THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume X, No. 8 † December 1, 1989

Secrets of the Second World War

John Kenneth Weiskittel

On September 1, 1939, German armed forces invaded Poland, setting in motion World War II. In terms of the sheer number of those who fought and died, of civilian casualties, of the scope of military, naval and aerial operations, and of the devastation of cities and countrysides, it remains a conflict without equal in the annals of history. It has inspired more books, perhaps, than all other wars combined.

Now, fifty years after the war began, there have been any number of reports analyzing its causes and consequences. For the week of August 28/September 4, 1989, *U.S. News & World Report* devoted a double issue to the topic. The magazine's cover has a painting of a maniacal-looking Adolf Hitler and the headline, "Hitler's War Against The World," while the contents page bears a photograph of the German dictator with the caption, "Adolf Hitler: The one man responsible for World War II."

This example is representative of much of the coverage we're seeing. The underlying method seems to be one of invoking Hitler's ghost and pinning all the blame there. In truth, however, this approach is far too simplistic and fails to take a great deal into account. It may be convenient to finger Hitler as the lone culprit, but is it *accurate?*

What such articles do is to perpetuate myths that some—including America's enemies—are happy to see flourishing. The following study will examine a few of these and look at the secret side of that great conflict.

The Phony Peace

World War II may, in certain respects, be said to have been an inevitable consequence of the peace negotiations that followed the First World War. When the terms of the treaty, signed at Versailles in 1919, were announced, France's war hero, Marshal Ferdinand Foch, made an astute observation. "This is not peace," he stated, "It is an armistice for twenty years."

As has been asserted in these pages before, World War I was precipitated by the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand, heir to the Catholic Hapsburg throne that ruled the Austro-Hungarian Empire, an act planned, ordered and carried out by Freemasonry. The war succeeded in destroying that empire and with it the strongest Catholic monarchy in Europe—and in the world. Leon de Poncins, one of the major Catholic authorities on secret societies in our century, revealed in his book, *Societé des Nations, Super-État Maçonnique (League of Nations, Masonic Superstate),* that a Masonic Congress held in Paris in June, 1917, mapped out the destruction of the Austrian Empire as well as the establishment of the League of Nations. (Cited, Father Denis Fahey, C.S.SP., *The Mystical Body of Christ and the Reorganization of Society,* Regina, 1984 ed., p. 110)

The Versailles Treaty is firmly linked to the League of Nations. In discussing American President Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points and their influence over the proceedings, historian Nesta Webster relates:

> The League of Nations Covenant was accepted at a plenary session of the Peace Conference on April 18, 1919. The counsels of President Wilson were again allowed to prevail in the matter of the Treaty of Versailles, signed on June 28 of the same year, and included the Covenant of the League of Nations as its first twenty-six articles. With the ratification of the Treaty on January 10, 1920, the League began its official existence and held its first Council six days later. (*Surrender of an Empire,* London, 1931, p. 34)

There is some evidence that Wilson was a Mason (though his name rarely appears in lists of presidents with Lodge ties). According to Webster, a French Catholic publication of 1919 charged that Masonry in France and its colonies toasted his efforts. In the fall of 1918, she writes, the *Comitè de Vigilance et d'Action Maçonnique* of Algiers cabled to their "'illustrious Brother Wilson their most fraternal homage and congratulations on his Masonic work in the War for the rights and liberties of the people'—to which the secretary of President Wilson replied with thanks." (p. 59. Webster also gives a number of examples of quotes from official Masonic sources showing their role in and support of the League of Nations, including a call by the Grand Lodge of France for "the formation of a United States of Europe, or rather a Federation of the World.")

For Germany, the reparations demanded by the Versailles Treaty amounted to the equivalent of billions of dollars. In addition, it had lands seized and given to France and Poland. British Prime Minister Lloyd George went so far as to label the Kaiser a "war criminal" and suggested he be executed. (Whatever the extent of his culpability, the Kaiser

was hardly alone in such acts. He was, for example, joined in abetting the conspirators who toppled Russian Czar Nicholas II by American and British financiers such as Paul Warburg and Lord Alfred Milner. For some reason, Lloyd George didn't denounce *their* activities. Neither did he condemn the deceitful way American and British passengers were allowed to board the Lusitania, a British liner used to transport munitions. Its sinking by the German navy was an incident used to lead a neutral United States into war.) So harsh and unchristian were the terms placed on Germany that Pope Benedict XV, whose counsels for peace during the war were ignored, expressed distress to those around him, but "knew that if he had said one word in protest, that same world would have called down upon him the fire and brimstone of its disorderly thinking." (Walter H. Peters, *The Life of Benedict XV,* Bruce, 1959, p. 174) This did not prevent His Holiness from speaking indirectly. Peters writes:

