THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume XII, No. 4 † June 1, 1991

The Emptying Of Hell

John Kenneth Weiskittel

Late in March an arresting sight was visible in newsstands around the country. HELL, the headline proclaimed in red letters nearly an inch-and-a-half high, the effect heightened by the stark black background and a painting of the rich man of the parable (Dives) being tortured by demons. What made this so surprising was its appearance, *not* on the cover of some obscure theological journal but on the March 25 issue of *U.S. News & World Report*. Cynics will no doubt attribute the magazine's newfound interest in religious topics to its trailing its chief competitors — *Time* and *Newsweek* — in circulation, thus compelling it to use shock tactics to attract readers.

But whatever motive was behind *USN&WR*'s decision to devote seven full pages to such an *un-newsy* subject, the move indicates that, as Americans approach the twenty-first century, despite all the smug, sophisticated "post-Christian" assurance they display, there are some age-old fears that all of the comforts and diversions of the Space Age will not dispel. In fact, the direct impetus for the special section was a Gallup Poll conducted last fall, showing that 60 percent of Americans say they believe in hell. Although this is well below the 78 percent who believe in heaven, it is seven percent higher that the figure reported in 1981; six percent higher than in 1965; even two percent higher than in 1952. (Cited, Jeffrey L. Sheler, "Hell's sober comeback," p. 57)

Such survey results represent a significant shift in belief. As one of Christ's "hard sayings," the dogma of eternal punishment for the wicked hasn't set well with the "ecumenical" Modernist crowd and its sentimental leanings towards some sort of universal salvation. This mentality has virtual control of the Conciliar Church and "mainline Protestantism." Jeffrey L. Sheler writes:

> ... Even Kenneth S. Kantzer, a former editor of *Christianity Today*, confessed a few years back that he hadn't preached a sermon on hell in more than three decades. A general neglect of the subject in theological discourse prompted Martin Marty, a chronicler of American religious trends and professor at the University of Chicago Divinity School, to observe that "hell has disappeared and no one noticed." (p. 56)

How, then, to explain the renewed interest? Interpretations are varied. Sheler states that some see it as "a hopeful sign ...that the America of the baby boomers is returning to traditional religion"; others speculate that "the pervasive violence and suffering in modern society ...makes the idea of hell more readily grasped"; while a third group of observers dismiss it as "shallow nostalgia for the beliefs of childhood." (*Ibid.*) Advancing the last view is Marty, who declares: "If people really believed in hell, they wouldn't be watching basketball or even the TV preachers. They'd be out rescuing people."

To understand Marty's skepticism, another glance at the Gallup Poll is in order. As noted above, 78 percent of the respondents professed a belief in heaven; when these same Americans were asked about whether they considered their chances of going there as good or excellent, the same number answered in the affirmative. But, although six out of ten surveyed acknowledge hell, the total who think it is likely or very likely that *they* will spend eternity there is only four out of *one hundred*. In other words, the United States is either a nation of saints or (as is really the case) one whose people have a distorted view of God's mercy, a weakened sense of sin and a similarly erroneous notion of the risk of hell so many of them run by their lifestyles. According to such a mentality, the only sin punishable by hell is possibly mass murder. This devilish deception, which preys on fallen human nature, is being mightily abetted as well by Conciliar theologians. In the next few pages the heresy of an empty hell will be assessed.

Snapshots From Wonderland

"The horror of that moment," declared the King in Lewis Carroll's "Alice" book, *Through The Looking Glass*, "I shall never, *never* forget!" The Queen then quipped, "You will, though, if you don't make a memorandum of it." When considering the horror of hell, it can be said that few in the Conciliar Church are making a memorandum of it.

