THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume XII, No. 1 † January 15, 1991

Two Major Enemies Get Silent Treatment

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

In the minds of all intelligent, honorable, informed individuals, it is, I believe, safe to say that never before throughout the Christian centuries have the forces of evil been more numerous and more powerful on a worldwide scale than they are at the present time. Nor is it any exaggeration to say that never before have those forces of evil been closer to ultimate victory in the pursuit of their abhorrent objectives than they are in this our day. Although *most* of them have been, and continue to be, identified and exposed for what they are by sound conservative publications (as well as by other means of communication), the vast majority of the morally good people of this country remain — even at this late date — in various degrees of ignorance of those diabolical forces (an ignorance due in large part to the lying American mass media which itself is under enemy control). While the utterly immoral, criminal, atheistic powers that be proceed systematically to destroy Christian civilization, the average good citizen continues to live his daily life in a "business as usual" fashion, seemingly all but totally oblivious to the awful reality of what is happening and to the dire fate that may well be his in the very likely event that developments on the American and world scenes maintain their present course.

As indicated above, *most* of the evil forces so diligently and successfully working today *against* God and religion and morality and freedom and *for* the One World Order have been, and continue to be, identified and exposed by sound conservative publications (their reach and effectiveness, of course, exceedingly limited by their relatively small circulations). There are, however, two major evil forces which are *not* given the attention they most certainly deserve by those publications. And those two are Freemasonry and John Paul II.

Since the conspiracy of Freemasonry has been expertly treated in seven different articles in this newsletter by Mr. Weiskittel over the past several years, there is no need to discuss the subject in any detail here. It is an indisputable fact that the ultimate objective of Freemasonry is to destroy completely the religious and political order of the world. Over the past two-and-a-half centuries numerous Popes have condemned it in the strongest language, describing it in such terms as "ill-famed," "ultra-criminal," a "foul plague," "full of the spirit of Satan," etc. Freemasonry is, in a word, one of the most powerful and anti-God and anti-civil government organizations in the world from which nothing less than "the total dissolution of human society can be expected" (Pope Pius IX — 1873) unless this diabolical conspiracy is totally unmasked and crushed. And its horrendous aims "just happen" to coincide very nicely with those of the conspiratorial Insiders (many of whom are undoubtedly Masons themselves) now fashioning the One World Order. Hardly a coincidence, of course.

Why is it then, I ask, that even some of the best of the nationally circulated, conservative, secular publications (four of which I regularly receive and read) very rarely even so much as mention, much less give any significant attention to, the "foul plague" of Freemasonry which assuredly is playing a prime role in the ongoing destruction of Christian civilization so evident today to so many of us? While the publications to which I refer do a very commendable job of exposing numerous organizations and movements and individuals in the enemy camp, they virtually ignore the conspiracy of Freemasonry. Because these publications are so very honest and straightforward in their treatment of so many other similarly hostile forces, why do they consistently bypass one of the most powerful forces of evil in the world — Freemasonry? And are not they thereby contributing by their silence on this vital subject to the advance of the satanic forces which they otherwise so rightly and so well oppose? I hate to think that this silence is, in fact, a cover-up of Freemasonry but I must say that it certainly appears to be.

And the same conservative secular publications which ignore Freemasonry do likewise regarding John Paul II. Obviously, I am not referring here to the question of his invalidity, a subject which is rather exclusively a Roman Catholic one. But John Paul II, in addition to being the head of the Conciliar Church, is also one of the major figures among the conspiratorial forces at work today in establishing the One World Order, being, I firmly believe, as deeply involved in that nefarious project as are his two friends and coconspirators, George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev. And yet, not so much is the slightest hint ever given of this in those conservative publications to which I refer. *(continued on page eight)*

Editorial Note: The following article was written during the latter part of November, 1990. The reader should keep this in mind because there have been since that time some changes relating to the Persian Gulf situation.

