THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume XI, No. 7 † October 15, 1990

CONTRACEPTION

John Kenneth Weiskittel

Since 1973, when the United States Supreme Court legalized abortion, the forces of light and darkness have advanced to a new phase of their age-old conflict. Now the theatre of war is the fetal habitat. Or, to repeat the message seen on a bumper sticker: THE MOST DANGEROUS PLACE IN AMERICA IS THE MOTHER'S WOMB.

A Dead Issue?

In pro-life circles there is very little said about the evil of birth control, as it is seen to be a divisive issue. Some pro-lifers are opposed to it but many accept it as the lesser of two evils (a stand which is in harmony with that taken by pro-abortionists). In a front-page article, "Birth Control Choices Limited," that appeared in the July 14 issue of the *Post-Bulletin*, a Rochester, Minnesota daily paper, staff writer Chris Herlinger states: "Anti-abortion organizations have not taken public positions on contraceptives. Sheralyn Meddock, chairwoman of the Olmsted County chapter of Minnesotans Concerned for Life, said opinions vary within the "pro-life" movement about the use of contraceptives."

But the pro-death forces aren't squeamish about discussing it. After all, they are *precisely the same anti-Christian forces that have pushed "free love," sex education, homosexual rights, as well as abortion and birth control.* As one writer put it, the abortionists see the fight for contraception as part and parcel with the fight for feticide. Herlinger's article, which cites a study by the National Research Council claiming that contraceptive failures result in about two million unwanted pregnancies and about half of the nation's one and a half million abortions each year, quotes Lynn Skinner, a regional coordinator for Southern Minnesota Planned Parenthood, as declaring: "I firmly believe that, if we had more choices in contraception, we'd see less abortions." (Of course we expect this from a Planned Parenthood spokesman since that group is in the business not only of referring teenage girls to abortion "clinics" — including those it runs itself — but in supplying them with contraceptives as well.) In the same issue of the *Post-Bulletin* there appears an editorial, "Abortion Dispute Cuts Contraceptive Research," which endorses development of "a more effective, more convenient and cheaper contraceptive," arguing that it is a middle ground that most Americans could accept. The editorial, suggesting that it is preferable that women have the "right" to choose when they will have children rather than conceive them on "a random basis under circumstances which are not favorable to a good parent-child relationship," goes on to state:

> Virtually everyone involved in the abortion controversy on both sides would agree that abortion is *not* the ideal way to achieve this goal. Contraception without side effects or other difficulties would clearly be preferable. Of course, some people also object to contraception on moral grounds but they are far fewer in number than those opposed to abortion.

Another proponent of this sort of "compromise" is Laurence Tribe, the Harvard law professor who testified against Judge Bork at confirmation hearings. In his book, *Abortion: The Clash of Absolutes*, he writes that, besides abortion, women may choose "to prevent pregnancy through the only proven means for doing so: sex education and the wide availability of birth control. Some will no doubt think that the only moral means of pregnancy prevention is abstention from sex. But it doesn't work as a policy because people don't abstain. This is the lesson of human history." (Cited in Brian Robertson's book review, "Tribal Superstitions," National Review, July 9, 1990, p. 48. Tribe's comment seems to say: Let's not drag morality into this; what's important in human activities is whether they "work as a policy.") Not surprisingly, his solution is to "pour significant sums of research and development money into new forms of contraception," not only because they will be "safer" or "less awkward" but because "development of such technologies *has potential for dramatically shifting our conception of what is 'natural.'*" (Emphasis added) In other words, such an innovation will further the deception that the stigma of sin need not be attached to artificially impeding the process of conception.

No Children Admitted

The traditional Roman Catholic position on marriage continues to be what it always has been (and ever will be): the marital act must always remain open to its primary object of procreation and, should either spouse (or both) willfully enter the act with the intention of preventing this object, then a mortal sin has been committed. The contraceptionists have always recognized the Church as their chief enemy and charge

it with being behind the times. What they refuse to recognize, however, is that, while times change, God's law does not change — nor does human nature.

