yet, a survey taken of seniors in Conciliar high schools in the greater Miami area reveals that not even supposedly mainstream dioceses can be counted on to guarantee a Catholic education, despite claims by conservatives in the Conciliar Church to the contrary.

The Voice, official newspaper of the Miami Archdiocese, conducted the poll in April, 1984, and published the results in its November and December issues. Sixty-six questions on the Church and its teachings, drugs and alcohol, sex and abortion were posed to 181 students at six Conciliar high schools. Those chosen were picked to statistically reflect the ethnic and economic makeup of the 2,898 youths enrolled overall (70 participants were of Hispanic descent). What follows will come as a shock only to Catholics who have spent the past 20 years on a desert island.

SURVEYING THE CARNAGE

Conciliar teenagers were born in the late 1960's and early 1970's and so, unlike their parents, they have no personal experience with the Catholic Church in America before the Second Vatican Council and how vastly different it was from the "reformed" parishes in which they live. They represent what can be called the Conciliar generation, as their beliefs and attitudes faithfully mirror the moral and doctrinal upheavals that so characterize post-conciliar catechetics.

The Church And Its Teachings

To the question "Do you believe the Catholic Church was founded by God or is it just a creation of man?", 79 percent of the respondents answered "God," but 20 percent said "man." Belief in life after death is fundamental to a Catholic outlook, but only 87 percent of these young "Catholics" affirmed this article of the Faith—12 percent said they didn't believe it. Regarding international affairs, the question "Would you support a nuclear freeze even if it involves risking that we may be more vulnerable to attack by the other side?" pretty much divided the teens, with 41 percent favoring the freeze and 58 percent rejecting it.

Drugs and Alcohol

A total of 40 percent of those queried admitted using marijuana, while another 20 percent said they had tried cocaine (of these, 7 percent said they currently use marijuana and 3 percent said they use cocaine "on a regular basis"). Twelve percent favored legalizing these drugs. As for "hard" drugs, such as LSD, heroin or "angel dust," 5 percent of the students stated that they had used one or more of these, though all denied they were now taking them. Despite the fact that 19 is the legal age to buy alcohol in Florida, over three-quarters (78 percent) answered "yes" to "Do you currently drink alcoholic beverages outside the home, such as at parties or lounges?" Not surprisingly, a majority (56 percent) allowed that they had "been drunk or high enough that your behavior was significantly impaired."

Sex And Abortion

Nearly half (47 percent) of those answering the poll said that they had engaged in sexual intercourse, while 23 percent were doing so regularly at the time of the survey. Only 29 percent felt that such activities ought to be limited to married couples, whereas 45 percent voiced the opinion that sex is permissible "if you are in love" and 23 percent approved "as long as both people agree." An even 50 percent answered "no" when asked, "Do you agree with the Catholic Church's teaching that the use of artificial methods of birth control is immoral?"—with another 37 percent saying "it depends" and only 12 percent responding "yes." Also on the question of birth control, 18 percent said they were currently using contraceptives and 73 percent said they would consider using them after they get married. According to 21 percent of the seniors, abortion should never be allowed, while 53 percent opted that it should be "only to save the mother's life" and 25 percent held that the decision "should be left up to the woman and her doctor."

A QUESTION OF ACCURACY

The results of *The Voice's* poll drew mixed reviews from Conciliar educators in South Florida. Father Vincent Kelly, the Miami Archdiocese's superintendent of education, called the findings "not representative." And the associate principal of one of the schools involved, Father John Maloney of Monsignor Edward Pace High School in Opa-locka, criticized the methodology, saying that *The Voice* "made an awful lot of assumptions on a very poor sampling." But Carol Farrell, director of the archdiocesan Family Enrichment Center, sees it as a tool for the "overall strengthening" of families. Father Joseph Kershner, supervising principal at another participating school, Ft. Lauderdale's Cardinal Gibbons High School, is another defender of the findings, which he views as a way to "stimulate parents...to get on the ball." The responses on sex, drugs and alcohol are not surprising to Father Kershner, who adds: "Seeing how the kids behave on campus in the daytime, I say, I wonder what happens at night when they're by themselves."

When some Conciliar officials and parents, shocked by questions on sex and alcohol, objected to the survey, *Voice* Editor Robert O'Steen replied: "Actually, most of the kids did *not* have a problem in these areas. It's just that a sizable number did, and we need to deal with it somehow. To question the survey results because they are unpleasant or suggest that they should not be printed is not going to help the problems any."

