THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL
Volume IV, No. 6 † September 1, 1983

The American Conciliar Church Bishops and PAX CHRISTI USA

— *John Kenneth Weiskittel*

When our risen Lord appeared to the apostles in the closed room, He greeted them, saying, *"Peace be to you; it is I, fear not,"* and issued their priestly commission *("As the Father hath sent me, I also send you.")*. Here, and in His discourse to them at the Last Supper *("Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, do I give unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, nor let it be afraid.")*, Christ sought to reassure them, despite the opposition they would encounter *("If the world hate you, know ye, that it hated me before you.")*.

This promise of divine assistance belongs to today's Catholics as well, and it serves as a sort of spiritual rudder that enables the Christian soul to pass unscathed through life's toughest trials and tribulations. The characteristic fruits of this inner tranquility are a closer harmony of the individual with God, and the establishment of peace between man and his neighbor. This true peace of Christ - or *pax Christi* - is the basis upon which St. Benedict directly founded his venerable religious order, and it is an indispensable need for any lasting peace among the nations.

With all this in mind, it would seem natural for a group which identifies itself as the "International Catholic Movement for Peace" to select as its name "Pax Christi." Unfortunately, Pax Christi (the organization) seem to have trouble distinguishing the peace given by Christ from that "as the world giveth." For the next few pages, I will endeavor to show how Pax Christi not only falls short in its claim of being an accurate interpreter of the Catholic position, but actually represents a dangerous force advocating in many instances positions that are compatible with the stated opinions of the *enemies* of the Church.

Two subjects that come to mind in connection with Pax Christi are the Catholic theory of what constitutes a just war, and the related issue of the recent pastoral letter of the U.S. Conciliar "Catholic" bishops endorsing a "halt" in the production and deployment of nuclear weapons and questioning the morality of the use of such weapons. Since both of these topics have been treated in *The Athanasian* and elsewhere in the traditional Catholic press, and for the sake of brevity, I will make only a few scattered remarks about them.

A Word About Peace

The stated "primary objective" of Pax Christi is "to work with all people for peace for all humankind, always witnessing to the peace of Christ." Before moving on to the central focus of this article, I'd like to pause to touch upon the use and misuse of the term "peace."

The Greek historian Polybius, writing over a hundred years before the birth of Christ, makes this distinction between different kinds of peace: "For peace, with justice and honor, is the fairest and most profitable of possessions, but with disgrace and shameful cowardice it is the most infamous and harmful of all." Of the first kind of peace, various reconciliations affected by medieval popes between conflicting Christian kingdoms come to mind, while America's betrayal of the Vietnamese people under the guise of "peace with honor" exemplifies the latter. It is not enough, then, to be for peace; it is necessary to choose *real* peace.

The need to recognize what is meant when a nation, group or individual advocates "peace" has never been more urgent than it is today. The USSR, while busily spreading subversion around the globe, ruthlessly smothering opposition at home and in its satellites, and engaging in the most stupendous arms build-up in history, claims to be peace-loving. The Communist regime there has supported "peace" in one form or another for all of its sixty plus years. "It is the banner of peace," declared Nikita Khrushchev, "that enables us to rally the broadest popular masses around us. If we

carry high the banner of peace, we shall score even greater successes."

For Americans, to "coexist peacefully" means to live-and-let-live. We see it rooted in the Golden Rule; it is a hoped-for goal of Christians, a positive good. Not so with the USSR. For them - and for Red China and other Communist governments - it is simply a deceptive means to an end...world conquest. It is deceptive precisely because the impression is given to the unwary that their meaning of the word is the same as our meaning.

In the first volume of his popular *Life is Worth Living* series, (then Bishop) Fulton Sheen included a chapter entitled "Peace Tactics of the Soviets." His definition of "peace" according to the USSR bears repeating:

> The Communist notion of peace is both a *tactic* and a *goal*. For no other people on earth is peace both a tactic and a goal as it is for the Reds. In this quality of purpose lies their trickery.
>
> Peace as a *tactic* means the use of nonviolent and non-military methods in order to prepare for violent offense and the demoralization of other nations. The *goal* of Communist peace is the complete subservience of the world to Communist dictatorship. For the Communists there can be no real peace until there has been a complete destruction of all private property, the abolition of morals and religion, the subjection of all democratic processes to a totalitarian dictator. That is the goal; but the tactic is to talk peace in order to induce nations to disarm and to convince them that the Moscow-inspired revolutions are purely local. By these ruses they hope to demoralize the rest of the world and prepare for its ultimate conquest.

If, as the German military theorist Karl von Clausewitz wrote, war is the continuation of political relations by other means, then for the Communists, peace is the continuation of war by other means. Back in 1930, while an instructor at the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow, Dmitri Manuilski, who later presided over the United Nations' Security Council, made a statement that seems almost prophetic. Before his student subversives, Manuilski boasted: "So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record... As soon as their guard is down, we will smash them with the clenched fist."

The sad fact of the matter is that our guard *is* down - and has been down for decades. Since 1959 alone, the USSR has entered into 14 arms-control agreements; without exception, it has broken every single one. In 1959, the USA was far-and-away the most powerful nation on the face of the earth; the latest Defense Department figures show us trailing the Kremlin in both nuclear and conventional arsenals. (Such evidence should be grounds enough for any thinking American to oppose the proposed nuclear freeze.)

Some have recognized the threat, and have sought to warn the American public. The American Bar Association published a 1964 report entitled *Peaceful Coexistence - A Communist Blueprint for Victory.* The study concluded by pointing out that

> The great paradox of our time may well turn out to be our inability to recognize that the cold war has in reality become more intense despite the increasing appearances of peace. It need not be emphasized that the overwhelming sentiment of the free world is to live in peace. But to mistake the illusion of peace for genuine peace would be a profoundly dangerous, perhaps fatal mistake.

Elsewhere, the A.B.A. has provided what may be the best illustration of what the Communists mean when they say "peace": a man enters a cage with a hungry lion; it is only after the lion has eaten the man that the two can lie down together in peace.