> Although Benedict himself kept a discreet silence, *Civilta Cattolica,* whose editor was in close touch with the Pope, spoke out, sharply indicting the treaty as a travesty of a conciliatory act. The four hundred and forty so-called "Articles of Peace" the periodical denounced as "Articles of War." "In those articles of a treaty promised us for so long a time and given to the world as the very epitome of political sagacity, there is evident a consecration to hatred, a tone inspired by the spirit of revenge, a perpetuation of war." With these all too prophetic words the famed Italian Jesuit publication characterized the Treaty of Versailles. (*Ibid.*)

And it *was* a perpetuation of war. Not only was Germany a defeated nation but it soon became an impoverished one as well. The economic depression there was as bad an any experienced anywhere, possibly worse. The mark became so devalued as to be practically worthless. In addition, the restrictions placed on the German military were such as to virtually *invite* violations. Not surprisingly, a great bitterness began welling up among Germans, a bitterness that would be exploited to the hilt by Adolf Hitler.

The Hitler-Stalin Pact

It could never happen. Or so political pundits in the West believed. A friendship pact between Soviet dictator Josef Stalin and his German "archenemy," Hitler? Yet, on August 23, 1939, little more than a week before Germany invaded Poland, just such a document was signed by representatives of the two powers. The nonaggression agreement included sections that carved up a fair portion of Eastern Europe between Nazi Germany and the Communist Soviet Union. Hitler would take most of Poland, while Stalin's spoils were to be eastern Poland and Finland and the Baltic states (Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania).

But how could Hitler, who gained power in part by his appeal to anti-Communists, have cut a deal with Stalin? John Toland, a Hitler biographer, provides part of the answer when he writes:

> On the face of it, Stalin and Hitler *were* most unlikely allies. What could they possibly have in common? In fact, there were a number of similarities. One admired Peter the Great while the other saw himself as the heir of Frederick the Great. Both were advocates of ruthless force and operated under ideologies that were not essentially different. Communists and Nazis alike were self-righteous and dogmatic; both were totalitarian and both believed that the end justified the means, sanctifying injustice, as it were, in the name of the state and progress. (*Adolf Hitler,* Doubleday, 1976, p. 542)

Others have observed that Hitler sought the U.S.S.R.'s natural resources and Stalin, whose Communists were still struggling to win the hearts of the Russian people, sought an opportunity to consolidate military force before the Nazis turned on them.

Of course, Hitler's overall war strategy was also a consideration. "Without the Soviet Union on their side, neither England nor France would do more than mouth threats," writes Toland. "In addition he was assured of getting from the East all those raw materials he might be deprived of by a possible British blockade." (p. 548) But the Nazi Fuehrer, it turns out, was outsmarted in this diplomatic chess match. After Germany stunned Poland with its blitzkrieg, Russia—according to the terms of the pact—was to strike with its army into eastern Poland. On September 3 Britain and France declared war on Germany, but the Soviets had yet to enter Poland—in fact, it was not until the 17th, after the Poles were already subjugated, that their troops moved in. It is worth recalling the duplicitous manner they employed at that time:

> ...At 4 A.M. local time the Red Army crossed the long eastern frontier of Poland. At one point men of the Polish Frontier Corps saw a horde of horse-drawn carts filled with soldiers coming through the morning mist. "Don't shoot," shouted the Red Army men, "we've come to help you against the Germans." The defenders were so confused—white flags were attached to the leading Russian vehicles—that the Soviets passed through many places without receiving a shot. It was the end of eastern Poland. (Toland, p. 583)

Despite the undeniable Soviet complicity in the rape of Poland there was *no* declaration of war issued by any Allied nation. And there wouldn't be one two months later when the U.S.S.R. attacked Finland. *Why?* Was there fear that such an act might cement Nazi-Soviet relations and thus turn loose a two-headed monster to ravage Europe? Or, perhaps, there was the hope that the Reds might come in handy later in fighting the more immediate threat posed by Hitler. To be certain, Stalin had his share of Western admirers. Not unlike Gorbachev today, leftists of the 1930's tried to portray Stalin as a great leader, lavishing him with loving monikers like "Uncle Joe."

