THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL
Volume V, No. 4 † June 1, 1984

WHO IS JOHN PAUL II? (PART TWO)

John Kenneth Weiskittel

In PART ONE of this article (*The Athanasian*, March 1, 1984), I looked at the election of John Paul II, at his slavish commitment to the ambiguous documents and revolutionary spirit of Vatican II and at the manner in which that commitment has been put into action regarding two critical issues, sex education and traditional Catholicism.

A theme running throughout the article was how John Paul II has remained an enigmatic figure who continues to convince both the semi-traditional and neo-modernist wings of the Conciliar "Catholic" Church that he is "on our side." He has been something of a puzzlement as well, I noted, to secular opinion-shapers, who seem not to know quite how to present him but always manage to show him in a favorable light despite disagreements they may have with one another. (e.g., CBS' made-for-television movie, "Pope John Paul II," an attempt at cinematic hero-worship that, not coincidently, first is broadcast on Easter evening.)

The events and statements of worldwide implication proceed from Rome with astonishing rapidity. Hardly a week goes by without news of some startling import generated by the Conciliar "pope," his curia and the revamped *L'Osservatore Romano.* In the first few months of 1984 alone, the New Vatican has subjected us to:

• The concordat, signed by Vatican secretary of state, Agostino Cardinal Casaroli and Prime Minister Bettino Craxi of socialist Italy, which denies Rome's status as the Sacred City and the Roman Catholic Church as the official state religion of Italy.

• John Paul II's homage to Soviet dictator Yuri Andropov (who imprisoned, tortured and executed untold Christians while KGB chief and as USSR premier) by sending his condolence to the Communist leaders at their ruler's death with the assurance of "special thoughts for the illustrious deceased one." (Reports from the Polish Conciliar hierarchy reveal that John Paul II had made plans to visit Andropov later this year.)

• The announcement that John Paul II will address the notoriously pro-Communist World Council of Churches at its headquarters in Geneva this June.

• John Paul II's pledge of support to one-worldism in an address made in Vatican City to the Independent Commission of International Development (headed by Socialist Willy Brandt, former chancellor of West Germany) and the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security (headed by the Socialist Prime Minister Olaf Palme of Sweden).

• The declaration on Martin Luther, who was called by Pope Leo X the "child of Satan" and in whose works St. Robert Bellarmine found over *one thousand* errors, the declaration building on John Paul II's praise of Luther by a call for a commission to reexamine the "misunderstandings" leading to his excommunication, with the final object to be the overturning of that ruling.

• Continued efforts to restore relations with Communist China, where that government buried priests and nuns alive during the revolution, while downgrading Taiwan's diplomatic status.

Obviously, wheels are turning in Rome—and turning in a hurry. The rest of this study won't attempt to keep up with every new development as that would virtually require a full-time correspondent at the Vatican. Rather, it will examine the roots of John Paul II's thinking and where it is leading millions of mesmerized Catholics.

The Strange Philosophy of Max Scheler

"I am fascinated," Karol Wojtyla once said, years before he was elected John Paul II, "by Scheler's theory of values and of human nature." (Malinski, op. cit., p. 113.)* In those same years, the early 1950's, the Polish priest also enthused: "what seems to me most important at the moment is to reconcile Thomist philosophy with that of Scheler." (ibid.) And again: "in my life I've had two great philosophical revelations—Thomism and Scheler." (ibid.)

*Readers should refer to Part One of this article for the titles of works first quoted there.

The "Scheler" referred to here is Max Scheler (1874-1928) who is known for his writing as a proponent of the philosophy known as *phenomenology.* Phenomenology, as the name suggests, is the study of phenomena, of objects in reality as perceived by the senses. But it is more than that. Roman Catholic journalist Mary Martinez notes: "Phenomenology in its pure form...involves the contention that the existence of substance is an illusion—that matter is no more than an indeterminate and unknown something underlying phenomena." (op. cit., p. 32)

In other words, we have here a form of systemized doubt in which our very ability to have any certitude about the world we see around us is questioned. This is contrasted with the Catholic position which teaches that (taking into account human limitations and fallibility) the world *is* what it appears to be and we *can* form valid impressions about it. To believe that you can leisurely stroll in front of a speeding car without harm is not only foolish, but potentially fatal. Reality is real—not an illusion.

