THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume IX, No. 3 † April 15, 1988

SENATOR JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

On May 2, 1957, death claimed the life of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin at the age of 49. In the course of the 31 years since then, the caliber and the character of this man have stood out more and more in stark contrast to the inferior quality of the vast majority of the members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives—and never has that contrast been more striking than it is today. Indeed, in my opinion there is not a single individual in either branch of the current American Congress who is of the stature of Senator McCarthy—and most of them wouldn't be worthy to tie his shoelaces.

Although he was in the public spotlight for less than seven years prior to his death, it is safe to state that no public figure in our nation's history has been more unjustly treated, falsely accused, maligned, vilified than Senator McCarthy. And why? Because he knew well the satanic evil of Communism and was resolute in his purpose to oppose and expose it to the very best of his ability with the influence and resources that were his as a member of the U.S. Senate. The Communists not only despised him but intensely feared him as well because of the incalculable harm which he could do in his prestigious position to their plans for world domination. And so there developed an unprecedented campaign of smear and hate against McCarthy, a campaign instigated by the Communist conspiracy and aided and abetted by its dupes and minions and fellow travelers—and especially by the despicable American press. If Communism was to continue its advance in the USA—perhaps even if it were to survive—the reputation of Joseph McCarthy had to be destroyed in one way or another.

How effectively that destruction was accomplished—and *that* was 30 years ago—points up the power and influence in the USA of the Communist conspiracy. Ask the average American today his opinion of Senator McCarthy and, if the name rings a bell with him at all, the chances are very likely that that opinion will be a negative one. And what else would we expect since, whenever the senator's name is mentioned in the communications media or by leftist politicians, it is done so in a derogatory manner? And then there is the often heard term, McCarthyism, which means the making of unsubstantiated charges against an individual in order to destroy that person's reputation or character. The word was coined by the senator's enemies, the implication being that he employed such tactics. Nothing could be further from the truth but, of course, the Communists and their allies couldn't care less about truth.

The real Senator McCarthy (a Roman Catholic) was a man quite the opposite from the false concept of him held today by countless brainwashed Americans. Any informed and unbiased person in the 1950's who heard his speeches or viewed on television (as I did) the hearings of his Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee could not have failed to be impressed by his courage, his sincerity, his fairness. I, for one, have never heard of a single *innocent* person whose reputation suffered at the hands of Senator McCarthy. Those brought before his Subcommittee for interrogation in public hearings were invariably individuals about whom there were well-founded suspicions of guilt in relation to Communism. Yes, McCarthy was rough and tough with some of the witnesses he confronted. So? It was, I believe, he who once said: "You don't fight Communism with kid gloves."

There are a number of ways in which a person can make a usually reliable estimate of another's character. One is by the enemies he has. Another (if he be a prominent figure) is by the kind of treatment he receives from the national press (TV, radio, the daily paper, etc.). For enemies McCarthy had the Communists and their various nefarious allies while the press constantly belittled and maligned and pilloried him. If I knew nothing about Joseph McCarthy other than the facts that the Communists detested him and the communications media almost invariably treated him with contempt, I would readily conclude that he was probably a very sound and commendable individual indeed. He certainly must have led a morally upright life because, had there been anything of a scandalous nature in it, the holier-than-thou American press, be assured, would have dug that out and proclaimed its discovery to the world.

Senator Joseph McCarthy was a man who loved his God and his country. He was a man of honor, of courage, of strong conviction—and he was a fighter. Clearly recognizing the grave danger posed by the satanic evil of Communism to the free world and to the Christian ideals he cherished—and beholding with sorrow the steady progress that conspiracy was making upon the American scene—McCarthy determined to oppose and to expose it with all of the power and influence at his disposal. And so he did, displaying a firmness and tenacity towards Communism which no member of the U.S. Senate has ever approached before or since.