For decades since the war there has been an effort, even in the West, to minimize Stalin's role in starting World War II. He was, after all, the leader of an "ally." The special *U.S. News* issue does devote a few paragraphs to the Hitler-Stalin pact but these are little more than a footnote when compared to the lengthy article it carries on Hitler and his dreams of world conquest. (Isn't this also the goal of the Communists?) Even in this era of *glasnost*, when Stalin's crimes are more or less admitted, there is the tendency to whitewash his role and suggest that his motivation was of a defensive nature. The facts, however, show otherwise.

The (Not So) Grand Alliance

Is it proper, in time of war, for a government to lie to its people for the purpose of aiding the war effort? This was the question that faced the Allied nations in World War II. Regretfully, the conclusion reached was *yes*. The falsehoods proved to be no smaller than Hitler's "big lie" since they revolved around convincing the Western nations that the Soviet Union was a worthy and honorable partner.

Part of the problem in getting the United States to enter the war was to show that there was an appreciable difference between Nazi and Communist forms of totalitarianism. Many Americans felt that there *wasn't*, and that we would do better to remain neutral and let the two fight it out between themselves. But patriots like Father Charles Coughlin and Charles Lindbergh soon found they were hit with the "pro-Nazi" tar brush.

The first aid to Stalin was in the form of Lend-Lease in 1941. The Churches, which at that time were not so thoroughly corrupted as at present, greatly objected to this scheme. Journalist Benjamin Colby states:

> There was strong opposition to war aid to the U.S.S.R. in the ranks of both Protestants and Catholics, the latter especially affected by a 1937 papal encyclical enjoining them against collaborating with communism "in any undertaking whatsoever." (*'Twas a Famous Victory: Deception and Propaganda in the War with Germany*, Arlington House, 1974, p. 39)

Stalin's U.S. supporters had been given the necessary excuse to push for aid when Hitler broke his pact by invading Russia in June of 1941. But the going was still rough for them. President Franklin Roosevelt's intimate, Harry Hopkins, wrote to the British minister of information, lamenting: "We are having some difficulty with our public opinion in regard to Russia. The American people don't take aid to Russia easily." (Cited, Colby, p. 38)

The dilemma faced by the government isn't hard to fathom for, although much of the press even then found much to praise in the Soviet Union, enough of the truth about it had leaked out to the West. To secure the support of Americans it would be necessary to dupe them into thinking the Soviets had changed and were thus less a threat than Germany. Senator Robert M. LaFollette of Wisconsin accurately warned:

> The American people will be told to forget the purges in Russia by the OGPU, the confiscation of property, the persecution of religion, the invasion of Finland, and the vulture role Stalin played in seizing half of prostrate Poland, all of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania. These will be made to seem the acts of a "democracy" preparing to fight Nazism. (Cited, *ibid.*, p. 34)

In short, the American people were being asked no less than to join one devil in fighting another!

But a worse shock was to come when, on December 7, 1941, Japan, an ally of Hitler, attacked the U.S. naval base at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Roosevelt aptly described it as "a date which will live in infamy," but the description is applicable in more than merely his sense of it being a sneak attack. The element of surprise was only experienced by those fated U.S. sailors, as it has since been disclosed by several reputable sources that Roosevelt and his cabinet *knew beforehand* of Japan's intentions. General Albert C. Wedemeyer, commenting on openly provocative acts by FDR prior to our formal entry into the war, stated:

> President Roosevelt has maneuvered us into the war by his patently un-neutral actions against Germany and the final ultimatum to Japan...On December 4, 1941, we received definite information from two independent sources that Japan would attack the United States and Britain but would maintain peace with Russia...On December 6, our intercepts told us that the Japanese were going to strike somewhere the very next day. President Roosevelt had ample time to broadcast a warning which might have caused the Japanese to call off their surprise attack. At any event, we would not have permitted 3,500 Americans to die at Hawaii without an opportunity to fight back. (Cited, Clarence Manion, *The Conservative American*, Devin-Adair, 1964, p. 41)