Evidence of this is to be found in the Gallup Poll already cited. The statistics gathered on "Catholics" are surprisingly similar to the overall data: 81 percent believe in heaven and 57 percent in hell; 76 percent feel confident about entering the abode of the blessed, but only five percent are worried about being lost forever. (p. 57) And this is in keeping with findings made by George Gallup, Jr., and Jim Castelli in *The American Catholic People: Their Beliefs, Practices and Values*. (Doubleday, 1987) There the authors note that "only 51 percent believe that God will punish evil for all eternity, while 32 percent do not believe that statement and 17 percent are undecided." (p. 16) When asked, "Do you think that a person who does not accept Jesus can have everlasting life?", some 48 percent answered "yes" and only 37 percent said "no". (p. 19)

What such opinion sampling demonstrates is that the traditional teaching of the Roman Catholic Church on the four Last Things (death, judgment, heaven and hell) is, at best, only an optional belief in the Conciliar Church. More often than not, however, the day-to-day practices of the new religion manifest a tacit nod in the direction of the distinctly *non-Catholic* teaching of universal salvation. Hence, instead of a Requiem Mass, with its somber reminder of that day of judgment that all must face (*Dies irae, dies illa* — "Day of wrath! O day of mourning..."), the Conciliarists have a "Mass of Christian Burial," in which the black of the requiem is removed in favor of white, just as the mourning of the former has been replaced in the latter by what may be described as "instant beatitude" for all the faithful. (Purgatory? What's that?!)

How could dogmas so fundamental to a Catholic outlook and to a secure relationship with God become the sort of questions so trivial as to be decided with a coin flip? As is so often the case in the crises afflicting today's Church, the blame can be directed towards the Second Vatican Council. The late Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, one of the first prelates to speak out against the Council, noted: "Since the Council was initiated it has, in a more or less general manner, shaken the certitude of many truths taught by the authentic Magisterium of the Church..." (Cited, Dr. Rama Coomaraswamy, *The Destruction of the Christian Tradition*, Perennial Books, 1981, p. 130) In this passage, taken from his book *J'accuse le Concile*, Archbishop Lefebvre stated that among those truths shaken by the Council are "the last ends" [or the Last Things — JKW].

In theory, anyway, Vatican II should have been a great opportunity to reaffirm the Catholic teaching on hell. After all, Pope John XXIII had expressed the view that the Council would be part of an effort to reach out to the world, a new way to bring it the mercy of Christ. One of the greatest services Vatican II could have performed would have been to counteract the lessening sense of sin, which has been seriously eroding morality for the better part of a century (further, even, if one traces it to its intellectual roots in eighteenth century Europe), warning of the consequences of following worldly allurements. Oh, passing reference is made here and there, as if an afterthought, but the Modernists who misdirected the Council saw to it that the subject be studiously avoided — an understandable view, given their penchant for the ultra-"ecumenical," "everyone-is-saved" error.

An example of such can be found in a debate that took place among the Fathers as *Lumen Gentium* (also called the Dogmatic Constitution of the Church or *De Ecclesia*) was taking shape. The dispute arose when the seventh chapter, which deals with the Church's *eschatological* (about the Last Things) aspect, was under consideration. Cardinal E. Ruffini, a defender of orthodoxy, was prepared to reject the text outright: "Purgatory was hardly mentioned, he complained, and the condemnation of those dying in the state of mortal sin was passed over in silence." (Xavier Rynne, *Vatican Council II*, Farrar, Strauss & Giroux, 1968, p. 294) This and similar complaints were met by the parry of Cardinal G. Urbani, who argued that "any major change in the chapter would destroy the harmony of the text which organically embodied the dogmatic, apologetic, pastoral and ecumenical aspects of the subject." (*Ibid.*) According to the Rev. Hans Kung, a liberal

peritus (or "expert") at the Council, in his book *Eternal Life?* (Doubleday, 1984), the question of hell "was not discussed at Vatican II." (p. 131)

And, of course, the "logic" of Alice's Wonderland was very much in play at Vatican II. Kung unconsciously demonstrates this in *Eternal Life?*. First, he quotes the following definition made by the Council of Florence in 1442:

> The holy Roman Church...firmly believes, professes and proclaims that none of those outside the Catholic Church, not Jews, not heretics, nor schismatics, can participate in eternal life, but will go into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels, unless they are brought into it (the Catholic Church) before the end of life. (p. 130)

He later observes that "the Second Vatican Council — admittedly without expressly revoking or correcting the definition of the Council of Florence, assumed by Rome to be infallible and irreformable — declares that even atheists of good faith can attain eternal salvation." (p. 131) And now, thirty years since the Council formally opened, beliefs expounded as "Catholic" have grown, in true Wonderland fashion, "curiouser and curiouser."

Hell Has No Fury . . . Period!

