THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL
Volume V, No. 5 † July 15, 1984

WHO IS JOHN PAUL II? (PART THREE)

John Kenneth Weiskittel

JOHN PAUL II AND THE NEW ECCLESIOLOGY

In the first part of this article, I quoted John Paul II's condemnation of those Catholics who defend the Church's traditions as being attached to "outdated... secondary aspects" of the Faith. (Oddly, he claims the rosary is his favorite prayer.) This "attachment" is unacceptable, the Conciliar Church informs us, because it refuses to accept the "new ecclesiology."

In the present context, *ecclesiology* means the way the Church perceives herself. This self-image is all-encompassing: Church government and discipline, faith and morals, liturgy and sacraments—all are represented either directly or implicitly by the term. Certain areas of the Church have specialized studies concerning them, of course, but, when taken as a whole, the life of the Church is the subject of ecclesiology. There can be no essential change in the way the Church perceives herself and fundamental Catholic truths are as valid in 1984 A.D. as they were in 84 A.D.

An ongoing theme in the New Church is the supposed maturity of humanity (who can forget Paul VI's absurd claim that people today are less inclined to embrace error than in the past?). From the sessions of Vatican II to the New Canon Law, this *Masonic* concept is the animating principle that permeates so much of what we see coming out of those quarters.

How is this brought into practice? A basic component in the makeup and structure of the Conciliar Church is its increasing use of the laity in roles that are properly the domain of the priests. Notre Dame's Father Richard McBrien describes the "benefits" of the system thus: "The Church of the United States...can address the challenge according to a wider ecclesiology and even more flexible legal system. Under the revised Canon Law...laypeople—in certain circumstances and under specified conditions—will be permitted to serve as pastor of a parish, to preach, and to administer most of the sacraments. Ministerial leadership for the future, therefore, can be developed from the laity as well as the clergy. That recognition in itself is a giant step forward."

This estimate comes from a man who has openly condemned St. Pius X for his censure of Modernists. His praise of John Paul II's Canon Law is a true barometer of what the "new ecclesiology" is really about. The Council of Trent, against the Protestant "Reformers," defined priests as distinct from laymen, and Pope Pius XII reiterated the teaching in his encyclical *Mediator Dei.* The Conciliar Canon Law does not explicitly refute this, but the overall effect blunts it.

In turn, this is part of a bigger movement—"democratization." Already, in many Conciliar circles, the notion of priests being chosen by lay elections is held as progressive. Luther and his followers were early proponents of "democratization," declaring that priests merely *represented* the congregation and could, therefore, be selected by "the people." Much later, the Freemasons would propose a similar, insidious inversion of licit power, leading Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical on Christian reunion, *Praeclara,* to condemn those who seek "to root out from the minds of men all respect for authority, whether human or divine." St. Pius X, in *Pascendi,* devotes an entire section to Modernist errors concerning Church structures. They hold, he writes, that the Church has long been under misconception that its authority flows directly to it from God. The partisans of error say this notion is "obsolete," and has been replaced by the "truth" that the Church is of human origin and formed by the believers' collective experience of God. No wonder Richard McBrien is happy with the Conciliar Canon Law; it is so at odds with that stuffy "reactionary," St. Pius X!

Now, let's see some other examples of the "new ecclesiology" in action:

THE NOVUS ORDO "MASS"

In 1978, *Christian Order,* a semi-traditional magazine published in London, carried an article in which a Dr.

Saventhem asked the late Cardinal Benelli why the traditional Mass was excluded by the New Church while every form of liturgical experimentation was accepted: "The answer was startling: 'Sir, all of these reforms go in the same direction, whereas the old Mass represents another ecclesiology'! Dr. Saventhem: 'Monseigneur, what you said is an enormity'! Benelli: 'I shall say it again: those who want to have the old Mass have another ecclesiology.'"

For once, Roman Catholics can agree with something a Conciliar spokesman says. After all, our traditional Mass isn't "blessed" with the input of six Protestant clergymen. Yet, this liturgical "masterpiece," the "new Mass," is enthusiastically favored by John Paul II in its various incarnations. So far from Catholicism is the new rite that, in a Critical Study of it endorsed by Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci, we read: "It is clear that the *Novus Ordo* no longer intends to present the faith as taught by the Council of Trent. Yet the Catholic conscience is bound to that faith forever. Hence the true Catholic, by the promulgation of the *Novus Ordo,* is faced with the tragic necessity of a choice—a choice between the "new ecclesiology" and the Catholic Faith. John Paul II's "curbing" of abuses in the "New Mass" is but a sop to the traditionally-oriented of the Conciliar Church, since that rite is itself an abuse and worse.