It isn't unusual to hear people question the accuracy and reliability of public opinion polls (we've been known to question them at times ourselves). Some find a problem with the size of the sampling (too small to determine what a much larger group thinks about an issue); others with the makeup of the group (doesn't reflect a true cross section of those it purports to be surveying); and still others with the way the data is gathered (the asking of biased, or "loaded," questions).

How accurate, then, is the *Voice* survey in revealing what's on the minds of these teens? And, if it is accurate, does it apply equally to other parts of the country as well? It should, of course, be remembered that even when a poll is fair, carefully worded and subjected to every scientific rigor and control to assure a truly representative test group, it remains only an indication of what people are thinking. Therefore, it becomes necessary to look at the larger picture to see if this study is consistent with a larger pattern or is an exception.

In an article, "Catholic teens: Their beliefs, behavior," which appeared in the *Miami Herald* of February 1, 1985, religion writer Adon Taft cites observations by students in area schools about the survey's findings. Julie DiCamillo, a sophomore at Miami's Lourdes Academy, is described as a devout girl who "for the most part, agrees with the teachings of the church." She is quoted as saying that the poll is "about right" regarding sexual attitudes, attributing it to "peer pressure." "They are considered to be abnormal," she said, "if they haven't had sex by the time they are 16." Another sophomore, Andrew Livingstone of Christopher Columbus High in West Dade, who, along with his closest friends, "neither drink, use drugs nor are sexually active," agrees that the percentages reflect the social environment at the school he attends. Freshman Ida Davis of St. Brendan High in Miami said she may use birth control when married and "after I have children," and would seek an abortion "in the case of rape or a really bad situation."

The *Herald* article also notes that Robert Bezilla, director of youth surveys for the Gallup Poll, says that the results correspond with his own findings among young Americans in general. While Gallup isn't exactly known for its objectivity, there are Conciliar sources that also confirm the authenticity. Consider the following passage from Douglas J. Roche's book, *The Catholic Revolution,* and, as you read, keep in mind two points about it—first, like *The Voice's* poll, we have a study conducted by Conciliarists about student views at their schools (this time a college) and second, that the book was written in 1968:

> More evidence of the credibility gap between the skepticism of the young and the faith of their fathers was offered by Father Bruce M. Ritter, a Franciscan who teaches theology at Manhattan College in New York City. Some 3,000 of the college's 3,500 students at this all-male school run by the Christian Brothers answered a 152-question survey.
>
> Of these Catholic students, 41 percent don't go to Sunday Mass regularly; 45 percent don't believe in the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist; 88 percent don't believe the pope is personally infallible; only 21 percent believe that premarital sex is always wrong; only 33 percent think a bishop has, in practice, much influence on Catholic life in his diocese; only 7 percent think that the use of contraceptive devices is always wrong.
>
> One of the many contradictions exposed by the survey is that, while only 6 percent of the respondents said they were influenced by the Church's teaching in making moral decisions, and only 3 percent said they were influenced by

their parents' teaching, a high proportion observes a moral code stricter than they actually profess. Though only 21 percent believe that premarital sexual intercourse is always morally wrong, 80 percent of the freshmen came to Manhattan without the experience, and 50 percent of the seniors had not had the experience.

Though only 22 percent accept a distinction in theory between mortal and venial sin, 72 percent will not receive the Eucharist without confessing their mortal sins—and this in spite of the fact that only 17 percent believe confession is necessary for forgiveness.

The similarities here with the Miami poll are clear enough, the only real difference, aside from some variety in questions, being the degree to which "progressive" views are favored over Catholic ones. If anything, the two surveys show a widening "gap," consistent with the conviction of many observers that the Vatican II revolution is aimed at destroying Catholicism and introducing Modernism in measured doses. (Notice that the number of boys entering Manhattan College who admitted to engaging in fornication, however scandalously high it may be by Catholic standards, is still almost 30 percentage points *below* that of Conciliar teens—boys and girls—12 years later!)