God alone knows the extent to which the advance of the criminal, atheistic conspiracy of Communism towards the takeover of America was at least slowed down by the noble efforts of Senator Joseph McCarthy. Please God, the reputation of this outstanding American patriot will one day be vindicated and his name indelibly written in history as one of this nation's truly great heroes.†

SAINT HELENA

Jill Wiesner

On the third day of May the Church celebrates the feast of the Founding of the Holy Cross. The person responsible for finding this precious relic was an eighty-year-old woman who had been reared as a pagan and who did not enter the Church until she was in her sixties. But, once having found the holy Catholic Faith, Helena, Empress of the Roman Empire, "became such a devout servant of God that one might believe her to have been a disciple of the Savior from childhood."

Born in Asia Minor about the year 250, Helena was the daughter of an innkeeper. Though innkeepers were of lowly social rank and did not fraternize with the ruling class, Helena was so beautiful and sweet-natured that, when she was twenty, she won the heart of a powerful Roman general named Constantius Chlorus. Overlooking her humble status, Constantius married Helena and took her with him on his military campaigns. In 274, while they were stationed in Serbia, their only son, Constantine, was born.

In the year 292, Diocletian, Emperor of the Eastern Empire, and Maximian Herculeus, Emperor of the Western Empire, chose Caesars to govern the outer regions of the empires in their names. Maximian's choice was Helena's husband, Constantius. There was, however, a condition imposed by the emperor: Constantius Chlorus would have to divorce his wife and marry Maximian's stepdaughter, Theodora.

Repudiated by her husband, Helena withdrew quietly, her son, Constantine, remaining loyal to her. Helena's exile lasted fourteen years. Upon the death of her husband, her son was proclaimed Caesar by his troops and then Emperor of the West. He summoned his beloved mother to the imperial court and gave her the title Augusta—honored mother of the sovereign.

As provincial governor and as emperor, Constantine had not participated in the persecution of Christians. He even prayed to God when his authority to rule was challenged by his half-brother, Maxentius. While en route to meeting Maxentius in battle at the Milvian Bridge outside Rome, Constantine begged God for His assistance. The night before the battle, a cross of light appeared in the sky, encircled by the words, "In Hoc Signo Vinces"—"In this sign thou shalt conquer." He promptly gave orders that the cross and motto be placed on a standard and carried at the head of the army. In the battle which followed, Constantine was victorious and Maxentius was killed.

Though his decisive victory did not result in the immediate conversion of either Constantine or his mother, they defended the Church more strongly than ever. At the command of Emperor Constantine, Christians throughout the western empire were permitted to worship God without harassment. In 313, Constantine persuaded Licinius, then Emperor of the East, to agree to the Edict of Milan, which granted complete freedom to the Church throughout the world.

The Empress Helena was baptized the same year at the age of sixty-three. From the moment of her baptism she was "incomparable in her faith and zeal." Her greatest delight was to assist at Holy Mass. In Church her attire was always simple and modest, her manner quiet and unassuming. As empress she used the riches at her disposal to aid those in need and to build beautiful churches.

Eleven years after her conversion her son was obliged to go to war once more, this time against the eastern emperor Licinius who had failed to abide by the Edict of Milan. After the defeat of Licinius, Constantine was the sole ruler of the entire empire and the Holy Land was finally free of pagan domination.

Though nearly eighty years old, Helena resolved to travel to Palestine to venerate the places made holy by the presence of our Lord and to find the cross on which He had been crucified.

On her pilgrimage she provided for the construction of churches. At Bethlehem she commissioned the building of a church in the Grotto of the Nativity and, near Jerusalem, she had a church erected on the Mount of the Ascension.

Her greatest efforts, however, were directed toward the search for the holy cross. The Christians did not know where to look because the pagans had covered the holy sepulchre and Calvary with mounds of rubbish and rocks. In the second century Emperor Hadrian had topped that with a three-hundred-foot terrace on which he had erected a temple of Venus and a statue of Jupiter.

