THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume X, No. 2 † March 1, 1989

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV: FRIEND OR FOE?

John Kenneth Weiskittel

Most readers of this newsletter will undoubtedly agree with the observation that we live in *a world gone mad,* and they can readily cite examples from the fields of religion, politics, culture, society and so on. But the latest—and, in some ways, most striking—example is a development that few would have thought possible: the emergence of the ruler of the oldest and largest *Communist* state as one of the most admired political figures in *non-Communist* countries.

As if to prove the adage, "fact is stranger than fiction," the West has fallen in love with the Soviet Union's Mikhail Gorbachev. A number of European public opinion polls ranked him higher in popularity than President Ronald Reagan and the enthusiastic crowds greeting him during his 1987 visit to Washington, D.C., prompted one U.S. journalist to write of "Gorby fever." The widespread perception is that he is a "different sort of Communist," one who truly cares about his people and sincerely seeks peace among nations.

Some traditional Catholics and other conservatives may be inclined to write all of this off as merely the latest attempt by the trust-the-Soviets crowd to convince the rest of us that atheistic Communism isn't so fearsome after all. We are greatly mistaken, however, to ignore the Gorbachev phenomenon—and we do so only at our own risk—*for the next few years may be the most crucial time in our nation's history.* The fact is we *are* dealing with a different sort of Communist, at least as far as appearances go. Unlike his predecessors, Gorbachev has replaced the "we will bury you" stand with a posture of reasonableness and conciliation. (His remarks at the United Nations, in which he suggests that the Kremlin does not possess "ultimate truth," could easily be branded as ideological heresy in doctrinaire Marxist circles.) Besides his rhetorical moderation, the Soviet president has exuded what, when contrasted with the Siberian chill of previous Kremlin heads, passes quite well for a friendly and personable manner.

Certainly Gorbachev has not been hurt by the praise he's received from Western leaders. In December, 1984, a few months before he rose to the top of the Soviet hierarchy, Mikhail Gorbachev visited Great Britain. After meeting with him, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher told the press: "I like Mr. Gorbachev. We can do business together." French President Francois Mitterand has called him the first "modern man" to rule the USSR. When asked about Gorbachev last December, then President-elect George Bush replied, "He's a warm human being, and people see that." Other favorable impressions have come from Reagan, Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney and West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl. (Of those mentioned above it is notable that, if political labels are true, only the Socialist Mitterand can be seen as Gorbachev's natural ally; all the others are routinely *perceived* to be on the center-right end of the spectrum.)

Reagan, in dealing with his Soviet counterpart, more than once used the old Russian saying, "trust but verify." But how trustworthy is Gorbachev? It is this question that is to be examined in the following study.

Before Glasnost

Strobe Talbott, *Time* magazine's Washington Bureau Chief and a Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) member, in his introduction to *Mikhail S. Gorbachev: An Intimate Biography,* writes of Gorbachev's transformation from "apparatchik to reformer." (*Time* Editors, Time Books, 1988, p. 2) There are many who hold to Talbott's interpretation that a dramatic change took place, moving Gorbachev from being a petty bureaucrat with unswerving loyalty to the Party into the crusading maverick who would stop little short of turning the nation's institutions inside out. An inspiring picture—but is it the *correct* picture?

To answer this, we need to trace Gorbachev's career before he became General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party in March, 1985. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was born to farming parents in the South Russian Village of Privolnoye on March 2, 1931, which makes him the first Soviet leader to be born after the 1917 Revolution. His grandfather was not only a Party member but chairman of a collective farm. (ibid, p. 26) As a teenager, Gorbachev joined the Komsomol (Young Communists League) and was awarded the Order of the Red Banner of Labor "at the remarkably young age of 18." (ibid, pp. 43, 45) Mark Frankland, former Moscow correspondent for Britain's *Observer* newspaper, has written that Komsomol membership is a "common first step towards joining the Party apparatus." (*The Sixth Continent: Russia & the Making of Mikahail Gorbachev,* Harper & Row, 1987, p. 161. Significantly, Gorbachev not only belonged to a Komsomol branch—he *led* it.) (The spelling—*Gorbachov* with a second "o"—is a case that points up the difficulty of rendering Russian names in English in a consistent way. Variants include czar/tsar, Romanov/Romanoff, Krushchev/Khrushchev, Gorbachev/Gorbachov and, although some spellings are used more than others, all are correct in the examples cited.)

