THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America†Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL†Volume VIII, No. 6†September 1, 1987

A GREAT TRAGEDY

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

It was, I believe, Pope Pius XII who once said that a great tragedy of his day was that the world had lost its sense of venial sin. A far greater tragedy of our day here in America is that our nation has lost its sense of *all* sin, mortal as well as venial. Surely this is true of multitudes of Americans to whom, from all appearances, sin has no meaning at all. Although they may profess some kind of belief in God, the chances are that He is for them little more than an understanding friend who at least tolerates just about anything and who certainly will not one day hold them to any strict account for the manner in which they live. As long as we love everybody in a "meaningful" way, you know, God is pleased. Hell, of course, is out. Never mind how clearly the awful reality of hell and its eternal punishment are presented in the Bible and taught by the Roman Catholic Church. The Bible, you see, contains many myths—of which, no doubt, hell is one.

The absence of all sense of sin among untold numbers of the American people is manifest in the rampant spirit of moral permissiveness that currently pervades our nation and contaminates it like a deadly virus or satanic plague. God and His moral law have been abandoned and secular humanism, which is essentially a philosophy of atheism, has become the prevailing "religion" of our day. The Almighty has been dethroned and man has become a god unto himself, with situation ethics as the sole determining factor for him as to what is right or wrong. But situation ethics has as its norms those of expediency or feeling or pragmatism and is a total denial of the moral law of God. With the "new morality" anything goes, the sky's the limit and almost nothing is sacred. If an action, whatever it may be, is the practical thing to do or makes one feel good, then one should by all means do it and have no qualms of conscience about it. Never mind that old-fashioned, outdated moral law of God. Man has at last come of age and now makes his own rules.

And so it is that sin, be it of the gravest kind, is not even recognized or admitted to be such in this perverted and depraved age of ours. In other words, so widespread and commonplace an occurrence has the commission of sin become today that the very concept of sin as a violation of divine law has been blurred or lost. So prevalent, so rampant on the American scene is the commission of sin that it is not only a way of life for countless individuals but is even more or less taken for granted by many otherwise good people whose minds and consciences have been warped by their constant exposure to immorality of one kind or another. But human nature does not change. Nor does the moral law of God. Despite all attempts by the entrenched forces of evil in our midst to eliminate all trace of God and morality from the mind and conscience of man—and tremendous strides have been made in that direction—mortal sin remains mortal sin, as does the obligation to avoid it and its proximate occasions.

But has the materialism and the secularism and the spirit of moral permissiveness which is today so very prevalent on the American scene—has any of this rubbed off, say, on those who are honestly and persistently striving to live as good traditional Roman Catholics? Are all traditional Catholics as concerned today about the practice of virtue and the avoidance of sin as they formerly were, or have they been adversely affected and influenced in varying degrees by the satanic philosophy of secular humanism which so extensively permeates our nation in this our day? Do we have the courage to dare to be different when, in matters involving morality, it is our clear duty to be different?

Yes, one of the great tragedies of our present time is that multitudes of this nation's inhabitants have lost all sense of sin. Secular humanism, which, again, is essentially a philosophy of atheism, is the predominant "religion" of the day in which man reigns supreme and is the measure of all things. Nor is there any question but that this spirit of irreligion, this spirit of indifference to, or even utter disdain for, morality and the things pertaining to God, has had its effect on many of us—to some extent at least—with the result that our sense of sin, both mortal and venial, has been dulled by it. To live in an age so engulfed in immorality as is this nation of ours and to remain entirely uncontaminated by it may well indeed call for exceptional virtue, that degree of virtue of which saints are made—but, with the grace of God, we all have that potential, do we not? And if this nation is to be rescued from the depths of immorality in which it is presently wallowing, upon whom, pray tell, is the responsibility for this more incumbent than upon traditional Roman Catholics? "Be not overcome by evil, but overcome evil by good." (Romans 12, 21)†

WORLD COMMUNISM: MADE IN THE U.S.A

John Kenneth Weiskittel

"The single greatest force on earth in support of the Communist advance has been the government of the United States." Robert Welch, the late patriot who made this assertion, did so after a lifetime of sober, tireless, probing scholarship.