This fundamental fallacy in phenomenology—that we cannot truly be certain, cannot really know anything—is enough to make it unacceptable; yet the life of Scheler is, if anything, even stranger.

Born in Munich of a Protestant clergyman and his Jewish wife, Max Scheler converted to Catholicism as a young man. As suddenly as he entered the Church, he left it. "In 1898 he breaks—because of a woman—with the Catholic practice, but his thought continues to evolve in a Christian direction." (*New Encyclopedia of Philosophy*—NEP.)

Scheler's career was just as convulsive as his personal life. As a university lecturer in a number of German philosophy departments, he wrote a treatise in 1915 defending "The Genius of War and the German War." This militaristic phase of his thinking was influenced by Friedrich Nietzsche, who coined the term "God is dead" and who taught that, by rejecting Christian "slave morality," the human race could go "beyond good and evil" and become a race of supermen. *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (EP) states: "He (Scheler) viewed himself as carrying out the philosophical programs of Nietzsche...and was firmly convinced that phenomenology would bring about a basic transformation in the way of viewing ourselves and the world."

Although he would later repudiate his jingoism, Scheler would ever retain other features of the Nietzsche program. He has been called the "Catholic Nietzsche."

Scheler "reconverted" in 1920 but, four years later, "he is separated from his wife and leaves again the Church for another woman." (NEP) His rejection of Catholicism is this time articulated: "Scheler saw a threat to the individual in the dogmas of the Church and renounced natural theology as conceived on the basis of Thomism." (*Encyclopedia Americana.*) He would never again profess the Faith.

Not only did he reject Catholicism, but theism in general. From there he went on "to develop a comprehensive anthropology that verged on vitalism and pantheism." (EP) Scheler proclaimed the "death of God" by identifying Him with the universe; by calling Him "the ground of being." His new "faith" was in "religious atheism" (NEP), and in that heresy he would live out his days.

We have, then, a man so far removed from Church teaching that he has been typified as "anti-Thomistic" in his thought. (EP) By his emphasis on experience he is close to the Modernists, of whom our beloved Pope St. Pius X wrote (in *Pascendi*): "within their boundaries there is room for nothing but *phenomena*; God and all that is divine are utterly excluded," and, by his pantheism, to Teilhard's myth of a god who is evolving along with the universe.

Despite all of this, John Paul II is a disciple of Scheler. The "pope" frequently emphasizes, in writings and speeches, "experience" at the expense of reason in a most Schelerian way. His book, *The Acting Person,* has drawn the praise of the Modernist George Williams, a Unitarian Divinity professor at Harvard, as a "major phenomenological work." (Martinez, op. cit., p. 32.) Williams is quoted by another Catholic writer, Dr. Rama Coomaraswamy, as saying that John Paul II's goal is "to use the methodology of...Scheler as a starting point for rebuilding a Christian ethic." (*The Destruction of Christian Tradition,* p. 104.) Why, we ask with Dr. Coomaraswamy, is it necessary to rebuild it?

Yet, "The Possibilities for Building a System of Christian Ethics on the Basis of Max Scheler" was the theme of Karol Wojtyla's doctoral thesis written when he was a student "at the Marxist-controlled Jagiellonian University in Poland." (ibid.) To this day, John Paul II has never retreated from Schelerism. That is why many conservatives and semi-traditional Conciliarists can hear him speak what sounds like authentic Catholic teaching, but wonder why the wording is "funny." They are unaware that the "pope" is interjecting "wisdom he has gleaned from his great source of "revelation"—the "Catholic Nietzsche," Max Scheler. We Catholics are obligated to show them John Paul II's bogus inspiration for what it is since he admits Schelerism gave him a "new way of thinking and observing

humanity." (Malinski, op. cit. p. 137.)