The "Nonviolent Spirituality" of PAX CHRISTI

The year is 1948, and France, ravaged by five years of war, is still on the mend. From 1940-45 she had suffered greatly from some of the most savage fighting seen anywhere during the Second World War. The German invasion and occupation, followed by the fierce Allied counterattack, had left France in many ways a broken country.

It is in this year at Lourdes that Monsignor Pierre M. Theas, French bishop of Compiegne, proposes a bold plan to heal the scarred relations between his countrymen and the German people. The prelate calls together a number of Catholics from Germany and France, with the expressed purpose of forming an organization to work to that end. The group is called *Pax Christi.* Poland and Italy are the next nations to become members and, with the merger of the group with Pax, a British organization, Pax Christi gains its international status, Antwerp, Belgium being chosen as the headquarters city. In 1973 the American branch, Pax Christi USA, comes into being. (Some sources set the year as 1972.)

A question comes to mind: is the extreme pacifism of today's Pax Christi consistent with the aims Bishop Theas had in mind thirty-five years ago or does it stem from some later additions and changes made? According to literature obtained from Pax Christi USA, he was motivated in part because he was "convinced that the

Gospel message of peace must challenge the horrors of modern war." That really doesn't tell us much, since any rational Catholic would agree with such sentiments; the problem arises when considering *how* to implement them. Whatever the case, I secured several books of Catholic history trying to uncover leads, but found few references to Bishop Theas and *none* of them shedding light on his motives.

Tuning in to the views of today's Pax Christi is an easier matter. A "Statement of Purpose" found in a promotional folder announces: "Pax Christi USA invites concerned Catholics to respond to the Church's call to evaluate war with an entirely new attitude and to take an active role in making secure a peace based on justice and love." The same declaration promises that to accomplish its goals the group will "work with various Catholic communities and agencies, and also collaborate with other groups committed to nonviolent peacemaking." The key points in these quotes, I believe, are that we are being asked to adopt "an entirely new attitude" concerning war and that Pax Christi collaborates with various pacifist outfits in addition to alleged Catholic ones. I'll take each point individually and then show how they are interconnected.

There's no question but that, even with the twenty years of innovation at any cost in America's Conciliar Church to prepare them, the bishops' pastoral letter on nuclear weapons took many by surprise. Bishop Daniel P. Reilly (Diocese of Norwich, Connecticut), a member of the committee in charge of drafting the letter, acknowledges this in response to a query posed by an interviewer for the national newspaper *USA Today.* "I think the media is fascinated" (by the pastoral letter), Bishop Reilly says, "because the Catholic Church is looked upon as a bastion of conservatism. That fascinates people in the press: 'How did this conservative Church ever get involved with a liberal question and come out on what would be considered the liberal side of things?'"

An answer is not too difficult when you consider that no less than 56 of the bishops of America's New Church belong to Pax Christi, and - as "activist" clergy are wont to be - they are far more vocal, are more adept at stacking caucuses, boards and committees with their members, and are pushier about having others accept their views than are the moderates. The co-founder and president of the U.S. branch of Pax Christi is Thomas Gumbleton, auxiliary bishop in Detroit (more about him later).

Getting back to this "newthink", the Pax Christi folder enumerates its position, as working for: (1) disarmament; (2) a just world order; (3) primacy of conscience; (4) eduation for peace; and (5) alternatives to violence. For them, disarmament means not only the curtailment of nuclear arms, but also a "general disarmament" and actively seeking "to reorient the priorities of our national government away from heavy arms spending and trading to policies which have as their chief concern the truly human development of all people." How there can be any "truly human development of all people" should the *inhuman* Communist ideology reign supreme on earth is not explained. The new world order favored by Pax Christi is embodied in the United Nations, which it "strongly endorses." The feeling is mutual: "In 1979 Pax Christi International received Consultive Status at the United Nations." Why a hangout for international terrorists is preferred as a model for a just world order over the Catholic Church is never explained. I guess I'm nitpicking, eh? Frankly, I confess to being somewhat confused regarding this "primacy of conscience" business or, at least, Pax Christi's position on the subject. Now, I don't have any problem with someone who seeks a non-combative role, but I fail to see how these "peace" people can logically move from this point into advocacy of a World Peace Tax Fund, designed to "designate tax funds to peace groups, peace education and human needs." Then they have the audacity to claim: "While Pax Christi attracts many pacifists, this is not a condition of membership," which means, I take it, that they will gladly separate *any* gullible souls from their money. "Peace and justice" courses, especially in "Catholic schools and universities," are the educational alternatives recommended instead of "military and ROTC programs." And finally, the folder says that, in order for the world to survive, "programs in nonviolent spirituality, nonviolent resistance and reconciliation, and nonviolent civilian and social defense" are required. This, too, had me a bit puzzled; I mean, *what* is "nonviolent civilian and social defense?" Isn't that a contradiction? Then it dawned on me: Why *of course,* this is what Bishop Gumbleton is talking about when he says that if Russia attacks us, we are to "surrender to the invader ...the perfect nonviolent defense."

Enter Bishop Gumbleton & Friends... Stage Left

"Surrender to the invader" - Bishop Gumbleton's "solution" to America's nuclear holocaust blues. Really brilliant, isn't it? And you thought being run over by a Soviet tank was painful. Nuclear war is wrong because it's murder, but suicidal compliance to nuclear blackmail is high virtue! (When Yuri gets to Detroit, will Tom Gumbleton be there to present him the key to the city?)

A photo - taken when Chicago's Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, chairman of the drafting committee, announced completion of the pastoral letter's final 44,000 word

version - shows Bishop Gumbleton seated at his side, smiling like a Cheshire cat. And why *not*? After all, the outlook of Church and state found in that document resembles (closely in places) the Pax Christi view. The real indictment of the bishops comes from their selection of him (Gumbleton) to that all-important committee in the first place, for that selection was made *long after* his widely-publicized, near-treasonous "surrender" remark. (I say *near*-treasonous since, technically speaking, treason is only treason when the country is in a state of *declared* war.)

