THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume XII, No. 5 † July 15, 1991

The War Against The Family

John Kenneth Weiskittel

Almighty God has given a great dignity to the family by making it the cornerstone of society. Even more glorious is the stature He has bestowed upon the Christian family. The love of the husband and wife is to be a mirror of the love of Christ and His Church (Ephesians 5:22-23), while God commends children to honor their parents and promises a long, fruitful life if they do so. (Ephesians 6:1-3) Although God allows all couples to participate in the miracle of life, He adds to this in Catholic homes by permitting parents to be the first to teach their children the rudiments of the Faith. So dear to His Sacred Heart is the family that it pleased Our Savior to be born into one and to be subject to Mary and Joseph.

Since the family is the object of particular affection by God, it comes as no surprise that Satan has always hated it and does all that he can to sow discord in individual families and to discredit and dishonor the very concept of the family. After the attack on the proper worship of God which the devil provoked in the Garden of Eden, he instigated Cain's murder of Abel, which is doubly significant as an assault on the family unit. The same pattern has been followed down through the ages: wherever a wave of rage has beset the Church, a siege against the family has been attendant.

More than four centuries ago, when the hell-spawned revolt against the Church reached epidemic proportions, the family was the indirect target of the barbs hurled at the Sacrament of Matrimony. The schism of King Henry VIII occurred because of his refusal to accept Rome's ruling that he was validly married and could not lawfully put away his wife to remarry, while Martin Luther and other heretics rejected the Catholic teaching on the sanctity of marriage and made divorce an option for their followers. The next salvo came from Voltaire and other Enlightenment writers two centuries later and intensified in the 1800's with the machinations of the secret societies, including the Communists, whose theorists Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels went far beyond other revolutionaries. In *The Communist Manifesto* of 1848 they advocated the "abolition of the family."

For the past thirty years in the United States and in other Free World countries the family has found itself under constant attack from all sides and is now at a stage where it may truly be called an endangered species. The open hostility shown to the family unit in Communist nations gives way to a subtler form of oppression in the West, but a form that is moving closer to the Marxist model. A healthy Roman Catholic Church would have led the resistance to such impositions (as it had in the past), but the confusion resulting from Vatican II — out of which the true Church became a remnant of believers — rendered such an effort impossible. The traditional family is rapidly becoming a thing of the past.

Troubles In The Neighborhood

Nostalgic Americans may end up searching in vain for the neighborhoods in which they grew up a generation ago. Oh, they can find them, but the transformations are often so drastic as to render them all but unrecognizable. There are changes that will be obvious, such as the price scanners at the supermarkets' checkout lines or the shopping mall built on the lot where kids once played ball, but the deeper ones are hidden away in the homes, apartments and housing projects. And these latter changes are quietly tearing away at the very fabric of society.

What kinds of changes? Well, consider the following items:

* Stable marriages are essential for healthy families, yet U.S. couples are yielding to the temptation of divorce with disturbing frequency. The 1991 *World Almanac* reports that in the twelve-month period ending with March, 1990, 2,423,000 couples married and 1,177,000 divorced. (p. 834) When the children are included in the divorce figure, more than three million people's lives are adversely affected. Commenting

in 1985 on the remarkable statistic that about half of current American marriages will end in divorce court, one researcher states that, "for the first time in our history, two people entering marriage are just as likely to be parted by divorce as by death." Equally startling is the projection that by 1990 only 40 percent of the children born in the United States will spend their entire childhood living with both natural parents. (Dr. Lenore J. Weitzman, *The Divorce Revolution*, Free Press, 1985, p. xvii)

* A *World Almanac* graph, labeled "Household Composition — 1960 to 1988," shows the findings of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. In 1960, homes identified as "Married couples with children" accounted for 44.2 percent of all households but by 1988 the figure had fallen to 27 percent. Conversely, over the same time frame, the total for "Other families with children" has risen from 4.4 percent to 8.0 percent. (p. 841)

* The immorality of premarital sex has become so acceptable that "(b)y 1988, more than one-quarter of all American births — more than one million babies — were out of wedlock, up four-and-a-half times since 1960." (Carolyn Lochhead, "Cradle to Grave," *Insight*, May 6, 1991, p. 15) Such births represent 18 percent of total births for whites and a staggering 63 percent for blacks. (p. 14) The likelihood of neglect, malnutrition, child abuse and other dangers are far greater for such babies.