John Paul II and Liberation Theology

When John Paul II visited Marxist Nicaragua last year, there is one image which stands out and to which conservative Conciliarists love to point as incontrovertible evidence of their "pope's" unswerving opposition to the government of that country. At Managua Airport, he greeted a line of officials; when he reached the Minister of Culture and Education, Ernesto "Che" Cardenal, the "poet-priest" known for his espousal of Communism, who knelt before him, John Paul II shook a finger at Cardenal, as though in stern rebuke. There, our Conciliar friends ask, what more evidence do you need that the man from Poland is on our side? What they may not know, however, is that the Red priest has since stated publicly that there was not, nor has there subsequently been, any order by Rome for him to desist from his avowed Marxism. At this moment, he and the other radical priests in Nicaragua's regime hold the posts they've held since the downfall of the legitimate government in 1979.

The Sandanista thugs, who led the revolt in and who took over control of Nicaragua, proclaimed as early as 1971: "the ideals of Lenin are a guiding star in the struggle which the revolutionaries of Nicaragua are waging." Any reasonably educated person knew that, at the time of their takeover, they were the same terrorists they were eight years before; if anything, their tortures and other gross human rights violations after the coup should have reinforced this truth to the world. It did for many—but not, apparently, for John Paul II.

A news item appeared in the Miami *Herald* on 3 March, 1980, entitled "Pope Receives Nicaraguans." Meeting with a group of "diplomats" from that country, he gave support to the new junta, saying: "The Church supports all initiatives that, in consonance with its earthly vocation and the transcendence of mankind, promote the dignity of persons and prepare them to freely and responsibly assume their individual, family and social destiny." He added, reported the article, his hopes that "the beloved Nicaraguan people live in a future of peace, concord and solidariety (sic) conforming to their centuries of Christian tradition," which is roughly like telling a family being held captive in their own home by gangsters to "have a nice day." This, we must assume, is another example of what he really means when he says: "We respect all ideologies." Any *bona fide* pope would have denounced post-Sandanista Nicaragua for the living hell it is. (Recall how different are the words of Pope Pius XI on the subject of Communism in his encyclical, *Divini Redemptoris:* "horrors," "insidious deceits," "inhuman," and "monstrous emanations of the Communistic system flow with satanic logic," are representative of the language that pontiff used in exposing the wickedness of it.)

Since John Paul II has always condemned the use of terrorism, there are those who would shy away from linking him with so-called "liberation theology." Terrorism, however, is not embraced by all "liberationists," so the matter can't be settled by simply drawing on the "pope's" statements about lawless violence. What *is* held by all such people is socialism, socialism with a capital "S." "Moderates," say, in El Salvador (such as Napoleon Duarte) support the same "land reform" as the rebels, and differ only in how quickly and by what methods it should be implemented. Does John Paul II favor socialism?

After a writer for the Arizona *Republic* said that *Laborem Exercens,* John Paul II's 1981 study on economics, "suggests that a socialist middle ground is the best model for economic progress," leaving "little doubt as to his meaning and support of socialism," the conservative Conciliar weekly, *The Wanderer,* rushed to its leader's defense with an editorial entitled "Laborem Exercens: No Endorsement of Socialism." It felt it necessary to contrast that document's references to "socialization" as being somehow different than socialism. (Brazil's "Red Bishop" Helder Camara, an advocate of socialization and a friend and admirer of John Paul II, says that the two terms are synonymous—and he should know. And, too, *The Wanderer* may have seen that *Laborem Exercens* was being touted as pro-socialist in many left-wing journals. The *New Republic* accompanied its article with a drawing showing John Paul II sporting tiara, crozier, robes and *clinched-fist* salute!)

The Wanderer's editors may have been well-meaning in what they felt to be a clarification of the "pope's" views, but equally were they wrongheaded. Had they read his comments in *John Paul II "Pilgrimmage of Faith,"* they would have known the opposite to be the case. Covering his flight to Latin America in 1979, the book speaks of an impromptu press conference held on the plane, during which time he told reporters that socialism was wrong only if atheistic or if it viewed the world differently than "Christian morality." Then the book relates: "It is different, he said, if by socialism is meant a system that accepts the dimension of religion and offers guarantees of religious freedom. (Like Nicaragua?) He quickly added that talking about such a system is easy before such a system is established. 'We must see what happens afterward in practice,' he said." (To date, five years after the Communist victory in Nicaragua, John Paul II still seems to be waiting to "see what happens.")