In 1950, Gorbachev entered Moscow State University and re-

ceived a law degree six years later, making him only the second Soviet leader to hold a degree. (Vladimir Lenin's degree, also in law, was acquired in Czarist Russia.) It was there that he met his future wife, Raisa, who would later serve at the university as a "lecturer in Marxist-Leninist philosophy." (*Time* Editors, p. 202) An important point frequently glossed over in accounts of this period of Gorbachev's life is brought out by The John Birch Society in an advertisement, "Please, President Reagan, Do Not Dishonor America," which argued against Gorbachev's December, 1987, visit to the U.S.:

> ...During a time when many fellow students were being purged in the Stalin-era crackdowns on dissent, (Gorbachev) won favor for his unquestioned loyalty and submission to discipline, secured full Party membership (in 1952—JKW) and became a Party official upon graduation. (See *The New American*, October 12, 1987, p. 19)

And, lest skeptics dismiss this as an example of the Bircher's "paranoia," we can turn to the writing of John Lawrence, a British journalist who has frequently visited the Soviet Union and who can hardly be regarded as a hostile source. In *A History of Russia*, Lawrence reports:

> ...Already in 1945 some university teachers were alarmed by the free thinking of their pupils and, in subsequent years, the concentration camps received a considerable number of recruits from idealistic youth at the universities. These new revolutionaries generally accept the October Revolution and call themselves Leninists. Most of them look for a reformed Communism rather than for a new kind of society... (Mentor Books, 1969, p. 320)

In other words, students who openly called for changes in the system (as Gorbachev now professes to champion) were persecuted. *But Gorbachev was not among them.*

Rising through government ranks, he became the de facto mayor of the provincial capital of Stavropol in 1966, where he lived in the luxury of a three-story mansion. (*Time* Editors, p. 91) At Stavropol Premier Alexei Kosygin "met Gorbachev many times," and regular visitors to the city's spa to whom Gorbachev has acknowledged a debt included Party ideologist Mikhail Suslov and KGB Chairman Yuri Andropov. (ibid, pp. 100-102)

Gorbachev was named Central Committee Secretary of Agriculture in 1978; a member of the Ruling Politburo in 1980; Chief of the Soviet Economy in 1982; and Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Supreme Soviet in 1984. Also in 1984, he became unofficial General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party after Konstantin Chernenko fell ill with a disease that would kill him the following year. Gorbachev's climb to the summit of Soviet power culminated in his selection as General Secretary in 1985, three decades after leaving school. And, at only 54 years of age, he was in a position to rule the USSR into the next century.

Reform Or Rhetoric?

Mikhail Gorbachev is regularly touted as a kind of Communist Saint George waging war against the fierce dragon of entrenched Stalinist bureaucracy. Into the monster's lair he gallantly charges, uttering the twin cries of *glasnost* and *perestroika*. How much of this is substance and how much shadow? Does he really intend to slay the beast or is he actually supplying it with another fair damsel to devour?

Certainly Gorbachev has, on occasions, sounded the chords the West wants to hear. In a speech marking the 70th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, he condemned the "guilt of Stalin...for his wholesale repressive measures and acts of lawlessness are enormous and unforgivable." His policy of *glasnost* (variously defined as "openness" or "publicity") allowed: the Soviet press to ferret out stories of inefficiency and corruption of low-level Party officials and to fill in some of the "blank pages" of Soviet history; the publishing of a few long-suppressed literary works (such as Boris Pasternak's *Doctor Zhivago*); the release of a token number of political prisoners; the freeing of Nobel physicist and Humanist Manifesto II signer Andrei Sakharov from his banishment—and from all accounts, comfortable banishment—in the closed city of Gorky (Sakharov has, in turn, lent his considerable influence and support to the Gorbachev agenda); and permission for several thousand Jews to emigrate to Israel. As a result of all of this outpouring of "goodwill," more ties with the West have been formed.