"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." (Psalms 110:10) This is a basic religious truth for Catholics but it is hardly such for many in the Conciliar Church. When they consider the judgment, it is as though God's justice is rendered totally enfeebled by His mercy, so much so that He cannot bear to condemn a soul to hell — or at least not eternally.

Not only are authentically traditional Catholic teachings challenged and held up to scorn and ridicule, but errors are championed by those who are supposed to be shepherds of souls. Jeffrey Sheler writes:

> In Roman Catholicism, the possibility of hell for the wicked remains on the doctrinal books. But, according to modern teachings, few souls are likely to end up there. Since the 1960's, when a spirit of ecumenism took hold of the Church at the Second Vatican Council, Catholic theology has emphasized the potential for all souls ultimately to make it to heaven — although many first may have to spend time in purgatory... In earlier times, "we were told hell was a real possibility for all of us," recalls the Rev. Richard McBrien, chairman of theology at the University of Notre Dame. "If you ate a hot dog on Friday and got hit by a truck before you went to confession, you'd suffer the same punishment as if you were a murderer." Now, says the Rev. Avery Dulles, theology professor at Fordham University in New York, the emphasis is on the mercy and love of God. "Hell is there and ready to receive anyone who meets the condition for falling into it," says Dulles, "but it's quite possible that no one will really go there..." (p. 60)

Reading such from two ordained priests is galling. Father McBrien trivializes an act of disobedience to Church law and distorts the justice of God by suggesting that His punishment for the infraction is exactly the same as for a slaying. It is difficult to believe that a learned cleric of his stature could be unaware of the consistent Catholic teaching that the degree of suffering experienced by the damned varies in a manner similar to those of beatitude for the blessed. But then, if his intention is to make the Church's laws and teachings — especially its teaching on hell — look ridiculous, a moment of "forgetfulness" serves well his cause. Father Dulles will be dealt with in a moment.

For Hans Kung hell is a concept to be molded, twisted and manipulated endlessly. He follows the lead of other Modernists by arguing that the fire of hell is only a metaphor to explain a sinner's anguish or refers to an area used for burning corpses outside Jerusalem, while the term "eternity" he waves aside as a mere Semitic expression for a long period of time, asserting that "Jesus is *not a hellfire preacher*." (*Eternal Life?*, p. 133.) If by "hellfire preacher" Kung means a raving fanatic, he is correct. And it is also true that Christ did not make damnation the central part of His message to the world. ("I have not come to judge the world, but to save the world." John 12:47) And yet the fact is inescapable — except, perhaps, to the Modernist — that, in a less obvious way, hell is vital to an understanding of Our Lord's life, death and resurrection because it is *from hell that He saves*. The prospect of everlasting punishment is too much for Kung, who says such "torture" would come

from "a truly merciless God." (p. 136) Yet this may not be reason for concern, since "the 'eternity' of the punishment of hell may never be regarded as absolute," and some future, universal reconciliation between God and impenitent sinners is possible — "the consummation of a salvation of all, an all-embracing mercy." (pp. 140, 142)

Eternal Life? does provide some interesting passing references. Mentioned is the book, *There Is No Fire Burning In Hell*, by the "Catholic theologians" Thomas and Gertrude Sartory, in which it is argued that the doctrine of hell is largely to blame for making Christianity the most "murderous" religion (by persecutions and the condemning of those outside the faith to hell). (p. 132) And according to polls in Germany, 47 percent of German "Catholics" in 1967 rejected a belief in hell; by 1980 the figure had risen to 59 percent. (p. 142) In the latter poll, 61 percent denied purgatory as well.)