continued on page 7

Distressing But Realistic

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

It was in 1968, sixteen years ago, that I gave up my position as pastor of a parish in the city and diocese of Bridgeport, Connecticut. My primary reason for doing so was that I might be able to devote far more of my time and effort actively to opposing Communism and exposing, to the best of my ability, the increasingly alarming inroads it was making into my Church and my country. I was well aware in the late 1960's that the Roman Catholic Church had long since ceased to oppose Communism and was more and more becoming a fellow traveler with it. Knowing all too well the satanic nature of Communism, I simply could not in conscience go along with, or be a part of, such collaboration, having deeply infused in my mind the absolute truth of the words of Pope Pius XI: "Communism is intrinsically evil and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever." And so it was that I was free and able for a number of years to do my part in the fight against Communism in various ways, especially through published articles and hundreds of lectures around the country. To oppose and expose militant atheism seemed to me to be a very priestly endeavor although only a very few priests in the USA ever appeared to share that conviction of mine. (Only in recent years, I readily admit, have I come to a full awareness that Freemasonry is every bit as great an evil as Communism.)

Although I never offered the Novus Ordo service once I began to suspect, back in the late 1960's, that it was not the true Mass, yet, as I indicated above, it was not because of the "new Mass" that I originally secured a leave of absence from my parochial duties in the Church. At that time I am sure that I had no serious doubt that what was described as the Roman Catholic Church was indeed the Roman Catholic Church. Not until the early 1970's did it become more and more apparent to me that this Church, while it persisted in retaining the name of Roman Catholic, bore ever less and less resemblance to the one true Church. At what specific point in time the non-Catholic Conciliar Church came into existence, I do not know, but eventually I became convinced that the one true Church is found and continues to exist in traditional Catholicism—and there only. And such has been my unassailable conviction for the past ten years or so now. As I have often stated in the pages of this newsletter, whatever the Conciliar Church is, it is not the one, true and eternal Church founded by the Son of God—and it completely escapes me how anyone who is not totally blind to reality can contend otherwise.

But if this is so very obvious, why is it that there are probably no more truly traditional Roman Catholics in the entire country today than there were parishioners in a parish in Connecticut in which I was stationed from 1956 to 1960? Are all the millions of members of the Conciliar Church (clergy and laity) in error in their affiliation with that Church? My answer is an unqualified "yes." How can this be? However it can be, such is the stark, unvarnished, all but incredible reality, the exceedingly lamentable consequence of the gradual infiltration and subversion of the Church by its enemies, primarily Freemasonry and Communism. Today those enemies are, for all practical purposes, in total control of the Conciliar Church from the top on down.

When the traditional movement first began to take shape some 15 years ago, I, for one, thought that it would be just a matter of a rather brief time before a significant number of priests and laity would come aboard. Especially priests and bishops in their 50's and 60's, I figured, would see what was happening to the Church every bit as clearly as I and a few other priests did and would readily take a public stand on the side of traditional Catholicism for the preservation of the Faith. How could they go along and be a part of the wholesale destruction of the Faith which they were witnessing on all sides? How wrong I was. To this day not a single bishop in the USA has taken an unqualified stand for the traditional Roman Catholic Faith and only one priest in approximately a thousand has done so. The best that can be said for many of them is that they are cowards. That there are at least some in their ranks who are enemies of the Church of Christ, men committed to the destruction of the Church, there is no doubt whatsoever. (As for the religious—nuns and brothers—who have stood up for the Faith without compromise, I would estimate that no more than one in four thousand in this country has done so—one of those rare individuals being Sister Rita Lawrence of Our Lady of Victory Chapel in Aurora, Colorado.)

A second major disappointment in the brief history of the traditional movement in this country to date is the deplorably small number of those who may be correctly classified as traditional Roman Catholics. While, for

various reasons, it was never expected that their ranks would be more than a remnant, I wonder if anyone ever imagined that that remnant would be so pitifully small as it actually is today. Being well aware that no movement or undertaking which takes an uncompromising, radical stand on principles will ever draw throngs of people, I did not really expect that even traditional Catholicism would be much different in this respect—but it remains difficult for me to this day to reconcile myself to the fact that, of the millions of members of the Church some 20 years ago, less than one in a thousand is a traditional Roman Catholic today!