More proof of the move away from Catholicism is found in publications of the Conciliar Church. On May 19, 1985, *Our Sunday Visitor* printed the final in a series of four articles by Peter Sheehen, entitled "Do Catholics still honor the traditional values?" Among those quoted in the article is Dr. William McCready, a sociologist at the National Opinion Research Center, who has researched the continuing subversion of the Church for over a decade. As far as values go, "the change is ongoing," said Dr. McCready, who concedes that "we have given up on Catholic schools. That is about half of the problem we face in trying to instill Catholic identity in our children." And in an admission that points to the theological confusion, he asks, "The big question today is that, with Catholics finding different ways to identify with the Church, how are our children, who will be further removed, going to identify with the Church?"

Even "Pope" John Paul II has seen fit, while addressing Italian bishops on May 30, 1985, to bemoan the "deficient catechetical formation (which) is at the root of not a few crises of faith." In telling them that "Catholic education is a right and a need for the baptized," he gave an idea of the "education" he meant by encouraging their prayers that the upcoming synod of Conciliar bishops will bring "a better understanding of the genuine message" of Vatican II. Father Paul Wickens, a conservative Conciliar priest who defied the notorious Archbishop Peter Gerety's sex education program in his parish in the Newark, New Jersey area, is still waiting for the New Rome to intercede for him. He was rudely ejected from his rectory for the "crime" of upholding Catholic moral teachings but, aside from public relations "hype," the Polish actor in the Vatican is no friend of defenders of Catholicism. (On the subject of Archbishop Gerety, one wonders if Howard Stevens' *Making Moral Decisions,* a Gerety-imprimatured textbook defending sodomy, abortion, divorce, "mercy killing," fetal experimentation, etc., is used in Miami's "Catholic" high schools.)

WHO'S TO BLAME?

When there is widespread defection from the teachings of the Church by pupils in supposedly Catholic schools—defection at a level unprecedented in history—then one naturally must wonder if part of the underlying cause isn't in the Conciliar educational establishment itself. Might not the reason that Miami archdiocesan educators cast doubts about the *Voice* poll be that it was striking too close to home?

On the question of church attendance, *Voice* Editor O'Sheen deflected criticism of the schools by saying, "They (the seniors) don't all go to Mass every week, but then Gallup surveys show that only about half of the adults go to Mass in a given week. So if we want our kids to go to Mass, we must go to Mass. We certainly can't expect the schools to make up for adult shortcomings."

Concerning promiscuity, in the same study Family Enrichment Center Director Carol Farrell remarked, "So many parents have a fear or reluctance of discussing sex because they did not have that experience with their own parents. That's one of the difficulties with sex education—so many never had any." A curious inversion of logic here; instead of placing the blame on the sex-ed classes, she says that the problem is partially with the parents who weren't "blessed" by having such classes in their own school days. Yet if these parents did miss out on Impurity 101, it was only because the Catholic Church, obeying Pope Pius XI's instructions in his encyclical on Christian Education and other such papal pronouncements, forbade the introduction of it into parochial schools. Isn't it very strange, if the Conciliar defense of sex-ed is to be believed, that at no time before Vatican II was there anything like the sexual epidemic going on today in the Conciliar Church?

As the Conciliar halls of learning grow increasingly secularized, shedding every Catholic vestige, they move ever closer to approximating the excesses of

the government-masonic schools. It is not at all unusual to hear conservative Conciliar faculty members lament that the once-Catholic colleges and universities at which they teach have lost their ethical moorings and have drifted into the dangerous waters of academic "freedom" occupied by the state schools. The head of a theology department at the turn of the century honoring arch-Modernnist Alfred Loisy as a "fellow Catholic theologian" would have certainly provoked response from Pope Saint Pius X; yet, when Notre Dame's Father Richard McBrien used precisely those words to welcome Loisy's heir apparent, Hans Kung, as guest speaker, John Paul II didn't bat an eyelash (talk about deficient catechetical formation!). Where the blame lies is painfully obvious to those who refuse to close their eyes to it.

CHILDREN OF THE REVOLUTION

No doubt some "see no evil" Conciliarists, having read all of this, will exclaim, "Yes, things are bad, but they *could* be worse." Well, things *are* worse, if fidelity to Catholic doctrine matters any more. With the 1985 convention of the National Catholic Education Association in April, *infidelity* among Conciliar pedagogues hit rock bottom.