The companion to *glasnost* in the economic realm is *perestroika* ("restructuring"). "To some, it means a return to the basics of socialism," note the *Time* editors in their biography. "To others, it means free enterprise and the market system." (p. 158) Could anyone *seriously* claim that the USSR is turning capitalist? Listen to what Establishment correspondent Henry Trewhitt (CFR) says, while quoting Gorbachev's U.N. speech:

> "We have (no) intention of being hemmed in by our values." Goodbye, Marx and Lenin. Hello, Adam Smith. Free-market forces will now be expanded. ("Responding to Gorbachev," *U.S. News & World Report*, December 19, 1988, p. 20)

And in 1987, after Gorbachev tried to persuade billionaire Donald Trump to invest in Moscow, the New York developer suggested, "Maybe capitalism is right around the corner." More often, however, *perestroika* is described as a restructuring of socialism by decentralization of management, less of collectivization in the work force and, as a result—surprise!—closer ties with the West.

Gorbachev first raised real doubts about *glasnost* and his own honesty in the wake of the Chernobyl nuclear reactor disaster. Although the meltdown took place on April 26, 1986, it was not until Western countries began reporting high levels of radioactivity in the air originating in the Soviet Union that he admitted the tragedy. On May 14, Gorbachev publicly faced the issue by accusing Western critics as hav-

ing created a "political campaign" based on "a veritable mountain of lies, most dishonest and malicious lies." (cited, James E. Oberg, *Uncovering Soviet Disasters: Exploring the Limits of Glasnost*, Random House, 1988, p. 256) Any hopes that the new "openness" is expansive enough to embrace rival political movements were dashed when, at a closed meeting of writers in June, 1986, Gorbachev explained:

> We do not have an opposition party. How then can we control ourselves? Only through criticism and self-criticism. Most important, through *glasnost*...(cited, *Time* Editors, p. 246. "Self-criticism"—accusing one's self in front of other party members—has been a long-standing tool for Party discipline among Reds.)

And although Gorbachev at the United Nations said that "free choice is mandatory," that freedom does not apply to the Baltic States of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania, all of which have heard him declare *nyet* to their cries of autonomy and civil liberties. (Perhaps he means the "free choice" to become or remain *Communist.*)

Similarly, *perestroika* has all the makings of being a ruse. Lenin established a New Economic Policy (NEP) in the 1920's that permitted small "private" farms and businesses but the government still held the title to the land. Even so, economic conditions improved somewhat when the noose of collectivization was loosened, then worsened when Josef Stalin revoked the NEP. It is also worth remembering, as historian Eugene Lyons reminds us, that such economic "'improvements' and 'reforms' do not affect the monopoly of *political* power" exercised by the Soviet state. (*Workers' Paradise Lost*, Paperback Library, 1967, p. 58. Emphasis added) It takes only a bit of reading between the lines to see in the following Gorbachev quote that the average Soviet citizen ought not to expect any marked improvement in his standard of living due to *perestroika*:

> On this point we want to be clear: socialism has nothing to do with equalizing. Socialism (as in Union of Soviet *Socialist* Republics—JKW) cannot ensure conditions of life and consumption in accordance with the principle, "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs." This will be under Communism. Socialism has a different criterion for distributing social benefits: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." (cited, *Time* Editors, p. 251)

Curiously, there has become even *more* centralizing in places. What *Time* editors call Gorbachev's "most ambitious *perestroika* project" has involved replacing five agricultural ministries with "a superministery called Agroprom." (ibid, p. 159) And last fall Gorbachev consolidated power by assuming the presidency of the Soviet Union. (*Facts On File* 1988 compilation, p. 725) *Perestroika*, states Gorbachev, is a way in which Soviet socialism "is more fully realizing its potential." (*Time* Editors, p. 162)