But even the above does not give the full story. However small its membership, traditional Catholicism, being the most noble cause on earth, undoubtedly has in that membership, almost to a man, the most apostolic, the most dedicated, the most literally Christian people in the world. These are the authentic Roman Catholics, men and women who, because they love their God-given Faith above all else, have adamantly and courageously refused to go along with the Conciliar Church and who, if the occasion demands and by the grace of God, would fight and suffer and die in defense of that same Faith. These people are of the stuff of which martyrs are made. They are the cream, the elite of Roman Catholicism. Never mind how woefully sparse their ranks; their quality will more than compensate for their scarcity in number.

Such, as best I now recall, was the trend of my thinking in the very early days of the traditional movement. But it didn't work out that way. As time passed, I began gradually to observe, to my amazement and great disappointment, that the remnant of the Faith was not at all of the sterling caliber and character I had envisioned it would be. Yes, there were indeed some of the quality described above but they comprised but a small percentage of the total of traditional Catholics. The vast majority, while very concerned about the salvation of their own souls and those of their families (and knowing that traditional Catholicism was the right and only way to go to accomplish this), manifested little or no concern for the Faith in terms of its propagation, of doing their part to brings its influence to bear upon their non-Catholic fellowmen and to make traditional Catholicism a spiritual and moral force to be reckoned with upon the American scene. In other words, this vast majority of traditional Catholics to whom I refer were not, and are not, the activist, dedicated, self-sacrificing men and women I had fully taken for granted they would be in the present circumstances. They attend Mass, they receive the Sacraments, most of them perhaps recite The rosary and other prayers each day—and that's about it. Fighters, warriors, crusaders for the Faith, they assuredly are not! And so even in the remnant of the one true Church there is found only a meager number who are truly Roman Catholic in every respect and who, together with a few real priests and nuns, carry on the herculean task of preserving and furthering the Roman Catholic Faith—the remnant of the remnant. If only the generality of traditional Roman Catholics had a dedication to the Faith comparable in intensity to the dedication of the hard-core Communists to the cause of world domination!

And then, almost as if to guarantee that traditional Catholicism would not make any appreciable progress, there are those conservative publications associated with the Conciliar Church and of which *The Wanderer* and *The Remnant* are the best known. Such publications, and especially these two, do incalculable harm to genuine traditional Catholicism because they neutralize countless individuals who would otherwise be authentic Roman Catholics. *The Remnant* is even considered to be traditional by many! How can any individual or publication be traditional which is a part of the Conciliar Church? Since, however, articles dealing with *The Remnant* and *The Wanderer* have appeared in two past issues of *The Athanasian*, I will not discuss them further here. Suffice it to say that such publications, but particularly *The Remnant* and *The Wanderer*, are the great neutralizers in relation to traditional Catholicism. Were it not for them, the number of true Roman Catholics would be, I think, significantly larger. (*The Maryfaithful* also deserves special mention as a traditionally neutralizing publication.)

And so where does all of this leave the traditional Roman Catholic movement? So many (the majority) of those who are counted in its ranks leave so much to be desired in terms of zeal and loyalty and devotion to the Faith. They are traditional Catholics up to a point insofar as they strive to live their lives in harmony with the teachings of the Church. But that's about as far as it goes. The lion's share of their time and attention is given to worldly occupations and pursuits of one kind or another. They love their Faith, yes, and would undoubtedly agree that it is the greatest thing in the world—but perish the thought that they should become activists in promoting and defending it in one or more of the numerous ways available to them. Need it be said that traditional Catholics such as these fall far short of what Christ and His Church expect of them in these unprecedented times?