The battle over birth control isn't new either. Indeed, one of the common expressions for it a generation ago, *onanism*, is taken from the name of an early practitioner of the vice who suffered severely from the hand of God. (Genesis 38:7-10) Also in the Old Testament we find in the book of Tobias the model for a chaste, godly marriage as contrasted with the lustful pagan union. The angel Raphael explains to young Tobias why seven husbands died before consummating their marriage to the virgin Sara: "For they who in such manner receive matrimony as to shut out God from themselves, and from their mind, and give themselves to their lust, as the horse and mule, which have not understanding, over them the devil hath power." (Tobias 6:17. Given the wholly carnal nature of so many modern marriages, we submit that, were God to exact the same severe punishment today that He brought upon Onan and the seven husbands, there would be so marked a reduction in the census that the Zero Population people — or what was left of them — would soon be put out of business!) Raphael advises Tobias, who is to be Sara's eighth husband, that — to avoid the fate of his predecessors — he must, after the wedding, "for three days keep thyself continent from her, and give thyself to nothing else but to prayers with her." (Tobias 6:18) Tobias, in later explaining this to Sara, uttered these noble sentiments about holy love: "For we are the children of saints, and we must not be joined together like heathens that know not God." (Tobias 8:5) And likewise he prayed: "Lord, thou knowest that not for fleshly lust do I take my sister to wife, but only for the love of posterity, in which thy name be blessed for ever and ever." (Tobias 8:9) Also worth noting is the admonition to Tobias by his father: "Take heed to keep thyself, my son, from all fornication and beside thy wife never endure to know a crime." (Tobias 4:14. In the biblical sense "to know a crime," as used here, refers to contraception.)

David Goldstein, LL.D., a Jewish convert to Catholicism and an ex-Socialist, echoing Raphael's condemnation of unclean marriages, writes:

> Those who practice birth control deliberately "shut out God" by rejecting His cooperation in the act of bringing a soul into the world for, as the Catholic Church says, the soul comes directly from God. Such birth controllers say, in act instead of by word, — "God, we are going to enjoy the pleasure You made possible when You gave us organs and faculties and sexual desire. But You, You keep out of it, we don't want any of those souls with which You impregnate women." (*Suicide Bent: Sangerizing Mankind*, Radio Replies Press, 1945, p. 139)

It is instructive to stop at this point and contrast Catholic teaching with that of its antagonists. Such contempt for the Church is evident in the anti-Marian *Alone Of All Her Sex: The Myth and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (Alfred A. Knopf, 1976), in which convent-educated (!) and Oxford-educated author Marina Warner explains:

> ...in Christian civilization, men and women do not believe reproduction is unadulteratedly animal, but maintain the special higher character of the species by a muddled [*sic*] but profound belief that all children come from God, who creates in each individual a unique soul. So that, although the virgin birth of Christ is a single miracle that reveals His divinity, all births are considered to some extent the work of the Spirit. There are elements of this type of absurd thinking [*sic*] in the Catholic ban on contraception: although sex undertaken without a view to conceive is sinful, the rhythm method is allowed, but any man-made method is forbidden because it places human intercourse on the practical level of animal reproduction, and so God no longer appears to determine and intervene in the origin of every human life. (p. 46; Conciliar "Catholics," whose names are acknowledged on page xv of this book and who apparently support Warner's view that the Church's moral teaching on contraception is "absurd," include Fathers Eamonn Carroll, O.C., and Peter Levi, S.J., Sister Benedicta Ward, O.L.G., and radical feminist "theologian" Dr. Rosemary Reuther.)

As statements of this sort go, Warner's attack is fairly restrained but it comes as no surprise that in the work's closing pages she beats the feminist drum again, assailing "the Church's continuing indefensible ban on contraception." (p. 338. Also on this page we find a New Age interpretation of the Blessed Virgin Mary: "Although Mary cannot be a model for the New Woman, a goddess is better than no goddess...")

Turning to the New Testament, we find St. Paul's famous exhortation: "Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled. For fornicators and adulterers God will judge." (Hebrews 13:4) The writings of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church are unanimous in condemning the vile practice. Saint Jerome, in his *Letter to Eustochium*, writes that those who "drink potions to ensure sterility are guilty of rebuffing God's own blessings" and calls the practice a form of "self-mutilation." (Cited, George Grant, *The Legacy of Planned Parenthood*, Wolgemuth & Hyatt, 1989, p. 35. Grant, a conservative Presbyterian, quotes a number of earlier Catholic writers but omits the "Saint" before each name. Among the Presbyterians are to be found some of the stronger critics of the birth control cult. Goldstein quotes a Rev. B. Sinclair, who grudgingly acknowledges the Church's