* Also important in any consideration of the plight of the family is the increasing number of women who work outside the home, necessitating in many instances the placement of their children in day-care centers and the change of their older ones into "latchkey children." In *Domestic Revolutions: A Social History of American Family Life* (Free Press, 1988), Doctors Steven Mintz and Susan Kellogg write: "The proportion of married women with preschoolers who were in the labor force jumped from 12 percent in 1950 to 45 percent in 1980." (p. 218) As for preschoolers' care, they observe: "...Back in 1970 just 21 percent of all three- and four-year-olds were cared for in day-care centers or nursery schools. But between 1970 and 1983 the proportion virtually doubled, climbing to 38 percent. Today over two-thirds of all three- and four-year-olds are in a day-care, nursery school or prekindergarten program." (p. 223) Although the overall majority of such arrangements are handled privately, the authors state that "(t)he single largest provider of day care now is the federal government, which offers child care, health and educational services to some 400,000 low-income children through the Head Start program and which subsidizes private day-care facilities through child care tax credits, state block grants, and tax breaks for employers who subsidize day-care services."

These are a few of the symptoms that point to a cancer eating away at the American family. In addition, the following can be cited: adultery, birth control, abortion, spouse abuse, child abuse, runaways, an estranged spouse "kidnapping" offspring from his (or her) mate and a plethora of teen woes, including the alarming rise in suicides. Repairing the damage done to the family unit from the neo-pagan onslaught would be formidable enough if the above problems were the only ones, but now the friends of the family must also combat efforts to blur even the very definition of the word *family*.

What Is A Family?

The question contained in the section heading is ridiculously obvious. Or so it would seem. The traditional sense of the term is well expressed in the fourth definition under the heading in *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*: "A group comprising immediate kindred; especially, the group formed by parents and children." In generations past this unit would also include any grandparents for whom care was required (observance of the fourth commandment was taken more seriously than it is by today's adult children who, if they do *anything*, are apt to send their aged parents to nursing homes rather than open their doors to them).

And yet this clear understanding of the term has become greatly obscured in only a few decades. The following excerpt from *Domestic Revolutions* brings the perceptual changes into focus:

> A generation ago Ozzie, Harriet, David and Ricky Nelson epitomized the American family. Over 70

percent of all American households in 1960 were like the Nelsons: made up of dad the breadwinner, mom the homemaker and their children. Today, less than three decades later, "traditional" families consisting of a breadwinner father, a housewife mother and one or more dependent children account for less than 15 percent of the nation's households. As American families have changed, the image of the family portrayed on television has changed accordingly. Today's television families vary enormously, running the gamut from traditional families like "The Waltons" to two-career families like the Huxtables on "The Cosby Show" or the Keatons on "Family Ties"; "blended" families like the Bradys on "The Brady Bunch," with children from previous marriages; two single mothers and their children on "Kate and Allie"; a homosexual who serves as a surrogate father on "Love, Sidney"; an unmarried couple who cohabit in the same house [sic] on "Who's The Boss?"; and a circle of friends, who think of themselves as a family, congregating at a Boston bar on "Cheers." (p. 203)

A common denominator of most of these programs (all situation comedies except for "The Waltons"), and a good example of the reason that television is such a mine field for those trying to lead a life based on Christian morality, is their nonchalant depiction of sinful — even in some cases *mortally* sinful — behavior as acceptable or at least *funny*.