Are these catchphrases a springboard from which the Communists and their allies in the West seek to launch the One World Government conspiracy's next phase of world conquest? In a revealing passage from his book *Perestroika*, Mikhail Gorbachev defines "the revolutionary": "...he knows how to plan ahead and rouse the people and the Party to a lengthy and sustained struggle, *noticing each step of progress and using it to gain another foothold for another, greater step.*" (cited, ibid, p. 246, Emphasis added) *Time* writer John Kohan sounds the following warning (though he later excuses it away):

> Gorbachev's refrain of *glasnost* and *perestroika* also raises the specter of another Russian word, *peredyska*, the old Leninist notion of seeking a "breathing space" by making temporary accommodations so that the revolution can eventually roar forward with renewed zeal. ("The Gorbachev Challenge," December 19, 1988, p. 20)

Lenin, it should be said, is held in particular reverence by Gorbachev.

Comrade Gorbachev: Snob, Atheist, Actor

Dining with Margaret and Denis Thatcher in 1984, Gorbachev put his foot in his mouth by saying that "we are all working class" in the USSR. "No, we are not," snapped his wife, Raisa, "you are a lawyer."Mikhail reddened (if that's possible for someone who's already Red) and explained he was just using "a sociological term" (cited,*Time* Editors, p. 191).

If any fashion designer is doing a Best-Dressed Dictator list, then the Kremlin boss should top it. Among his suits are custom-tailored ones bought in England and Italy at 600 to 700 dollars *and up*—several months wages for many Soviet workers—and he sports a Rolex watch on his wrist. (ibid, p. 188) (Rolex watches, I understand, cost a *minimum* of five to six thousand dollars.) Not to be outclassed (no ideological pun intended), Raisa has outfits by Pierre Cardin and Yves Saint Laurent and, during the couple's 1984 visit to Britain, used "her American Express Gold Card (no credit limit) for purchases in London's tony Harrod's department store..." (ibid, p. 128) "...and spent $1,780 on a pair of diamond Cartier earrings." (ibid, p. 204) Who would have ever dreamed that oppressing millions could be so *chic*!

Apologies for making this sound like a segment of *Lifestyles of the Rich and Infamous* but there is a point to be made, namely, that the Gorbachevs are the first Soviet premier andwife to be making a major concerted effort to play up to the Western public. It's as though someone is coaching them on what to say, how to dress, what body language to use, etc. Democratic national committee chairman Robert Strauss (CFR), during Gorbachev's D.C. visit, told *Maclean's*, the Canadian weekly magazine: "He's working this country like it hasn't been worked before. It's a h— of a P.R. (public relations—JKW) show." (op cit, p. 25)

More suspect even than his high-fashion profile, however, is what Talbott of *Time* magazine refers to as Gorbachev's

"penchant for religious turns of phrase," such as: "Surely God on high has not refused to give us wisdom to find ways to bring us an improvement (in relations)." (*Time* Editors, p. 12. Talbott adds that "God" was changed to "history" in a Soviet translation of the interview.) Before his UN speech, he told its Secretary-General, Javier Perez de Cuellar: "God is on your side at the United Nations." (*Time*, December 19, 1988, p. 20) He is said to have then reworded it in Marxist jargon. According to reports, his mother is still a churchgoing Russian Orthodox. He told an English audience in 1984 that his grandparents hid icons behind portraits of Lenin and Stalin; once they took him to church with them, but he never returned. (*Time* Editors, p. 39) Although his wife is the more vociferous atheist of the couple, "he has spoken out on at least one occasion on the need to combat manifestations of religious sentiment." (ibid, pp. 39, 204, 206)

Mark Frankland speaks of "Gorbachev's skill as an actor," a talent he says is essential to survival in the Soviet system. (op cit., p. 158) A big assist in Gorbachev's present role came in 1983 when, on a trip to Canada, he met Soviet Ambassador Alexander Yakovlev who became "an important part of his management team." (*Time* Editors, p. 125) Yakovlev's time in Canada was spent "monitoring American television, reading American publications and absorbing American culture at its most basic level. From his Canadian listening post he gained an intuitive understanding of how American opinion is formed and, of course, manipulated." (ibid) When Gorbachev came to power two years later, Yakovlev was called back to Moscow and made media advisor and propaganda chief. Another valuable tool must be Soviet "journalist" Vladimir Posner, a frequent guest on U.S. television and a man who knows our culture intimately from having grown up in New York City and from his lectures on college campuses. Gorbachev's image makers have coached him well, he has played his part well and Western politicians and media people have done the rest.