The most popular Conciliar view of hell appears to be that of Father Dulles (and, implicitly, that of John Paul II) — namely, a largely empty inferno populated by only the devil and his fellow fallen angels. (Satan, if this version of hell is to be believed, would be the loneliest individual this side of the repairman in the Maytag washer ads.) That the enemy-occupied Vatican is supportive of the error is evident in the case of the late Swiss theologian Hans Urs Von Balthasar, a man who in 1988 was seriously being considered as a potential cardinal. In the two years prior to this he published two works in German that were later printed together in an English translation entitled *Dare We Hope That All Men Be Saved?*. The July, 1989 issue of the Conciliar journal, *Homiletic & Pastoral Review*, featured an article, "Von Balthasar and Salvation," by the Rev. James T. O'Connor, a professor at St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, New York. From the first paragraph of the article, in which Balthasar is described as "justly renowned," O'Connor leaves little doubt as to where his sympathies fall, though he does make some effort at balance. He writes that "(Balthasar) characterizes his opponents (that is, those who maintain that there are, *de facto*, humans who are or will be eternally damned) as 'infernalists,' even while recognizing that some of the Church's greatest theologians (he cites Augustine, Gregory the Great, Anselm, Bonaventure, Aquinas, John Henry Newman, etc.) belong to this category." (p. 10) Who are those mentioned that took the opposite view? Mystics such as Julianna of Norwich, Saint Gregory of Nyssa and other Church Fathers, and principally Origen. But O'Connor weakens both his and Balthasar's case by quoting a condemnation of "Origenists" in 543 by the Synod of Constantinople that was later approved by Pope Vigilius, and which reads:

> If anyone says or thinks that the punishment of the devils and of evil men is for a time and that there will be an end of it at some time, or that there will be a restoration of the devils and evil men, anathema sit. (p. 16)

Now Balthasar's thesis isn't exactly contrary to this, as he acknowledges the damnation of demons and, rather than say the damned will be eventually restored, "proposes the *hope* that no humans are or will be actually damned." (*Ibid.*)

O'Connor allows that this hope goes against the reasonable presumption that some people will be lost, "a presumption," he writes, "that the words of Jesus and the teaching of the Church would appear to have as their own, and better guides in this matter we cannot have." (p. 20. He cites Matthew 25:41) How, then, can he and Balthasar support the opposite? O'Connor contends:

> ... Against such a presumption one cannot have what is properly defined as *theological hope*, but one can and must have a human hope, a wish which expresses itself in prayer and zealous efforts, for the salvation of all." (p. 20)

The problem here is that it flies in the face of the stern warnings of Our Lord (see the prophecy in Matthew referred to above), reason and experience. Although the Church has never made a list of the damned, the overwhelming view of the traitor Judas is that he died impenitent and was lost. For example, in its article on hell, we read in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*: "Of Judas Christ says: 'it were better for him if that man had never been born.' (Matthew 26:24) But this would not be true if Judas were ever to be released from hell and admitted to eternal happiness." (Joseph Hontheim, "Hell," Vol. VII, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1910, p. 211) Another scriptural text, less frequently used in this regard but just as valid, comes in Our Lord's prayer for His disciples at the Last Supper: "Those whom thou gavest me have I kept; and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition,

that the scripture may be fulfilled." (John 17:12) It is difficult to see how a case could be made for Judas' redemption after Christ Himself has declared him lost.

Is it realistic to think that all have made a perfect act of contrition before their deaths? Insofar as we can judge from outward appearances, the answer would clearly have to be in the negative. But, the universalists argue, only God can see the inner disposition of a person's heart, so the one who *seems* to be dying impenitent may really be inwardly disposed to repentance. This, of course, is true but the same kind of argument can be made that some who make an outward show of sorrow for sins haven't truly repudiated them. What cannot be reasonably denied, however, is Christ's warning: "Enter ye in at the narrow gate: for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there are that go in thereat. How narrow is the gate, and strait is the way that leadeth to life: and few there are that find it!" (Matthew 7:13-14) In light of such clear indications that some souls will be lost, one would think that the universalists might give pause for reflection. Not so for O'Connor. He goes so far as to misapply the Fatima prayer, despite its being phrased as to refer to the *living* (note the present tense of "forgive us" and "save us..."). Surely the desire that all those still living may accept Christ does not require one to throw reason out and entertain half-baked sentimentalist notions about earlier generations nor does it mean that one seriously believe that all the living *will* be saved. (It is God's will that people don't sin but He nevertheless permits it. So, too, He wills that all be saved but He allows free will to be used either to that end or to perdition.) The universalists' views remind one of the Negro preacher who is reported to have remarked in the course of his sermon at the funeral of a ne'er-do-well: "We all hope he is where we know he ain't."

Can Universalists Be Saved?