lead in this battle: "God forbid that I should eulogize Romanism, but the Roman Catholic is the Church which is a practical foe of this hell-born sin... Before God, I believe that many of the errors [*sic*] of the Roman Church are canceled by its loyalty to the great law of God which enforces the truth that the end of marriage must not be profaned." p. 175) In his sermon *On Marriage*, Saint Augustine of Hippo speaks of the "lustful cruelty" of women who stoop "to such extravagant methods as to use poisonous drugs to secure barrenness..." (Cited, Grant, p. 35) It is also Augustine who teaches that "(i)ntercourse even with one's legitimate wife is unlawful and wicked when the conception of offspring is prevented," calling it "(as) impure as the conduct of Onan who was slain." (Cited, Goldstein, pp. 147-148) The Angelic Doctor, Saint Thomas Aquinas, declares: "Next to murder, by which an actually existent being is destroyed, we rank this sin by which the generation of a human being is prevented." (*Ibid.*, p. 147)

Finally, in our brief survey of Catholic teaching on the subject, let's turn to Pope Pius XI's great encyclical, *Casti Connubii* (Latin for "Chaste Wedlock"), written in 1930. That pontiff's inspired words on the subject are worth citing at length:

> No reason, however grave, may be put forward by which anything intrinsically against nature may become conformable to nature and morally good. Since, therefore, the conjugal act is destined primarily by nature for the begetting of children, those who in exercising it deliberately frustrate its natural power and purpose sin against nature and commit a deed which is shameful and intrinsically vicious.
>
> Since, therefore, openly departing from the uninterrupted Christian tradition, some recently have judged it possible solemnly to declare another doctrine regarding this question, the Catholic Church to whom God has entrusted the defense of the integrity and purity of morals, standing erect in the midst of the moral ruin which surrounds her, in order that she may preserve the chastity of the nuptial union from being defiled by this foul stain, raises her voice in token of divine ambassadorship and through our mouth proclaims anew: Any use whatsoever of matrimony exercised in such a way that the act is deliberately frustrated in its natural power to generate life is an offense against the law of God and of nature, and those who indulge in such are branded with the guilt of a grave sin. (Cited, Goldstein, pp. 19-20. The entire text can be found as Appendix II, pp. 194-238.)

Pius' strongest words are reserved for those priests who betray the "sacred trust" by either condoning such evil or even promoting it, whom he castigates with the words of Our Lord: "They are blind and leaders of the blind: and if the blind lead the blind, both fall into the pit." (Matthew 15:14) Let us turn now to the purveyors of moral ruin, whose destructive policies are reaping a harvest of lost souls.

The Plot Against The Womb

Human sin is as old as the Garden of Eden, and the sin of Onan is nearly as ancient. While some Jews before the birth of Christ and Christians since that time have broken God's commands regarding a chaste marriage, there was never any doubt that the sinful nature of their acts was evident to them. It was only in pagan societies that such behavior was deemed to be acceptable.

During the centuries of Christian civilization, promotion of contraception was limited to fringe groups — witches, occultists and some heretics. The anti-Christian and neo-pagan forces did not really begin to forge a strong movement along these lines until recently, as can be seen in the title of James Reed's sympathetic study, *From Private Vice to Public Virtue: The Birth Control Movement and American Society Since 1830.* (Basic books, 1978) Reed points out that from 1873 — when the Comstock Act was passed by Congress to tighten the ban on the use of the mail for the circulation of obscene material until a Supreme Court ruling excluded it — the sending of contraceptives or literature promoting their use was classed as the dissemination of obscenity.

David Goldstein's journey out of the Marxist-Socialist movement was largely based on his opposition to the sexual permissiveness he found being espoused there. For a while he remained in it, "believing that the things I found objectionable therein were merely personal opinions..." (p. 3) He goes on to write:

> But these sex teachings in Socialist writings, which I imagined to be merely personal opinion to which Socialism was not at all committed, became so numerous that I began to halt in my conception of what's what in Socialism as related to the family. I found that every book written on the subject, that had a worldwide standing in the Socialist movement, upheld the same disruptive views... (pp. 3-4)