Bishop Gumbleton's radicalism is not confined to his devotion to disarmament. No mere flirtation, his long-standing reputation for taking the controversial side of any issue is a career bordering on obsession. Beginning with anti-war preaching during the U.S. involvement in Vietnam in the 1960's, he has a record for radicalism that is tough to top. His remarks on Latin America have given vocal aid and comfort to the Marxist subversives in El Salvador, yet he denies any awareness of oppression in Communist Cuba. (I presume he thinks the Cuban "boat people" were on a pleasure cruise.)

And Bishop Gumbleton shows he can be just as wild in his views over domestic social and religious matters. Speaking recently before a meeting of RENEW - a Conciliar program for so-called "spiritual renewal" - in Toledo, Ohio, the Michigan firebrand attacked ecclesiastical handling of the Mansour Affair as "an injustice." This was the case involving Sister (now Miss) Agnes Mary Mansour, a former Mercy Sister who clashed with Detroit's Conciliar Archbishop Edmund Szoka over her insistence that she be permitted to continue in her position as director of the Michigan Department of Social Services, a job that includes the allocation of abortion funding. She contended that she was "personally opposed" to abortion, but in practice this is an empty phrase, equivalent to some bureaucrat in Nazi Germany alleging to be "personally opposed" to the gassing of Jews but signing the papers needed to fund the "project." If real Catholic Canon Law had been in effect, she would have been excommunicated for helping women procure abortions; since Conciliar "Canon Law" held sway, she was given the choice of remaining a religious (so to speak) or keeping her secular job. She opted for the latter. But even this slap on the hand is too much for Bishop Gumbleton, who says that Miss Mansour "was not treated with the justice you'd expect to have within Church structures," that she did not receive "the minimum due process we would expect from civil society." (Did, I ask, the unborn, murdered with the stroke of her pen, receive due process, Bishop?) This, he argues, is but one of many examples of "injustice" against women, who must "assert their rights" in the Church. Bishop Gumbleton then admirably condemns the absolute poverty of millions around the world as "so degrading as to insult human dignity," but he never equates abortions as being equally repugnant.

Though Thomas Gumbleton is the big newsmaker over at Pax Christi, his colleagues there are of a feather. Pax Christi prelates read like part of a guest list for some dinner party of extremists in the Conciliar Church: Seattle's Archbishop Raymond Hunthausen; Bishop Leroy Matthieson of Amarillo, Texas; and Bishop Walter Sullivan (Richmond, Virginia) are the leading headline grabbers. The visitor to these men's dioceses should not be surprised to find - amid the continual exhortations to drop U.S. defenses - liturgical anarchy, and the fight against "sexism" in the church, including the push for homosexual "rights." Archbishop Hunthausen's Seattle archdiocese, for example, is one of the nation's leaders in the promotion of the Christ-denying "Gay Masses."

The best-known foreign member of Pax Christi is Brazil's "Red Bishop," Dom Helder Camara. He is known as a subversive in his own country for his espousal of synthesizing Marxism and Catholicism into a "liberation theology." Dom Helder's speech for Pax Christi International during the U.N.'s Second Special Session on Disarmament is featured in a packet available from Pax Christi USA (for a contribution of only $2.50...tax-deductible, of course).

As I have mentioned previously, Pax Christi is a willing co-worker with other pacifist/radical organizations both within and outside the New Church. One Conciliar group I've already alluded to is RENEW; another is the Maryknoll Order. An "educational tool" utilized at Pax Christi presentations is the disarmament film "Gods of Metal," produced by Maryknoll. Also, the two groups (Pax Christi and Maryknoll) were among the sponsors of last year's Catholic Disarmament Assembly held in New York. Other "Catholic" groups involved included: Franciscan Federation of Brothers and Sisters of the U.S. Office of Peace and Justice; Benedictines for Peace; U.S. Catholic Mission Association; National Assembly of Women Religious; Catholic Peace Fellowship; The Catholic Worker; Jesuit Office, New York; Dominican Fathers and Brothers; Dominican Sisters of the Sick Poor; and Network, Catholic Social Justice Lobby (this is a partial listing of sponsoring groups).

The nuclear freeze movement's ties with international Communism are well documented and have appeared in a number of books and periodicals. One of the best studies is *The War Called Peace: The Soviet Peace Offensive,* a detailed look at the movement published

by Western Goals, a non-profit foundation with the admirable stated purpose of working "...to rebuild and strengthen the political, economic, and social structure of the United States and Western Civilization so as to make any merger with totalitarians impossible." The World Peace Council (WPC) is identified as "the major Soviet-controlled front group," that operates "under the joint control of the International Department of the Central Committee of the Soviet Union (CPSU) and the KGB." The American branch of the WPC is the United States Peace Council (USPC). "Pax Christi," notes *The War Called Peace*, "...has had members participating in WPC disarmament activities."

Halloween 1981 was an appropriate date for the Second Special Session on Disarmament's organizing meeting, held at Riverside Church in New York City. Reverend William Sloan Coffin, pastor at Riverside, is truly a world class leftist whose interests seem to extend into every facet of the "New Theology" (he was one of the three radical ministers - Reverend William Howard and Bishop Gumbleton were his companions - selected by President Carter to visit the American hostages in Iran). The meeting was an extravaganza that was attended, notes *The War Called Peace,* "by nearly 200 representatives from 72 groups, including the Communist Party, U.S.A. (CPUSA); the U.S. Peace Council (USPC); the Trotskyite Communist Socialist Workers Party (SWP); the U.S. Section of the Brussels-based Fourth International; Workers World Party (WWP), a strident supporter of Cuba, North Korea and Soviet-supported revolutionary terrorist groups that has earned a reputation for street confrontations with police; the WWP-controlled People's Anti-War Movement (PAM); the Coalition for a People's Alternative (CPA), a revolutionary "party-building" formation including the Castroite Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP) and American Indian Movement (AIM)...; Vieques Support Network, that backs PSP causes aimed at making Puerto Rico the next Cuba in the Caribbean; All-African People's Revolutionary Party (AAPRP); and the National Lawyer's Guild (NLG)." The United Nations sent a delegate, and representatives from the following religious communities attended: Muslim, Jewish, Lutheran, Church of Christ, Presbyterian and "Catholic," as well as "ecumenists" and Riverside's own Church Disarmament Program. Inevitably, Pax Christi was involved at the Session.