Mr. Welch was no stranger to controversy. By writing *The Politician,* a scathingly critical but meticulously researched study of the public career of Dwight David Eisenhower, and by founding the anti-Communist John Birch Society, he became the target of one of the most vicious smear campaigns in history. When it was seen that the compelling evidence he had marshaled could not be refuted, it was ignored—and the Establishment rolled out its big guns for character assassination.

It is easy to see why many Americans were ready to accept the media's disinformation since the charges Mr. Welch made were unpleasant to contemplate. The steady socialization of the U.S. economy and the long series of Communist successes worldwide were, he concluded, due primarily to a calculated course of action taken by people in the highest echelons of the American government. Decent Americans were—and still are—horrified at the thought of so colossal an evil. Denial, for some, is the comfortable (and easy) way out of the dilemma.

But no problem was ever solved by pretending it didn't exist. The destructive forces in the Eisenhower Administration, exposed by Mr. Welch over thirty years ago, have continued the same essential policies in the succeeding years. If the programs implemented by Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter and, yes, even Reagan are reflected upon objectively, the similarities are seen to be striking. Although the rhetoric often differs from one administration to the next, an overriding *pattern* of action—carried from one to the next without interruption—indicates that, behind the distinctive programs of each, there is an underlying *unspoken agenda* agreed upon by all. Whether the name given to a domestic policy is the New Deal or Fair Deal, the New Frontier or the New Federalism, the Great Society or whatever, the results are largely the same: an ever-increasing expansion of the power of the Federal Government and a diminishing of individual rights because of this encroachment. And whether "detente," "glasnost" or "peaceful coexistence" is the label applied to U.S. relations with the Soviet Union, the same ends are pursued: helping the U.S.S.R. and its client states through trade, cultural exchange, diplomatic recognition and giveaways (euphemistically called "sales" and "loans")—and one pro-Western, anti-Communist nation after another is betrayed to Communism along the way.

Many Americans have some idea of the situation but a vast majority of them are willing to take the government's word at face value that its size is an inevitable product of the times and can never be reduced in any significant way; and that the Communists ruling in Moscow are to be appeased (since they are "mellowing"); and that allies really haven't been betrayed but were—or are—either: (a) the victims of bungled policies from Washington, or (b) repressive regimes that deserved or deserve to be toppled because of their flagrant disregard for human rights. Unfortunately, the real record has been covered up and sanitized to the point that little can be known of it without digging through decades of documents and then putting together the pieces.

This study will review that record in an effort to show that a conspiracy does, in fact, exist and remains entrenched in the U.S. government. (It must be noted that there are decent people in public service as well as many opportunists. But, while exceptions are granted, a core of subversives remains that wields immense power.) Space permits only a summary and, no doubt, readers will think of other examples that could have been included. Indeed, if—and, God willing, when—the conspiracy is fully exposed, it will take thousands of pages to cover its scope.

Seven Decades of Subversion

A number of years ago the *Miami Herald* carried a work by its editorial cartoonist, Jim Morin, that could have been titled "Presidential Bloopers." In the cartoon's first panel, Gerald Ford declares: "Poland is free." Jimmy Carter, peering out of the center panel, solemnly states: "There is no Soviet threat in the Caribbean." And from the third panel, an obviously pleased Leonid Brezhnev delivers the punch line: "With enemies like this, who needs friends?"

Morin's point, obviously, was that the Communists benefit when American foreign policy is based on a nonsensical view of world geopolitical realities. Also, he seemed to be asking: "What are men like this doing in the White House?" The notion that our dealings with the Reds are being formulated and implemented by the Keystone Cops is the conclusion that many, like Morin, seem to reach. Yet in order to adopt such a position it becomes necessary to close one's eyes to the fact that the government of the United States has—or, to be more precise, certain high-ranking members of the government have—been aiding and abetting the International Communist Conspiracy since Lenin imposed totalitarianism on the Russian people in November, 1917.