There is no doubt to my mind but that the present abominable amoral and immoral state of the nation and the world is primarily the result of the decline and fall (humanly speaking) of the Roman Catholic Church. Nor

"Distressing" continued from previous page

will there be any substantive return to God and His eternal truth and His moral law on the part of the multitudes unless and until that Church becomes again the predominant force for truth and morality that it is supposed to be. And the burden for the accomplishment of that task (surely an insurmountable one according to worldly standards) falls all but exclusively upon that segment of traditional Roman Catholics whom I have endeavored to describe in the course of this article. (Is there, I wonder, any group of people anywhere that is, in terms of numbers, less a minority than those who constitute the remnant of the remnant of traditional Roman Catholics?) No undertaking or movement faces a challenge comparable to that which today confronts traditional Catholicism. To what extent that challenge will be effectively met depends, under God, upon the extent to which traditional Roman Catholics are willing to go to preserve and to defend the one, true and eternal Faith which is theirs, the most precious treasure on earth. Literally millions of our predecessors, forsaking family and friends and possessions, fought and died for that same Faith. If need be, can we not do what they have done? How could we do less?

What the ultimate outcome of the present exceedingly lamentable state of affairs may be, the good Lord alone knows. But God forbid that the bleakness of the situation in which we traditional Roman Catholics find ourselves cause us to lose heart and to despair! Such is definitely *not* the will of God. Rather may it serve to effect in each of us an unflinching resolve henceforth to do our full part, always and in all ways, to be what we are called to be as Roman Catholics: loyal sons and daughters of the Church; staunch defenders of the Faith; dauntless soldiers of Christ and His glorious Virgin Mother. Soldiers of Christ. O how very urgent is the need of our beloved Church for them in this our day! †

Pray The Rosary Daily

On Religious Liberty

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

No person has the moral right to profess any religious doctrine other than that revealed by God and committed by the Son of God to the Church which He founded, to be preserved and taught by that Church until the end of time. This is the logical and inescapable conclusion from the premise that the Roman Catholic Church is the one true Church. It alone possesses the totality of divine truth. All other religious bodies, then, are in error, whatever be the good intentions of their clergy and members. Such is the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. True enough, untold millions of people profess religious beliefs which are contrary to those of that Church, a practice permitted or encouraged or approved by civil governments around the world. But that does not mean that those people have the right before God to profess such beliefs. How can any individual morally have a genuine *right* to profess any religion or to observe any code of morality other than that revealed by God and found in its entirety only in the Church established by His divine Son? How can anyone have an authentic *right* to preach or to practice religious error? How can a person have a moral *right* to profess a religious creed which is opposed in any respect to divine truth? And if he does not have such a moral right, how can he justifiably have a civil right to profess religious falsehood? Before God, of course, error of any kind has no rights.

Now the Declaration on Religious Liberty of Vatican Council II holds that man does have the right to religious liberty, to profess whatever religion he wishes, and that this is quite in accord with the traditional doctrine of the Church. The Declaration bestows upon non-Catholic religions and their erroneous teachings a legitimacy which cannot be theirs by virtue of the nature of divine truth and without gravely compromising the Roman Catholic Faith. The position on religious liberty of Vatican Council II is clearly heretical and has been condemned by the Church on several occasions, most notably, perhaps, by Pope Pius IX in his *Quanta Cura*. But John Paul II has publicly and frequently and consistently declared his approval of the documents of Vatican Council II, including the heretical Declaration on Religious Liberty. Although there are other examples available to prove the invalidity of the pontificate of John Paul II, what more is needed than this? Nor is this a matter of one's personal judgment of him. The record of John Paul II speaks for itself.

"Who is John Paul II?" continued from page 3
By "socialization," John Paul II would, it seems, go so far as to support the legalized theft known as land reform, as with the seizure of farms by the government in El Salvador:

> When he was in Oaxaca (Mexico) he went so far as to state there must be no hesitation when it comes to the expropriation of private property, "correctly carried out," provided it is for the common good. But nowhere does he say who is to decide what is for the common good, or what "correctly carried out" means. (Coomaraswamy, op. cit., p. 107.)

How stealing can be reconciled with "Christian morality" is puzzling, until one considers the Schelerian "rebuilding" of ethics.

John Paul II is the Issue

When I began this article, I went on the assumption that I would seek merely to illustrate why semi-traditional and conservative Conciliarists' trust in John Paul II as a defender of the Catholic faith is a misplaced trust, by providing a number of examples of his infidelity on certain issues. Now, with two parts completed and still much to say about him, I've reached the conviction that he is not merely important in his relationship to a given issue but, in a real sense, he *is* the issue.