Goldstein's break with these groups occurred when he read what was touted as "one of the great Socialist classics," a translation of a work by Friedrich Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property & the State*, based on the notes of his collaborator, Karl Marx. (p. 4) Goldstein became infuriated by statements such as one advocating: "A more unconventional intercourse of the sexes and a more lenient opinion regarding virgin honor and female shame." (Cited, *ibid.*) Deciding, then and there, "that the time had come to quit Socialism and to give it battle," in May, 1903, he wrote a letter of resignation that included this charge: *"I am*

convinced that socialism, as organized internationally, stands for the entire breaking down of individual standards of moral responsibility; that the socialist philosophy of economic determinism stands for the substitution for religion principles of social standards of ethics set up upon the basis of mere physical satisfaction." (pp. 4-5)

Less than a decade after Goldstein left the Socialists, they were to gain a promising recruit in the person of Margaret Sanger. Then in her early thirties, she would go on to have her name intimately linked to the birth control (a term she coined in 1914) movement and to Planned Parenthood (aptly described by the Conciliar pro-life priest, Father Paul Marx, O.S.B., as *Banned* Parenthood and Planned *Barrenhood*), which she helped start. Sanger was baptized and confirmed a Catholic but she lived in a divided home, her mother being a Catholic who was forced out of the Church by her father, an atheist and a freethinker. Soon she found herself siding with her father, which led her to socialism. There she became a successful organizer and "learned the propaganda techniques that were later to stand her in such good stead." (Madeline Gray, *Margaret Sanger: A Biography of the Champion of Birth Control*, Richard Marek, 1979, p. 37)

Like Goldstein, Sanger would part company with the Socialists. But, while he left out of moral indignation, she did so because she sensed that she had to do so in order to bring her message to a populace she couldn't hope to reach as long as she remained openly attached to radicalism. Gray writes that "by 1928, she felt she had to use the kind of lecture that would curry favor with people of wealth, those who could donate the much-needed cash to her cause as well as supply what they had learned in their long battle for woman suffrage." (p. 289) And the tactic worked; within a year she began receiving donations from the likes of John D. Rockefeller and George Eastman of the Eastman Kodak Company. (p. 303) But even in her overtly Socialist days she had found a significant source: In 1922, after a divorce, she entered into a free-love "marriage" with J. Noah Slee, millionaire founder of the Three-in-One Oil Company. For the Catholicism she renounced Sanger embraced Unity, a spinoff of Christian Science, and the occult Rosicrucian Society. (pp. 108, 306; Sanger was paralleled closely in Britain by Annie Besant, a Socialist and leader of the New Age-oriented Theosophical Society, who was prosecuted in 1877 for publishing a pro-contraception book.) When Sanger learned that the Soviets had adopted birth control as their official policy, she visited Russia in 1935 and, according to Gray, wrote uncomplimentarily about the trip to her friends. (pp. 350-351) What Gray doesn't mention, however, is that she also stated, on returning to the States: "There are no obstacles to birth control in Russia... We would well take example from Russia where there are no legal restrictions, no religious condemnation, and where birth control instruction is part of the regular welfare of the government." (Cited, Goldstein, p. 65)

From Margaret Sanger, let us briefly examine some of what George Grant calls the *illusions* of Planned Parenthood:

Privately Funded: In 1972, Congress passed the Family Planning Act which "provided federal subsidization of birth control clinics for all." (Brigitte & Peter L. Berger, *The War Over the Family: Capturing the Middle Ground*, Anchor/Doubleday, 1983, pp. 28-29) Through Title X of the Public Health Services Act, Planned Parenthood (and other birth control clinics and abortuaries) receives tens of millions of dollars — and it receives additional money from the World Bank, the Agency for International Development and the United Nations Fund for Population Activities. (Grant, pp. 20-21. As he notes, that's *our money* we're talking about! Planned Parenthood also receives money from United Way and March of Dimes.)