Actually, U.S. aid to Communism *predates* the Bolshevik takeover of Russia by a few months. Lenin, as is common knowledge, returned from Switzerland to Russia across a war-torn Europe in the spring of 1917, carrying millions of dollars in gold with him aboard a "sealed train." The German high command provided the funding in hopes that the ensuing revolution would partially divert Russia's attention from its war against Germany—but the Kaiser was not informed that the money was for Communists. Less known is the fact that, after Lenin's coconspirator Leon Trotsky

was stopped in March, 1917, by Canadian authorities when he was enroute to join the revolution, they were instructed to release him by Britain's Sir William Wiseman and by the advisor to President Woodrow Wilson, "Colonel" Edward Mandel House. Trotsky, along with his money and an entourage of 275 revolutionaries, was freed and continued his journey. What made the Anglo-American action odd (aside from the illogic involved in supporting a Red) was Trotsky's repeated statement, while a reporter for a New York City Communist newspaper, that, once the Czar was overthrown, the new Russian government would seek a peace with Germany. From a strategic perspective this made no sense at all since it would bring more German soldiers into the Western front to fight against British and American troops. (See Gary Allen, *None Dare Call It Conspiracy,* Concord Press, 1972, p. 68) Research shows that the German and Anglo-American efforts, though seemingly unrelated, had a connecting thread.

The Federal Reserve Act, passed in 1913, started the gradual move from a free market economy to one in which layer upon layer of bureaucracy has taken government into the marketplace as a competitor of private enterprise and strangled small businesses. This returns us to "Colonel" House. Described by the editor of his personal papers as the "unseen guardian angel" of the Act, House's influence with Wilson was so great that the president called him "my alter ego." Some historians have suggested that he was the virtual president. "House had set down his own political ideas in 1912 in his book called *Philip Dru: Administrator,"* writes Allen:

> In this book House laid out a thinly fictionalized plan for the conquest of America by establishing "Socialism as dreamed of by Karl Marx." He described a "conspiracy"—the word is his—which succeeds in electing a U.S. President by means of "deception regarding his real opinions and intentions." Among other things, House wrote that the conspiracy was to insinuate "itself into the primaries, in order that no candidate might be nominated whose views were not in accord with theirs." ...The idea was to use both the Democratic and Republican parties as instruments to promote world government. (op cit, pp. 78-79)

To advance this goal, "House, both in his book and in real life, called for the passage of a graduated income tax and a central bank providing 'a flexible (inflatable paper) currency.' The graduated income tax and a central bank are two of the ten planks of *The Communist Manifesto.*" (ibid, p. 49)

Weeks after the Bolsheviks overthrew the socialist government of Kerensky, Wilson received a cable from House, then in Paris, that alluded to "statements made by American papers to the effect that Russia should be treated as an enemy. It is exceedingly important that such criticisms should be suppressed..." (quoted, Antony Sutton, *National Suicide: Military Aid to the Soviet Union,* Arlington House, 1973, p. 50) In his book, *The Red Web,* a review of events in the early 1920's that demonstrated a very real threat to the American way of life, author Blair Coan, writing in 1925, expressed the belief that Wilson was a dupe to forces that played on his fondness for "progressive" causes. This is quite possible for he allowed House considerable leeway in the selection of appointees. Whatever the case, however, President Wilson complied with House's cabled advice and hailed the Russian Revolution as the dawning of a "new day" in which the Communists represented the "voice of the Russian people" and were working "in the true spirit of Western democracy...with a largeness of view, a generosity of spirit, and a universal human sympathy which must challenge the admiration of every friend of mankind."

Although Wilson would, in September, 1918, condemn the Red's "campaign of mass terrorism," the damage had already been done. True, the Kremlin's tyrants would have to wait until 1933 for official recognition but Wilson's praise, then criticism (but neutrality), set the course America has followed for the past 70 years. From the beginning there has been what amounts to censorship of certain aspects of U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations. Antony Sutton notes that House's Paris message "was placed on the 'confidential file' and was not declassified until the 1960's. Open public discussion in 1917 of Colonel House's instructions and intentions might well have changed the history of the world." (*National Suicide,* p. 52)

Tightening The Noose

Lenin once predicted that Western capitalists would supply the rope with which to hang themselves. The fifteen years following the Red takeover of Russia included a planned famine, liquidation of farmers, purge trials and a system that, frankly, didn't work. The U.S. government didn't give the Soviets direct support at that time (unless there are still classified papers to that effect) but did give American firms free reign to "wheel and deal" with their sworn enemies.