The Persian Gulf Crisis And American Sovereignty

John Kenneth Weiskittel

Thanksgiving Day 1990. Families around the nation have an unexpected reason to be thankful this year. So far, the 230,000 U.S. troops stationed in Saudi Arabia have yet to see any combat action. Before leaving for the 34-nation Conference on Cooperation and Security in Europe and talks with Arab leaders, and for his carefully orchestrated Thanksgiving pep talk to the troops, President George Bush talked to reporters in the Rose Garden. "Perhaps their sacrifice," he said, referring to American hostages and soldiers in the Persian Gulf, "will make those of us at home this Thanksgiving Day reflect even more deeply..."

What has deepened in the minds of Americans in the nearly four months since Iraq's invasion of Kuwait is *confusion*. Confusion over *why* the defense of a tiny sheikdom 6,000 miles away concerns us. Confusion over *what* precisely are our objectives in launching Operation Desert Shield. Confusion over *who* is benefiting from our presence there. Confusion over *when* our troops will be returning home. Confusion over *what* flag they are actually serving. And confusion over *where* this operation is leading our country — and the world.

Evidence of this confusion is everywhere. Ask Americans why our troops are over there and you're apt to get a variety of responses. Oil. Jobs. American interests. To free the hostages. To push the Iraquis out of Kuwait. To defend Saudi Arabia. To defend Israel. To prevent Iraq's dictator Saddam Hussein from realizing nuclear capabilities. To overthrow him. To act as "regional security" police. To do Japan's and Europe's "dirty work" for them. And no doubt there are other variations as well. But the single most important reason for U.S. presence in Saudi Arabia — and, in all probability, the *only* genuine one — is likely to be the one you're least apt to hear (that is, of course, unless you happen to know someone in the Council on Foreign Relations — the CFR). When, on September 11th, President Bush addressed the nation to announce the deployment of troops, he gave as one of five objectives the following: "The crisis in the Persian Gulf, as grave as it is, also offers a rare opportunity to move toward a historic period of cooperation. Out of these troubled times our fifth objective — a new world order — can emerge." To this he added: "We are now in sight of a United Nations that performs as envisioned by its founders."

As this article is being written, Bush has maintained this position although he still attempts to temper it by talking about "national security" or "innocent lives." In an exclusive essay, "Why We Are in the Gulf," published in the November 26th issue of *Newsweek*, he writes of the "immediate and unwavering" response by the "international community" and of his Administration's promise "to continue the effective implementation of the United Nations sanctions." The President expresses confidence that with the success of Operation Desert Shield:

> ...We will have invigorated a United Nations that contributes as its founders dreamed. We will have established principles for international conduct and the means to enforce them. In short, we will have taken a major step toward a community of nations bound by a common commitment to peace and restraint. This is something Americans and peace-loving peoples have long sought. Out of this difficult time of testing, we have the extraordinary opportunity to make this dream a reality.

Iraq's invasion "is not just a case of petty aggression," he argues. "We stand now at a singular moment. The civilized world is now in the process of fashioning the rules that will govern the new world order beginning to emerge in the aftermath of the Cold War."

The meaning of these words is lost, no doubt, to a majority of Americans, as is the fact that the phrase *new world order* is similarly favored by Bush's Soviet counterpart, Mikhail Gorbachev. What is not lost on them is the anxiety that grows every day. The tenor of the country is well captured by Steven V. Roberts, a Senior Writer for *U.S. News & World Report*, when he notes:

> ...In hundreds of thousands of homes this year there will be an empty chair where a soldier used to sit, and nobody knows when — or if — it will be filled again. The correspondents, who proclaimed months ago that the "post-Vietnam syndrome" was buried in the sands of Saudi Arabia, may well have spoken too soon. The

parents of today's soldiers belong the the Vietnam generation, and for them the memories have not faded. They remain deeply suspicious of any President who talks about war and, as they give thanks this week for their blessings, they are also asking increasingly urgent questions: Why have their children been sent to that distant desert? What vital national interests are really at stake there? (November 26, 1990, "The growing call to talk turkey on the Gulf," p. 9)