What I mean here is that the whole credibility of the Conciliar Church's claim to be the *real* Roman Catholic Church stands or falls with him. If he can deserve our trust as the true successor to St. Peter, then we have no recourse other than compliance with the whole Modernist "New Church." That is the position held by the tradition-leaning element in Conciliarism: "We don't like what's going on any more than you do, but out of obedience we must do as we're told and not ask questions."

Now, we know that isn't the case, but how do we get the message across to potential converts to traditional Catholicism? The most effective way is to show them where John Paul II's positions (and actions) are at variance with Catholic thought. Nothing short of that, I'm convinced, will change their minds. The principal reason, humanly speaking, why our numbers have remained small is that he has done a better job of convincing people of his orthodoxy than we have of discrediting it?

To get the truth to people it is necessary to give them detailed evidence of his heresey; otherwise they will accuse us of quoting him out of context. What began as one brief examination of John Paul II's credentials has grown much larger than was planned. I hope you see that the reason for this is that the *issue* is much larger. To destroy the tree bearing bad fruit—and such a tree the Conciliar Church surely is—we have to strike at its roots. But, just as surely, those roots are the continuing confidence game that is foisted upon millions of Catholics of good intention, who follow John Paul II as mindlessly as the children of Hamlin are said to have followed the Pied Piper. †

(PART ONE of "WHO IS JOHN PAUL II?" appeared in the March 1, 1984 issue of The Athanasian. In the second-to-last paragraph of PART ONE Mr. Weiskittel stated that he would deal with John Paul II's views on a number of other subjects in a future article "if reader response warrants one." Reader response did warrant one and that is the article above. But several subjects which were to be discussed in relation to John Paul II in this newsletter issue are not treated, such as, for example, his views on feminism, the U.N. and world government, and disarmament. So? So there will be a PART THREE of "WHO IS JOHN PAUL II?" which will appear in the next issue of The Athanasian, that of July 15, 1984. Although I have no doubt that Mr. Weiskittel has enough material for at least one or two more pieces on the current occupant of the papal throne, PART THREE should conclude our detailed newsletter treatment of the subject for now.—Editor)

In Answer To Inquiries

Occasionally a new subscriber to our newsletter inquires about the meaning of the name, *The Athanasian*. It refers to St. Athanasius who lived in the fourth century and was the Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt for 46 years. Banned from his diocese at least five times, he spent a total of 17 years in exile. The famous convert to the Church, John Henry Cardinal Newman, described him as a "principal instrument after the Apostles by which the sacred truths of Christianity have been conveyed and secured to the world." Often referred to as the Champion of Orthodoxy, Saint Athanasius was undoubtedly one of the most courageous defenders of the Faith in the entire history of the Church. If anyone can be singled out as a saint for our times, surely it is Saint Athanasius. †

TCA TRADITIONAL LATIN MASS SCHEDULE

COLORADO
COLORADO SPRINGS
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY
(303) 636-1575
Mass at 10:00 a.m. June 3
Mass every Friday at 9:00 a.m.

DURANGO
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY
Centennial Savings and Loan
1101 E. Second Ave.
(303) 884-2526
Mass at 10:00 a.m. June 24

STRATTON
OUR LADY OF FATIMA CHAPEL
(303) 348-5454
Mass on June 3, July 1

LOUISIANA
OPELOUSAS (Lafayette area)
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY CHAPEL
Route 1, Box 195
(318) 942-9053
Mass at 11:00 a.m. June 17, July 15, July 29

MINNESOTA
ROCHESTER
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY CHAPEL
5820 Viola Road, NE
(507) 282-5163 or 289-8522
Mass at 10:00 a.m. June 10, July 8, July 29

MONTANA
GREAT FALLS
IMMACULATE HEART OF MARY CHAPEL
2020 Second Avenue North
(406) 452-8826
Mass at 10:00 a.m. June 10, June 24, July 8, July 22

NEW YORK
BUFFALO
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY CHAPEL
231 McKinley Parkway
(716) 537-9533

UTAH
SALT LAKE CITY
OUR LADY OF PERPETUAL HELP
Hilton Inn
154 West 600 South
(801) 278-7501
Mass at 11:00 a.m. July 22

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.†

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.