Even more damning was the following statement of Admiral Husband E. Kimmel, Commander-in-Chief of the Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor at the time of the attack. During an interview in 1958 with *The Manion Forum*, a nationally-broadcast radio program, the retired admiral said:

> I believe those who had seen the intercepted and decoded Japanese messages, including the fourteen-part message received on December 6 and December 7, 1941, knew war with Japan was inevitable and the almost certain objective would be the fleet at Pearl Harbor...*My belief is that General Short and I were not given the information available in Washington and were not informed of the impending attack because it was feared that action in Hawaii might deter the Japanese from making the attack.* (Cited, *ibid.*, pp. 41-42)

FDR, then, *sacrificed* 3,500 Americans to an Alamo-like slaughter to traumatize a nation into action.

(A quick comparison of Wilson and Roosevelt uncovers telling similarities. Both were Democrats and, if Nesta Webster is correct, Freemasons—FDR was 33°. Both administrations advanced socialist policies at home and aided Russian Communism. Both supported world government. And both presidents ran as "peace" candidates, only to draw America into war by similarly despicable acts.)

Hollywood contributed considerably to the propaganda effort, churning out a number of films glorifying the Soviets. This was done in collaboration with the Office of War Information. *Mission to Moscow,* a big budget and highly promoted production, was based on a book that "presented the 1937-38 purges as destroying a German 'fifth column...'" (Colby, p. 79) So overt were its falsehoods that even sympathetic reviewers and the Writers War Board expressed misgivings. "Fifty-two American educators, historians, writers and trade union leaders issued a statement terming it 'the first full-dress example of the kind of propaganda hitherto confined to totalitarian countries...It falsifies history and glorifies dictatorship.'" (*Ibid.,* p. 80) Another pro-Red movie, *The North Star,* featured portrayals of German cruelty at an idyllic Russian commune and of happy Soviet children singing the joys of being the "future generation"—lyrics courtesy of Ira Gershwin. (*Ibid.*) All those in the film business were expected to join in this "patriotic" enterprise. Robert Taylor, one of the leading actors of the day, found that influence in Washington was exerted to prevent him from entering the Navy until he starred in *Song of Russia,* despite his attempts to get out of the cast. (*Ibid,* pp. 80-81) So pervasive was Communist influence in Hollywood that even anti-Communist screen writers had to tone down their films or even include pro-Soviet segments in them.

The Katyn Forest Massacre

No instance of cover-up by the Western Allies was more reprehensible than that surrounding the cold-blooded murder of 14,500 Polish prisoners of war by the Soviets. Again, government and news media worked as one to keep the shocking truth from the people.

During its ill-fated Russian campaign the Germans made a grim discovery. In the Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, they found the bodies of Polish officers (also clergy, educators, political leaders, etc.) thrown into mass graves. The corpses had their hands tied behind them and had been killed by pistol shots to the back of the head. Some appear to have been buried alive. On April 13, 1943, the Germans announced their grisly find over the wireless and offered to produce proof. The International Red Cross—urged by the Polish government-in-exile—requested permission to make an inquiry but were rebuffed by the Russians. This refusal seemed to substantiate the German claims.

The Soviets made the countercharge that it was actually the German Army that was guilty of the atrocity. Incredibly, they went on to accuse the Poles (who had requested Red Cross assistance) of *being in league with the Nazis.* As farfetched as this may be, it did not stop the loyal pro-Soviets in the West from collaborating in a massive cover-up. Even when Germany organized a commission of leading medical experts and scientists from neutral and occupied countries to examine the physical evidence firsthand, which confirmed the Soviet guilt, the cry went up that this was merely Nazi propaganda. There may have been a propagandistic angle to the German revelation but it remained, nonetheless, *an undeniable fact.*

How does one deny the undeniable? Well, one can take up the Red line. On April 19, 1943, the *Washington Daily News* literally carried that line when it printed a *Pravda* piece on the subject. (Colby, p. 70) The *Christian Science Monitor* of April 27 said the German story was "concocted with diabolical cunning," while the *Washington Post* indulged in One-World editorializing: "The assumption of all loyal members of the United Nations must be that they were killed by the Germans." (*Ibid.,* p. 72) Many other examples could be introduced, including articles in *Time* and *Newsweek.* Only a few brave papers of that period, such as the *Chicago Tribune,* were willing to entertain the view that the Russians were easily capable of such horrors.