And the same questions are being asked in that "distant desert." Father (Lt.) Jim Ingram, a Conciliar "Catholic" Navy chaplain aboard the USS *Raleigh* in the Persian Gulf, reports that the morale of servicemen is low and says one of the major questions being repeated is: "Are we being supported back in the U.S. or is this another Vietnam? (Cited, Mary K. St. Pierre, "Mail means 'home' for servicemen overseas," *The Florida Catholic*, October 19, 1990, p. 1) While it is anyone's guess whether another no-win war is on the horizon or if our troops stationed there will even see combat, certain disturbing facts are known. In the pages that follow we will examine some of these and their implications on our nation's future.

Hussein's Hostages . . . Or Bush's?

During the Iran-Contra hearings two questions that were heard coming from the lips of Congressmen and television news anchormen was: "How much did the President know? And when did he know it?" These are queries that Americans, with their country teetering on the brink of another undeclared war, ought to be asking about the present crisis. The answers are available, though, as is so often the case, ignored by the mass media. They are answers, however, that should alarm and infuriate because they suggest that our government is callously using American lives as pawns to advance an internationalist agenda in the manner of such classic deceits as the *Lusitania* and Pearl Harbor.

On more than one occasion, President Bush has likened Hussein to Adolf Hitler, and no one who has any acquaintance with the Iraqi tyrant's career will object to such a characterization (aside from pointing out, perhaps, that Saddam is strictly a minor leaguer in the "naked aggression" game). His use of poison gas in the war with Iran and in subduing the Kurdish segment of his own country has helped identify him as such, as has the summary executions of an estimated 300 military officers who protested against the attack on Kuwait.

Now, we know about these executions from our intelligence network in the Middle East. Are we supposed to believe, then, that our government had no idea that the Iraquis were gearing up for a strike against Kuwait? This is what George "Read My Lips" Bush expects us to believe. But don't believe it, warns conservative reporter Jane H. Ingraham. In her article, "Iraq and the New World Order," published in the October 8th issue of *The New American*, Ingraham writes:

> The first deception put across by George Bush was his claim of having been surprised by the Iraqi invasion. So important was it for him to appear to have been taken off base that he even ran the risk of sacrificing the reputation of the CIA and appearing to be a naive fool himself. On the morning following the invasion, in a remarkable interview with reporters, he said that he had "trusted" Hussein's "promise" to two Arab presidents that he would not invade. "But," Mr. Bush blurted out, "he lied!" (p. 5)

Remarkable, indeed, is the peculiarity of the suggestion that a man later compared to Hitler could have been perceived as honorable and worthy of our confidence. Somehow, we're led to believe, this "responsible" leader was seized overnight by a demon of conquest and transformed into a power-hungry, frothing-at-the-mouth lunatic.

Could Mr. "No New Taxes" be so politically ignorant as to believe such a thing? Are our undercover operatives over there for the sun and sand? Are our spy satellites merely surveying a site for the next domed stadium? Hardly. Ingraham states that "it would be difficult for Saddam Hussein to surprise Mr. Bush" and asserts: "There is no question that Mr. Bush knew the invasion was coming well in advance; there is even more evidence that he knew much more than this..." (*Ibid.*) Before examining the evidence concerning what was known concerning the Kuwaiti affair, let's consider what Bush and others in our government knew about Hussein.