Of all the ways traditional Catholics have to demonstrate the validity of their stand, perhaps few are as strong as a comparison of the public morality they profess and that of Conciliar "Catholics." The true Catholics have a greater respect for the sanctity of marriage, while Conciliarists divorce with the same regularity as other non-Catholics. Traditionalists are more likely to have large families but their counterparts more often use birth control. The Conciliar Church is also the home for groups supporting homosexuality and abortion, something that would not be tolerated for a moment by real Catholics.

Can any more evidence be needed to show the truth of the expression, "ideas have consequences"? If parishioners are not reminded of the danger of losing their souls, it follows that they will be less vigilant in safeguarding virtue since there is no penalty attached to sin. It is an easy step from there to begin questioning the very existence of evil, rationalizing all such behavior as mere social aberrations, genetic defects, psychological disorders, etc.

The extent to which even the idea of hell has vanished from the minds of Conciliarists became sharply focused when Bishop Austin Vaughan admirably warned "Catholic" pro-abortion politicians that they were in danger of damnation. The Conciliar response to their bishop's statement was typical. While some conservative Conciliars applauded him, there were also loud protests against his "meddling in politics." The thought that someone still believed in hell was too much for many "progressives" to take. They regarded Bishop Vaughan with the same sort of shock one may have upon seeing a fellow drive a horse and buggy onto an interstate highway.

God has warned about hell not because He seeks to cast people into it but precisely because He wishes for no harm to come to those redeemed by His Son. Likewise, the traditional Catholic has the duty of warning his separated Conciliar brother of the danger of a lax attitude toward sin. For those with ears, let them hear Pope Benedict XII in his 1336 Constitution *Benedictus Deus*: "We define that according to the general disposition of God the souls of those who die in actual mortal sin go down immediately after death into hell and are there tormented by the pains of hell." And let them hear as well the words of Saint John Chrysostom: "The fire of hell is unbearable and its torments awful. But if you were to heap together a thousand hell fires, it would be as nothing compared to the punishment of being excluded from the beatific glory of heaven, hated by Christ, and compelled to hear Him say, 'I know you not.'" †

Conscience And Temptation

Fr. Oswald Baker (England)

In consequence of what we call original sin we are all born into this life with a self-centered, self-seeking, self-indulgent disposition. Even when a soul reaches an advanced stage of sanctity and selflessness, a residue of potential selfishness remains in the depths of the soul while earthly life lasts. Impulses from that nether region of our personality we call temptations.

We are all subject to temptation. We all experience sinful impulses. We cannot avoid them but we can resist them. Temptation is a problem of understanding, control, resistance. The first requirement in tackling any problem is to understand the nature of it. The more we understand about the way our mind works, the better our self-knowledge — and so the better our capacity for self-control. What elevates self-knowledge and self-control into virtue is prayer. Not the mere recitation of prayers but true, sincere, thoughtful prayer, which means acknowledgement of our helplessness without God, humble self-surrender to God, and suppression of ungodly desires. When this is the established disposition of a soul, the result is serenity, clarity of mind and strength of will that will make right decisions both easy and increasingly likely. But temptation remains always a possibility.

Temptations will vary according to our personalities. If we are ambitious, we may find it hard to refrain from trampling on the feelings or even the rights of others. If we think we are more important than others appear to think we are, we have to guard against talking too much about self, against sensing a snub where none is meant, against viewing everything in terms of self-reference. If we tend to be perfectionists, we shall have to resist the temptation to demand too much of others. It is immensely important to know precisely our dominant failing. When we know it and frankly acknowledge it, the battle is half won. And whatever the virtue against which we find we are most often tempted, in the faithful practice of that virtue our particular service of God lies.

The voice of conscience might well be a whisper rather than a shout, and this is why it can come easy to stifle it. We do not as a rule directly flout our conscience. We are cunning. We humbug our conscience. We make a dishonest attempt to justify doing what we want to do. As the embezzler tells himself he is just borrowing money, as the unfaithful husband assures himself that what his wife does not know will not hurt her, and as the salesman pads his expense account on the plea that everybody does it — so we might justify, for example, sloth by calling it tiredness. The domain of conscience is peculiarly liable to the intrusion of conscious or half-conscious fraud.