Government stonewalling was equally abhorrent. In England, Harold Nicolson, a leading member of Parliament, mentioned, in a diary entry for April 20, a conversation he had with Prime Minister Winston Churchill. "I ask him about the German wireless reports on the Katyn massacres," writes Nicolson. "He grins grimly. 'The less said about it the better.'" (*The War Years 1939-1945, Volume II of the Diaries and Letters of Harold Nicolson,* edited by Nigel Nicolson, Atheneum, 1967, p. 291) This was in no way evidence of a reluctance to believe by the prime minister but simply another instance of the protection of an unworthy ally. Colby writes:

> ...Churchill wrote long afterwards that he had believed from the first that the Russians were guilty. Indeed, the British ambassador to Poland, Owen O'Malley, reported when the discovery was made that he was convinced the Russians had committed the murders. "We have, in fact, perforce used the good name of England to cover up the massacre," he wrote in another report. But such views could not be admitted to the people in wartime, and O'Malley's messages were kept secret until the official records were opened thirty years later. (p. 65)

On April 24, Churchill promised Stalin that "we shall certainly oppose vigorously" the Red Cross investigation. (Cited, *ibid.,* p. 68)

The lengths to which the Americans would go to defend Stalin's reputation is well illustrated by the case of George H.

Earle. In May, 1944, Earle, former governor of Pennsylvania and FDR's special emissary in Turkey and the Balkans, brought incontrovertible evidence of the U.S.S.R.'s guilt directly to the president. He got nowhere. Roosevelt responded that it was "entirely German propaganda and a German plot." Earle doggedly continued to send evidence to the White House until March, 1945, when he gave an ultimatum. In it he "told the President that he would publicize the facts unless ordered not to do so. Roosevelt forbade him, and Earle, who held a naval commission, was sent to Samoa." (*Ibid.*, p. 75) Similarly, the report of Colonel John H. VanVliet (one of two American officers who, as a German POW, had seen the atrocity and believed the Soviet's guilty) was suppressed. Curiously, the report had, after being duly received by Army Intelligence, *vanished into thin air.* A House of Representatives investigating committee later concluded that the VanVliet report "was either removed or purposely destroyed in Army Intelligence." (Cited, *ibid.*, p. 76)

At the Nuremberg trials following the war, which were proceedings against Germans accused of war crimes and crimes against humanity, the Russians again tried to pin the blame on Germany. Although these charges were not pursued, the evidence given by Poles to Supreme Commander Dwight D. Eisenhower was also suppressed. It just wouldn't be "proper" to try our "illustrious" allies for precisely the same sort of crimes perpetrated by the vanquished. It wasn't until the 1950's that this foul deed was finally acknowledged. And only this year did it make headlines when a memorial to the victims was dedicated in Poland. We can only speculate as to how many other Soviet war crimes remain secret.

Operation Keelhaul

Another chapter of the war that has been shamefully hidden is the forced repatriation of millions of Russian, Hungarian and other East European men, women and children. This crime has the added dimension of active and direct assistance by the U.S. and Great Britain.

The eminent British historian Hugh Trevor-Roper, in his introduction to Lord Nicholas Bethell's study, *The Last Secret: The Delivery to Stalin of Over Two Million Russians by Britain and the United States* (Basic Books, 1974), suggests that the American government and media had no monopoly in deceiving its people:

> ...By 1944 British propaganda had for three years recorded the sufferings and extolled the heroism of the Russian people. It had concealed the true character of the Russian government. It had suggested that its true aims were similar to our own. Thereby it had created a public attitude towards that government which made possible, and even acceptable, certain great betrayals. (p. ix.)

Of these betrayals, however, the return of these refugees was "less a public betrayal because it was kept secret. Indeed, its true history was kept secret for twenty-seven years." (*Ibid.*, p. x.)

As the war ended, countless East Europeans fell into the hands of Allied forces. The situation was in itself somewhat odd. What, after all, were they doing in the West to begin with—and fighting with the Germans? True, some had been forcibly conscripted into military duty by their captors (they accepted it as preferable to life in labor camps), but many voluntarily fought for the opportunity to return to a homeland where Communism would be defeated. It was totally out of line with Allied propaganda to allow that the U.S.S.R. might not be the workers' paradise it was advertised to be. Hence, the shroud of secrecy.