The Woolen Wolf

Mikhail Gorbachev spoke at the UN of the need for a "new world order" and "interdependence" among nations, the language of the CFR and Trilateral Commission. At this moment that One World objective is advancing closer and closer to becoming a reality. The merger of the U.S. and USSR is the fundament upon which it would rest—and we have every reason to believe that President Bush will be working with Gorbachev to hasten the day.

When former Soviet Foreign Minister and President Andrei Gromyko nominated Gorbachev in a speech before the Central Committee of the Communist Party in 1985, he (Gromyko) gave a highly revealing endorsement: "This man has a nice smile, but he has teeth of iron." We would be wise to remember those teeth when he offers to withdraw troops from Europe, when he speaks of the "spiritual values" found in the French and Russian Revolutions, when his KGB proposes to work with Western intelligence to "fight terrorism" and when he invites U.S. companies to the Kremlin.

Our Lord warned us of false prophets who appear in the clothing of sheep. May God help us in our fight to expose them while there is yet time! †

ATTENTION!!!

The entire cost involved in the operation of the TCA and in the publication of *The Athanasian* is approximately $4000.00 a month. For about 60 percent of that total we depend upon the financial contributions of our newsletter subscribers. Because of the forthright and uncompromising stand we take on issues of the day relating to Church and country, a publication such as *The Athanasian* will never have a popular appeal. Absolutely convinced though we are of the truth and of the urgency of what we write, the simple fact is that the overwhelming majority of people are either so apathetic or so brainwashed that it is impossible to get through to them. Hence, the source of whatever financial support we need is necessarily limited to those who share our strong convictions and who, consequently, want to do their part to guarantee the continued publication of *The Athanasian.* And who are they except those who subscribe to it? Where else, pray tell, can we turn for financial assistance for such a publication except to its subscribers?

We are not presently about to collapse, I assure you, and we are completely free of debt. Our current funds, however, are quite meager. In order then to ensure, hopefully, a regular and sufficient income to cover our expenses henceforth, we are asking our newsletter subscribers to make a monthly pledge to the TCA. A self-explanatory pledge form will be found on page 7 of this issue and checks should be made payable to Traditional Catholics of America (or just TCA). Your regular monthly support of our TCA apostolate in this way will be very much appreciated.

Fr. F. Fenton

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

A FEW REMINISCENCES

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

For those who do not know but may wonder, I am now 71 years of age. When I was in grade school and high school I used to think (as all young people in that age bracket probably did and do) that anyone over 40 or so was old. As the years pass though, one's perspective on this matter of age gradually changes—as does one's perspective on numerous other matters as well. I now consider a person, say, in his early 40's as a youngster and I myself feel like one when conversing with people in their 90's! So much for those "profound" comments.

The tendency to reminisce is characteristic of people of more or less advanced years and, not surprisingly, I find myself doing just that from time to time. While engrossed in one such reverie, the thought occurred to me that perhaps I could put together an article for *The Athanasian* revolving around a few recollections from the past. At least such an article would be a sort of change of pace from the usual type of material which appears in these pages. Anyway, I'll give it a try.

It was away back in the middle and late 1920's when I attended grade school, of necessity a public school since there was no Catholic one in the area. As I now recall though, that public school was far more Catholic than most of the so-called Catholic schools of the present day. A number of the faculty were Roman Catholics, as was the principal whose son was a priest. On the particular day of the week when catechism classes were held at the parish church, we were regularly reminded of this by our teachers lest we should conveniently forget. As for discipline, there was plenty of it for infractions of the rule, some such infractions (improper dress, chewing gum, not paying attention, etc.) considered all but totally insignificant today in most public schools and in many "Catholic" schools. And if in those days you were punished for whatever reason by the principal or teacher and you were unfortunate enough that your parents heard of it, the chances are that you were administered a second punishment at home (usually of the corporal kind) for the same offense. So it was in my case for sure. If I were disciplined by anyone in authority in school or anywhere else, it was a foregone conclusion, at least to my parents, that I was in the wrong and deserved whatever punishment I got—and that settled that. Yes, my parents were strict and how often over the years I have thanked God that they were.