What is often swept under the rug when the Hitler comparisons are being made is that Saddam Hussein's political lineage is such as to make him, more accurately, another *Josef Stalin*. Donald S. McAlvany, in the October, 1990 issue of *The McAlvany Intellignce Advisor* (*M.I.A.*), tells us:

> It should be remembered that Saddam Hussein is a hard-core Marxist-Leninist communist revolutionary, trained by the Soviet General (Military) Staff (in Russia) as was Kim II Sung (North Korea), Daniel Ortega, Fidel Castro, etc. Hussein is Soviet to the core — right down to the red flashings on his Red Army-like uniform. Hussein, like Fidel Castro (in 1958), Colonel Kadafy (in 1969), and Daniel Ortega (in 1979), *was placed in power as a Soviet puppet by the Soviets in 1979.* (p. 13)

We've already mentioned the war with Iran, initiated in 1980 by Hussein, which lasted eight years and left one million dead, 1.7 million wounded and 1.5 million refugees. McAlvany writes: "(Hussein) recently executed a British journalist and he once shot one of his own cabinet members who disagreed with him, at point-blank range during a cabinet meeting. When an Iranian-backed Shiite organization was formed to disrupt his rule, he executed 600 members in 1984." (*M.I.A.*, August, 1990, p. 2)

Given such a record, how could George Bush have been shocked at Hussein's deceit? After all, the U.S. already *knew* that he was a bloodthirsty Soviet surrogate with one of the worst human rights records in the world. Such knowledge means that our government must have already opposed this vicious terrorist regime long before the current crisis — doesn't it? Guess again. Ingraham states that not only had the Soviets sustained it but America and other nations now supporting anti-Iraqi sanctions sustained it as well:

> ...Since 1983, Iraq has received $5 billion in vital food subsidies, $141 million in direct export subsidies since 1985 and $2.5 billion in export loan guarantees since 1988. Iraq has been the largest single export market for U.S. rice, while the Commodity Credit Corporation has lent $2.3 billion. The British, too, were a major trading partner, while the French sold him fighter planes (at U.S. urging) and the nuclear reactor that was destroyed (to world condemnation) by the Israelis in 1981. The Germans made him mustard gas. (*Op. cit.*, p. 10)

In other words, we knew full well of his brutality and yet, while doling out billions, we conveniently looked the other way. (Note that the loans continued to flow even after 37 sailors were killed aboard the U.S. frigate *Stark* when it was hit by Iraqi missiles on May 17, 1987).

Presumably, Bush was convinced that all of this aid had succeeded in making for a "kinder, gentler" Iraq. Whatever the case, he had plenty of advanced warning about the present danger. Consider the following chronology of the events surrounding Saddam's August 2nd invasion:

July 17 — According to French intelligence sources, Colonel General Albert Makashov, one of the Soviets' top General Staff planners, arrives in Baghdad to meet with Iraqi leaders. He is a specialist in tank and tactical warfare. (October M.I.A., p. 12, and the August 23rd *Washington Times* article carried in the October issue of Dr. David Nobel's *Summit Journal*, p. 7)

July 24 — The CIA is aware "that Iraq has moved enough battle units that a strike at Kuwait appeared imminent." (Ingraham, p. 5)

August 1 — Secretary of State James Baker, while conducting talks in the U.S.S.R. with the Soviets' Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, tells him that the CIA was monitoring the Iraqi troop buildup. "We hope you'll try to restrain those guys," Baker reportedly said. (Margaret Garrard Warner, "The Moscow Connection," *Newsweek*, September 17, 1990, p. 24)

August 7 — In the six months preceding the invasion, Soviet arms sales to Iraq were at *double* the rates typical in the 1980's. *New York Times* correspondent Peter Schweitzer observed on August 22nd that "...photoreconnaissance and other intelligence sources show critical Soviet military shipments reaching Baghdad as late as August 7 — a full five days after the invasion was launched and the (Soviet-endorsed) embargo was announced..." (October *Summit Journal*, pp. 7-8)

All the signs were there for the Bush Administration to be on guard. Could it be that somehow this information was not reaching the President's desk? Not likely. Jane Ingraham reminds us:

> ...The two top Insiders in charge of intelligence, CIA Director William Webster (CFR) and National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft (CFR), were hand delivering information to the White House for days beforehand. Whatever was going on covertly, we know there was a long string of overt warnings, with Hussein advertising his intentions at least three weeks in advance. Although these were brushed aside as "blusterings," the movement of tens of thousands of troops and war equipment cannot be camouflaged, nor accomplished overnight, even in this day of modern miracles. (p. 5)