Helena was informed that, if she could locate the sepulchre, she would also find the cross for it was the custom of the Jews to bury the instruments of execution near the place where the body of a criminal was buried.

She ordered the destruction of the pagan temple and the excavation of the debris which supported it. After digging to a considerable depth her engineers located the holy sepulchre. Three crosses were found nearby as well as the nails which had fastened our Savior to the cross.

Unable to determine which cross was the one on which Jesus had been crucified, Helena asked the holy Bishop Macarius for help. He suggested that she have a piece of each cross taken to the bedside of a lady who was gravely ill. Having prayed, Bishop Macarius applied them, one by one, to the patient. A miraculous recovery at the touch of the third cross revealed its authenticity.

continued on page 8

REAGAN, THE REDS AND THE RIGHT

John Kenneth Weiskittel

When Ronald Wilson Reagan became our fortieth president in 1980, many conservative Americans felt exhilaration and relief. At long last, they congratulated themselves, we've succeeded in placing a man in the White House who will bravely steer the Ship of State out of the dangerous course it has taken for the better part of this century. President Reagan shares our longing for a return to traditional American values, he'll fight to dismantle socialist big government and he won't take any guff from the Commies either.

Ah, the best laid plans...As the months wind down on the Reagan presidency, some of those who had been his staunchest supporters are finally beginning to awaken to the Grand Canyon that separates his rhetoric from his actions. The splash of ice water that roused many sleepers came last December in the form of the INF treaty. More confirmation came earlier this year when Reagan unveiled a 1.1 trillion dollar federal budget. And in February two of his Supreme Court appointees joined in an 8-0 decision that overturned a lower court ruling that awarded the Rev. Jerry Falwell damages for a thinly disguised attack made by smut-peddler Larry Flint. (The newest justice, Daniel Kennedy, did not participate.)

So what has become of Ronald Reagan, the steely-eyed anti-Communist, the tight-fisted fiscal conservative, the shining defender of the nation's morality? The question being asked by some of the right is whether they erred in trusting him in the first place. This is a bitter pill to swallow, but one that needs to be taken, for any sober review of the Reagan Years clearly shows that in its domestic affairs and as a world power the United States has continued the same policies against which he so skillfully campaigned.

Moscow on the Potomac

For a few days in December our nation's capital resembled a set from *Amerika*, the ABC-TV miniseries about a Communist takeover. Bright red Soviet flags were in abundance everywhere, including the White House. In some cases they were hanging on the same flagpoles as American flags, but hanging *above* Old Glory. Also in evidence were reproductions of the U.S.-Soviet logo, a design combining features of both flags.

This was the dubious protocol that greeted Soviet dictator Mikhail Gorbachev and his entourage when they arrived for arms reduction talks. Although the elimination of short and intermediate range missiles based in Europe was at the top of the summit agenda, representatives from the two nations huddled together to lay the groundwork for joint space projects, expanded trade (with the USSR receiving most-favored-nation status) and increased cultural and educational exchanges (including the broadcasting of Russian propaganda over USA television and the National Academy of Science's supplying one million personal computers to Soviet schools and universities). Gorbachev and President Reagan, who seemed to enjoy playing the role of cordial host, posed together, smiling, for the army of press reporters on hand to cover the meetings.

On December 11, one day after the summit ended, Reagan met with leaders of the Democrat-controlled Congress to brief them on the treaty. Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole (R-KS), noting the enthusiasm of the briefing, described it as "sort of a love feast." But Senator Steve Symms (R-ID), a critic of the treaty who joked that "the good news is that Gorbachev got out of town and didn't win the nomination," expressed concern: "It may make it harder to get a defense budget passed around here because there's an appearance the 'evil empire' is a partner in peace." Perhaps Senator Symms meant a subtle rebuke of Reagan by using the president's 1983 characterization of the Soviet regime. If so, "the Gipper" wasn't listening. Proof of the changed outlook can be seen in the title of a December 12 *Tampa Tribune* wire report: "Reagan sees no evil in 'new' Soviet Union." The article reveals a good deal of the president's current attitude, manifested as he fielded reporters' questions at the White House. When asked whether he stood by his "evil empire" statement, Reagan remarked:

> I meant it when I said it because under previous leaders they have made it evident that they were based—that their program was based on expansionism, on going forwards toward the Marxian philosophy of a one-world communist state...And it was true that it was a philosophy then, and under previous leaders, that there was no immorality in anything that furthered the cause, therefore permitting themselves to violate trust, to lie and so forth.

But under Gorbachev, he continued, "there seems to be an entirely different relationship." Reagan says he developed a "certain chemistry" with his Soviet counterpart and even told Gorbachev two jokes about the USSR, getting a "belly laugh from both of them." (There is already talk that Reagan and Gorbachev will be sharing the Nobel Peace Prize by year's end.)

Sad to say, the situation is far from funny. In the first place, despite the public relations hype from the Western news media (and, now, from Reagan), Mikhail Gorbachev in no way has deviated from his predecessors' goal of a One-World Communist State. Only a month before his Washington visit Gorbachev told Communist Party comrades: "In October, 1917, we parted with the Old World, rejecting it once and for all. We are moving toward a new world, the world of Communism. We shall never turn off that road." Second, the Soviets negotiate only to gain advantages over their adversaries. In the 66 prior U.S.-Soviet treaties, all broken by the Communists, the slow, steady, cumulative effect has been the weakening of the American military to the point

that it now trails the Soviet Union in numerous areas. Third, ratification of the INF treaty by the Senate will put U.S. allies in Western Europe at high risk since the Russians enjoy a 3-to-1 superiority of conventional forces in the region. Retired NATO Commander General Bernard Rogers observes that "the Soviets are removing only eight percent of their warheads capable of hitting Western Europe and we are removing 100 percent of our European-based missiles capable of hitting the Soviet Union." Fourth, President Reagan, who in the past had never approved of a single arms treaty and who called the unratified SALT II a "fatally flawed" treaty in 1980, will journey to Russia in May or June to sign SALT III. Finally, if Gorbachev says he will never leave the "road" his predecessors traveled, why should *he* be trusted?

Thunder From The Right

For his part in the INF treaty negotiations and the Washington summit, Reagan has received much praise and not a little criticism. What is interesting here is seeing who backs him and who blasts him. Those who usually are identified as being the opposition—liberals, "peace" activists and even radicals—have thrown their support his way. (Every democratic presidential contender endorses the INF treaty.) And leveling some of the sharpest attacks have been conservatives, including some of those who helped him win in 1980.

"It is tragic," said Howard Phillips, chairman of the Conservative Caucus, "that we have a president who is nothing more than an instrument of Soviet propaganda." Phillips warned that if the treaty is ratified "a major battle of World War III will have been lost by default." He glumly concluded that Reagan "is a very weak man with a strong wife and a strong staff. He has become a useful idiot for Soviet propaganda." (It is significant that Mr. Phillips has seen fit to call Reagan a "useful idiot" for the term is taken from Lenin's description of those in the West who would blindly give the Bolsheviks the wherewithal needed for global domination.)

Richard Viguerie, veteran fundraiser for the so-called New Right, bitterly told the press that conservatives "feel alienated, abandoned and rejected by the president." Reagan, he suggested, has become an "apologist for Gorbachev." Mr. Viguerie made this statement before the summit but the president gave more evidence of its validity during the talks by saying he didn't hold the Soviet leader responsible for the invasion of Afghanistan, that being an unfortunate state of affairs he "inherited" from earlier Kremlin regimes. Yet this version of the Soviet's brutal occupation, while technically correct, fails to explain why Mr. Gorbachev, who took over leadership in the USSR in 1985 and who had been its de facto ruler the previous year owing to the poor health of Konstantin Chernenko, saw fit neither to withdraw his troops nor to bring to trial those guilty of war crimes against the Afghan people. (Phillips and Viguerie have underscored what they see as Reagan's defection from the conservative ranks by organizing the Anti-Appeasement Alliance, a coalition of 30 conservative, anti-Communist groups formed to defeat attempts to ratify the INF treaty.)