Since it was during the years of the Great Depression in the early 1930's that I was a teenager, I suppose that I and countless other boys and girls of that period would likely have been labeled as "poor" and "deprived" youth according to present worldly standards. My parents, along with innumerable others at that time, were victims of the depression in various ways—but they managed to make it all right even though they had very little of the material things which are today so much a part of the lives of multitudes of Americans. As for myself in those youthful years, I doubt if I ever gave much thought to the hardships of the times and probably just took those depression years for granted. Looking back on those years though, I know now that they were very difficult ones for countless individuals and families and that, by comparison to them, my own parents were far less hard-pressed.

And then came the seminary years, thirteen in all. While it is highly unlikely that most boys in their early teens have any certain concept of what they wish to become in terms of a vocation or career, my father and mother were apparently determined at least to channel my thoughts and desires towards the priesthood. They certainly gave me an early start in that direction by enrolling me in the minor seminary at the ripe old age of thirteen. While the education I received there for six years was an excellent one, it was not until years later that I came to realize how fine it was. As is wont to happen in life, we often do not appreciate the blessings we have until they are past and gone.

Seven years in the major seminary followed, which for me was the Sulpician Seminary at Catholic University in Washington, D.C. The training of candidates for the priesthood was the primary work of the Sulpician Fathers and they were professionals in the performance of their duties. Truly men of God, their spirituality and their dedication could not help but make a deep and lasting impression upon the young men in their charge. The seminary rules were strict and discipline was very much a part of the seminary training. In other words, the Sulpician Fathers, as we would say in current parlance, ran a tight ship.

What a striking contrast from the "country clubs" of the Conciliar Church that are being passed off as seminaries today where, at least in a number of them, discipline is a farce, homosexuality is tolerated if not actually approved, the spiritual life is depreciated, the curriculum in good part resembles that of a secular college, etc. (It is my understanding that in some of these Conciliar Church seminaries dating is permitted and I read some time back of one such seminary that had a bar—frequented by homosexuals—as one of its attractions!) Well, let us at least be thankful to God that the Conciliar Church and its "seminaries" are not Roman Catholic.

Most of my classes in philosophy and theology were conducted at Catholic University itself which in those days (1937-1944) was indeed a *Catholic* University. Of the many commendable professors whom I had there (all of them priests), I would mention but one, Father Francis J. Connell of the Redemptorist Fathers. If I were to single out any priest who had the greatest influence on me and for whom I had a profound admiration, it would be Father Connell. Although he was very well-known as an authority (perhaps *the* authority) on moral theology during the 1940's and 1950's and al-

though he was an excellent teacher (in whose classes it was my good fortune to have been a student for four years of moral theology) and although he was widely respected and loved, I mention him here for one reason mainly—and that is because he was one of the most humble persons I have ever known. 'Tis said that not all humble people are great but that all truly great people are humble. If Father Francis Connell may be described as having been a great priest—and I would so describe him—then he must have been *truly* great because he was so very, very humble.

A far more famous priest on the faculty of Catholic University in those days was Monsignor (later Bishop and Archbishop) Fulton J. Sheen. Certainly the Roman Catholic Church in this country has never had a more articulate and influential spokesman against Communism. How very regrettable that even he became a casualty of Vatican Council II, a striking example of the effect upon an individual of the insidious indoctrination and subtle brainwashing which took place during the course of that infamous Council.