Certainly this shows a great deal about where the sentiments of Pax Christi lie. The get-together was everything you'd imagine a reunion of Communistic factions to be: a public flagellation of U.S. defense and an absolution of Soviet aggression. The blame for the "arms race" was placed squarely on the doorstep of the United States (funny, as President Reagan has observed, that the American nuclear arsenal was never used after Hiroshima/Nagasaki, despite the fact that we were the only country capable of "delivering the goods" for more than a decade - strange tactics for one bent on commencing an arms race or intimidating neighbors). The consensus of those assembled was that we are to blame precisely because we refuse to see the "good intentions" of the peaceloving USSR, but continue to cling to the "myth" of a Communist threat. Echoing Manuilski's pledge of the "most spectacular peace movement on record," the meeting's Civil Disobedience task force promised to "build for the largest outpouring of disarmament sentiment this nation, and possibly the world, has ever seen."

This philosophy, that it's permissible to work with the forces of Communism to solve the problems of the nuclear age, is held by Pax Christi International as fervently as by its U.S. branch. It has attended "peace" conferences in East Germany and other Iron Curtain nations which were sponsored by Communist disarmament organizations and presided over by leaders like Patriarch Pimen of the Russian Orthodox Church in Moscow. What the great Cardinal Mindszenty once said about the "religious"leaders of his native Hungary applies to those in other Communist lands also: "The regime decides who is to occupy ecclesiastical positions and for how long. Furthermore, the regime also decides what persons the bishops will be allowed to consecrate as priests." It goes without saying that the "peace priests" and "bearded bishops," as the late cardinal described them, will be only those amicable to and willing to teach from the "Christian Marxist" catechism. Some, such as Patriarch Pimen, are K.G.B. (or its equivalent) agents. Yet we find Monsignor Bruce Kent of Great Britain's Pax Christi sending a greeting to the 1980 World Peace Council's World Congress in Sofia, Bulgaria and, five years before that, Bishop Gumbleton was a *sponsor* of the same Communist front's U.S. Tour. The only question in my mind is how professed Catholics can sit across the table from WPC-types and not *know* that they are face-to-face with their sworn enemies. Or perhaps they *do* know. Although the Church has always condemned collaboration with those who would destroy her, those leaders mentioned above seem ready to jump into such situations with both feet. Can they really be that innocent? I like to avoid using worn cliches as much as possible, but in light of Pax Christi's willing assistance to world Communism, I find myself thinking, "with friends like *these...*"

The Bishop's "Prophetic" Peace Pastoral and Pax Christi

Archbishop Philip Hannan (New Orleans) was fighting a losing battle and he knew it. Down on the floor of the

"Pax Christi" continued on page 8

THE WANDERER and THE REMNANT:

The Conservative Wing of the American Conciliar Church

— Fr. Francis E. Fenton

Of the numerous religious newsletters, newspapers and magazines which are received in our TCA office in the course of a month, there are perhaps a dozen or so which I quite thoroughly read from beginning to end of each issue. Since I have long since ceased to read most of the publications associated with the Conciliar Church, practically all of those to which I refer are traditional Roman Catholic publications. There are, however, two newspapers which I regularly read which are neither traditional in the current strict meaning of that term nor Roman Catholic because they are associated with the Conciliar Church. Those two publications are *The Wanderer* and *The Remnant*. Perhaps they are best described as conservative "Catholic" publications.

Both *The Wanderer* and *The Remnant* are different in many respects from just about all other publications of national circulation allied with the Conciliar Church. They contain much fine material with which no traditional Roman Catholic could reasonably take exception. And therein lies the rub. It is my contention that many of the readers of both publications are basically traditional, or at least traditionally inclined, and think that they are truly Roman Catholic if they concur with the stance of these publications in relation to the Church. This is particularly true of the readers of *The Remnant*, so many of whom consider themselves to be traditional Roman Catholics even though they are not so in fact. Nor are they likely to become such so long as their comprehension of traditional Catholicism is that of *The Remnant*.

Take, for example, the treatment by the two publications in question of the current occupant of the papal throne. One not otherwise informed on the record of John Paul II would never suspect from a reading of *The Wanderer* that he may be something other than he is presented as being, while *The Remnant* does little more, for the most part, than voice an occasional criticism of him. His heretical statements and actions over the past few years; his presiding over the most rampant heresy in the Conciliar Church and his failure to take any *decisive* action to punish the culprits; his appointment of scores of bishops in this country and throughout the world who just happen to be, all but invariably, of the "liberal," leftist persuasion, and some of them, I have no doubt, Communists or Freemasons; his failure to condemn in the most forthright terms the abominable practice of the wholesale granting of marriage annulments, a number of them contrary to divine law, by various dioceses in this country - all of this relating to John Paul II, and much more of the same, is practically ignored in the pages of *The Wanderer* and, in *The Remnant*, is generally discussed with much less than the complete candor and forthrightness these vital matters demand. Indeed, while a strong case has been made by some traditional Catholic writers that "His Holiness" is not a valid pontiff at all, neither of the two publications under discussion has ever, to my knowledge, presented to the consideration of its readership the reasons why an increasing number of traditionalists take that position. *The Wanderer* ignores the issue; *The Remnant* beclouds or ridicules it.