Households that have *grown* in recent years include single-parent families and DINKs (double income/no kids). In *Changing Families: Meeting Today's Challenges* (Enslow, 1988), Kathlyn Gay writes that "a single parent heads one out of every four U.S. households with children and that number is expected to double by the end of the century." (p. 61) She goes on to bring up the controversy surrounding such homes:

> The rapid rise in single parenthood is a subject that sparks heated debate. Some say the trend is a sign that our society is falling apart; they call for more concerted efforts to preserve the traditional family structure. Others view single parenthood as just a new family form — a type of family that is here to stay. They see little chance that family life will be like that depicted in such 1950's TV shows as "Leave It To Beaver" and "Father Knows Best." Those who accept the reality of single-parent families in our society believe that such families should be judged on their quality and strengths, not whether households are headed by one or two parents. (*Ibid.*)

Gay mentions the perception of single-parent homes as "a new family form" but what can she mean since, through death, separation or illicit sex, such fragmented families are age-old? Those in this new category are unwed mothers who, unlike teens who accidently conceive as a result of fornication, do so *deliberately*. Regarding this shocking development, Gay explains:

> Some single women are so convinced that they can raise healthy, emotionally stable children on their own that they have made decisions to become pregnant but not to marry. During the years of social upheaval in the 1960's, some young women chose single parenthood partially as a rebellious act against the establishment. Today it is the women of the established middle class that are making decisions to become mothers but not wives. According to a December, 1985 *Newsweek* report, "an increasing number of single women in their thirties, women with good jobs and financially secure futures who have everything except a husband," are becoming mothers" either through artificial insemination or with a male partner, often one who has been carefully chosen." (pp. 64-65)

Newsweek helpfully notes that this is "not a way of life that will work for everyone," while Gay calmly reflects that there may be certain legal and personal difficulties that may crop up from such arrangements. What is evident is Gay's commitment to the familial destruction going on in society. One need only read through the list of "Organizations Helpful to Families" that she carries at the end of her book. Where it would seem that groups such as Focus on the Family, American Family Federation and various pro-lifers should be found, Gay's incredible directory includes such organizations as the American Civil Liberties Union, American Friends Service Committee, (Conciliar) Catholic Social Services, Gray Panthers, National Abortion Federation, National Abortion Rights Action League, Planned Parenthood, Women's Legal Defense Fund and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

(By some oversight, and *surely* it must be one, Gay has neglected to include such stalwart "family help" groups as the National Organization for Women and People for the American Way. Perhaps she will correct this in some future edition.)

And yet even the deliberately unwed mother phenomenon is not the outermost limit in new "families." Media watchdog Joseph Farah, writing in the June 4, 1991 issue of *The New American*, states:

> The latest trend by liberal crusaders in the news media has newspaper publishers and editors printing announcments of "gay bonding ceremonies" on the traditional wedding page. If you have any doubt that this is a deliberate effort by those who would like to transform traditional family newspapers into counterculture rags that promote alternative lifestyles, read what the *Washington Journalism Review* had to say about this trend: "The weddings page, that anachronism of newspaper journalism, is finally moving, albeit slowly, into the 1990's — but not without a fight from some readers. Announcements of gay bonding ceremonies recently appeared in two mainstream West Coast newspapers." ("Between The Lines" column, p. 29. The *WJR* remarks are classic examples of liberal "moralizing" in favor of evil: marriages are ridiculed as anachronistic and opposition to the "gay" announcements is seen to come from people who are behind the times.)

Since the *WJR* piece, a third small West Coast newspaper has begun this practice, as has a daily in a large metropolitan area — the *Minneapolis Star Tribune*. In March the *Star Tribune* published two announcements for lesbian "domestic partnerships" and changed the name on its society page from "Weddings" to "Celebrations." An article from the New York Times News Service reported: "In announcing the *Star Tribune's* new policy last week, spokeswoman Bette Fenton [no relation, as far as we can determine, to a certain well-known priest-editor — JKW] said it was 'a natural response' to a new Minneapolis ordinance allowing homosexuals to register their relationships with the city." ("Paper publishes gay partnerships with weddings," *Miami Herald*, March 24, 1991, p. 27a.)