So, how much *did* President Bush know and *when* did he know it? From the foregoing, it is evident that he knew the sort of ruler he was facing and that in the days prior to the invasion there was sufficent proof that the 3,000 Americans in Kuwait and 600 in Iraq were in harm's way and needed to be immediately alerted. "Yet the trusting President sounded no alarm," writes Ingraham, "nor was there a word of warning to (Americans in the region — JKW) while there

was still time to get out. As a result of Mr. Bush's inaction, the fate of thousands of men, women and children has become the most inflammatory issue of the crisis and is determining the type of response Mr. Bush can pursue against Iraq..." (*Ibid.* About 1,100 U.S. citizens are still in Iraq and Kuwait [as of November 28, 1990] and Hussein has threatened to use them as "human shields" to prevent air strikes on military bases, oil fields, etc.)

If syndicated columnist Joseph Sobran is *correct* (as he likely is in this case), the U.S. embassy personnel in Kuwait aren't really "hostages," as the news media (and the President) have insisted. According to Sobran:

> ...The President is keeping them in our embassy in Kuwait to make the point that the United States doesn't recognize Iraq's annexation of Kuwait, *but they are free to leave at any time. Iraq isn't forcing them to stay; Bush is.* They constitute the chip on his shoulder ("Destruction Ahead," *The Wanderer*, November 15, 1990, p. 6. Emphasis added)

George Bush takes umbrage at such charges, stating: "I don't think anyone — even the most cynical — would ever suggest that a President would play politics with the lives of American kids halfway around the world. I'm offended that anybody would suggest that, and I don't think that any decent, honorable person would." (Cited, *ibid.*) Decent? Honorable? Like Bush's buddies — Gorbachev, Nelson Mandela and Deng Xiaoping? Sadly, the history of our nation demonstrates that Presidents *have* played politics with American lives and we are forced to speculate with Jane Ingraham when she writes: "As George Bush keeps reminding us that the hostages are his 'constant concern,' one begins to wonder whether they are Saddam Hussein's pawns or George Bush's."

Gorbachev — *Whose* Ally?

One of the most detestable, though thoroughly predictable, developments emerging from the Persian Gulf crisis has been the growing U.S./Soviet partnership. Fifty years ago was the last instance of such open cooperation — we joined the U.S.S.R. in battling Hitler. Now Bush has publicly called Gorbachev an "ally" in battling the Iraqi Hitler, even suggesting he send troops to fight next to ours!

The propaganda blitz for Mikhail Gorbachev has moved to a new stage in recent months. In early September he met with Bush at the Helsinki Summit to establish a "joint peace-keeping venture" in the Persian Gulf. A month later, Gorbachev was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. (We aren't sure why he won it. Perhaps it had something to do with the way he "kept the peace" in Lithuania by rolling the tanks into Vilnus when the natives took *perestroika* a bit too literally. As we write — late November — he has furthered the cause of "peace" by authorizing Soviet troops stationed there to shoot into any "disruptive" groups protesting the presence of the occupying Red Army.) In November he was jetsetting his way around Western Europe: first to Rome, where he was "chumming it up" with John Paul II (a "papal" visit to Russia is planned for 1991), and then on to Paris, where he took part in the Conference on Cooperation and Security in Europe. Lost in all this euphoria is the unsettling truth about the Soviets playing both sides of the fence in the Iraqi invasion.