Charity: The claim of the liberals is that we are obliged by compassion to see that the lower classes be given the "benefits" of federally-funded abortions and contraceptives. Grant writes: "The truth is, Planned Parenthood appears to want to *eliminate* the poor, not *serve* them." (p. 19) On what does he base this? On the stated goals of Sanger (the quotes are hers):

> Her alternative to charity was "to *eliminate* the stocks" that she felt were most detrimental "to the future of the race and the world." To that end, Planned Parenthood has always targeted minorities, the unwanted and the disadvantaged for family limitation, contraception, abortion and sterilization. "More children from the fit, less from the unfit," Sanger penned, "that is the chief issue of birth control." (*Ibid.*)

Pro-Choice: Planned Parenthood has loudly proclaimed a woman's "right" to choose abortions, but its counselors are *notorious* for not advising teenage girls of *alternatives* to abortion. And, of course, it does *not* want parents to be able to *choose* to have full medical disclosure of their minor children; fathers to be able to *choose* to save their unborn offsprings' lives; pro-life activists to be able to *choose* to exercise their First Amendment rights in front of abortuaries, etc. It has also advocated "compulsory abortion for out-of-wedlock pregnancies," "compulsory sterilization for those who have already had two children" and "tax penalties" for existing large families — and it has praised Red China's forced abortion and infanticide as a "model of efficiency." (Cited, Grant, p. 17) In 1934, Sanger proposed an "American Baby Code" that demanded a permit for any parent and added that "(n)o permit shall be valid for more than one birth." (Cited, Goldstein, p. 169) And in 1969, Planned Parenthood

President Alan Guttenmacher (signer of Humanist Manifesto II which supported birth control) asserted that "eventually coercion may become necessary." (Cited, Grant, p. 34)

Overpopulation: The most successful deception used by the anti-family forces has been the myth of a population "explosion." Contrary to the myth, so serious has the population decline actually been in Europe that France's former Prime Minister Jacques Chirac has warned: "Europe is vanishing... soon our countries will be empty." (Cited, Grant, p. 26) And we've all heard about the "graying" of America. Even in Third World nations birthrates are falling — so much so, writes Grant, that "the worldwide birthrate is now falling faster than the mortality rate [excluding abortions, we assume — JKW] for the first time in recorded history." (*Ibid.*) Contraception advocates have long been called *neo-Malthusians* after English economist Thomas Malthus who, in the late 1700's, was predicting a dire future for mankind because, he believed, the birthrate would soon outstrip the world's ability to produce food — and so he sought policies that would discourage the poor from reproducing. The error propounded by Malthus and his followers is thoroughly debunked by Dr. Jacqueline Kasun in her book, *The War Against Population*:

> Resources, far from being limited, are abounding. No more than 1 to 3 percent of the earth's ice-free land area is occupied by human beings, less than one-ninth for agricultural purposes. Eight times, and perhaps as much as twenty-two times, the world's present population could support itself at the present standard of living, using present technology; and this leaves half the earth's land surface open to wildlife and conservation areas. (Cited, James J. Drummey, "Correction, Please!", *The New American*, December 19, 1988)

The problem of overcrowding in some countries could be lessened, as David Goldstein observed, if more sparcely inhabited nations would open their doors to these people. (In Canada, for example, there are fewer than seven people per square mile!)

Stand Up For The Family

The contraceptive mentality has spawned a generation of monsters and has cut at the heart of the very idea of a family, encouraging teenage promiscuity. How far has it gone? Even into what claim to be *Catholic* schools. For a look at how serious a concern this is in the Conciliar schools we take a look at the conservative weekly newspaper, *The Wanderer's* "From The Mail" column of July 26, 1990. (We are not endorsing this publication for its weaknesses far outweigh its strengths.) Two "Catholic" high schools in the Sacramento diocese have staged *Secrets*, an "AIDS education" play. While much of the dialogue includes mention of specific contraceptives, we've excerpted a bit of it to give you an idea of what is being passed off as a "Catholic" education:

> DENISE: I'm serious. If you like this guy, you should be prepared.
>
> MONICA: Prepared for what?
>
> DENISE: Being naive is not a very good form of birth control. (She reached into her purse.) I'll show you what I use. Two kinds. You should always carry a backup.

Later, Denise advises, "You might as well sleep with him. Everybody's going to think you are anyway." In the final scene, Monica and her boyfriend Eddie are shown trying out one kind of contraceptive on a green banana.

The August 2, 1990 issue of *The Wanderer* carried an article, "Teach Catholic Doctrine, Not Dissent," regarding the sex education programs in the Milwaukee diocese. The reporter, Margo Szews, noted that in "one of these, the *New Creation* program, eighth graders will learn no fewer than six methods of artificial contraception, and seventh graders can read that incest 'may not be harmful — it is more like experimenting with sex with your brother and sister before you begin to have sexual relations with other people.'" Of course, *The Wanderer* crowd scream and shout as usual and imagine that, if they do so long enough and loud enough, their hero, John Paul II, will intercede, throwing the villains out and restoring law, order and the Angelus to these wayward dioceses. Trouble is, this has been happening *throughout* the Conciliar school system for years — and what has Rome done about it?