The (Anti-) Family Plot

As indicated at the beginning of this article, Satan has an abiding hatred for the family, reflecting as it does the love of God. And as also has been shown, his war against it has proceeded to an advanced stage and has taken many casualties. There follows a brief examination of how the human militia of this army has succeeded in inflicting so much damage on the family unit and how the *true* Roman Catholic Church responds.

At about the same time as Marx and Engels were advocating the abolition of the family, the Masonic super-Lodge Alta Vendita's instructions, which had been seized by Italian authorities, were published at the order of Pope Pius IX. The instructions were secret plans on how the lodges sought to weaken the influence of the Church in society, to infiltrate the Church and to eventually destroy it from within. Proof of the diabolical cunning of the group is evident by its goal to debase woman who, as faithful wife and mother, is the heart of the Christian home. The instructions state: "... since we cannot suppress woman, let us corrupt her along with the Church... The best poniard with which to wound the Church mortally is corruption." (Cited, Father Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp., *The Kingship of Christ & the Conversion of the Jewish Nation*, Christian Book Club of America, 1987 edition of the 1953 work, p. 21) In 1884, when Pope Leo XIII condemned Freemasonry's wicked doctrines in his immortal encyclical *Humanum Genus*, he foretold with astonishing accuracy the consequence of nations adopting them as the basis for law (as is today the rule for virtually all nations): "(T)he time is quickly coming when marriages will be turned into another kind of contract — that is, into changeable and uncertain unions which fancy may join together, and the same when changed may disunite." (From complete text reprinted in Cardinal Jose Maria Caro y Rodriguez' *The Mystery of Freemasonry Unveiled*; no publishing information given, p. 274)

By the early 1920's, the situation had worsened to the point that the Chilean Cardinal Caro y Rodriguez, in his critique on the Masons, could write:

> The attack of Masonry upon the family has been one of the most dangerous to society. Starting with *laws of civil matrimony*, deprecating matrimony in the eyes of the pernicious or ignorant masses,

Masonry has deprived it of consecration, that character of sacramental institution endowed by Our Lord Jesus Christ, and has reduced it to the character of a human contract, similar to many others, whose strength depends on human law. The evils that have been caused in the Christian society we live in are a first attempt against matrimony and against the family are unfortunately visible to all, they are so enormous, that they have almost destroyed family life among the popular classes of the cities. (*Ibid.*, p. 184. Grammar and punctuation are the translator's.)

The contribution to this corruption by the various forms of entertainment and information (books, films, radio, etc.) was castigated by Pope Pius XI in his encyclical on Christian Marriage (*Casti Connubii*) in 1930. His Holiness lamented that in far too many of these sources "the sanctity of marrriage is trampled upon and derided; divorce, adultery, all the basest vices are either extolled or are at least depicted in such colors as to appear free of all reproach and infamy." And, he further noted, even the more "moderate" advocates of such ideas "more or less wittingly are emissaries of the great enemy who is ever seeking to sow cockle among the wheat." (*Five Great Encyclicals*, Paulist Press, 1939, p. 90) Seven years later, in his *Divini Redemptoris* (the encyclical condemning Communism) the same pontiff attacked a Marxist teaching that has gained considerable favor in the United States under the guise of "equal rights." The Pope wrote:

> ...Communism is particularly characterized by the rejection of any link that binds woman to the family and the home, and her emancipation is proclaimed as a basic principle. She is withdrawn from the family and the care of her children, to be thrust instead into the public life and collective production under the same conditions as man. The care of home and children then devolves upon the collectivity. Finally, the right of education is denied to parents, for it is conceived as the exclusive prerogative of the community, in whose name and by whose mandate alone parents may exercise this right. (*Ibid.*, p. 181)

The unmistakable conclusion reached after reading this and the other quotes in this section is that every front upon which Satan has directed his might against the family has made significant gains in the intervening years. And, when the plans to merge the U.S. and Soviet systems as a step toward a New World Order are considered, it can be seen how important it is to the conspirators that the family be dissolved in favor of a soulless collective. It may very well be that the force of government may come to bear on those who insist on upholding traditional family values (for example, in the not too distant future newspapers may be obliged to print homosexual "wedding" announcements for fear of being charged with "discrimination").