As for the American bishops of the Conciliar Church, since they have been discussed in a number of past issues of this newsletter, there is no need to go into that unpleasant subject here. Suffice it to say that they are a disgrace, as any honest and informed individual knows well. As a body, they bear no resemblance to genuine Roman Catholic prelates - and, of course, they are not. From a regular reading of *The Wanderer* and *The Remnant*, however, the worst one might conclude regarding these bishops is that they are weak and/or uninformed individuals who just happen to lack the knowledge and/or the courage to stand up for Church and country and morality and freedom. They are a disaster to the Church and they are more and more openly aiding and abetting the sworn enemies of God and country, yes, but they really mean well. Nonsense! Rather does it make far more sense to me at this stage to conclude that at least some of these American Conciliar Church bishops know exactly what they're about and that they are conscious subverters and destroyers of the Roman Catholic Church and of the USA. Could it be that some of the them are Freemasons or Communists? I believe it could well be. Indeed, those known to be Masons or Communists could hardly do the job more effectively. In any case, it must surely make more sense to *The Wanderer* and *The Remnant* that there are enemy agents among the hierarchy of the Conciliar Church rather than the assumption that the more than 300 members of that hierarchy are all weak and/or uninformed men. If so, I do not recall

ever seeing so much as a hint of this in either publication.

And then there is the matter of the true Mass versus the Novus Ordo service. *The Wanderer* presumably accepts the "new Mass" unreservedly since nothing appears therein criticizing it as such, much less condemning it. *The Remnant*, while highly critical of the many "abuses" associated with the Novus Ordo and while even finding much fault with the service itself, has nonetheless never condemned it nor urged its readership not to attend this false form of worship. No rightly informed, truly traditional Roman Catholic, however, will have anything whatsoever to do with either the Novus Ordo or with any part of the Conciliar Church.

As has been so often stated in the pages of this newsletter, the "ecumenical" Conciliar Church is simply *not* the Roman Catholic Church. Once this premise is accepted, then all of the abominations and immoralities associated with it, and which so many of its bishops and priests condone or encourage, and in which a number of them are participants - and about which the "Holy Father" does little or nothing - all of this at least begins to make sense if the Conciliar Church is, in fact, not the true Church. This Conciliar Church openly collaborates with atheistic Communism; it allows its members to join the Freemasons and has Freemasons in some of its highest echelons; it permits members of its clergy and "religious" who are Marxists and self-proclaimed homosexuals and who deny fundamental doctrines of divine revelation to remain "in good standing"; it brazenly ignores the mind and teaching of the true Church on the matter of sex education; its American bishops openly play into the hands of the Communist conspirators with their declarations on nuclear weapons; and so on and on. And yet *The Wanderer* and *The Remnant* actually believe that this abhorrent Conciliar Church is the Roman Catholic Church, the Mystical Body of Christ? And *The Remnant* continues to urge its readers to petition the Vatican and various Conciliar Church bishops for this, that or the other - with nothing of substance, of course, to show for it.

But, one may ask, in view of the scores of "liberal" and leftist and pro-Communist publications aligned with the Conciliar Church, why this denunciation of *The Wanderer* and *The Remnant*? Even though they clearly profess their affiliation with the Conciliar Church, are not they at least conservative periodicals and, to some degree, traditionally oriented, especially the latter? True enough, and it is, again, precisely for this reason, that they are singled out for criticism. Because they are conservative and because much of their content (markedly applicable to *The Remnant*) is of a traditional nature, countless individuals suppose that their thinking is quite solidly Roman Catholic if they find themselves in agreement with the position of these two publications relative to the Conciliar Church. In other words, although the resemblance of that Church to the historic Roman Catholic Church is today, except in some externals, almost nonexistent, the people to whom I refer are, in general, either unaware of or indifferent to this most fundamental matter because *The Wanderer* and *The Remnant* assure them, at least by plain implication, that there is no problem here. Indeed, it is my strong conviction that *The Remnant* in particular, because of its allegiance to the Conciliar Church, does more harm to the cause of authentic traditional Catholicism than any other publication on the American scene. At least a vast majority of its readers, after a steady diet of *The Remnant* treatment, are, in my opinion, more or less totally neutralized and actually believe that they are truly traditional Roman Catholics. But how can a person be a member of the Conciliar Church and be a Roman Catholic at all? And, since John Paul II is the undisputed head of the non-Catholic Conciliar Church, how can he be a valid pontiff?

And so, however well-intentioned some of them may be, are all those - bishops, priests, religious, the laity - who belong to the Conciliar Church non-Catholics. In my mind, I have no doubt of this. In traditional Catholicism alone is preserved today the totality of the historic Roman Catholic Faith, pure and unadulterated. The Conciliar Church is no more the One, True Church than, say, Hinduism - and it is with that Church that *The Wanderer* and *The Remnant* are allied, their conservatism and quasi-traditionalism notwithstanding. ❁

†††††††††††††††††††††††††††††††††

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.

†††††††††††††††††††††††††††††††††

"Pax Christi" continued from page 5

National Bishops' Conference last spring, he was doing everything he could to inject a degree of sanity into the proceedings but no one was listening. Dubbed by *Time* as the "most persistent conservative at the meeting, Archbishop Hannan - a chaplain in World War II - warned his colleagues: "I don't think you know what you're talking about at all, not having been in war. You're just inviting the enemy in if you withdraw these nuclear weapons we have." In a press conference after his return to his diocese, he elaborated, saying: "The bishops don't know anything about weaponry and yet they're making statements about it." Although disappointed by the Chicago conference, Archbishop Hannan must be heartened by the fact that his office has been swamped with mail, and "90 to 95 percent of the letters are in favor of my stand." (A similar percentage for his position was also recorded around the country.)