FEMINISM

Another new phenomenon is sweeping many Conciliar circles—"women's liturgy." These feminist simulations of the Mass include the usual trappings found at gatherings of such enthusiasts: exhortations to militancy, "non-sexist" readings of the Scripture and threats to topple the "male domination" of the Church. An added feature at some of these functions is the substitution of taped lectures by feminist "Catholic" leaders in place of a sermon. One such tape is by Rosemary Ruether, who uses language unfit for these pages to describe why only men are called to the priesthood.

And John Paul II's reaction to such heresy? Perhaps *nonreaction* would be a better way to describe it, for the exercises in futility continue and "Ms." Ruether is still a theologian in good standing with Conciliar authorities (obscenity is, apparently, an acceptable form of liturgical expression for the Conciliar ecclesiology). Still, there have been many rhetorical gestures by the "pope" to raise hopes in the predictable quarters.

First, there are the frequent denunciations of abortion, artificial birth control and sexual promiscuity, all sacred cows of feminism. Then, there are the calls for the defense of the family, including last fall's full-blown document, "Charter of the Rights of the Family."

Concerning the former subjects, the New Vatican has consistently—*consistently*—turned its gaze in the other direction regarding "Catholic" politicians who vote for public funding for abortions and contraceptives. The Kennedys, O'Neills, Moynihans, et al., (also New York's Geraldine Ferraro, mentioned as a Democratic vice-presidential possibility) continue pushing pills and "minor surgery" at our youths, while John Paul II yawns.

"Those who hold the reins of government should not forget," wrote Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical *Casti Connubii,* "that it is the duty of public authority by appropriate laws and sanctions to defend the lives of the innocent...in the first place infants hidden in the mother's womb. And if the public magistrates not only do not defend them, but by their laws...betray them to death at the hands of doctors or of others, let them remember that God is the Judge and Avenger of innocent blood which cries from the earth to Heaven." In an interview given to *Christian Order* in February, Cardinal Oddi, prefect of the New Vatican's Congregation for the Clergy, was asked why John Paul II wasn't cracking down on notorious heretics like Fr. Andrew Greeley. He replied that "perhaps the Church thinks it is better to tolerate certain errors..." In the case of several "Catholic" legislators, he might have added: "...such as murder."

Mention should be made about ordination of women. Conciliar Canon Law states that only *men* are to be ordained, yet also allows women to serve as lectors or acolytes. Since, traditionally, lectors and acolytes are minor orders, leading to the priesthood, there is nothing to stop the Conciliarists from arbitrarily changing the "offending" Law in a few years to allow women "priests."

ECUMENISM AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

If mental gymnastics were an Olympic event, some of our semi-traditional friends would take the gold every time. What agility it takes for them to spring forth and call Vatican II's Declaration on Religious Liberty a 180° reversal of true Roman Catholic teaching and then, still in midair, spin 180° themselves and ask for a "clarification" of the document of a Council which they hold to be inspired by the Holy Ghost. While physical gymnasts defy the law of gravity, mental gymnasts defy the law of reason!

continued next page

"Pope" John Paul II has shown unmistakably how he feels about the subject; he opts for the position that Leo XIII describes as "that liberty in individuals which is so opposed to the virtue of religion, namely, the *liberty of worship* as it is called. This is based on the principle that every man is free to profess as he may choose any religion or none."

As mentioned in the first part of this article, the Polish bishop, Karol Wojtyla, had a major part to play in the fight to overturn traditional Catholic ideas on religious liberty and ecumenism even before he became "pope." His "progressive" friends point with pride to the work he did at the Second Vatican Council, while his conservative admirers try to forget it. What they can't forget, they ignore.