The meeting took place in St. Louis and had as featured speakers Father Avery Dulles, Robert Muller and Carl Sagan. Father Dulles, introduced as "one of America's finest theologians," is the author of several controversial books, such as *Models of the Church* and *Models of Revelation*. A linear descendant of Loisy, George Tyrell and their disciples, he didn't let his audience down, questioning the "so-called Christ event" and attacking traditional Catholic apologetics as "widely discredited" because in it "the miracles and prophecies of the biblical period were depicted not as rich and meaningful symbols but as incontrovertible facts..." Rather than "suffocate our students with too many definitions and dogmas," he continually championed throughout his address the "new" (read *Modernist*) approach of religious imagination." Robert Muller, Under Secretary of the United Nations' Economic and Social Council and a disciple of Teilhard de Chardin, gave a lesson in globalism. Though a self-professed Catholic, Muller denies that anyone can be certain that he belongs to the true Faith. For this reason he is a cult figure in New Age circles. Another New Age luminary, Carl Sagan, also took the podium. Sagan is well-known for his "nuclear winter" theory, and for hosting the PBS series, *Cosmos*. He is a past recipient of the American Humanist Association's "Humanist of the Year" award and, when asked at the NCEA convention, admitted that he didn't know if God exists.

As has been indicated in past articles, it is the aim of the Conciliar revolutionists to draw Catholics gradually from the Faith, while replacing it entirely for the younger generation. An unmistakable example of this comes as a condition made by the Vatican when it gave "permission" to attend Tridentine Masses: only those who had attended them before they were "outlawed" are eligible—clearly this rules out any teens or preteens.

The spiritual harm being inflicted by the Conciliar Church upon the young in the name of "reform" and "renewal" is incalculable. But anarchy knows no mercy. The nineteenth century writer Georg Buchner, in his *Danton's Death*, compared the French Revolution to a bloodthirsty Roman god in words equally applicable to the Conciliar Revolt: "The Revolution is like Saturn—it eats its own children." †

Opus Dei

Although founded in Spain several decades ago, the movement bearing the above name has recently been getting worldwide publicity because of the special attention and treatment given to it by John Paul II. However, as an article in the December 1, 1984 issue of this newsletter makes very clear, Opus Dei may not really be what it gives the impression of being. The favoritism shown to it by John Paul II could be one more indictment of him rather than a vindication of Opus Dei. Having in mind especially those who have but recently been receiving *The Athanasian* and, hence, may not be familiar with the article mentioned above, we still have a number of copies (at $1.00 each) of the issue in which it appeared. Perhaps some may wish to read this expose of Opus Dei by ordering that particular issue.

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. †

Pray
The Rosary
Daily

America's Catholic Heritage (Part IV)

CATHOLICS IN THE WAR FOR INDEPENDENCE

Jill Wiesner

American independence was won through courage and perseverance. American Catholics, who had remained true to their Faith in spite of numerous forms of persecution, possessed these qualities in abundance. As a result, they often led their countrymen in the struggle for independence from England. European Catholics also came to the aid of America, giving their experience, their fortunes and, in many cases, their lives, so that America could be free.

One of Maryland's wealthiest families, the Carrolls of Maryland, had a profound influence on their colony's decision to vote for independence in the Continental Congress. Charles Carroll of Carrollton first spoke out, in a series of letters to the *Maryland Gazette,* opposing Daniel Dulany's support of Governor Robert Eden's plan to reinstate mandatory stipends for the Anglican clergy. Through their subsequent printed debates, Carroll gained popular support for the Patriot Party which opposed the royal governor.

As a result of his courageous stand, Charles Carroll was soon elected to represent Anne Arundel County and Annapolis at the provincial convention. He was the first Catholic to hold public office since the Baltimores had been deposed. When ratification of the Declaration of Independence was discussed, Maryland initially opposed it. By his arguments and by his example, Carroll won the support of his fellow representatives for ratification. With a personal fortune of over two million dollars, he risked it all to gain America's freedom. On July 4, 1776, he signed the Declaration of Independence for the State of Maryland, using his full designation of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, "so that King George would know which Carroll to hunt down for treason."

Daniel Carroll, brother of John Carroll, America's first bishop, was a staunch ally of his cousin Charles in convincing their fellow citizens to fight for independence. Like his cousin, he was a representative in the Continental Congress. After the war, Daniel Carroll, with another Catholic, Thomas Fitzsimons, participated in the Convention that framed the Constitution. In defense of that document, he said, "I am bold to assert that it is the best form of government which has ever been offered to the world."