Such a betrayal was not easy to sell. Western soldiers who heard and believed the bloodcurdling tales told them by the refugees were often convinced of their truth. Many were sickened at the prospect of shipping these "displaced persons" (as they were euphemistically called) back to certain imprisonment or death. A few were courageous enough to turn their backs to allow escape but most of them halfheartedly obeyed orders. If they asked why these people were being returned, they were told it was simply a matter of sending them home. If they continued their questioning, the reply they heard was that these were traitors to our Soviet friends and that the agreement at Yalta guaranteed their return. The justification used was that there were Western POWs who had been "liberated" by the Russians and that we were obliged to live up to our part of the bargain if we hoped to see them released unharmed. (As it turned out, there are some Western soldiers who, to this day, were never returned.) The entire scenario is one that crystalizes the very dubious nature of the war— *friends who were enemies and enemies who were friends!*

Space does not allow detailed descriptions of the heartrending scenes: the pleas for freedom; the desperate attempts to remain; the profanation of a Russian Orthodox service by British troops; the suicides committed to avoid being sent back. The program of the Americans was under the direction of General Eisenhower and, writes Robert Welch, was officially designated by the Pentagon as "'Operation Keelhaul—keelhaul being the most cruel form of punishment known to the older navies." (*The Politician*, Belmont, 1963, p. 41)

The vision of our soldiers herding people into cattle cars at bayonet point is not one we like to consider. The moral voice of the world did not hesitate to speak. Lord Bethell writes:

> On February 20 (1946—JKW), Pope Pius XII published an allocution protesting against "the repatriation of men against their will and the refusal of the right of asylum". Senior Vatican officials told American reporters that the Yalta policy was "a betrayal of the morality and ideals for which the Allies fought" and "against humanity and justice." The

Vatican claimed to have information that when Russians arrived home "only too often they ended up in Siberia." Many of these Russians fought for the Germans, the Vatican admitted, but "whether they did or not, they are treated alike." This information was correct. (p. 192)

Alexander Solhenitzyn in *The Gulag Archipelago*, states Trevor-Roper, "saw Churchill and Roosevelt as criminals who sent millions of Russian political refugees back into Russia to be persecuted and killed." (Cited, *ibid.*, p. xi.)

The Legacy of World War II

The outcome of the war was a victory for One-Worlders. The League of Nations failed because it could not win U.S. support but the United Nations (founded in large part by the efforts of Council on Foreign Relations member, Soviet spy and FDR aide Alger Hiss) has succeeded primarily through American support. The United Nations is a product of the war and is the groundwork for the intended future world government.

The study of the Second World War is more than a mere historical pastime for, in a very real sense, the world we live in is one we have inherited from that era. The same sort of double-dealing and betrayal of allies has continued unabated. To the list of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, East Germany and other lands that fell to Red tyranny at that time, we can add the names of China, North Korea, Cuba, Laos, Cambodia, Nicaragua and Rhodesia.

When we view the war carefully we find that many crimes were committed in the name of freedom (including the bombing of civilian areas), that an enemy of freedom was presented as a friend and that traditional values were dragged through the mud to appease that "friend." The same continues unchanged to this day. It will only change when the scoundrels who formulate and perpetrate these policies are put on the run.

We ought not be fooled by the cries of reform behind the Iron Curtain. We have heard those cries before. Only when we see the Baltic States freed from the yoke imposed upon them fifty years ago by the treacherous Hitler-Stalin pact—only then may we acknowledge progress. Only when those countries captured by Stalinist aggression at the war's end are allowed to pursue their own course can we even think of possible victory. And only when Russia itself is liberated will we have reason to cheer. Alas, what we see now is but a continuation of the plan of the Insiders to bring about their godless world government. †

"Consistency has never been a mark of stupidity. If the diplomats who have mishandled our relations with Russia were merely stupid, they would occasionally make a mistake in our favor." (James Forrestal, First Secretary of Defense)

SUBSCRIPTION RENEWALS

The date on the envelope address label indicates the month and year in which the recipient's subscription is due for renewal. At the proper time, a subscription envelope will be enclosed with the newsletter. One may enter a new subscription at any time, of course, and will then receive the eight following newsletter issues. †

THE ATHANASIAN

Published by Traditional Catholics of America

Eight issues a year: (Jan. 15, Mar. 1, Apr. 15, June 1, July 15, Sept. 1, Oct. 15, Dec. 1)

Subscriptions: $12.00 per year (via First Class Mail) for the USA, Canada and Mexico; $16.00 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.