Although not as sensational in its nature as his scandalous visit to a Lutheran Church last year, another event from his past looms, perhaps, even larger in showing John Paul II's belief in "ecumenism." In February, 1978, the Communist government of Poland officially invited Billy "Russia-has-religious-freedom" Graham to preach in Poland. In John Pollack's authorized biography, *Billy Graham: Evangelist to the World,* we learn that "to Baptist astonishment, the Catholics offered the use of their Cathedrals and Churches (for Graham's "Crusade"). Cardinal Wojtyla, soon to be Pope John Paul II, had been foremost in offering his Cathedral in Cracow when other bishops hesitated." (pp. 307-8)

But wait, you haven't heard the worst. Billy Graham had more in mind than just a glorified speaking tour; he was in Poland to bring "Christ" to wretched Catholics deprived of the "True Faith" a la Graham. Anyone who has seen one of his television specials knows that the Rev. Graham uses the same formula favored by other American "evangelicals": after preaching, hymn-singing and personal testimonials, the minister asks those who have "accepted Christ as their Savior" as a result of the service to come forward. During the Polish "Crusade," the following account of a service attended by 3,000 is typical: "At the end, when Graham asked those who wished to decide for Christ to raise their hands, the response was prompt. Among the 200 or so who responded were twenty priests and some nuns, rededicating themselves to God." (*ibid.,* pp. 310-11)

Readers should take note that Mr. Pollock's use of the term "rededicating" is a device used to cover what is really occurring. In the same place he speaks of "the hunger on the faces of the intent listeners," as though the congregation is being given spiritual food it didn't have before. (Note the more explicit "decide for Christ" earlier in the quote.) Objectively speaking, those who consider themselves Catholic, yet "receive Christ" from a Protestant, have sinned. They do so because all have made a public commitment to Christ at their Confirmation, and priests and religious in a further commitment.

A crowd of 18,000, "most of them Roman Catholic," was on hand in Katowice, Poland, for what Pollock calls "perhaps the high point" of the visit. Here, the "converted" were given another taste of American evangelism: post-conversion "counseling." I think you'll agree that the symbolism of this "counseling" being conducted in a *crypt* is significant. The only question remaining is whether and when Billy Graham will take his "Crusade" to Rome.

In his retreats for Paul VI, Karol Wojtyla takes the next step in error. The English translation of those talks, *Sign of Contradiction,* has the future "pope" saying that the God "professed in his silence by the Trappist or the Camaldolite" is the same God "the desert Bedouin turns (to) at his hour of prayer. And perhaps the Buddhist too, wrapt in contemplation as he purifies his thought, preparing the way to Nirvana." (p. 16)

The "desert Bedouin" here pertains to one of the Islamic nomadic tribes of the Middle East. Some readers may wonder if John Paul II might be right; after all, they say, "Moslems (those of Islamic faith) worship one god—Allah—don't they?" Yes, they do worship one god—but is Islam's Allah the same as the Blessed Trinity of Catholics? Hardly. Islam began after its founder, Mohammed, had a visitor identifying himself as the Archangel Gabriel instructing him to start a new religion. This scene took place more than six centuries *after* the real Gabriel made a visit that began with the words "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee..." Obviously, it was *not* Gabriel who spoke to Mohammed, but it very well could have been Satan, who we know can appear as an angel of light. Moslems deny both the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ, while they profess polygamy and a paradise of worldly delights. In Islamic secret societies like the bloodthirsty Assassins, and in modern leaders typified by Iran's Khomeini and by Louis Farrakhan, the saying, "Paradise lies in the shadow of swords," takes on sinister import.

Buddhists, on the other hand, can believe virtually whatever they wish, and still be considered Buddhists. Those who are not outright atheists (such as Zen Buddhists) may believe in some impersonal god, but

others may worship Buddha or engage in black magic (like certain Tibetan Buddhists). *A Dictionary of Buddhism* notes that for the Buddhist conception of some nebulous force behind nature, "it is doubtless incorrect to use the term 'God,' with its Christian, Jewish and Islamic connotations," for the "Far East philosophies are pervaded by the spirit of agnosticism." And Geoffrey Parrinder, in *A Dictionary of Non-Christian Religions,* states bluntly that Buddhism worships "no supreme deity."

What does John Paul II's "new ecclesiology" mean for the faithful in their pews? Nothing less than the destruction of the Catholic Faith, conducted under such glowing terms as "reform" and "renewal."