We've already alluded to the fact that Soviet arms shipments continued to Iraq even after the invasion. While Gorbachev is being touted as anti-Hussein in the Western press, the Soviet press has excused the Iraqi strike and quoted the Comrade Peace Prize winner as unswerving in his support of Iraq. Don McAlvany reveals:

> On August 3, Moscow's *Red Star* (p. 3) said that "*Hussein would not have acted as he did toward Kuwait without the precedent of America's 'criminal' invasions of Grenada and Panama.*" On August 10, while Bush and the whole Western media were describing Gorbachev as "wholeheartedly pro-West in his stance on Iraq," the Soviet leader told *Pravda* (p. 1) that he sought to "*enhance Moscow's traditional support of Iraq*" and "*there is nothing anti-Iraq in Soviet policy on the crisis.*" Page one in Moscow but the U.S. media completely spiked it.!" (October *M.I.A.*, p. 12)

And yet we see the Soviets supporting U.N. sanctions — what gives?

Don't ask George Bush; the last we heard he was parroting Red propaganda. Such as? Such as on the number of Soviet advisers still in Iraq. Commenting on the September summit, Rowland Evans and Robert Novak state the Soviet claim: "President Bush chose to look the other way at more than a mere 193 Soviet advisers that Moscow admits keeping on in Iraq. Indeed, Soviet-Iraq continuing military ties involve shared intelligence and new contacts since the invasion of Kuwait that the Kremlin has so vigorously condemned in public..." (Cited, October *Summit Journal*, p. 8) So how many are *really* over there. According to McAlvany:

> The State Department quietly acknowledged in the *New York Times* (September 22, 1990) that before the invasion the Soviets had 10,000 advisers in Iraq and that they still have at least 5,000 advisers there. Western intelligence sources believe the number is presently 8,000-9,000 advisers, with 3,000-4,000 of those military advisers, and many of the rest (so-called Soviet citizens) are KGB... (October *M.I.A.*, p. 12)

Could it be that the President was also in the dark about the $25 billion in military aid that the Soviets have provided to Hussein or about the "estimated 400 Soviet specialists (who) actually readied the key weapons systems employed in the invasion of Kuwait? (John F. McManus, "Our 'Ally,' Mikhail Gorbachev," *The New American*, November 5, 1990, p. 17)

Don McAlvany, for one, doesn't think so. In fact, he charges:

> There has to be a hidden agenda. Bush's intelligence (brains or spy network, Don?) is not so bad that he does not know about the magnitude of the Soviet involvement in Iraq. *He has deliberately covered up that involvement and lied about the number of Soviet advisers involved* (he claims there are only 150-200). Why? (October *M.I.A.*, p. 14. Recall that the Kremlin admits to 193 advisers.)

Another harsh critic, Jane Ingraham, states:

> Although reports of the 8,000 Soviet advisers and technicians greasing the Iraqi war machine to kill Americans had been denied by the Pentagon as early as August 15th, it was not until September 4th that it became clear that Mr. Bush had known about this "minor detail" all along. Perhaps, it was speculated, he might ask for their withdrawal when he met with his good friend Gorbachev; but not to worry, for the only reason the Soviets are there is because they are under "contract"; they had nothing to do with the invasion, the Soviets assured us. Later, at their meeting in Helsinki, Mr. Bush didn't even ask for their removal as he pledged billions in U.S. aid to the Soviets; they are "not a major irritant," he said. (*Op. cit.*, p. 12)

She follows this up by bluntly declaring, "Mr. Bush knew — and lied about — the crucial Soviet presence before the invasion..."

A new wrinkle has entered the picture as these last pages are being written, and may well have begun to play itself out as you read this. On November 26, the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council (the U.S., Britain, France, China and the Soviet Union) unanimously voted to issue an ultimatum to Iraq: Withdraw from Kuwait by sometime in January or be evicted by "all necessary means." Perhaps it's puzzled you why we only hear of U.S. hostages, British hostages, German hostages, etc.,... but never *Soviet* hostages! Well, wonder no more. According to an article in the *Tampa Tribune*, at the time of the U.N. resolution "the Soviet Union demanded that Iraq release more than 3,000 Soviet citizens stranded there, charging for the first time that Baghdad was preventing them from leaving." ("Resolution gives Iraq deadline," Novemer 27, 1990, p. 1) And if you believe that Hussein is really holding these "citizens" against their will, Gorby has a nice piece of beachfront property in Siberia he'd like to sell you.