Our American Navy owes its beginning to John Barry, who was the first to volunteer to defend the new nation against the British at sea. The "Father of the American Navy," Barry outranks even John Paul Jones. Born in Wexford, Ireland, in 1745, he went to sea at a very young age. On one occasion, his ship docked at Philadelphia and, seeing America for the first time, he knew he wanted this to be his home. When the War for Independence began, he immediately offered his services. His commission, authorized on December 7, 1775, was the first commission issued by the Maritime Committee of the Continental Congress. He was given command of the first available vessel, an old ship named the *Lexington.* With it, he captured the *Edward,* a large British warship.

After this victory, Barry went to Philadelphia, where he was to be given a new ship which, however, was not yet ready. While waiting, he learned that British ships were stopping all American boats on the Delaware River and were bringing supplies to the British land troops. Barry took four boatloads of men down the Delaware by night. Putting rags in their oarlocks to muffle the sounds of the oars, they rowed up to a British warship and silently climbed onto her decks. Taken by surprise, the British surrendered the ship. In a similar manner, Barry and his men captured four British supply ships, transferring the much-needed supplies to the Americans.

On March 27, 1794, an Act of Congress officially established the United States Navy. Captain Barry's commission, signed by President Washington, appointed him "Captain in the United States Navy... to take rank from the 4th day of June, 1794... registered no. 1."

Support for American independence also came from the Catholic clergy. Father Pierre Gibault, a missionary priest from Canada to the Northwest Territory, made it possible for George Rogers Clark to win the territory for the United States. When Clark and his men attacked and took possession of the British fort at Kaskaskia, Illinois, on July 4, 1778, Father Gibault, who was stationed there at the time, came to know the Americans and what they represented. He then convinced the citizens at the key fort of Vincennes, Indiana, to haul down the Union Jack and raise the American flag. His letter to Clark, dated August 7, 1778, reflects the hardships he and his flock suffered as a result:

> We are very poor and destitute of all things. We are impatiently awaiting the village boats. We fear the savages and the evilly disposed people

who are urging them to kill us. In a word, we are in a truly sad situation. In spite of this we are of good courage and are so good Americans that we are ready to defend ourselves to the death against any who attack us. I pray you to accept my respects and to employ me in any way in my power for your service.

The most famous marksman of the war was Pennsylvania-born Timothy Murphy. Though only about 5 feet 6 inches tall, Tim Murphy was powerfully built and a swift runner. He had vast experience as a woodsman, which he used to the detriment of the British. He and a companion, David Elerson, were particularly adept at Indian-style attacks on British foraging parties. Once, they learned the password to a British camp and used it to carry off an officer. With Morgan's Riflemen, Murphy also helped to protect the villagers of the Mohawk Valley against British-instigated Indian raids.

In the spring of 1780, he and a friend were captured by a party of Indians and subjected to hours of agonizing torture. In the night, as their captors slept, they freed each other and knifed eleven braves. Only one escaped.

In October of the same year, at Schoharie Valley in New York, a large British force surrounded the military unit to which Murphy was attached. The American commander, Major Woolsey, decided to surrender and started toward the British with a white flag. Murphy immediately fired on him and forced him back. Three times Woolsey tried to reach the British, but each time Murphy and his men fired on him and made him turn back. When Woolsey demanded that the troops themselves raise the flag of surrender, Murphy promised to kill the first man to try it. The British, whose artillery was less than Woolsey had thought, decided the Americans could not be made to surrender and moved on. Murphy and his men were not captured and went on to the Battle of Yorktown, the decisive battle of the war.

European Catholics, sympathetic to the cause of freedom, also gave invaluable help to America. Thaddeus Bonaventure Kosciuszko, of the Polish nobility, had been orphaned at an early age. Having seen the freedom of his own country crushed by the Russians, he came to America in 1776 and went to George Washington to enlist in the Continental Army. He was given a commission in the Engineer Corps and put in command of the defenses of West Point as well as Saratoga, where his defenses resulted in an American victory. General Kosiuszko is known as the Father of the United States Army Engineers.

Count Casimir Pulaski was the son of a Polish nobleman who had fought a tough but unsuccessful campaign to free his nation from Russian domination and had been captured and killed by the Russians. Pulaski attempted to avenge his father by bringing Poland and Lithuania into open revolt. The revolt failed because of the overwhelming size of the Russian forces, and he was forced to flee into exile.