A striking example of the process taking place here is found in an article that appears in the May, 1983 issue of *the WORD in the HOME,* a four-page bulletin published by J.S. Paluch Company and circulated to many Conciliar churches around the U.S. for Sunday distribution. "He's Losing My Faith" is written by the well-known New Church columnist, Dolores Curran, and it begins with an anecdote about a woman who tells her pastor that her son is losing the Faith while away at college. "'He doesn't practice any of the things we taught him,' she said, her voice breaking. 'He scoffs at the rosary, novenas, statues...everything! All he talks about now is how we neglected to teach him real Christianity.' She broke into full-fledged sobs. 'He's losing his faith and we don't know what to do about it.' The priest, of the "reformed-and-renewed" variety, then asked the mother if her son ever attends Mass, if he considers himself a Catholic and if he has "an attachment to Christ." After receiving positive responses, a light comes on inside the head of the already "enlightened" priest. There was a long pause and the pastor said gently: 'Joe isn't losing *his* faith, Mrs. Reilly. He's losing *your* faith. And he has a right to lose your faith. Yours was developed for you. Let him find his own faith.'"

All of this abounds with error. The rosary, novenas, statues and other sacramentals have been part of the spiritual life of Catholics for centuries. They would not have survived to our day had the Church not felt that they were real aids to Eternal Life. Further, it is not a matter of parents' faith versus children's faith, of "ours" versus "yours." Parents, most emphatically, *do* have a right, moreover, an *obligation,* to see to it that the most precious gift they can give their children—the Roman Catholic Faith—is handed down in completeness. If parents fail to do their part, you may be certain that they will someday answer to God. Here, then, is the principle of religious liberty in its most vicious form, entering the Catholic home to divide families and to destroy from within.

Now we can see clearly where the "pope's" Conciliar ecclesiology is going. The fervent hope of New Church subversives is the day when all Catholics who recall the Church prior to the Vatican II Revolution will be dead and buried, and when the Catholic Church will be buried as well. In the meantime, the children are being programmed in "newthink" to view true Catholicism as being as out of date as the horse and buggy. How enormous, then, is the task for traditional Catholics.

JOHN PAUL II AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER

In meetings with President Reagan and with U.S. Ambassador to the Vatican, William Wilson, held earlier this year, John Paul II has expressed his belief that America is a major key in preserving international peace and order. But to which America does he refer? Is it the America that has stood in the past as a bastion against totalitarian regimes, be they Nazi or Communist, or is it the America whose anti-Communism rarely gets beyond the rhetoric stage and which, more often than not, works for accommodation and merger with the militant atheists (including, significantly, the surrender of Poland to the USSR at World War II's Teheran and Yalta summit talks)?

For an answer, let's go back to 22 October, 1978, to the inauguration of "Pope" John Paul II in Rome. Seated with other dignitaries to the right of the altar and near the papal throne was the representative for the United States, President Carter's National Security Advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski. It would seem that Mr. Brzezinski was a logical choice to go in place of the president since he is of Polish-Catholic descent. There is another chapter from his past, however, that makes his presence at such an event more than a little unsettling. In 1970, Brzezinski penned a work, *Between Two Ages,* in which he extols the virtues of Marxism, speaks of America's "obsolescence," says the future of America lies in totalitarian-style planning and promotes the goal of "world government" (also called "the new world order" and "one-worldism" or, less directly, "the spirit of internationalism" and "the postnational age").

So, what has this to do with the "pope?" Three years after Brzezinski wrote the book, billionaire internationalist David Rockefeller founded a group of rich and influential individuals from around the world, which he

called the Trilateral Commission. The group's stated aims are so close to those expressed in *Between Two Ages*—a book Rockefeller had read—that it has, with reason, been nicknamed "The Catechism of the Trilateral Commission." Then, Brzezinski was picked to direct the Commission. In the last 11 years, many Trilateralists have held or hold positions in our government; you may have heard of some of them: George Bush, Walter Mondale, John Glenn, Henry Kissinger, John Anderson and Jimmy Carter.

The Trilateral Commission has held meetings all around the world, from the White House to Peking. The 10th Plenary Meeting of the Commission met in Rome, on April 17-19, 1983, and John Paul II received its members for a special audience. The "pope" praised the "ethical dimension" of their activity, and gave his blessing to the New World Order when he reminded them of their "responsibility for encouraging people to face their duty of international human solidarity." On hand for the audience were the Three Musketeers of one-worldism: Rockefeller, Kissinger and Brzezinski.