CONVICTIONS AND COMMENTS

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

Conviction, as the term is here employed, means a firm belief, a state of mind which is beyond doubt on a particular subject. A person is convinced of this or that matter who has certainty about it. And so it is with a number of statements contained in this article. I strongly believe in, I am thoroughly convinced of their truth. Most of them are familiar to the relatively longtime readers of the *The Athanasian* but may not be to more recent subscribers. In any case, since this eightieth issue marks the completion of ten years of its publication, it seems a rather appropriate issue for the personal convictions and comments which follow. Just about all of the subjects mentioned have been treated in detail over the years in the pages of this newsletter.

1. Despite any and all appearances to the contrary, the conspiracy of Communism has never posed a more serious threat to America than it does at the present time. ("The most powerful single force promoting the worldwide advance of the Communist conspiracy is the government of the United States." (Robert Welch) No intelligent, informed and honorable person can deny this. The principal enemy of this country and what's left of the free world is not in Moscow but in Washington, D.C. Next to the American government, foremost among Communism's most powerful allies are the American press and the Conciliar Church.)

2. A One World Order, by way of the United Nations, and a One World Church have long been in the making and are today well along towards realization. (Such organizations as the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission are major forces in the formation of the former; John Paul II and his Conciliar Church are prime movers towards the latter.)

3. Of equal, if not surpassing, danger to this nation is the immorality destroying it from within. (Words seem inadequate to describe the extent and the depth of the current moral corruption which is poisoning America to the core. Surely the USA is the Sodom and Gomorrah of the twentieth century—and we know what happened to those cities. Moral decadence of every kind and description abounds across the land. Nor is there any sign of abatement. Indeed, quite the contrary is the case. What need would there be, then, for the Reds to attempt any military destruction of America? Contaminated through moral rottenness and, consequently, devoid of the will to resist, it will "fall like overripe fruit" into their hands.)

4. How many good people there are who, even though aware of the nature of Communism and of the fact that millions of their fellowmen are enslaved under that utterly brutal tyranny in country after country throughout the world, naively persist in supposing that "it can't happen here." But it *is* happening here. Why, such people even think that Mikhail Gorbachev is "a good guy." Imagine! He is a villain, albeit a very clever one, who will, in due time, show himself in his true colors.

5. The root cause of the myriad evils of our day is the rejection by multitudes of God and His revealed truth and His moral law. (Secular humanism—essentially a philosophy of atheism in which man, not God, is the measure of things—is the current paramount "religion" on the American scene. The devil is in the driver's seat as Satanism in one form or another becomes an increasingly common occurrence.)

6. The Conciliar Church is *not* the Roman Catholic Church and its head, John Paul II, because he is a formal heretic, is *not* a valid Pope. (Nothing has been stated more frequently nor emphasized more strongly than this in *The Athanasian* during the past several years. Nor is it possible for even a significant start to be made towards the rectification of the utterly tragic Church situation unless and until the above two facts are openly and widely acknowledged and appropriate action taken.)

7. The one true Church is found and exists today only in authentic traditional Catholicism wherein alone is preserved the totality of the Faith. Solidly traditional Roman Catholics will have nothing whatsoever to do with the Conciliar Church. (By solidly traditional Roman Catholics is here meant those—sedevacantists—who hold that the Chair of Peter is currently vacant. It logically follows, among other things, that those who take this position may not, for example, attend the Masses of priests—however sincere and devout and traditional they may otherwise be—who have not disavowed the Conciliar Church and who recognize John Paul II as a valid Pope. Whether priest or layman, either a person belongs to the non-Catholic Conciliar Church or he does not. You can't have it both ways.)

8. To a large extent the Conciliar Church is what it is because of the presence and influence within it of its archenemies—Freemasons, Communists, Modernists, many of them in clerical garb. (Could it be that some of the bishops and other clergy of the Conciliar Church in the USA are Communists and/or Freemasons? It could very well be. There are scores of Masons in high-ranking positions in the Vatican and elsewhere, perhaps the most notorious of them being the papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Agostino Casaroli. Never once, incidentally, has John Paul II, to my knowledge, publicly condemned Communism or Freemasonry during his 11 years as "Pope" to date. And, if the consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary by the Pope in union with

the bishops of the world is so imperative an obligation, how explain why John Paul II has never performed that consecration?)