Even more critical, if that is possible, is a special report, "Betrayal and Surrender: The Reagan Sellout to the Soviets," that appeared soon after the summit in the *McAlvany Intelligence Advisor*, a monthly newsletter edited by Donald S. McAlvany, a contributing editor to *The New American* magazine. According to Mr. McAlvany, who in October met with another treaty opponent in London (former NATO Commander General Sir William Walker), the INF and SALT III treaties are "tantamount to unilateral disarmament since the Soviets have systematically violated every such treaty we have ever signed with them, while we have abided by same." For those who hope that Reagan will back away from the ominous path he has been taking, McAlvany suggests there is little reason for optimism since "David Rockefeller, Armand Hammer, George Schultz, the Liberal Eastern Establishment and the political left are today in 100 percent control of Ronald Reagan and his Administration." A great part of today's political crisis, he points out, stems from the stubborn conviction of many ill-informed conservatives that President Reagan will yet mount his white horse and lead a glorious anti-Communist cavalry charge. McAlvany writes:

> *America is being betrayed and the incredible thing is that, because it is Ronald Reagan doing the betraying, no one will believe it is really happening.* Most Americans still cannot see the difference between his smooth, witty and "sincere" rhetoric and the reality of what his Administration is doing to weaken America financially, morally and militarily. What a man says is not important—it is what he does. The Reagan Administration...is today to the left of the Carter Administration when it left office.

Mr. McAlvany backs this bald assertion by noting that "U.S. aid, trade and high technology transfers to the Soviets have nearly quadrupled under Ronald Reagan, and active sellouts of the Contras, the Afghan Freedom Fighters, UNITA, Chile, South Korea, Taiwan, South Africa and Western Europe are in varying stages of completion. (Among the summit talks were plans for a cutoff of funding to the Contras and formal U.S. recognition of the Soviet-controlled Afghan government.)"

Reagan And The Reds

The strongest selling point for Ronald Reagan throughout his political career has been his remarkable oratorical talents. Helped along considerably by his work in films spanning four decades, Reagan can "turn it on" for a camera better than any other politician of the television era. At his best, he conveys the image of a man who is in complete command of the situation at all times, up on his facts and ready to take charge—while at the same time narrowing the distance between himself and his constituents with his disarming Irish wit and an "aw, shucks" sort of Midwestern wholesomeness and accessibility that belie the fact that he is a millionaire several times over. Most appealing has been the

way that he has been able to join to these skills a knack for crystallizing the concerns of the American voter with one-liners that go to the heart of the matter, such as his often-repeated opposition to the Panama Canal giveaway: "We bought it, we paid for it, it's ours, and we're going to keep it."

What is not generally known by the public about Reagan is the fact that he has been giving speeches and writing articles about Communism for almost 40 years, dating back to his days as president of the Screen Actors Guild (SAG). To better appreciate President Reagan's present thinking on the subject, a summary of his views from those times, as well as of his activities, is in order. Strangely, the first important politically-oriented address by him was made for a Communist front group: In 1945, he spoke at a mass meeting, "Atomic Power and Foreign Policy," sponsored by the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of Arts, Sciences and Professions. (see Anne Edwards, *Early Reagan: The Rise to Power*, William Morrow, 1987, pp. 293, 305) At the time, Reagan was a Democrat and an ardent supporter of New Deal policies; later he would say that he had been a "hemophiliac liberal." (ibid., p. 293) He belonged to HICCASP and another front, the American Veterans' Committee, but quit both when their Red ties were made known. (ibid., p. 305-306.)