It was in the early years of my priesthood that I became intensely interested in the subject of Communism and increasingly concerned about the steady progress it was making towards its ultimate objective of world domination (an objective it has never renounced). So concerned, in fact, was I about the Communist menace even back then (early 1950's) that I recall contacting Louis Budenz and arranging to have him deliver a series of ten weekly lectures on the "Techniques of Communism" in the parish in which I was then stationed. (The name, Louis Budenz, would likely be familiar to some of the older readers of this article. He had been a Communist and for some years the managing editor of the (Communist) *Daily Worker*, the best known publication of the Reds at that time. In 1945, he made a complete break with the Communist Party and either became a Roman Catholic or returned to the Faith which he had abandoned in his younger days. In any case, he was a Roman Catholic when I first made his acquaintance.) The series of lectures mentioned above proved to be a real education on the awful truth about Communism from a man who knew so very thoroughly the subject whereof he spoke. How well I remember—and this was some 35 years ago—Louis Budenz saying on more than one occasion: "The *New York Times* is a transmission belt of the Communist Party." And what the *Times* was then it remains to this day.

In one of the parishes in which I was stationed while still a fairly young priest there was a parishioner worth mentioning by the name of William F. Buckley, Jr. At the time I knew him (the late 1950's) I really thought that he would one day become an eminent leader on the side of anti-Communism. He certainly appeared to me then to be a staunch anti-Communist and to have the potential for such leadership. With the passage of time though, my high expectations for Mr. Buckley gradually faded. Whatever may be said on his behalf today, he assuredly is not distinguished as an articulate and militant anti-Communist. Indeed, he is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, an organization in which solid anti-Communists would be exceedingly difficult to locate.

During the 1940's and early and middle 1950's (up to the death of Pope Pius XII), at least the vast majority of the bishops and priests of the Church in this country were still Roman Catholic and more or less anti-Communist. Oh, there were occasional signs (more so in a few other countries than in the USA) that the Church was gradually being infiltrated and subverted by its enemies but this was not public knowledge and so the Church appeared on the surface to be functioning pretty much the same as usual. Although the infiltrators and subverters were definitely in the woodwork long before Vatican Council II, it was not until the advent of that Council that their vile machinations began to come to light. From that time on, the tragedy, in human terms, that has befallen the Church is a horror story that only a very exceptional individual could have foreseen and predicted years ago—unless, that is, he was one of the prime promoters of the destructive plot. To give credit where credit is due, Satan and his cohorts (Freemasons, Communists, secular humanists, etc.) have done a truly masterful job. Their nefarious efforts have met with astounding success to date and, from all present indications, that success will continue.

Since this article is already of sufficient length, I'll simply conclude it here with this one "unbrilliant" observation: 'Tis said that experience is the best teacher. If only we had in our younger years the insight and practical knowledge and common sense that we gradually come to acquire through experience as the years pass, how very different in various ways our lives might have been—and how much less of the past we might have had to regret. There is indeed no substitute for experience but only by living long enough is that lesson learned. †

Significant Communist Statements — 1

Conspiracy is so essential a condition of an organization of this kind (the Communist Party) that all other conditions...must be made to conform with it.

(Lenin)

Promises, like pie crusts, are made to be broken.

(Lenin)

Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron.

(Stalin)

Anyone who thinks we have forsaken Marxism-Leninism deceives himself. That won't happen till shrimps learn to whistle.

(Khrushchev)

Our Socialist world is definitely helping capitalism in one thing: *to dig its grave more quickly.* Such are the facts of the "fruitful" competition of the two systems.

(A. Solodovniko—Soviet theorist)

SAINT CANUTE, KING AND MARTYR

Jill Wiesner

Wealth, pleasure, power—these are the goals of modern man. Hearts grown cold toward God are ruled by passion. Evil men hold prominent positions in government and morality is replaced by pragmatism.

Just over nine hundred years ago, in the year 1080, Pope Saint Gregory VII was suffering greatly at the hands of a wicked and deceitful ruler, Henry IV, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. Excommunicated by the Pope for treating the laws of the Church with contempt, deposing bishops who condemned his lawless behavior, seizing Church property and giving to "his concubines precious stones stolen from the churches," Henry had appeared to repent of his sins and, clad in penitential garb, had stood in the snow outside the Pope's winter quarters at Canossa for three days, beseeching the Pope to absolve him from the ban of excommunication. Absolution was given him but Henry's contrition, if genuine, was short-lived. With the support of other grasping nobles, Henry "deposed" the true Pope and appointed an antipope. He then led an army against Pope Gregory, attacking Rome and setting fire to Saint Peter's. The Pope escaped but spent the rest of his life in exile. His last words were: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile."