Defending The Family

The defense of the family is one of the greatest challenges facing traditional Catholics today. Not only must its sanctity be upheld but there is also the long and arduous process of overturning the anti-Christian laws and cleaning up entertainment as part of the restoration of a Christ-centered society, of which the family is the very essence.

The task at hand certainly seems difficult, almost too difficult to achieve. The enemies of God are confidently proclaiming that the changes are part of an inevitable movement and that all efforts to resist it will be futile. They forget, however, that the only thing inevitable is the Providence of God and the only ultimately futile effort is that of the soul who resists God's will.

We must fight with every lawful means at our disposal those whom Pope Pius XI called "the latter-day subverters of marriage." May Catholics consecrate their families to the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, ever keeping in mind that Father Peyton's "the family that prays together stays together" is more than a slogan. And may they pray often and devoutly, as should all traditional Catholics, to the Holy Family in reparation for the manifold offenses committed against the family. †

†††

Grant us, O Lord Jesus, faithfully to imitate the examples of Thy Holy Family so that in the hour of our death, in the company of Thy glorious Virgin Mother and Saint Joseph, we may deserve to be received by Thee into eternal tabernacles.

(Indulgence of 200 days, once a day — Pope Leo XIII, February 6, 1893.)

†††

"That they all may be one... that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me." (John 17, 21)

Fr. Oswald Baker (England)

The Church founded by Christ has never been disunited. It has always been a unitary, compact body of believers, completely unanimous in faith, morals, essential form of worship and obedience. If it lost its unity it would cease to exist. The Church of Christ is one and united, not because Christ prayed that it should be so, but because it cannot but be so. The reason for this is simply that it is an organized society of divine foundation, with a divinely ordained purpose, divinely appointed means and divinely guaranteed permanent survival. If it were not thus guaranteed by God but were a merely human institution, it assuredly could not have survived its many crises. No matter the upheaval, the Church has always unfailingly come through, stately, resplendent, displaying — after temporary obscurity — the striking, superhuman unity for which Our Lord prayed. It was not for mere unity that He prayed but for a conspicuous, instructive, convincing unity, indicating the divinity of the Church's Founder. Since that time, hundreds of separate Churchs have been founded, claiming the title Christian and, claiming it, they have in courtesy been accorded it. But the original, one Catholic Church has always insisted that salvation cannot be attained by non-Catholics through membership in any of their sects, but only in spite of it. It must have been the most revolutionary volte-face of all time when Vatican II, purporting to speak for Catholicism, declared that heretical sects, set up in opposition to the Church of Christ, are divinely approved vehicles of salvation. To accept this declaration is to deny the unity of the Church of Christ, to repudiate a vital Catholic tenet — and so to cease to be a Catholic. Even if there were no other reason for condemnation, this pronouncement marks and damns Vatican II as not Catholic.

This attempt to change Catholic doctrine gave a tremendous boost to the "ecumenia" which had taken root even before the Council. In 1962, Cardinal Heenan of England observed that the Dutch were making a veritable religion of "ecumania." One of the Council members, Bishop Carli, complained of ecumenical excesses, noting that it had become scarcely possible to speak, for example, of Our Lady lest non-Catholics take offence. The Council used vague, ambiguous terms. One bishop, objecting to this and demanding a clear definition of terms, was told that the Council was pastoral, not dogmatic, and so not disposed to insist on definitions. In one instance a vague term was actually substituted for one that was too clear. The original draft of the Constitution on the Church had Christ's "Church in the world is the Catholic Church." The word "is" was later changed to "subsists in." Although the Council warned that "nothing is so foreign to ecumenism as the false attitude of appeasement which is so damaging to the purity of Catholic doctrine," it went on to encourage joint prayer, discussions on an equal footing and united services.