We are presently fighting an uphill battle to keep our nation free, but we can hardly expect to win unless we *restore* it to the moral standards that give it the stamp of a *godly* nation. The Almighty commands nations as well as individuals to do His will. And the single most vital area of this fight is *the family*, which is the cornerstone of all human society and every nation. †

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. †

Mary, Mediatrix Of All Graces

Fr. Oswald Baker (England)

The Incarnation means that God the Son, Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, came on earth in human form, Jesus Christ, true God and true Man. The Church has always emphasized that the Incarnation took place through the free consent of Mary, the Mother of Christ. The place of Mary is clearly unique in all creation. She is essentially and incomparably superior to all other creatures. Unique as the Mother of God, she is unique in the holiness which necessarily accompanied that ineffable privilege. All the honour given to Mary in the Church is the natural consequence of the initial honour conferred on her by God.

As with the doctrine of the Real Presence and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, public devotion to Mary in the Church was of gradual growth. Did you know that, for the first five hundred years of the Church's history, there was no public devotion to saints other than martyrs? About 500 A.D., a church was for the first time dedicated to a saint (Sylvester) who was not a martyr. The early Christians concentrated on the martyrs. After the great persecutions ceased, devotion to other saints began to be practised, including public devotion to Our Lady. The Council of Ephesus in 431 defined the doctrine of the Divine Maternity. Mary was truly the Mother of God. This was to settle a controversy concerning the divinity of Christ's Person and His dual nature. The Lateran Council, 649, under Pope Martin I, defined Mary's perpetual virginity.

Mary is the Mother of God because she is the Mother of Christ, our God and universal Saviour. She is thereby Mother to all for whom our Saviour died, spiritual Mother to the human race. To be baptised is to accept her as our Mother. By baptism we are incorporated with Jesus Christ, God the Son, and become by this union adopted children of God. Since Jesus is equally the Son of Mary, our union with Him makes us her children too. Mother of our King, Mary is our Queen and Queen of Heaven.

It is important for us to understand that Mary had an active part in our Redemption. "Thou shalt bring forth a Son and thou shalt call his name Jesus — and Mary said: 'Be it done unto me according to Thy word.'" Knowing His name, Mary was, from the beginning, consciously associated with Our Lord *as* Our Saviour in His Passion. "Thine own soul a sword shall pierce." (Luke 2:35) Pope Saint Pius X and Pope Benedict XV explicitly taught that Mary consciously and actively cooperated with Jesus in the offering of His life for our salvation. As Eve, by her sin of disobedience, forfeited our state of grace, Mary, the second Eve, by her cooperation with God, wrought our restoration to grace. This is a fond parallel found in the writings of the Fathers. Since it was Mary who freely brought Our Lord, Author of all graces, into the world, she is clearly the channel of all graces from God to mankind. This is the meaning of Our Lady's titles: Mediatrix of All Graces, Mother of Divine Grace, Refuge of Sinners, Solace of the Afflicted. It has always been Catholic belief that Our Blessed Lady is, dependently on Christ our Mediator, coredemptrix with Him. As Christ came on earth through the consent of Mary, so, we believe, all the graces He merited come to us through her mediation.

Mary stood by the Cross, silent, impassive, fulfilling a role providentially appointed to her, completing in that hour the offering of her Son which she made on the day of His Presentation in the Temple, fulfilling Simeon's prophecy that a sword of anguish would pierce her soul. She knew her suffering Son was the Redeemer of the world. She loved the souls that He loved. It was her privilege as well as her undoubted desire to suffer in union with Him for them.