"The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response" (the official title of the pastoral letter) has been nothing if not controversial. For the surrenderists, it is seen as an almost prophetic statement, *"a voice of one crying in the desert,"* a vindication. Interestingly, U.S. military leaders with Catholic backgrounds have not been, shall I say, as enthusiastic in their appraisals. One of the most influential of them is Daniel O. Graham, a retired lieutenant general in the Army and former Defense Intelligence Agency head, who currently is Director of Project High Frontier (a proposed high-tech defense system) and a member of the Advisory Board of Catholics for a Moral America. One difficulty in the letter, according to an article he wrote recently, "is its failure to distinguish clearly between those elements in it which constitute clearly and long-held moral principles of the Catholic Church,...and the bishops' own more or less private theological conclusions reached by them in attempting to apply universal principles to the particular realities at hand." Then, General Graham demonstrates this failure in striking terms:

> For example, the Pastoral Letter states that many individuals see in the Gospels and the Life of Jesus a condemnation of all violence, and it praises these individuals for their "courageous" pacifism. It then places pacifists on an equal moral plane with men who have served in the armed forces and who have laid down their lives for their country and its citizens in just wars.
>
> Nowhere in the document is it made clear that pacifists fly in the face of the Just War tradition of the Church, and that those serving the country in its armed forces in fact are fulfilling a solemn moral obligation, i.e., to contribute to the defense (common good) of a society whose privileges they enjoy.

To my thinking, the author hits upon one of life's greatest ironies: for the pacifists to exist and thrive - much less gather together to work out a refined and rarified ideology - without the heroics and sacrifices of the military to preserve freedom is impossible (there are few pacifists in the USSR...and those few are regarded as non-entities); for his effort, the soldier is often branded warmonger or militarist by the very ones who owe him a debt of gratitude for protecting their life and liberty.

This militant pacifism is very much in line with that of Pax Christi. Also consistent is the call in the pastoral letter for a "halt" to new arms production (via negotiations) with Pax Christi's urging of a nuclear freeze. The bishops had a great deal of trouble making up their minds as to how they would phrase this particular section (under the heading "On Promoting Peace"). For a while, the term "curb" was favored, but the word was changed to "halt" for the third and final draft (the sentence in question reads in full: "We support immediate, bilateral, verifiable agreements to halt the testing, production and deployment of new nuclear systems.") But does "halt" mean the same as "freeze"? It does if we are to believe National Council of Catholic Bishop's President Archbishop John Roach's response to the same question: "That's right. That's absolutely right!"

Pax Christi International issued a 1981 Declaration on Disarmament and Security at the close of its International Council. After citing Pope Paul VI's opinions on the arms race (a "danger," "mistake," "wrong," "folly," and an "injustice") and its impact on lives ("the waste involved in the overdevelopment of military devices"; "by their cost alone armaments kill the poor by causing them to starve"), the Council offered its view. The hazards of life in the nuclear age, the Declaration suggests, leave us no alternative but to search "to find a new system, a new solution, new methods which will enable us to settle our differences in a manner worthier of humanity." The bishops' letter speaks of "an arms race which robs the poor and the vulnerable," and urges "new efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons in the world."

The "new methods" and "new efforts" of Pax Christi/ U.S. Bishops also converge with one another. I've already examined the advocacy of Pax Christi of a "just world order" that includes the promotion of such schemes as the World Peace Tax and, ultimately, the United Nations as a world government best able to bring about such an "order." This involves the purely subjective view that the nations of the world must rely more and more on one another; that they must become "interdependent." In turn, the bishops write (also in the section "On Promoting Peace"):

> We support, in an increasingly interdependent

> world, political and economic policies designed to protect human dignity and to promote the human rights of every person, especially the least of us. In this regard, we call for the establishment of some form of global authority adequate to the needs of the international common good.

Whether or not they mean the United Nations is to serve as the groundwork for the "global authority" isn't spelled out although, based on the near-unanimous support of the U.N. by U.S. bishops (know any of them who dissents?), plus its enthusiastic endorsement from every post-Conciliar pontiff, it would seem well within the bounds of possibility. Connected with this outlook is the implication by Pax Christi that, "for the estimated cost of the MX missile program alone, 50 million malnourished children in developing countries could be adequately fed, 65,000 health care centers and 340,000 primary schools could be built." And the U.S. bishops are on the same wavelength. "The next 'Peace and Justice' (pastoral) on the bishops' agenda," notes Father Anthony Cekada in the June issue of *The Roman Catholic,* "will be 'redirecting human resources to human needs of our citizens and the poor of the globe.' Translation: raising taxes on the money you've earned and giving it away to someone else." (A World Income Tax is already being considered at the U.N. - imagine twice as much of our tax dollars going to perpetuate Bolshevism in Russia, to help procure abortions in India, and the propping up of crumbling anti-Christian, anti-American regimes around the world.)

I would like to close this section much as I began it, by quoting a U.S. military leader, raised a Catholic, on the matter of the pastoral letter. The *National Catholic Register* recently talked with Major James F. Kealey, whom it identified as "a Catholic with 13 years of Jesuit education under his belt,...(and) military assistant to the U.S. chairman of the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks." "I take very seriously," Major Kealey told the *Register*, "what each and every one (of the bishops) says. But, having said that, I do find it bordering on irresponsible for, say, a Father Frank Winters (another pacifist) or a Bishop Gumbleton or some of the others to preface their own personal opinions with 'The Church teaches...' I'd be pleased to listen to their personal opinions. But I find it irresponsible that they're not labeled as such." The major could save himself much needless worry if he only would use this simple rule of thumb when evaluating comments from Bishop Gumbleton and friends and from the New Church in general: if the topic in question is part of the infallible teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, it is open to debate while, if it is part of the modernist malarkey of the "new magisterium," one is obliged to hold it as revealed truth in its entirety. At least that's what much of the Conciliar Church is moving towards, though they placate their more conservative members by making appeals to the true teaching in order to cloak their error in an aura of orthodoxy.

"'Peace, Peace'...Though There is No Peace"

The parallel of this quotation from the Old Testament (Jeremiah 8:11) with the Pax Christi movement is, I believe, obvious. By eagerly joining with Communist fronts such as the WPC and the USPC, they lose any credibility they might have as a "Catholic Peace Movement." It is irrelevant to the question being considered as to whether individual Pax Christi members are collaborating with such groups out of ignorance or not (certainly many grassroots members *are* ignorant of the nature of the fronts but, just as certainly, many leaders have been made aware of the background of these groups, yet continue - for whatever reason - to work with them). The reason it is irrelevant is - to go back to an earlier distinction - simply because trying to reconcile the *Christian* notion of peace with the false peace of the *Communists* is as futile as attempting to mix water and oil...no matter how hard one tries to mix the two substances and regardless of the good intentions of the would-be mixer, it can't be done.