Ecumenical dialogue aims, not for an agreed discernment of truth, but for the promotion of mutual respect and fellow-feeling. Ecumenism has been substituted for evangelization. Ecumenists are so obsessed with their task that they have lost interest in preaching the Gospel. In seminaries the interchange of Catholic and Protestant lecturers has produced a crop of newly-ordained priests (?) who do not know the authentic Catholic Faith. In parishes, difference in religious beliefs is overlooked and mutual goodwill emphasized. Loyal Catholics are easily represented as bigoted, discourteous and uncharitable. Criticism of ecumenism is made to appear as opposition to the will of Christ for unity. The new belief is that there is not, after all, one true Catholic Church but a higher institution, the Christian Church, in which all persuasions and traditions are on a par, baptism being the all-important factor and the basis of unity that really matters. A new, federalized Church has emerged. Intercommunion is practised.

All the wretched changes inflicted on Catholics within the past twenty-five years are directed towards a senseless, gossamer ecumenism. Ecumenism is a sentimental fiction. It destroys the boundary between truth and falsehood. It mixes the truth of God with the errors of men. The only religious association founded by God is the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Roman Church. Catholicism is to be accepted not by way of approval but by way of submission. Recognition of the divine authority of the Catholic Church, acknowledgement of previous error, total submission — these have always been and remain for all time the only possible conditions for Christian unity. †

Hope Springs Eternal!

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

The Athanasian is now in its twelfth year of publication, the first issue having appeared in January, 1980. Throughout the course of those years it has remained what it was intended to be from its beginning, a thoroughly traditional Roman Catholic journal in every respect. However, while I certainly had grave doubts on the subject long before, it was not until 1984 or 1985 that I arrived at the conviction that John Paul II was not, and could not possibly be, a valid Pope. That conviction has been exceedingly strengthened over the ensuing years to the extent that it is today totally beyond my comprehension how any other stand relating to John Paul II can conceivably be logically and honorably taken except that of sedevacantism. In all of the confusion and turmoil and chaos that prevail relating to the Church, the stark fact that John Paul II is a bogus Pope is *the bottom line*.

But it is not my intention in this article to discuss once again the subject of sedevacantism. That topic has been treated and analyzed and rehashed over the past several years in the pages of this newsletter more often, I am sure, than it has been in any other publication in this country — and, in any case, there is probably nothing more that I can say on it. While there are, I am strongly inclined to think, a relatively sizable and increasing number of individuals who are sedevacantists, I do not have even a remote idea of how many that number may be nor of how many of them may have become such by way of *The Athanasian*. As I read, however, as I regularly do, *The Wanderer*, *The Remnant*, the writings of the Society of Saint Pius X, the *New Jersey Catholic News*, *The Fatima Crusader* and other publications of a similar kind, there is not the slightest hint in any of them that they are about to turn sedevacantists. Indeed, I, for one, cannot escape the conclusion that, no matter how logical and forceful are the arguments that John Paul II is a non-Pope and that the Conciliar Church is not Catholic, such publications are hell-bent on remaining aligned to that Church and John Paul II and that no amount of realism and common sense is likely to change their position. And how presumptuous of so more or less insignificant a newsletter as *The Athanasian* to challenge that position! True enough, perhaps, if one were to put aside the essential consideration of right and wrong, of truth and error. Most fortunately, moral right and wrong, truth and falsehood are not determined by the number of individuals on one side or the other. If this were the case, *The Athanasian* would be extremely presumptuous in the stand it takes because it is hopelessly outnumbered by those it confronts in the present matter. *The Wanderer*, for example, has a circulation of some 35,000; the *New Jersey Catholic New* is sent *free* to all who request it; the Spring, 1991 edition of *The Fatima Crusader* (whose editor, Father Nicholas Gruner, persists in referring to non-Pope John Paul II as "the Holy Father") had a printing of 400,000 copies of a recent issue and was also sent *free* (as it always is, I believe). In stark contrast, the current list of paid subscribers to *The Athanasian* totals approximately 900.