Opening the doors of U.S. capital *saved* Russian Communists from an uprising of their slaves. John Stormer writes in his book, *None Dare Call It Treason:*

> Immediately following World War I, economic chaos developed in Russia. Lenin's attempt to make the big leap into communism had failed. The toppling of the socialist experiment was imminent.
>
> Millions were starving when American relief, food, medicine and other supplies eased the pressure. Lenin had time to consolidate his strength...(Liberty Bell Press, 1964, p. 28)

While Stormer calls this a "humanitarian gesture...(that) solidified the power of tyrants," it is also true that other aid at the time had more sinister applications. A recently declassified document shows that the State Department made no attempt to halt a U.S. firm from erecting a plant in the Soviet Union for the production of aluminum powder, which can be used to raise the explosive force of ammunition. (*National Suicide,* p. 52)

The election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt as president in 1932 gave the conspiracy its biggest boost up to that time. In the 12 years he occupied the Oval Office the nation underwent some of the most radical changes in its history. "I do not believe in communism any more than you do," Roosevelt once said, "but there is nothing wrong with the communists in this country; several of the best friends I have got are communists." (cited, Stormer, p. 27) If appointments are any indication, he certainly believed in taking good care of his friends. There were, without exaggeration, *scores* of Red agents in New Deal posts, including Harry Dexter White (Treasury assistant secretary), Nathan Witt (National Labor Relations Board secretary), John J. Abt (special assistant to the Attorney General), Lee Pressman (General Counsel of the Works Progess Administration, an agency heavily riddled with Communists) and Laughlin Currie (executive assistant to FDR). And at Yalta's sellout of Eastern Europe in February, 1945, and at the United Nation's founding five months later was Alger Hiss, a man Roosevelt knew to be a Soviet spy.

Under Harry S. Truman in 1949 China was handed to Mao Tse-Tung, the "agrarian reformer" (so named by his allies in the U.S. government). When troops led by General Douglas MacArthur were prevented from liberating North Korea from the Reds and Truman fired MacArthur, the general would later complain that he believed he was removed because of his recommendation that "a treason trial be initiated to break up a spy ring responsible for the purloining of my top-secret reports to Washington." (cited, Curtis L. Dall, *F.D.R.: My Exploited Father-in-Law*, Action Associates, 1970, p. 175) General James Van Fleet also gave similar testimony to Congress of subversion in Korea. (Stormer, p. 32)

So concerned were Americans that they elected Eisenhower, largely on his campaign pledge to "clean up the mess in Washington." He did nothing of the kind. Instead, he reinstated rules placing all security files of executive branch employees "off limits" to congressional investigating committees, participated in the smear of Senator Joseph McCarthy and installed such leftists in the Supreme Court as Earl Warren who, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover told Congress in 1958, was responsible for the freeing of 49 top Communists and who presided over a case that a Red leader hailed as the Party's single greatest victory. (ibid, pp. 39, 44) Eisenhower betrayed the Hungarians' fight against their Bolshevik rulers in 1956, helped Castro seize Cuba, continued aid to Communist nations and invited Soviet butcher Nikita Krushchev to America. (ibid, pp. 11, 36, 49) While FDR had affectionately called Stalin "Uncle Joe," Ike said that his grandchildren being photographed on Krushchev's lap was "heartwarming." This was after the House Un-American Activities Committee took *seven volumes* to document Krushchev's crimes against humanity. Eisenhower was called a "Modern Republican" and posed as a fiscal conservative, but he had had the support of the ultra-left Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) for the *Democratic* presidential nomination in 1948, pushed through the Truman-sponsored Department of Health, Education and Welfare, increased the National Debt by 25 billion dollars and raised domestic spending by 89 percent during his last five years in office. (ibid, pp. 196-197) So impressed was veteran Socialist Norman Thomas that he said: "The United States is making greater strides towards Socialism under Eisenhower than even under Roosevelt, particularly in the fields of Federal spending and welfare legislation." (W. Cleon Skousen, *The Naked Capitalist*, privately published, 1971, p. 130)

The John F. Kennedy-Lyndon Johnson years produced even bigger social budgets, national debts and entrance into a war in Vietnam that they would not win (the alleged goal was to "contain" Communism). These administrations were top-heavy with members of the ADA (a group Kennedy had condemned as a senator in 1953) and the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), a group that "Colonel" House helped found. (ibid, p. 52, and Stormer, p. 199) After eight years of these Democrats, Republican Richard Nixon was elected but, the more things changed, the more they stayed the same. The Nixon anti-Communist, anti-big government image was not matched by a corresponding record. LBJ was quoted in 1971 about Nixon:

> "Can't you just see the uproar," he asked during a recent interview, "if I had been responsible for Taiwan getting kicked out of the United Nations? Or if I had imposed sweeping national controls on prices and wages?
>
> "Nixon had gotten by with it," he observed, an appreciative tone in his voice. "If I had tried to do it, or Truman, or Humphrey, or any Democrat, we would have been clobbered." (cited, *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, p. 111)

At Nixon's right hand was Henry Kissinger as National Security Adviser and Secretary of State. Kissinger was at that time an official in the CFR and, according to very creditable evidence, a member of the Soviet KGB. (See Frank Capell, *Henry Kissinger: Soviet Agent*, 1974, pp. 74-90) During the Ford tenure Kissinger negotiated with the North Vietnamese the "peace with honor" (a term also used for the 1953 pullout in Korea) that led to Communist victory over American allies in the South. During Jimmy Carter's White House stint, Nicaragua and Rhodesia fell (with U.S. backing) to Communism—and the Federal Government grew still larger.

The Reagan Record: Rhetoric vs. Results

When Ronald Reagan handily defeated Carter in 1980, many Americans believed that *finally* there would be a change for the better in the White House. Now, with just 16 months to go in his presidency, the informed opinion is that the same policies have been continued under Mr. Reagan that have plagued our country for most of this century.

Reagan sailed to victory aboard a fairly conservative platform, buoyed up with the kind of "get-tough," no-nonsense rhetoric that appealed to many voters. He said the right things: no, he would not sell out Taiwan to Red China; yes,

he wanted to get government off the people's back; no, he did not think we need Energy and Education Departments (Carter creations); yes, he believed the U.S.S.R. to be an *evil empire* and not to be trusted. He said he wanted to keep Federal spending down and to balance the budget. For conservatives, it all sounded *too good* to be true—and, as the record shows, it *was* too good to be true.

When Reagan was running back in 1980 he expressed his concern over the influence of the one-world lobby—the CFR and its sister group, the Trilateral Commission (TC)—on U.S. foreign policy. When asked in Florida about the fact that Carter had made many TC members in his administration, Reagan responded that he did not believe that "the Trilateral Commission is a conspiratorial group, but I do think its interests are devoted to international banking, multinational corporations...I don't think that any administration should have 19 of its top positions filled by people from any one group or organization representing one viewpoint. No, I would go in another direction." Reagan's idea of "another direction" must mean doubling back around, because no fewer than 80 members of his administration are or have been members of these two groups, including such major figures as Vice President George Bush, Secretaries of State Alexander Haig and George Shultz, Treasury Secretary Donald T. Regan, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige (recently deceased) and CIA Director William J. Casey (recently deceased). *Candidate* Reagan condemned the failed policies of detente promoted by Henry Kissinger, and conservatives urged him not to include Kissinger in his administration. *President* Reagan selected the sinister Mr. Kissinger to chair a policy commission on Latin America that eventually helped install socialist Napoleon Duarte as the head of El Salvador.

One of the most telling signs of the *reality gap* between words and deeds came with the destruction of a Korean airliner by the Soviets in which 269 innocent people were killed, including anti-Communist U.S. Congressman Lawrence P. McDonald (D-GA). Shortly after the shootdown the president remarked that it should "dispel any lingering doubt about what kind of regime we're dealing with and what our responsibilities are as trustees of freedom and peace." But what was an opportunity to close down the Soviet Embassy, expel their personnel (read *spies)* and sever diplomatic relations was rejected by Reagan in favor of a temporary suspension of Russian flights into this country and other wrist-slapping. Since that time he has offered to share "Star Wars" anti-missile technology with what he rightly termed an evil empire; has had summits with his Red counterpart, Mikhail Gorbachev, which, if past summits are an indication, will benefit only the enemy; has supported "the development of non-strategic trade with the Soviet Union" (much of which has military application); and has worked for the goal of destabilizing South Africa (Reagan signed into law sanctions against anti-Communist South Africa that have far exceeded any placed on the U.S.S.R.)