Another organ of internationalism favored by John Paul II is the United Nations. The U.N. has rightly been called an organization whose sole purpose, once all pretense is stripped away, is to further the goals of atheistic Communism, ultimately leading to the subjection of the globe to the International Communist Conspiracy. A few examples should suffice to demonstrate this. Sixteen of the seventeen men from the U.S. State and Treasury Departments who participated in planning for the creation of the U.N. (including the first U.N. Secretary-General, Alger Hiss) were *identified under oath as Communist agents* (the only one not cited was Dean Acheson but he was pro-Soviet, was praised by U.S. Communists and protected Red agents in the State Department). Every U.N. Secretary-General has been either Marxist or a radical socialist (e.g., U Thant who, in 1970, praised the dictator Lenin, saying that his "ideals of peace and peaceful coexistence among states...are in line with the aims of the U.N. charter"). All Under Secretaries-General for Political and Security Council Affairs have been Communists from the Eastern Bloc.

The "peace" of Lenin and the U.N. is also the peace of John Paul II. In fact, he says that the U.N. has "a key function and guiding role" for "the peaceful future of our planet." But Pope St. Pius X warned against entering "societies and parties" that seek a peace without God, for "Where God is absent, justice departs; and once justice is banished, vain is the hope for peace." Only "the party of God" can bring true peace, says St. Pius; all others labor in vain.

AGAIN, WHO IS JOHN PAUL II?

Our conservative and semi-traditional friends are always finding ways of shifting blame from John Paul II to the American hierarchy, say, or to disobedient priests or nuns. Journalists once quipped that the Reagan Administration's ability to deflect scandals makes it a "Teflon-coated Presidency." Similarly, no matter how outrageous the New Vatican behaves, nothing seems to stick.

Even in their excellent "Brief Resume of the Principal Errors of Conciliar Ecclesiology" (which parallels much covered in this article), Archbishop Lefebvre and Bishop Castro-Mayer retreat from condemning the occupant of the papal throne while they accuse him of "grave error" (and even "heresies," in the resume's cover letter) and address him with the filial "Holy Father." Of the distinguished authors of the "Resume" we must respectfully request: Gentlemen, carry your thinking to its logical end—for your followers and for the good of the Church—and use your positions to unmask this deceit called John Paul II. †

THE END

Pray The Rosary Daily

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 VIRTUE OF PURITY

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

Purity or chastity may be defined as that virtue which disposes or regulates man's thoughts, words and conduct according to the will of God in sexual matters. Closely associated with the virtue of purity is that of modesty which regulates one's thoughts, words and deeds in matters which could reasonably lead to violations of purity. Modesty, then, is a protection or safeguard for purity. If a person is modest in all ways he or she will be pure. Opposed to these two virtues are, respectively, the vices or sins of impurity (willful, forbidden sexual pleasure) and immodesty (any deliberate thought, word or deed that could reasonably lead to impurity). Because impurity is always gravely immoral (or serious matter), it is always a mortal sin *if* there is sufficient reflection and full consent of the will. Such is the teaching of the Church. In other words, there is no such thing as a venial sin of impurity. Immodesty, on the other hand, may be mortally or venially sinful depending upon various factors.

The vice of impurity in all forms is saturating and poisoning the very soul of America. Nor is there any need to give examples here for they are all too familiar to the American public. Even perversion has become a "life-style" acceptable to many. Impurity has always been one of the major forms of immorality afflicting fallen human nature, yes, but it was at least acknowledged to be such by the generality of people in times past. Not so today. Sexual immorality no longer has the stigma of evil it formerly had. Glamorized by the repulsive so-called entertainment media and justified through situation ethics, sins of the flesh are now sophisticated and "respectable," which only the old-fashioned and religious extremists oppose and condemn. In this perverse age in which we live, nothing is sacred in the realm of sex among multitudes of people. The divine moral law having been rejected, man is the measure of things and the arbiter of what's right or wrong. On a vast scale the atheistic philosophy of secular humanism has replaced the Commandments of God. And so "anything goes" and morality be damned, with the inevitable result that the USA is wallowing in sin.

But, despite all attempts to obliterate it, the moral law of God remains. And the observance of that law and the practice of virtue will ever be the duty of all who love God and desire to do His will. Nor is this an easy task. Indeed, to avoid sin and its occasions, to live a virtuous life, to be authentic disciples of the Son of God—this is, quite literally, a full-time job demanding, among other things, a strong faith and courage and perseverance. To be morally good, to be Christlike, to talk and to act as a commendable Roman Catholic now and then or when the occasion calls for it—that's easy enough. But to avoid sin and to practice virtue over the long haul—there's the rub.