The Crucifixion was not only the Sacrifice for sin. It was also the vital action which regained our supernatural life, forfeited by the sin of our first parents. Our Lord's Sacrifice began with His birth into the world and was completed on Calvary. Mary was concerned in both, Mother of our Redeemer and Mother of mankind. Secondary to that of Jesus, her mediation is universal and includes all the graces given to man since the fall of Adam. Pope Benedict XV appointed a Mass in honour of Mary, Mediatrix of All Graces. The doctrine is, therefore, safe and we can make practical use of it. It can and should inspire us with boundless confidence in Mary. †

Pray The Rosary Daily

More On Sedevacantism

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

First, for the benefit of those few subscribers to *The Athanasian* who may not fully understand the meaning of the word, what exactly is sedevacantism? The term is derived from two Latin words, *sede vacante*, meaning vacant chair or seat. A sedevacantist, then, is one who believes that the Chair of Saint Peter is presently vacant, who believes, in other words, that John Paul II is not a valid Pope either because his election in 1978 was not valid or, if it was, that he has ceased to be such because of his formal heresies in the years since then. Because I have always thought it to be far simpler to make the case against the validity of John Paul II by way of the formal heresy approach, I have never given any consideration in these pages to the other (the papal conclave of 1978). In any case, a sedevacantist is simply a person who holds the position that John Paul II is a non-Pope.

Having discussed the subject of sedevacantism in a number of issues of this newsletter over the past few years, I would much prefer to write on some other topic — such as, for example, the decline and approaching fall of our former American republic. (The great American sellout is now in high gear.) However, both because I consider the matter to be of such fundamental importance and because so few other editors and writers who share my conviction regarding sedevacantism are willing to declare themselves publicly, I feel a measure of compulsion to continue to dwell on the subject. The reason for this latest article is to try, from the perspective of a committed or convinced sedevacantist, to categorize various groups as they relate to sedevacantism. Roughly, these groups would, I think, fall into four categories. A few comments on each:

The Members, Clergy and Laity, Of The Conciliar Church

These people, of course, aren't Roman Catholics at all although many of them still think they are and many others couldn't care less whether they are or not. While ignorance or lack of knowledge of what happened during and since Vatican Council II may have long been an excusing cause for multitudes remaining in good faith in the Conciliar Church, it is today increasingly difficult to justify in many such cases their staying therein on the ground that they still don't know the score 25 years after Vatican Council II. And then there are those in the Conciliar Church, from the Vatican on down, who know very well what has happened because they are the ones who made it happen by way of infiltration and subversion (the Freemasons, the Communists, the modernists, the secular humanists, the One Worlders, etc.).

But what is the relationship between the Conciliar Church and sedevacantism? Well, it is obviously a purely negative one and is mentioned merely to emphasize the veritable chasm that exists between the Conciliar Church and John Paul II and those outside that Church (the sedevacantists) who firmly believe it to be one more non-Catholic sect and John Paul II to be an impostor.

The Self-Styled Traditional Publications Aligned With The Conciliar Church (*The Wanderer, The Remnant, The Angelus* And *The New Jersey Catholic News* Among Others)

All of them recognize the Conciliar Church as the true Church and acknowledge John Paul II as a true Pope. While they do not hesitate to provide numerous examples of how bad things are in their Church, they all stop short of facing up to the essential problem, John Paul II. However much, for example, they may criticize and attack the bishops of the Conciliar Church, never once have I seen the point made that practically all of

My contribution to the Traditional Catholics of America is $ _____

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State and Zip _____

More On Sedevacantism

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

First, for the benefit of those few subscribers to *The Athanasian* who may not fully understand the meaning of the word, what exactly is sedevacantism? The term is derived from two Latin words, *sede vacante*, meaning vacant chair or seat. A sedevacantist, then, is one who believes that the Chair of Saint Peter is presently vacant, who believes, in other words, that John Paul II is not a valid Pope either because his election in 1978 was not valid or, if it was, that he has ceased to be such because of his formal heresies in the years since then. Because I have always thought it to be far simpler to make the case against the validity of John Paul II by way of the formal heresy approach, I have never given any consideration in these pages to the other (the papal conclave of 1978). In any case, a sedevacantist is simply a person who holds the position that John Paul II is a non-Pope.