Not all rulers were like the malevolent Henry. In 1080, the same year that Pope Saint Gregory was "deposed," Canute, the second of thirteen sons of Sweyn II, King of Denmark, succeeded to his father's throne. Canute was not driven by worldly ambitions but sought only to serve God and His Church and to protect the people whom God had placed in his charge. Intelligent, courageous and skilled in warfare, Canute was above all renowned for his piety. Upon ascending to the throne, Canute wasted no time in securing his nation's borders by ridding Danish waters of pirates and subduing the neighboring provinces from which barbarian raids had terrorized his people for years. Victorious, he did not add to his royal treasury by looting the conquered lands but instead planted the Faith there, providing funds for the building of churches and encouraging missionaries.

When Canute returned to Denmark's capital city of Zealand, he eschewed the honors of conquering hero, going instead to Roskilde Cathedral and prostrating himself before the crucifix. He removed his royal crown and laid it before Our Lord on the cross, offering "himself and his kingdom to the King of kings."

Having provided for the peace and safety of his nation, Canute married, choosing the gentle and pious Eltha, daughter of the Earl of Flanders, for his wife. The only son born to Canute and Eltha became known as "Robert the Good."

Within his kingdom Canute sought to curb the abuse of power by his nobles and to defend the rights of the church. He enacted severe but just laws which were to be obeyed by all citizens, regardless of rank. The old custom of "blood vengeance" was outlawed. Clergy were treated with honor and respect. King Canute encouraged and contributed to the building and adornment of numerous churches. However, a number of greedy and ambitious nobles, resenting

Traditional Catholics of America
P.O. Box 38335
Colorado Springs, CO 80937

_____Yes, I hereby pledge _____ a month to the Traditional Catholics of America.

(Please check one):
_____Please send me a monthly reminder.
_____I do not need a monthly reminder.

_____No, I cannot make any specific pledge but will try to contribute something each month.

Name _____

Address _____

City_____ State_____ Zip_____

the restraints he put upon them, organized a rebellion.

On July 10, 1086, the rebels, led by the king's brother Olaf, learned that Canute and his guard were at the Church of Saint Alban where he had gone to pray. Hearing their approach and realizing that escape was impossible, Canute's guard defended the doors of the church, thereby giving him the opportunity to receive the Sacraments. Kneeling at the foot of the altar, King Canute made his confession and received Holy Communion. Then, with outstretched arms, he recommended his soul to God. As he knelt thus in prayer, a javelin thrown through the window of the church struck and killed him. With Canute seventeen others were killed, including his brother Benedict.

After the death of King Canute a number of miraculous healings took place at his tomb and, in 1101, at the request of the second successor to his throne, Eric III, Canute was canonized by Pope Paschal II. The feast of Saint Canute is observed on January 19 and, in memory of his martyrdom, his emblems are a lance or arrows.

To the "virtues which constitute a great king" Saint Canute added those which "prove the great saint." Surrounded by men filled with worldly ambition, he did not allow himself to be deceived by such hollow joys. Emulating his example of love for God above all things, may we too "ever follow our suffering Lord and thereby deserve to enter into the same everlasting joy." (Collect from the Mass of Saint Canute.)†

Significant Communist Statements — 2

The time will come, of course, when there will be a world government, but it will the government of a world Socialist community in which there will be no place either for "free enterprise" or for the monopolies.

(Solodovnikov)

Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win, we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we will smash them with our clenched fist.

(Dimitri Manuilski—Soviet theorist—1930)

We are confidently going along our direct road, which was pointed out by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

(Khrushchev)

We are moving toward a new world, the world of Communism. We shall never turn off that road.

(Mikhail Gorbachev—November 2, 1987)

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.