Treatment is even better for our "ally," Communist China. At a press conference in Alaska in 1984 Reagan described Red China as "so-called Communist." Since, in the president's view, Red China is a "friendly, nonaligned country," it has received *strategic* aid, including an agreement to "buy" 550 million dollars worth of F-8 fighter planes from the U.S., training of its military leaders on American bases and numerous other deals to modernize China's fighting capabilities. As late as September, 1986, China granted Communist Nicaragua a 20 million dollar interest-free loan, money it could never have given without itself first receiving U.S. funding. Had *President* Reagan kept in touch with *Candidate* Reagan, he might have recalled rejecting the idea of sending arms to the Chinese Communists "because...they could turn right around and the day after tomorrow discover that they and the Soviets had more in common than they have with us."

It was at the Alaska press conference mentioned above that Reagan made what may well be the most revealing statement during his term in office. On May 1st (the Communist holiday, May Day) in Fairbanks, the president indicated that his image as an anti-Communist was overblown, saying:

> Now I know there's been much said about my anti-Communism. Well, I'm anti-Communist if you talk about Communism for the United States. And in some Communist regimes, I'm very critical of their violation of human rights and so forth. But I have never thought it was necessary for us to impose our form of government on some other country...
>
> So, as far as I'm concerned we can live at peace with one another. If they prefer Socialism or Communism and we prefer the democracy that we have—we may know that ours is best but (laughter)—we won't say that to them.

Translated, this is just more confirmation of the difference between perception and reality when considering Reagan: he may be "very critical" of Communists in his speeches but he will not "impose" on them. (Imposing on pro-American, nontotalitarian nations such as South Africa is another matter.) But belligerent words will never defeat an entrenched tyranny of organized atheism bent on spreading its darkness over the face of the earth. Stripped to their essence, Mr. Reagan's remarks make it clear that he will not lift a finger to help free the enslaved peoples. Equally chilling is Reagan's presumed ignorance of the satanic nature of Communism, of its intrinsic vileness. (Is this the same man who spoke of the U.S.S.R. as an *evil empire*?) Aside from human rights violations, Reagan's opinion suggests that he regards the differences between our Constitutional Republic and their bloody dictatorship to be as inconsequential as whether one takes his coffee black or with cream and sugar.

Last year syndicated columnist John F. McManus wrote an article entitled "Is There a Communist Conspiracy?" that appeared in *The New American* (March 24, 1984). Mr. McManus was prompted to write it in response to an ex-

change between the Reagan Administration and a Colorado state legislator. On January 18, 1984, President Reagan signed into law Presidential Determination 84-4, which authorized financial aid to Yugoslavia for "International Military Education and Training." The act was defended in the text by Reagan on the grounds that "Yugoslavia is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy." In an effort to determine just what countries *are* part of the conspiracy, State Representative Dale Erickson of Colorado queried the president in a letter. A State Department official wrote back that "a list of those countries officially controlled by the international Communist conspiracy does not exist." A private citizen in Washington State put the question succinctly to his senator (and received an evasive answer): "The United States is spending 350-400 billion dollars per year on defense. In your estimation, who is the enemy of the United States?" The unpleasant but logical conclusion Mr. McManus makes is that the arrogant attitude exhibited by the Reagan Administration and the senator can be summed up as: *"Yes, there is an 'international Communist conspiracy' but as long as we keep Americans in the dark about where it is, who is controlled by it, and whether it is even an enemy, we can continue to feed it.* It would seem, therefore, that the conspiracy conceivably reaches even into the U.S. government." This gives new meaning to the terms "covert activities" and "plausible deniability."

Domestically, *Candidate* Reagan promised Americans relief from the oppressive effects of runaway big government. A large part of his appeal was based on his ability to tug on people's emotions by way of their purse strings. The question he asked in 1980 that struck a responsive chord was: "Are you better off than you were four years ago?" Reagan's landslide reelection in 1984 indicated that personal income may have improved for many but lost in the fervor was sight of the larger picture. If Jimmy Carter was a big spender, as Reagan properly cast him, then what is Ronald Reagan? *Candidate* Reagan was little short of a Saint George against the congressional dragon, but *President* Reagan has given the dragon *carte blanche* for whatever suits its taste. Unfair criticism? The first budget under Carter in 1978 was 440 billion dollars; next year's proposed budget is 1,024.3 *trillion* dollars—the first *ten-figure* budget in history. Forty-two percent of this goes to direct payment programs for individuals, 29 percent for defense, 14 percent for debt interest, 10 percent for state and local grants and only 5 percent for operating funds. The national debt ceiling has ballooned to 2.3 trillion dollars. Mr. Reagan says he doesn't want Communism for America but he has been a partner in the expansion of welfare state *socialism.*