Having discussed the subject of sedevacantism in a number of issues of this newsletter over the past few years, I would much prefer to write on some other topic — such as, for example, the decline and approaching fall of our former American republic. (The great American sellout is now in high gear.) However, both because I consider the matter to be of such fundamental importance and because so few other editors and writers who share my conviction regarding sedevacantism are willing to declare themselves publicly, I feel a measure of compulsion to continue to dwell on the subject. The reason for this latest article is to try, from the perspective of a committed or convinced sedevacantist, to categorize various groups as they relate to sedevacantism. Roughly, these groups would, I think, fall into four categories. A few comments on each:

The Members, Clergy and Laity, Of The Conciliar Church

These people, of course, aren't Roman Catholics at all although many of them still think they are and many others couldn't care less whether they are or not. While ignorance or lack of knowledge of what happened during and since Vatican Council II may have long been an excusing cause for multitudes remaining in good faith in the Conciliar Church, it is today increasingly difficult to justify in many such cases their staying therein on the ground that they still don't know the score 25 years after Vatican Council II. And then there are those in the Conciliar Church, from the Vatican on down, who know very well what has happened because they are the ones who made it happen by way of infiltration and subversion (the Freemasons, the Communists, the modernists, the secular humanists, the One Worlders, etc.).

But what is the relationship between the Conciliar Church and sedevacantism? Well, it is obviously a purely negative one and is mentioned merely to emphasize the veritable chasm that exists between the Conciliar Church and John Paul II and those outside that Church (the sedevacantists) who firmly believe it to be one more non-Catholic sect and John Paul II to be an impostor.

The Self-Styled Traditional Publications Aligned With The Conciliar Church (*The Wanderer, The Remnant, The Angelus* And *The New Jersey Catholic News* Among Others)

All of them recognize the Conciliar Church as the true Church and acknowledge John Paul II as a true Pope. While they do not hesitate to provide numerous examples of how bad things are in their Church, they all stop short of facing up to the essential problem, John Paul II. However much, for example, they may criticize and attack the bishops of the Conciliar Church, never once have I seen the point made that practically all of

My contribution to the Traditional Catholics of America is $ _____

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State and Zip _____

those bishops are appointees of either John Paul II or, in his words, of his "illustrious predecessor," Paul VI. Nor have I ever seen in these publications any effective refutation of the charges made by sedevacantists of the instances of formal heresy which have marked the course of John Paul II's twelve years in the Vatican. As far as the publishers and editors of such "traditional" journals are concerned, it is apparently inconceivable that John Paul II is a bogus Pope and so — no matter how strong a case is made of his formal heresy — they simply ignore the issue.

The Society Of Saint Pius X

Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and the bishops, priests and laity of his Society of Saint Pius X (SSPX) also acknowledge John Paul II as a true Pope and are, of course, members of the Conciliar Church of which he is the recognized head. How this can be has ever been a mystery to me in view of the strong language which Archbishop Lefebvre has employed from time to time over the years in reference to the Vatican and John Paul II. It was, as I recall, back in 1976 that the archbishop declared: "The Conciliar Church is not Catholic" — and those are his exact words. Since that Conciliar Church has hardly become Catholic in the years since then, it is impossible for me to understand how the continuing affiliation of the SSPX with that Church can be justified in any manner. Surely at least some of the Society's members, especially among its clergy, ought long since to have realized that sedevacantism is the only sensible and logical position to be taken under the circumstances.

The "Secret" Sedevacantists

While I could not even hazard a guess as to how many sedevacantists there are, say, nationwide, I am much inclined to think that there are far more today than there were even two or three years ago. A number of them, however, are "secret" sedevacantists. In other words, although such individuals firmly believe that John Paul II is not a valid Pope, they refrain from openly or publicly declaring their conviction. And why? Well, they contend, while a person may be convinced that John Paul II is a non-Pope, he may not publicly say this because, by doing so, he is judging the Pope and only the Church can make such a declaration. Because of the conditions which currently exist, however, that official declaration cannot be made by the Church regarding John Paul II until some future date. Such is the general line of argument used by the "secret" sedevacantists to explain their silence or secrecy. In the meantime, John Paul II continues unimpeded along his destructive, heretical, subversive path while those who know him for what he is must keep quiet!

Now the above position held by the "secret" sedevacantists is, I submit, a nonsensical one. It *defies* common sense. Even though the formal heresy of John Paul II is perfectly obvious and even though a person is absolutely convinced of this, yet he must not dare to state his conviction publicly. Preposterous!

It is imperative that John Paul II be unmasked for the fraud that he is as a counterfeit Pope and for the major part that he is playing in the formation of the One World Order. Indeed, far from being silent on this most vital matter, I have a moral obligation to speak out while there is yet time! There is, I maintain, no more deceptive and dangerous individual on the world scene today than John Paul II! †

"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.