Of all the virtues, perhaps the most difficult for the average normal person to observe consistently is that of purity. The grave duty incumbent upon all to be pure in thought and word and deed is not without good reason called the difficult Commandment. So it has always been since the commission of original sin by Adam and Eve. But I wonder if there was ever a time when the obligation to be pure has posed a greater challenge than it does in this our day when the glamorization of illicit sex and the glorification of the flesh confront us almost everywhere. Indeed, so uninhibited and widespread is sexual immorality in all forms today on the American scene that to resist its allure may well call for nothing less than heroic virtue on the part of some.

But this does not mean that the observance of chastity is impossible for anyone. Whatever God commands He gives the grace to accomplish—and His will that all be pure according to their state in life is crystal clear from the pages of Sacred Scripture and from the teaching of His Church. To talk about loving God is easy. The proof that one's proclaimed love is the real thing is found in deeds, not words. "If you love Me, keep my Commandments," said Christ. And again, "If anyone love Me, he will keep my word." The more difficult is the practice of a particular virtue for this or that individual, then the more convincingly does he manifest his love for God through his fidelity to that virtue. But it is safe to say that the faithful observance of the virtue of purity poses the greatest challenge in the moral order for the majority of people (and especially youth). Apart from the various other means presented by the Church for the observance of chastity (including devotion to the Mother of God, the Queen of purity), traditional Catholics have the inestimable benefit of the Sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist. There is no single practice more conducive to the preservation of the precious virture of purity than the frequent and devout reception of the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist.

God alone knows the number of those in Heaven today who attained celestial glory as martyrs in defense of the virtue of purity, among them being such canonized saints as Agatha, Agnes and Maria Goretti. So priceless was this virtue to them that they made the supreme sacrifice of their lives rather than compromise or violate it. They were our predecessors in the Faith. The preservation of the angelic virtue of purity meant more to them than their lives. Should it mean any less to traditional Roman Catholics?†

Being A Good Catholic Includes...

BEING A GOOD AMERICAN

It is the imperative duty of all truly traditional Roman Catholics of this nation not only to pray but also to work for the preservation of America as well as for the preservation of their divine Faith. We are duty-bound to oppose evil, whether that evil be found in religion or in the political sphere. While the generality of traditionalists may be more or less well-informed on the evils that directly beset the Church, all too few of them seem to be knowledgeable about the exceedingly grave evils which threaten their country in the political realm, with fewer still doing anything about it. For the well-being—indeed, for the survival—of both the Church in America and of America itself, it is exceedingly urgent that those despicable politicians in all echelons of government (and especially on the federal level) who are today in the process of selling out this nation be brought to task and replaced by God-loving and God-fearing men of wisdom and honor and courage. And again, it is a moral duty incumbent upon all traditional Roman Catholics to do their part towards that end. In a letter to the Bishop of Madrid, Spain, in 1906, Pope Saint Pius X wrote in part as follows:

"All must remember that nobody has the right to remain indifferent when religion or the public welfare is in danger. Those who strive to destroy religion and civil society aim above all at getting control, as far as possible, of the direction of public affairs and at having themselves chosen as legislators. It is therefore necessary that Catholics should strive *with all their might* to avert that danger." (emphasis added.)

It is the undeniable objective of many of those who today occupy the highest positions of power and influence in the American government so to transform the political and economic structure of this nation that it can be merged with that of the Soviet Union, and this as an essential preliminary step toward the ultimate end of a One World government, the New World Order (the Novus Ordo, if you will). In other words, the name of the game (an abhorrent game, to be sure) is the destruction of the independence and sovereignty of the USA and its amalgamation into a One World organization under the total control of a ruthless, power-hungry, godless, amoral regime of universal slavery such as exists, say, in Red China today. The world, in a word, would become one vast concentration camp in which all believers in God would be endlessly persecuted or brutally exterminated (a minimum of 34 million human beings has been put to death since the Communist murderers took over on the mainland of China). Needless to say, in any Red conquest of America traditional Roman Catholics would be in the forefront of those marked for persecution and liquidation.

Would that such gruesome observations were but the figment of a weird hyperactive imagination! That they, and many more of the same kind, are all too literally true, however, is a terrifying fact, as all sincere, well-informed Roman Catholics fully realize. Both our Church and our nation are being destroyed from within, a destructive process now far advanced towards its ultimate goal.