And that's the whole point: Pax Christi doesn't know what it's talking about. Or does it? It takes its pronouncements as much from the professional pacifists, such as Moscow's darling, Dr. Helen Caldicott (she says the U.S., *not* the U.S.S.R., is the nation that is the greatest threat to world peace), as from Church sources (it does quote Pope John Paul II but, then, he is very much pro-United Nations which - whether he knows it or not - is the largest Communist front in the world!). Pax Christi endangers the free world in direct proportion to the degree that its viewpoint is accepted by the shapers of public policy. In the next several paragraphs I will identify a number of danger areas of thought that are underlying current and that spill over into the bishops' peace pastoral.

(1) AN ALL-OUT NUCLEAR WAR WOULD ANNIHILATE ALL LIFE ON THE PLANET.

I'd like to preface this with an opinion. Personally (and I speak here only for myself, other newsletter staff members possibly having other views on the subject), I find it difficult to imagine conditions in which a full-scale, empty-all-missile-silos-type nuclear war can be regarded as moral. I can even agree with a point made by the bishops' letter, if taken out of its questionable context - truth is truth wherever found - that point being that "no defensive strategy, nuclear or conventional, which exceeds the limits of proportionality is morally permissible." Unlike the innovative theology found elsewhere in this letter, this refers back to one of the

bases of the Just War Theory - the Principle of Double Effect. That principle states, as described by the pro-life leader Father Charles Fiore, O.P., "that under certain circumstances an action may be performed even though it is forseen that one of its effects will be either a physical or moral evil." Four conditions must be met to justify the act. The first is that such an action cannot, of itself, be immoral and, skipping over to the fourth (since that is what is involved with the notion of proportionality), that "the good effect must be sufficiently beneficial to compensate for the permitting of the bad effect." No sane person longs to gaze upon the nightmare landscapes strewn with the incinerated remains of neighbors and loved ones, and do so knowing that this dead hull was once a thriving city. But in spite of the real capacity for terror, claims of "annihilation" (found so often in the literature of Pax Christi and other related groups) do not hold up under the light of dispassionate scrutiny. Even the worst possible scenario, i.e., an unexpected nuclear strike giving a city no time for evacuation and to take cover, doesn't warrant the exaggerated doom and gloom picture of a dead planet painted by the professional scare-mongers. No reputable scientist with any expertise in this field has ever offered so dark a view, yet Pax Christi has no qualms about offering it, and is thus guilty of irresponsibly spreading unjustifiable rumors and fear.

(2) MORE MONEY FOR SOCIAL PROGRAMS, LESS FOR DEFENSE. In a section of Pax Christi's Declaration on Disarmament and Security entitled "Characteristics of This New Way of Thinking and Approach," it is stated that "there should be a search for... initiatives to diminish the military-strategic elements of security in our societies, and to improve the socio-economic, political and cultural-ideological elements." Here they beg the question, since it is not so much a case of either/or but, rather, both/and. This is to say that society has several components, all needed for its properly ordered working, and a drive to divide them into warring factions, as such proposals tend to do, has a detrimental effect on the whole. Indeed, it's reasonable to hope for improved economic conditions or better social structures in a given nation and to work accordingly but there can be none of this without a climate of freedom and security, and this, in turn, is possible only by means of a vigilant guarding of citizens - and society itself - from those enemies that would try to attack from within and without. Can we really consider cutting back defense outlays in the U.S. budget in favor of more social (or "entitlement") programs? Hardly. The 1983 budget is now spending nearly $2.00 in welfare-oriented funding for every dollar spent on the military. One last point: conspicuously absent, in the Pax Christi passage quoted above, is any mention of religion as an "element" of society worthy to be considered with the "socio-economic, political, and cultural-ideological" - a strange omission for a "Catholic" peace movement.

(3) A BILATERAL, VERIFIABLE NUCLEAR ARMS FREEZE. One of the most dangerous of all propositions to be outlined and yet, seemingly, the most innocent. It is based on two equally false assumptions: first, that the U.S. is as much a threat to peace as the U.S.S.R. and therefore as guilty of inciting the "arms race"; and second, that the Soviet government can be trusted. I have already covered the first assumption in the text above, so I'll go on to the second. As also stated above, the Soviets have an abysmal record when it comes to compliance with arms control treaties. Freeze groups tell us that the Communists have finally come to a realization of the need for world peace, and have made an eleventh hour conversion (if such is the case, someone should tell the people of Afghanistan, Poland, and Russia itself, since they haven't been told). No, the successors of Lenin still subscribe to the article of his Credo that reads "Promises are like pie crusts - made to be broken." It is a disturbing aftermath of the bishops' pastoral to learn that Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger says it is "consistent" with Administration policy to work for a freeze - after "parity" of arms is reached. The U.S.S.R. has always refused to allow on-site inspections, a land whose borders encompass an area twice as large as that of the U.S. What Pax Christi, the American bishops and the U.S. government all deny is the most obvious of observations: that as long as the sky is blue and the grass is green; as long as babies cry and nightingales sing; just as long will the committed Communist continue to lie.

(4) THE PUSH FOR A "NEW WORLD ORDER."
Fifty-three years ago, Pope Benedict XV warned the faithful of subversive moves for world government "longed for, and confidently expected, by all the worst and most distorted elements." This would be a godless, communistic regime reigning over the planet with a merciless iron fist of "unheard-of-terror." The spectre of nuclear Armageddon has moved many to turn to this idea of a community of nations (even with Communists controlling). How naive! Red insurgents in Zimbabwe pull an infant from its mother's arms and, after lopping off its four limbs, begin tossing and kicking the twitching body in a game of macabre football, before the mother's helpless and horrified gaze. This scene can be projected to countries all over the earth, and multiplied literally by the millions. Such is life - and death - wherever the poison of Marxism is injected directly into the body politic. Nuclear death is only one of many gruesome ways to die, and torture has been refined to an art form by people who are *consciously* evil. When the anti-war protestors helped Vietnam fall nearly a decade ago, refugees in their tiny crafts managed to

flee to America; if the protestors are successful *this time, where* are *we* to go? The point is made in a somewhat different fashion by writer Walter Berns, in his "The New Pacifism and World Government," which appeared in the May 27th issue of *National Review*. His description of this "new world order" notes: "This universal and homogeneous state will differ from the Soviet Union in only one important respect: *there will be no escape from it*." (emphasis added.)