But didn't Reagan stop the Soviets from establishing a base in Grenada? Hasn't he appointed conservatives to the Supreme Court? And hasn't he given aid to Nicaraguan freedom fighters? A careful look at these activities shows them to be subject to further scrutiny. The Grenada victory is tempered with the fact that there are far bigger threats in Cuba and Nicaragua. The jury must remain out concerning the Reagan appointments to the Supreme Court until determination of their faithfulness to conservative principles can be made. And Reagan's "Contra" support is tainted on various counts: (1) he expounds the false version of the Nicaraguan revolution in which the Sandinistas allegedly betrayed a wide-based freedom movement—but in fact it was always a Communist-inspired and Communist-directed insurgency that *used* non-Communists; (2) he promoted a "democratic solution" to the problem—that is, a coalition government—and not genuine liberation; and (3) he defends "Contra" leadership that includes several Sandanista "defectors," raising doubts about what kind of "resistance" they are providing. (See Warren L. McFerran, "It's Now or Never," *The New American,* July 20, 1987) Even if these and other of his stands (such as his stated opposition to abortion) are taken in the best possible light, it remains clear that President Reagan has done little to stem the conspiratorial tide. To believe otherwise is to allow the heart to take control of the brain.

Moving Closer Together

In the course of the Iran-Contra hearings, Marine Lt. Col. Oliver North implicitly told the Congress that it would do well to *investigate itself.* Col. North may have hit upon something more significant than was his intent. Although the conspiracy first penetrated and significantly controlled the executive branch and later subverted the judiciary, for years Congress often opposed their positions—albeit ineffectually at times. Over the past few decades, however, Congress, too, has fallen prey to the same forces.

Recently, House Speaker Jim Wright (D-TX) visited the Soviet Union where he appeared on state-controlled television to offer viewers a lapel pin displaying crossed U.S. and U.S.S.R. flags. The offer has been relayed to Americans, and Wright (who stands behind only the Vice President in line of presidential succession) is sending this "symbol of peace and friendship" to those requesting it.

Only those ignorant of the schemes of the conspirators would be shocked at Wright's propagandizing. The notion of merging U.S. and Soviet systems is a crucial part of the goal of world domination. More than 30 years ago Ford Foundation President Rowan Gaither revealed that the State Department advised him that, to conform to U.S. Government policy, he should work "so to alter our life in the United States that we can be comfortably merged with the Soviet Union." In his book, *Toward Economic Reconstruction,* former State Department official Miklos Szabo-Pelsoczi, a Hungarian native, writes, in a chapter entitled "Beyond Capitalism and Beyond Communism," that "(b)oth superpowers gradually losing their ideological and political differences can reduce military expenditures." (Exposition Press, 1976, p. 226) This view of the future is so widely accepted that Campbell R. McConnell has included, in a chapter on the Soviet economy in his college textbook, *Economics,* a section entitled "The Convergence Hypothesis" wherein he notes that some economists have argued that, "as capitalistic and communistic systems evolve, they encounter experiences and problems which induce adoption of similar institutions and policies" that will bring them to the same place. (McGraw-Hill, 1978, 7th ed., p. 939)

The Hour Is Late

Again recalling the Iran-Contra hearings, a remark by Senate Chairman Daniel Inouye (D-HI) about a "secret government" within the government stands out. He was referring to the attempt to divert funds to the Nicaraguan resistance, but a more powerful secret government is not being investigated and desperately *needs* to be. The fact that it *isn't* ought to be reason enough in itself for Americans to be gravely concerned, for every day that it is allowed to continue solidifying its stranglehold on our freedoms means the closer we are to slavery. We must become thoroughly informed of this sordid history and alert others.

As you read this, 49 nations and over 1.7 billion souls (one of every three persons in the world) are enslaved by Communism. There is not a single instance where this slavery would exist had it not received support from highly placed individuals in the U.S. government. And yet America is the only free country left that still remains strong enough to reverse the process.