Count Pulaski understood the American yearning for liberty and offered his services to Benjamin Franklin in Paris. In 1778, Congress put him in charge of a cavalry unit. He trained prisoners, deserters and volunteers to form Pulaski's Legion, a highly efficient troop used in surprise raids and for protecting the frontier from British and Indian attacks.

During the Battle of Charleston, Pulaski ignored the advice of military counselors, who told him to pull out. He refused to leave or to surrender. His determination led to victory for the American forces.

On October 9, 1779, Pulaski led his Legion, as well as the French and American cavalry, in a charge against the British line at Savannah. The casualties were high and included the heroic young Pulaski, who died from his wounds a few days after the battle.

The King and Queen of France sent some of their finest officers to America. These men were experienced and disciplined, and often served without pay during their duty here. Jean Baptiste Donatien de Vimeur, Comte de Rochambeau, headed the French force. Born in Vendome in 1725, the Comte de Rochambeau had been training for the priesthood when his elder brother died. As a result, he was required to leave the seminary and assume the family title and responsibilities.

Tall, refined, and distinguished, Rochambeau was shocked by the ragged appearance of the American troops. The sight of the elegant French troops provoked derision among the Americans. But the meeting of Washington and Rochambeau inspired mutual respect between the two leaders and they came to work closely together, Rochambeau serving as aide-de-camp for Washington.

Combining their outstanding abilities, Washington and Rochambeau devised military strategies which overcame the superior British forces. On the march from New York to Virginia to join the American forces at Yorktown, Washington and Rochambeau convinced the enemy that they intended to remain in New York and attack the British there. Leaving a small force at their original camp, they marched to New Jersey where they built a dummy encampment, indicating that they planned to lay siege along the Hudson River. As the British planned their defense, Washington and Rochambeau slipped out of sight

continued on page 8

A Crucial Question—

The Roman Catholic Church Or The Conciliar Church?

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

Traditional Catholicism is the Roman Catholic Faith. Only since Vatican Council II has it become necessary to employ the term "traditional" in conjunction with the word "Catholicism" to distinguish the genuine article from the false religion of the Conciliar Church which deceptively persists in calling itself Roman Catholic. It has, of course, long since relinquished all claim to that title. To differentiate the Roman Catholic Church, however, from the non-Catholic Conciliar Church, it is a practical necessity today to speak of traditional Catholicism to identify the former, the true Church.

Nine years ago Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre made the statement that "the Conciliar Church is not Catholic." Since I have never heard nor read that he retracted those words, I assume he still subscribes to them—and, presumably, the priests, religious and laity aligned with him subscribe to them as well. In any case, I most certainly agree with that statement of the archbishop and quote him merely because his words carry far more weight than mine.

But if indeed "the Conciliar Church is not Catholic," why is it, for example, that so many priests who call themselves traditional refuse to repudiate that Church? On the contrary, the so-called traditional priests to whom I refer are a part of it, a fact completely obvious by their acceptance of the head of the Conciliar Church, John Paul II, as a valid pope. But, since these self-styled traditional priests acknowledge John Paul II, as a legitimate pontiff, why do they disobey him, as, for example, in their regular public offering of the traditional Latin Mass, a practice known to be opposed by him? Is not this a blatant contradiction and an open defiance of his supreme authority—and in a matter of such central importance as the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass?

Either the Conciliar Church is the one true Church or it is not. Either John Paul II is a valid pope or he is not. If an individual, priest or layman, believes that the Conciliar Church (as inconceivable as this is to the author of this article) is the one true Church and that its head is a valid pontiff (likewise inconceivable to me), then that individual should have nothing to do with the traditional Roman Catholic movement. By the same token, if any priest or layman believes that the historic Roman Catholic Church exists today in traditional Catholicism—and nowhere else—then he should totally avoid and reject the Conciliar Church. We cannot have it both ways. The latter, despite any appearances to the contrary, is but one more non-Catholic denomination; the former is the real thing, the Roman Catholic Faith, the same yesterday, today and forever. The acceptance of the one demands the complete repudiation of the other.

One cause of extensive confusion among traditional Roman Catholics today is found in the use of that very term "traditional," primarily in reference to priests. Is a priest traditional because he offers the traditional Latin Mass even though he refuses to break with the Conciliar Church and considers John Paul II a valid pontiff? As for members of the laity who accept the validity of the pontificate of John Paul II, are they traditional because they attend the True Mass? Indeed, are they not disobeying him by their attendance at such Masses which are regularly and publicly offered by a priest such as I?