Where does this leave Pope John Paul II and the "new Rome"? Squarely in the middle, it seems. To begin with, John Paul II has gotten in the habit of honoring the Pax Christi-sponsored World Day of Peace each year with a special proclamation. On top of that, he has done nothing to make public his dissatisfaction - if indeed he *is* dissatisfied - over Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger's political remarks praising the U.S. bishops' letter for having "the *courage* to confront (government) policy squarely." Cardinal Ratzinger's statements would suggest that this is the position of the "new Vatican" on the subject since he, as prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, is one of its very highest officials.

In the final analysis, Pax Christi may, ironically, be indicted most severely by its own founder, Bishop Pierre M. Theas. It has consistently rubbed elbows with some of the worst mass murderers, and refused to speak out against them (indeed, it encourages us to be "receptive" to disarmament proposals made by "the socialist countries"). Bishop Theas knew firsthand what it was to suffer under the hands of totalitarians (he served time in a German concentration camp.) His criticism of his fellow bishops who failed to warn their flocks of the coming danger, and his own commitment to warn them, is not unlike the situation we have today, of those who speak out - or refuse to speak out - about the ever-growing menace of world Communism. "I do not wish," insisted Bishop Theas, "to be a dog that does not bark. When danger comes, I bark: that is my duty. Silence would be a betrayal."

The Scottish historian Thomas Carlyle once wrote: "We hope for a living peace, not a dead one!" How apropos to our situation today. We must choose between the living peace that is Jesus Christ or a bleak and lifeless one offered us by the world. However desirous individual members of Pax Christi *may* be for the former kind, it is, regrettably, the latter for which they are spending their efforts. "It is one thing," wrote the great Doctor of the Church, St. Augustine, "to see the land of peace from a wooded ridge...and another to tread the road that leads to it." In the case of Pax Christi, it is an inability to see the forest for the trees. Or is it?

The Church Before the Bible

Christ never commanded His Apostles and disciples to write anything. Yes, the Bible is the most precious book in the world and is one of the two sources of divine revelation, the other being tradition. But the Church antedates or predates the complete Bible by some 3½ centuries. It is the Church then - the Roman Catholic Church - which is the ultimate authority on divine revelation as contained in Sacred Scripture. The private interpretation of the Bible is just that: the personal opinion of the individual -hardly a sound basis for determining the eternal, unchangeable revealed truths of Almighty God. How very true indeed the words of one of the most eminent of 19th century converts to the Roman Catholic Church, John Henry Cardinal Newman: "To be deep in history is to cease to be a Protestant."

Pray the Rosary Daily

Joy Amidst Adversity

Any Catholic who has a real and strong faith and who firmly believes in the goodness and mercy of God will be joyful even under the most trying conditions, for such a person has perfect confidence that Almighty God will bring forth victory in His own good time. It is a contradiction that any genuine follower of Christ become discouraged and lose heart because of the sufferings which are his. The servant is not greater than the Master and the Master first suffered and died for us.

Ideally then, we Catholics should be joyful always, with a joy arising from the conviction that this short life is merely a period of probation and trial and that eternal happiness in God's glorious Kingdom of Heaven awaits those who remain faithful. We Catholics should cultivate an abiding spirit of joy as our Christian duty, a joy which is beyond the world and the hardness of circumstances as was that of our divine Model, He Who could say to His beloved followers on the eve of His crucifixion: "Be of good cheer! I have overcome the world!". And whenever we tend to become sad and depressed, Christ's words of encouragement to His Apostles at the Last Supper should renew in us a joyful spirit: "...you have sorrow now, but I will see you again and your heart shall rejoice; and your joy no one shall take from you."

TCA TRADITIONAL LATIN MASS SCHEDULE

COLORADO

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

COLORADO SPRINGS
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY
Mass at 10:00 a.m. July 17, August 28
(303) 636-1575
Mass at 10:00 a.m. Sept. 18, Oct. 30
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. Oct. 16

STRATTON
OUR LADY OF FATIMA CHAPEL
(303) 348-5454
Mass on Sept. 4

LOUISIANA

OPELOUSAS (Lafayette area)
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY CHAPEL
Route 1, Box 195
(318) 942-9053
Mass at 11:00 a.m.
Sept. 11, Oct. 9, Oct. 23

MINNESOTA

ROCHESTER
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY CHAPEL
5820 Viola Road, NE
(507) 282-5163 or 289-8522
Mass at 10:00 a.m.
Sept. 11, Oct. 9, Oct. 30

MONTANA

GREAT FALLS
IMMACULATE HEART OF MARY CHAPEL
2020 Second Avenue North
(406) 452-8826
Mass at 10:00 a.m.
Sept. 25, Oct. 2, Oct. 23

NEW YORK

BUFFALO
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY CHAPEL
231 McKinley Parkway
(716) 537-9533
Mass at 10:00 a.m. on first and third Sundays

PENNSYLVANIA

ESSINGTON (Philadelphia area)
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY
Ramada Inn
Airport South, Route 291
(215) 876-8737
Mass at 10:00 a.m. on fourth Sunday of each month

UTAH

SALT LAKE CITY
OUR LADY OF PERPETUAL HELP
Hilton Inn
154 West 600 South
(801) 278-7501
Mass at 11:00 a.m. Sept. 25

THE ATHANASIAN

Published by Traditional Catholics of America • Fr. Francis E. Fenton, Editor • Miss Marie Rust, 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 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.