Make no mistake, *this is a war* that confronts us and it is a war that *we are undeniably losing!* Like it or not, we are all combatants and have an obligation before God to oppose this monstrous evil with every morally lawful means at our disposal—before it is too late.

("Every Communist country in the world literally has a 'Made in USA' stamp on it."—John Stormer)

Pray the Rosary Daily

A CORRECTION

In the June 1, 1987 issue of this newsletter it was stated that 870 copies of that issue were mailed, 830 of them to paid subscribers. In determining those figures, however, we neglected to include the bulk orders. So, including those, some 980 copies of that June issue were mailed, of which 940 were paid subscribers. Since this makes for a somewhat brighter picture in the number of newsletter subscribers, it was thought worthwhile to mention it. The total number of paid subscribers for this September 1, 1987 issue is approximately the same: 940. †

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. No articles from this newsletter may be reproduced either in whole or in part without the written permission of the TCA.

LET THE BUYER BEWARE!

It is safe to assume that all of the subscribers to this newsletter are against Communism and I know that a substantial number of them are actively so in varying degrees. (A pro-Communist Roman Catholic is a contradiction in terms.) Merely being against Communism, however, means little unless one's anti-Communism manifests itself in action one way or another. Assuredly, the powers that be in that satanic conspiracy have nothing to fear from the passive anti-Communism still characteristic of multitudes of Americans even at this late date.

While genuine anti-Communist activity may take many forms, it is the purpose of these few paragraphs to focus briefly on but one of those activities. Although, in comparison to the many kinds of anti-Communist action in which an individual may involve himself, this particular one may *appear* to be rather insignificant, yet it is singled out for attention here for two reasons: (1) it is an activity in which most people can easily participate; and (2) if enough tens of thousands were to commit themselves to it, it could be a very effective weapon in the fight against Communism.

The American retail market is currently flooded with merchandise produced by slave labor in Communist countries. There are innumerable such items on sale in stores across this country and they *are* being purchased by the American people. While it is likely that such items are found among a large variety of products, they would seem to be most common in wearing apparel and household goods. (Perhaps the best known single Communist slave-labor product presently being sold in the USA is the junk machine, the Yugo automobile from Yugoslavia.) From my observation, the greatest quantity of slave-labor merchandise being sold in this country comes from Red China, the primary reason for this undoubtedly being that, according to the current un-American administration in Washington, the inhuman Red Chinese rulers are really our friends! Never mind that those godless tyrants run the largest concentration camp in the world. (If, incidentally, an item is from Communist China, it will be labeled: "Made in China"; if from Free China, it will bear the label: "Made in Taiwan.")

So, while it is ardently to be hoped that every American would do far more to save his country from Communist domination, at the very minimum he should buy no product whatsoever which has been made in a Communist country because that item is the product of slave labor and, by purchasing it, he is helping to support the economy of a conspiracy whose leaders have vowed to bury the USA. Not only should we refrain from buying such a product but we should inform the store clerk why we are doing so. Beyond that, we should ask to speak to the manager—or, better, the owner—of the store and voice our protest to that individual, informing him that, if he continues to offer Communist merchandise for sale, we will not only cease trading in that store but will request our friends and acquaintances to do likewise. If the store in question happens to be one of a chain, then a letter of protest should be written to the appropriate person at the national headquarters of that particular chain of stores.

It also should be noted that a number of items that are made by slave labor in Communist countries bear American brand names on them. That being the case, one should not purchase a product merely because he sees the name of this or that American corporation on it. It is necessary to check as well the label which states in what country the item was made. If it is a Communist country, then that item should not be purchased regardless of the brand name it bears. The heads of many American business organizations have no qualms of conscience about supporting Communism in this way as long as they make money in the process—and slave labor comes cheap, you know.

Countless Americans who consider themselves anti-Communist are actually, though innocently, supporting Communism in various ways because they are uninformed. The subject treated in this article provides one such example. Surely just about every subscriber to this newsletter can do at least this small bit. It seems so little in itself but, again, if multitudes of Americans will do likewise, the combined effect of such action on a national scale could inflict incalculable damage upon the Communist economy. If we, through our silence or inaction, do not oppose evil, are we not, in effect, to some degree cooperating with it? †

Fr. F. Fenton