9. Conservative journals of the Conciliar Church, such as *The Wanderer* and *The Remnant*, do incalculable harm to the cause of sound traditional Catholicism. (Undoubtedly, the vast majority of their readership are traditionally-minded individuals who honestly think that such publications are truly traditional and are effectively fighting the enemies of the Faith. But this is not the reality. *The Wanderer* and *The Remnant* and similar publications recognize the Conciliar Church as the true Church and acknowledge John Paul II as a valid Pope. Although a strong and, to some, a convincing case can be made to prove the opposite, no indication of this is presented in these periodicals, with the likely result that countless readers are uninformed on this vital matter, many of whom might well become *real* traditional Roman Catholics if they were given the full story. In a word, the conservative publications of the Conciliar Church to which I refer are neutralizers and compromisers and, as such, they are a major obstacle in the way of any concrete progress being made in resolving the deplorable Church situation.)

10. With the passage of time the battle lines are ever more and more clearly drawn. The fundamental conflict is not Communism against anti-Communism nor freedom against slavery but rather it is God against militant atheism, Christ versus anti-Christ, morality versus immorality and amorality. Neither is there any solution to this conflict nor hope of victory except through a massive return to God and to the acceptance of His eternal truth and His moral law on the part of the individual and society. Unless and until the sovereignty of the Almighty be humbly recognized and the Kingship of Christ over the nations be universally acknowledged by man, the prospects for the future (or for *any* future) are exceedingly dim. Whether or not it is already too late, God alone knows. But if sound reason for realistic hope remains, the fulfillment of that hope is to be found in one place only: the Roman Catholic Church. †

"The signs of the times suggest that somewhere a man is building an ark. Or is that the faint odor of brimstone wafting in the air?" (Paul A. Fisher—*The Remnant*, September 30, 1989)

Pray the Rosary Daily

FATHER PLACID F. WHITE, O.S.B.

Because of his travels for a number of years on the traditional Latin Mass circuit, the above name is one familiar to many of the readers of *The Athanasian*. Father White, a Benedictine, died on September 21 of this year at the venerable age of 90. On September 26 he was buried with a Solemn High Requiem Mass at Our Lady of Victory Chapel in Aurora, Colorado, where he had formerly served as pastor for some eight years.

Father White was born in England as a non-Catholic and became a convert to the Faith at the age of 18. His studies for the priesthood were made primarily at the Benedictine College of Saint Anselmo in Rome. On July 7, 1925, he was ordained to the priesthood in Rome at the Church of Saints Cosmas and Damian. In addition to assignments in the earlier years of his priesthood in England, Spain and the Philippine Islands, he served as a chaplain during World War II with the British Army in Africa.

In 1951, Father White came to the United States, becoming a citizen of this country in 1956. After some four years service as a hospital chaplain, he became pastor of a parish in Springfield, Colorado, in 1955. Twenty years later, at the age of 77, he assumed pastoral duties at the traditional Chapel of Our Lady of Fatima in Stratton, Colorado. His final pastorate was at Our Lady of Victory Chapel in Aurora, Colorado, where he remained until his retirement in March, 1984, at the age of 85.

It was in the early 1970's that Father White determined that the Church of which he was still a member was no longer the Church to which he had converted in his youth and which he had served for so long as a priest. Convinced of this, he broke with the Conciliar Church, becoming one of the few truly traditional Roman Catholic priests in America, which is to say that he firmly believed that the Conciliar Church was not Catholic and that John Paul II was not a valid Pope. He was, in a word, one of those rare priests, a sedevacantist—and he did not hesitate to identify himself as such whenever he had occasion to do so!

Father Placid White was a true man of God, a priestly priest, devout, humble, of deep faith, thoroughly dedicated to the cause of Christ and His Church. Although the Benedictine Order to which he belonged has long since gone the way of the Conciliar Church, he remained always a loyal spiritual son of the great Saint Benedict. How sorely does our beloved Church need today more priests of the caliber of Father White. May the good Lord whom he served so long and so well on earth deign to receive him with those glorious words of welcome: "Well done, good and faithful servant; come, possess you the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world"! †