A few years back I had hoped that this newsletter would have at least some 4,000 - 5,000 subscribers by now and thereby perhaps be able to make some impact upon the American scene in general and upon the Church situation in particular, specifically through its becoming an effective force in counteracting the conservative organizations and publications associated with the Conciliar Church such as those mentioned previously. While I still fondly entertain that hope, it will never be realized if subscriptions to *The Athanasian* remain at the pitiably low number of 900. No matter how important and how strong the stands we take and no matter how right we are, we will simply continue to be ignored because, as I see it, our influence is negligible and our impact minimal. As proud as we are of *The Athanasian* and as well as it is received, the fact is that we are getting nowhere. We get so many, many letters from our subscribers telling us how very much they appreciate *The Athanasian* and the uncompromising positions we take on the various issues of the day — and for such letters of commendation and encouragement we are assuredly most grateful. But, I ask myself, what have we to show in terms of concrete results, what impact have we made, what have we accomplished? I don't know.

One thing I do know, however, and that is that our financial condition leaves much to be desired. The total expense involved in the operation of the TCA averages out to about $5,000 *per month* while, for some time now, the monthly income has averaged around $4,000. The amount we receive by way of newsletter subscriptions (included in

the above $4,000 figure) actually covers less than a quarter of the TCA expenses over the period of a year. For some time now I have been supplying from my own funds the amount needed each month to pay the balance of expenses. However, as willing as I have been to do this, there is one problem which could soon become an insurmountable one — and that problem is that I don't have much money left.

My plea, then, is simply that more of our subscribers will support us financially on a regular basis by using the white envelope for that purpose which is enclosed with each issue of *The Athanasian*. I assure one and all that I would never be asking for additional income for the TCA unless it was very much needed — and it is. Please God, that additional income will be forthcoming in sufficient amount so that we may thereby be able to guarantee the continuing life of our newsletter. Despite the pessimistic tone of this article, perhaps somewhere down the road publication of *The Athanasian* may prove to have been eminently worthwhile. Hope springs eternal! †

Of the several secular magazines and newsletters of national circulation which regularly come to our TCA office, there are two which invariably impress me very favorably: *The New American* (TNA) and *The McAlvany Intelligence Advisor* (MIA). Dealing primarily with current events, both of them are highly informative and, in their accuracy and straightforwardness, are a striking contrast to the dishonorable controlled mass media with whose disinformation the minds of multitudes of Americans are incessantly polluted. In a word, what TNA and MIA do, in my opinion they do very well indeed and I take no exception to most of what I read therein.

It is rather to what I *don't* read therein that I would and do take vehement exception. Given the excellent coverage which both publications devote to the exposure of so many of the subversive individuals and organizations which today abound nationwide and worldwide (many of which are allied in the planning and formation of the horrendous and atheistic One World Order) — two of the most powerful and most dangerous of these have long been, and continue to be, consistently ignored by TNA and the MIA, namely Freemasonry and John Paul II. Surely these are glaring omissions. Why is this? How come? To my mind at least, they are impossible to justify.

— Fr. F. Fenton

Pray the Rosary Daily

The enclosed white envelope is for the convenience of those who may wish to send a donation to the TCA. If a blue envelope is also enclosed, that is to be used for subscription renewal.

SUBSCRIPTON 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 unholy trinity":
George Bush
Mikhail Gorbachev
John Paul II

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: $12 per year (via First Class Mail) for the USA, Canada and Mexico; $16 per year (via Air Mail) for all other countries.

Additional Copies: Single copy - $1.50; 10 copies - $12.00; 40 or more to same address - $1.00 each

Mailing Address: P. O. Box 38335, Colorado Springs, CO 80937 **Telephone:** (719) 636-1575

Articles appearing in this newsletter may be reproduced providing no changes of any kind are made in those articles and adequate credit is given to *The Athanasian* for them. The adequate credit preferred would be the inclusion with the articles reproduced of the information contained in this box.

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.