The anti-Communist image began to take shape in the fall of 1947 when, as SAG president, Reagan was called before the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a friendly witness during the hearings on Communist subversion in the motion picture industry. The transcript of his testimony shows Reagan admitting some infiltration had occurred but not volunteering information on who might be involved and making what seemed to be a veiled criticism of the committee. (The full transcript is reproduced by Edwards, pp. 342-349.)

In the early 1950's, Mr. Reagan began writing articles, including one for labor columnist Victor Riesel in which he states: "I believe that all participants in the international Communist conspiracy against our nation should be exposed for what they are—enemies of our country and our form of government." (cited, Edwards, p. 404n) A decade later he began touring the U.S. to give speeches sponsored by General Electric. He told audiences that "we are at war (with Communism) and we are losing that war simply because we don't or won't realize we are in it." (ibid., p. 475) Another passage indicates Reagan's knowledge of the Conspiracy's plan to merge the USA and USSR:

> The Communists are supremely confident of victory. They believe that you and I, under the constant pressure of the cold war, will give up, one by one, our democratic customs and traditions. We'll adopt emergency "temporary" totalitarian measures, until one day we'll awaken to find we have grown so much like the enemy that we will no longer have any cause for conflict. (ibid.)

In a speech entitled "Losing Freedoms by Installments," given before the Fargo, North Dakota Chamber of Commerce in 1962, Reagan returned to the same point, stressing that, in this scenario, America would "move to the left in a planned economy and the Soviets, reassured, would move to the right to meet us and thus the lion and the lamb would lie down together." (ibid., p. 549) And in the same speech he charged that the income tax is "a progressive system spawned by Karl Marx and declared by him to be the prime essential for a socialist state—the method for taxing the middle class out of existence." (ibid.) Why, then, it may be asked, has President Reagan done nothing to dismantle our socialist welfare state but rather has increased its might—and why hasn't he supported the Liberty Amendment which has as its goal the abolition of that great engine of socialism, the federal income tax?

Since becoming the nation's Chief Executive, Reagan has succeeded in the difficult task of *sounding* hard-line on Communism while, in *substance*, promoting a continuation of the *detente* he claims to hold as anathema. When the Korean airliner was shot down by the Soviets in 1983, Reagan felt "anger," he told *Time* magazine (September 19, 1983), but in the same interview he turns right around and says "there is no way you can avenge such a thing." A year later he referred to Red China as "so-called Communist." (You can't get much more "so-called" than the Chinese Reds.) And he claimed that the enslaved peoples behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains "prefer Socialism or Communism." (For the full quote, see "World Communism: Made in the U.S.A.," *The Athanasian*, September 1, 1987.) How he can state that those in the Captive Nations *prefer* living under such regimes boggles the imagination. *The inescapable conclusion, based on his speeches and writings, is that Ronald Reagan knows the score when it comes to Communism but, for whatever reason, has opted to ignore it in carrying out his sworn duties as President.*

Reagan And The Right

When Ronald Reagan ran for governor of California in 1966, it was as a conservative Republican. He blasted the incumbent's spending binges and pledged to "cut, squeeze and trim" the size of government and to institute no new taxes. After being elected, he sponsored a tax increase of one billion dollars the following year—the largest in state history up to that time. His cabinet included liberals and he would sign into law liberal abortion "reform" in 1967. Many conservatives must have asked themselves: Is *this* the man we helped to elect?

Now, over 20 years later, they're asking the same question. A clue to Reagan's *true* political identity emerged from the 1966 gubernatorial campaign. When asked by White House correspondent Lou Cannon about support from members of The John Birch Society, he responded, "Any members of the society who support me will be buying my philosophy. I won't be buying theirs." (Cannon, *Reagan*, Perigee, 1984, p. 115) And what *is* the philosophy of the Birch Society? It is precisely the one for which Reagan ostensibly stood: "less government, more responsibility and, with God's help, a

better world" (the motto of the JBS). If he wasn't for this—what was he for?