In a new allegedly traditional magazine, there appeared a list of six publications, all described as "bonafide Traditional Roman Catholic" publications. But four of the six are aligned with the Conciliar Church! While much of the content of some of them is soundly Roman Catholic, should not the four to which I refer be identified as publications whose editors, writers, etc., are a part of the Conciliar Church? To include clergy and laity who consider that Church as the one true Church and accept John Paul II as a legitimate pope with those who totally repudiate both—and to call them all traditional—is certainly misleading and, I submit, gives to the term "traditional" a broad meaning which, for the sake of clarity, it certainly ought not to have in the present context.

As the word is used in relation to the Faith, the term "traditional" is today a widely abused one. So many priests are called traditional who really are not such except in a very liberal or general sense. In order to dispel the existing confusion on this matter then, and in the interest of honesty, it is my contention that the term "traditional" should have a very limited application and that that application should be directly related to the position a priest takes (the same goes for the laity) on the Conciliar Church and its acknowledged leader, John Paul II. If the Conciliar Church is not the Roman Catholic Church, how can the man who is its recognized and official head be an authentic pontiff? And if the Conciliar Church and John Paul II are not, in actual fact, Roman Catholic, by what stretch of the imagination is it possible to justify calling any priest traditional who accepts both as Roman Catholic? And by what justification does a

traditional Catholic layman attend the Masses of those priests (or bishops) who so believe?

So, it being understood, of course, that he is in all other respects soundly traditional as well, the bottom line, I maintain, in conclusively determining the identification of a particular priest as truly traditional is this: He totally rejects the Conciliar Church and he firmly believes John Paul II to be an invalid pope. What sense does it make to call a priest or layman a *traditional* Roman Catholic who accepts a non-Catholic sect as the true Church and its head as being the Vicar of Christ?

Of all the issues, then, which separate truly traditional Roman Catholics from those who are not, those involving the identity of the Conciliar Church and the validity/invalidity of its head are, far and away, the most fundamental ones. Again, either the Conciliar Church is the one true Church or it is not; either John Paul II is a valid pope or he is not. Nearly 20 years having now passed since the conclusion of the infamous Vatican Council II, surely it is high time for those priests and members of the laity, who have for so long been straddling the fence on these essential issues, to take—at long last—an open, firm, uncompromising stand one way or the other. The Conciliar Church has inflicted massive destruction upon the true Church and is the archenemy of traditional Catholicism. Consequently, the choice is a clear-cut one. Either an individual is a traditional Roman Catholic or he is not. †

††

A booklet written by Father Noel Barbara of France contains the best treatment I have seen of the subject of the invalidity of John Paul II. I urge our readers to secure one or more copies. The booklet is entitled *Fortes in Fide* (No. 1, 1985 Review). It is available at $4.00 per copy from:

William F. J. Christian, Sr.
758 Lemay Ferry Road
St. Louis, Missouri 63125

Checks should be made payable to *Fortes in Fide* and payment must accompany order. It might be advisable to allow four to six weeks for delivery. (Please note: the booklets are to be ordered from Mr. Christian in Saint Louis and *not* from our TCA office here in Colorado Springs.)

"Catholics in the War" continued from page 6
and did not reappear until they and their forces reached Philadelphia, enabling them to continue unhampered to Yorktown.

The Catholic patriots who fought to win American independence shared with their European allies a vital quality which the Catholic explorers and missionary priests had possessed: perseverance. In the face of insurmountable odds they held firm and, as a result, they won the day. The conversion of America could well depend in good part upon our ability to follow their example of dogged perseverance. †

An article on Roman Catholics who were prominent on the side of America in its war for independence from England would appear quite incomplete without at least a few lines about the Marquis de Lafayette. It was deemed advisable, however, to omit all reference to him in the above article because Lafayette was a Freemason—and Catholicism and Freemasonry are incompatible. *—Editor*

THE ATHANASIAN

Published by Traditional Catholics of America

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 each
Mailing address: P.O. Box 38335, Colorado Springs, CO 80937
Telephone: (303) 636-1575

Manuscripts sent to us for possible publication in *The Athanasian* should be typewritten, double-spaced and no more than seven pages in length. If not accepted, they will be returned to the sender.