My U.N. 'Tis Of Thee?

The greatest tragedy of the Persian Gulf crisis — aside from the human lives that may be lost — is that its primary objective appears to be to further the utopian One World government dreams of the CFR schemers and their cohorts. Or, as the President puts it, "a United Nations that performs as envisioned by its founders." He has forgotten (conveniently?) that his oath of office binds him to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States," *not* the Charter of the United Nations.

Some have speculated an apocalytic (in the literal sense) scenario emerging from the crisis, while others are fretful over a possible Communist invasion of America while our defenses are down. Our own view is that it is still a bit early in the endgame for either of these events to happen very soon. (Just the same, don't give up your guns!) What we *do* see as certain is the continued glorification of the Insiders' goals: in general, the furthering of the *new world order* agenda of a unified global political system and, specifically, calls for the strengthening of the United Nations as the vehicle for world government. And Gorbachev most likely will be a winner, his selection as Peace Prize recipient given additional phony luster by his role as "mediator" in the crisis. A prompt cessation of hostilities, amounting to little or no American fatalities, will win him new friends here as the man who prevented another Vietnam from occurring. And it will pave the way for more U.S.-Soviet joint "crisis management" ventures. Any prolonged U.S. presence will undoubtedly be exploited as the pretense by which Moslem extremists call for a *jihad* (holy war) against the "Great Satan" and its imperialist lacky, Israel. Our objective should be to free the hostages and then withdraw as soon as possible. While Iraq's army is young (with many in their early teens) and their weapons old, their sheer numbers could mean costly casualties for us. And those figures could go up dramatically if Saddam Hussein is able to secure any sizable reinforcements from other Arab states.

George Bush ran, among other things, on a pledge to be an "environmental president," but what we desperately need is an "energy president" (not to mention a Red, White and Blue one!). We need to be energy self-sufficient, yet Bush has spent the first two years in the Oval Office placing further restrictions on domestic explorations and production. We need to continue to speak out against the federal budget crisis, which isn't going away despite the fact

that efforts are being made to distract our attention from it. And we must continue to argue against another no-win war, against aid to the Soviets and against a policy that places U.N. goals above U.S. interests.

"In God We Trust"

Our prayers must continue for Bush, Gorbachev and other world leaders. *All things* are possible with God, even the miraculous conversion of a George Bush. And it may well require a miracle with Bush for, as John McManus laments, "he continues to refer to the smiling Gorbachev as his ally and good friend. In an eerie way, the two really have become allies, both openly seeking 'a new world order' under U.N. control. God help our troops in the Middle East; and God help America!" How much more readily would that divine help arrive if our beloved Republic would only give its heart freely to the merciful reign of Christ the King. †

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

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.

ONE WORLD GOVERNMENT

"The coming of the world state is longed for, and confidently expected, by all the worst and most distorted elements. This state, based on the principles of absolute equality of men and a community of possessions, would banish all national loyalties. In it no acknowledgement would be made of the authority of a father over his children, or of God over human society. If these ideas are put into practice, there will inevitably follow a reign of unheard-of terror." — *Pope Benedict XV (July 25, 1920)*

THE MASS

Amid all the features of greatness and grandeur that Almighty God has bestowed upon His Church, there is nothing more glorious, nothing more sublime, nothing more awesome than the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. It is the supreme act of man's worship of God, a spiritual treasure of inestimable worth, a supernatural drama of unsurpassed beauty. It is the heart and center of our divine Faith, the prayer par excellence of the Roman Catholic Church, the focal point around which the entire life of Christ's Mystical Body revolves, "the fountainhead of all the blessings of redemption." †

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 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.