Also revealing was the following exchange between Lou Cannon and a White House aide regarding Reagan allowing himself to be photographed with March for Life leaders. Cannon writes:

> "What do you want to give them?" I asked. "Symbolism," he replied. He then offered an analogy drawn from the popular film, *The Godfather*, in which the criminal leader advises, "Hold your friends close, hold your enemies closer." That, the aide said, was the tactic which the administration would follow with its friends on the fringes of the right. "We want to keep the Moral Majority types so close to us they can't move their arms," he concluded. (ibid., p. 316)

Holding them as a boa constrictor holds its prey, perhaps?

But if Reagan's real role is to neutralize the right by pretending to be a conservative, the strange distance between his words and deeds falls into place. When KAL 007, carrying U.S. Congressman Larry McDonald and 268 other civilians, was shot out of the sky by the USSR, conservatives implored President Reagan not to let this atrocity go unpunished, to "get tough." In "Reagan: the Wrong Stuff," an article that appeared in the February, 1984 issue of *American Opinion* magazine, the late Gary Allen (author of *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*) wrote:

> Upon hearing Conservative outrage at his failure adequately to respond, Mr. Reagan actually asked with fatuous irony if his critics wanted him to start a nuclear war.

The national news media, of course, did *not* inform Americans that many on the right reasonably argued that, in retaliation for the KAL murders, the U.S. should close the Soviet embassy, expel their "diplomats," sever relations and the like, the media saying *only* that the president had hinted that they were nuts who wanted to start Armageddon. More recently, when conservatives were assailing the INF treaty, Reagan said: "Those people, basically, down in their deepest thoughts, have accepted that war is inevitable." (White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater would actually tell the press that individuals such as Howard Phillips and Richard Viguerie had nothing to do with Reagan being elected.) Some of the president's remarks can be written off, perhaps, as being the result of misinformation, but the two above have a *calculated* ring to them. What better way to destroy the conservative movement in America than to have the beloved president, thought to be a solid conservative, ridicule its leaders as loonies and warmongers. An average American, who gets his news only from the controlled sources, hears the president attack and concludes, "These guys must *really* be extremists if Reagan won't have anything more to do with them." And it is just as easy for the gullible citizen (who probably still has his "Reagan in '80" lapel pin) to believe that the latest arms treaty—which he'd oppose if a Democrat were in office—"*must* be good or Ronnie wouldn't sign it."

The End Of The Line?

Is President Reagan a "useful idiot"? Or is he just weak and easily manipulated? Or is he a conscious agent of a criminal conspiracy bent on merging the USA with the Soviet Union to form the foundation of a New World Order? The reader is free to draw his own conclusion. In the final analysis, it really doesn't matter greatly how one answers because the destruction of our nation continues unabated. It is difficult to see how Reagan can fully escape responsibility. He's had eight years to fight for those values he has spoken so captivatingly about and, almost without exception, he has presided over a greater erosion of them. Those policies that favor the Conspiracy have been followed by President Reagan in the same way they have been followed for much of this century.

In a few more months Ronald Reagan will pass the scepter of power to the next carefully-groomed Establishment lackey. Then the script has him mount his steed, doff his cowboy hat to the camera and ride off into the sunset. And for America and her freedoms, unless enough informed citizens are aroused to action in time, that sunset is getting perilously near. †

> Patriotism means to stand by the country. It does not mean to stand by the president or any other public official save exactly to the degree in which he himself stands by the country...
>
> It is patriotic to support him insofar as he efficiently serves the country. It is unpatriotic not to oppose him to the exact extent that by inefficiency or otherwise he fails in his duty to stand by the country...
>
> *(Theodore Roosevelt)*

Pray the Rosary Daily

SURSUM CORDA

"Lift Up Your Hearts"