How very distressing it is, then, to realize that there are some (many?) traditional Roman Catholics in this country who, from my observation, do little or nothing that would identify them as truly patriotic Americans. Does their professed loyalty to the Church blind them to the fact that, if this nation falls victim to Communist conquest, the Roman Catholic Church in America will surely function quite literally underground and all true Catholic priests, religious and laymen will undergo a persecution every bit as horrible as did their predecessors in the early Church or at the time of the so-called Reformation in sixteenth-century England? Don't they realize that the enemies of our Church and our nation are much the same? Is one somewhat less a Catholic because he is also a patriotic American?

To which should a traditional Catholic American give prior or greater love and loyalty and service—to Church or country? By any standard the answer, of course, is self-evident. As Heaven transcends earth, the claims of the Church to the allegiance and fidelity of a Catholic transcend those of his native or adopted land. Were a situation ever to arise wherein he would be forced to choose between the two, the choice he must make is a foregone conclusion. In practice, however, the two loyalties are much intertwined. True patriotism (not to be confused with extreme nationalism) is both a virtue and a moral obligation imposed by the Fourth Commandment. It follows, then, that a Catholic American who is a good Catholic is also a good American and, if he is not a good American, he can hardly be classified as a good Catholic. Note the words of Pope Pius XII (March 23, 1958):

"Today you sometimes meet citizens who are almost afraid to show any particular devotion to their country. As if a love of your own land has to mean a contempt for all other lands; as if the natural desire to see your own country beautiful, internally prosperous, and esteemed and respected by others, must inevitably lead to a hostility toward other peoples!...

continued on page 8

TCA TRADITIONAL LATIN MASS SCHEDULE

COLORADO
COLORADO SPRINGS
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY
(303) 636-1575
Mass at 10:00 a.m. Aug. 5, Sept. 2
Mass every Friday at 9:00 a.m.

DURANGO
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY
Centennial Savings and Loan
1101 E. Second Ave.
(303) 884-2526
Mass at 10:00 a.m. Aug. 26

STRATTON
OUR LADY OF FATIMA CHAPEL
(303) 348-5454
Mass on Aug. 5, Sept. 2

LOUISIANA
OPELOUSAS (Lafayette area)
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY CHAPEL
Route 1, Box 195
(318) 942-9053
Mass at 11:00 a.m. July 15, July 29, Aug. 19

MINNESOTA
ROCHESTER
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY CHAPEL
5820 Viola Road, NE
(507) 282-5163 or 289-8522
Mass at 10:00 a.m. July 29, Aug. 12

MONTANA
GREAT FALLS
IMMACULATE HEART OF MARY CHAPEL
2020 Second Avenue North
(406) 452-8826
Mass at 10:00 a.m. July 22, Aug. 12, Aug. 26

NEW YORK
BUFFALO
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY CHAPEL
231 McKinley Parkway
(716) 537-9533

UTAH
SALT LAKE CITY
OUR LADY OF PERPETUAL HELP
Quality Inn
154 West 600 South
(801) 278-7501
Mass at 11:00 a.m. July 22

††

"Good American" continued from page 7

"Surely, beloved Sons, We must say that this diminished love for one's native land—the largest family given to us by God—is one more sign, and not the least important, of a loss of direction on the part of modern men."

While truly traditional Roman Catholics in America are gravely concerned over the current pathetic state of the Church, so many of them do not seem to have a comparable concern for the survival of their country or any significant awareness of the extent to which it is today under the control of its enemies. Do they not see that their country is being sold down the river by its traitorous leadership? Don't they see that the precious freedom they have to practice their beloved Faith will cease to be if Communism takes over, and that their lot will be that of the millions of their fellow men already subjugated to its diabolical tyranny? Do they not realize, in a word, that their Catholicism is deficient to the extent that they fail to be informed, active, truly patriotic Americans?†

—Fr. F. Fenton

THE ATHANASIAN

Published by Traditional Catholics of America

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

Subscriptions: $ 8.00 per year (via First Class Mail) for the USA, Canada and Mexico; $12.00 per year (via Air Mail) for all other countries

Additional copies: single copy - $1.00; 10 copies - $8.00; 40 or more to same address - $.70 each

Mailing address: P.O. Box 38335, Colorado Springs, CO 80937

Telephone: (303) 636-1575

Manuscripts sent to us for possible publication in *The Athanasian* should be typewritten, double-spaced and no more than seven pages in length. If not accepted, they will be returned to the sender.