Thou Shalt Love The Lord Thy God

Fr. Oswald Baker (England)

It is not easy to give a precise and complete definition of holiness. One could faithfully keep all the Ten Commandments and so have moral rectitude. He could be humble, kind, selfless, generous, a model citizen — and yet be without holiness. The essential factor which makes mere goodness into holiness is the *motive* prompting you to live a good and virtuous life. Holiness requires that your motive be — love for God. Holiness consists essentially in the union of your will with the will of God, by love. Truly to love God is to cleave to Him with all your strength, to find your endearing joy and delight only in Him, in Whom alone all our love must terminate. Creatures, howsoever beautiful, good, attractive, holy, are yet properly destined only to help us towards a closer union with God, our Supreme End. To be attached to any creature for that creature's own sake, without reference to God, is to fall short of the order willed by God. We shall conform to that order so long as our love for any other human being remains predominantly a benevolent love, a positive, active desire for that person's well-being and happiness. The true, noble, godly love that we call charity means self-abandonment to God, with self-sacrificing, benevolent love for all our fellowmen for God's sake. A soul imbued and vitalized with such love will be a sanctuary of imperturbable peace.

Perfect interior peace, tranquility of order in the soul, is assuredly one of God's greatest gifts to man. Unless the soul be at peace the action of God within us is impeded. Peace of soul requires that we use God's gifts only to lead us to their Giver, refraining from any perversion of the goods of this world to merely selfish purposes. To see self and the world in true perspective, in relation to God and eternity, is to lay the foundation of true peace of soul and true happiness.

So varied are men's notions of happiness that we might be tempted to think that no one standard of happiness for all can be defined. But this is not so. What makes for human happiness is no more a matter of individual choice than is what makes for good health. The diet that a man personally considers to be healthy may prove his poison, and where he looks for happiness he may find only wretchedness and sorrow. Man must live according to the requirements of his physical nature, his bodily constitution, if he is to be healthy; and according to his whole nature, but especially his mental and moral constitution, if he is to be truly happy. And human nature is specifically the same for all. Also universally, the desires of human nature are insatiable. Our aspirations are unlimited, the human mind and heart reaching beyond what this life holds for us. This is not, of course, *consciously* so with every individual. It is possible to neglect development of the intellect and will and live a life of sensual indulgence, or a life stunted by absorption in the goods and affairs of this world. The cares of this world, Our Lord warned us, are the weeds that stifle our higher, fully human yearnings, which will never find complete satisfaction except in God. It is a perversion of right order and progress when man makes any creature the ultimate object of his energies. He will exhaust his energies in vain, finding only failure.

Here as well as hereafter we find no true satisfaction but in God. No object less than the Infinite and Eternal is worthy of the service of an immortal soul. God alone is the true goal of human development. In the Sermon on the Mount Our Lord deals mainly with the love of riches as the obstacle to our undivided service of God, but what is true of money is true also of every other possible object of human devotion that might divert us from the love and service of God. Whether the competition comes from wealth or ambition or human affection it is always to be set aside if it cannot be reconciled with love for God, our Creator and our Last End. †

Two Major Enemies Get Silent Treatment

(continued from page one)

If John Paul II is not one of the top Insiders, he is, I have no doubt, one of their very close confidants. Assuredly, he is in the camp of the enemy. But, if I and many others know this, certainly the highly informed and very capable conservative editors and writers I have in mind must likewise know it. Why, then, do they remain silent about it? (The same point can readily be made regarding the conservative journals aligned with the Conciliar Church. They never so much as hint — and they *must* know — that their "Holy Father" is a wolf in sheep's clothing.)

And so, even the best of the current, nationally circulated, conservative, secular publications (dealing with the Conspiracy, world government, etc.) are, I submit, open to grave criticism by their failure to identify and to expose two of the principal evil forces on the world scene today. For whatever reasons, Freemasonry and John Paul II are apparently immune from attack, exempt from exposure in the pages of those publications. Why? Can this silent treatment of two of the enemy's major instruments of destruction be justified? Of course not. †