Despite the nearly incredible state of disarray to which its enemies have brought the Church in their attempts totally to destroy it, we traditional Roman Catholics must ever bear in mind one of the basic doctrines of our Faith, namely, that the Church is a divine institution which, by the will and power of God Himself, is indestructible. No evil force or any combination of such forces in all the world could possibly destroy the Roman Catholic Church for it has the infallible guarantee of its divine Founder that it will last until the end of time, until the world itself is no more. It is today the same One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church that it was on the first Pentecost Sunday, the day of its birth: the Kingdom of God on earth, the ever glorious Mystical Body of Christ. To be sure, that Body, as never before, has been severely scarred and bruised and pierced both by her avowed enemies without and by her disguised, traitorous enemies within. But have no fear. These wounds are not unto death. The Church will survive all. We have God's Word for that.

And there is a second reason why, in spite of all that has happened, we traditional Roman Catholics should take heart, and that is the simple truth that *we* are holding fast, that *we* are remaining faithful to the one true Church. In our steadfast adherence to the True Mass and the traditional Sacraments and devotions (especially the Rosary), in our fidelity to total Roman Catholic orthodoxy in doctrine and morals, in our adamant refusal to compromise our divine Faith for *any* reason—we *know* we are right and, consequently, by the grace of God we will never abandon the principles we hold and the stand we have taken!

Let us, then, never permit our sadness at the present woeful plight of the Church to become excessive and thereby discourage and divert us from the noble apostolate to which we are committed. Nor let the fact that we are but a remnant, a small minority, deter us or tempt us to despair. Superior numbers do not determine morality. If a course of action is morally right, it remains morally right even if no one follows it; if a course of action is morally wrong, it remains morally wrong even if everyone follows it. What is supremely important is that the stand we take *is* a morally right and just and logical one.

So, "lift up your hearts"! Pray often and ardently to the good Lord for the precious grace to remain ever loyal and true to our beloved Faith until death! "For...the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come..." (Saint Paul—Romans 8, 18)†

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

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. No articles from this newsletter may be reproduced either in whole or in part without the written permission of the TCA.

"Saint Helena" continued from page 2

Helena had the cross divided into three parts. One was sent to Rome and placed in the Church of the Holy Cross of Jerusalem; another was sent to the Emperor Constantine in Constantinople. The remaining portion was placed in a silver shrine in the Basilica of the Holy Cross which the Empress Helena had built over the spot where the cross had been found.

The elderly empress remained in Jerusalem where "she continually resorted to church, appearing humbly dressed among the praying women; and she adorned the sacred buildings with rich ornaments and decorations, not passing by the meanest towns." She continued to aid the poor, the imprisoned and those condemned to the mines. Through her efforts many were freed from chains and oppression. She was kind to everyone, but especially to religious, and took a particular delight in holding the water for the nuns to wash their hands, regarding herself "as the handmaid of the handmaids of Christ."

In 326 (the twentieth year of the reign of her son), Helena, who had rejoiced in humility while surrounded by the temptations of worldly honors, "received her heavenly crown." Before he died in 377, Constantine, following the example of his mother, was baptized.

Though she had been brought up as a pagan, Saint Helena gave herself unreservedly to God, once she had found the true Faith. Through her intercession may we also live our Faith without reserve, carrying always in our hearts the image of our crucified Lord. †

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. †

Pray the Rosary Daily

To live in our great cities without the loss of faith and purity requires no less heroism than was needed in the days of bloody persecution.

(Pope Pius XII)

Christianity has not been tried and found wanting; it has been found difficult and left untried.

(G. K. Chesterton)

Those people who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants.

(William Penn)

I am only one but I am one; I can't do everything but I can do something; what I can do, that I ought to do; and what I ought to do, that, by the grace of God, I shall do.

(Edward Everett Hale)

Treason doth never prosper, what's the reason? For if it prosper, none dare call it treason.

(Sir John Harrington)

All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing.

(Edmund Burke)