In the quest for heaven a fundamental task is the formation and preservation of a healthy conscience. The rectitude and efficiency of our conscience depend on our care and cultivation of it. We have first to ensure that our conscience is not erroneous, that it does correctly express the will of God. It is precisely for our guidance here that Our Lord has instituted His Church. But even after apprehending what is right and what is wrong, conscience still needs training. It must be firm but not scrupulous, strict but not severe, solicitous but not anxious, delicate but not petty, prompt but not hasty, cautious but not apprehensive, calm but not careless, punctilious but not fastidious, quick to detect the beginnings of sin but not alarmed at its mere shadows. The influence of the passions tends to blind conscience and set it aside. Faced with temptation we should look ahead and see how eventual disadvantages outweigh the satisfactions of the moment. The extra drinks this night are not worth tomorrow's hangover. The momentary satisfaction of making the cutting remark is not worth the loss of a friendship. The trouble is that strong temptation can oust intelligence. Freud wrote that "intelligence can function reliably only when removed from the influence of strong emotional forces." When making a decision in some moral matter, we should carefully make sure that our judgement is not clouded or in any way biased by personal emotional involvement.

The struggle against temptation is lifelong for all of us. But if we can recognize temptation for what it is, correctly identify it, if we can pinpoint our own weaknesses, if we can eliminate insincerity and shortsightedness, we can be optimistic. Having constant recourse to prayer and the sacraments, being resolutely loyal to the Faith (despite some failures to live up to its ideals), we shall preserve our state of grace and make progress. Though we may lose a few battles, we are likely to win the war. □

To Tell The Truth

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

Of the manifold and diverse offenses which man commits against the moral law of God, the most common is not, say, impurity or anger or uncharitableness or injustice. Rather it is, I submit, the sin of dishonesty or deception in one form or another (lying, hypocrisy, corruption, duplicity, etc.). And, fallen human nature having remained pretty much the same since the commission of original sin by our first parents, that statement would likely be as applicable to the human race down through the centuries as it is today. The vice of dishonesty is rampant on the American scene and is both one of the primary signs and causes of the exceedingly immoral state to which this nation has degenerated. While moral goodness may never have been an outstanding mark of the USA among the generality of its citizens, one thing's for sure and that is that its opposite, moral wickedness, is here and now one of those marks. Nor is there any better single example of that wickedness currently poisoning America than the sin of dishonesty.

Whether it be business or the professions or politics or religion, if any one evil trait can be singled out as being a common denominator among them, that trait is dishonesty — and on a massive scale. Yes, there are honest and honorable people in all of them but they are, I submit — and perhaps especially in the legal profession and in civil government — far more likely the exception than the rule. Duplicity, double-talk, hypocrisy have come to be a characteristic mark of so many lawyers and most politicians. While the profession of law and the science of government are in themselves noble concepts, these careers have been so debased by unscrupulous lawyers and politicians over the years that they are today held in low esteem by principled men and women. Honest lawyers, I suspect, are a minority in the legal profession while honest politicians, particularly those in the echelons of the federal government, seem to be an almost extinct species.

But, of all places where one might expect to find immorality in general and (in the context of this article) dishonesty in particular, the least likely would surely be in the realm of religion, that is, among those whose lives, ostensibly at least, are dedicated to the service of God and who are supposed to be exemplars of moral righteousness in their words and deeds. Well, while this was apparently true to a large extent in years gone by, it most certainly is not true today, the Conciliar Church providing the best case in point. And, of the several forms of dishonesty for which that Church is presently notorious, the hypocrisy of its hierarchy is, I think, the most outstanding. Although they pose before the public as men of God and defenders of His moral law, their actions so often belie their sincerity. (Numerous examples can be given relating to such issues as homosexuality, abortion, religious indifferentism, etc. To give but one: Cardinal John O'Connor, allegedly less "liberal" than most of his episcopal confreres, allowing the pro-homosexual, pro-abortion mayor of New York City to speak at "Mass" in churches in the Archdiocese of New York.) The Weaklands and the Bernardins and the Hunthausens and the Hubbards and the Gumbletons and the Unteners and so many others of their ilk, while masquerading as sincere spiritual leaders, are using their influential positions to destroy whatever is left of the Faith in the Conciliar Church and, in the process, laying the groundwork for the upcoming One World Church. Thank God, they're not Roman Catholics. But, considering the Conciliar Church worldwide, is there any one member of its hierarchy who excels all the rest in the vice of hypocrisy? Assuredly, there is: that master hypocrite, John Paul II.

The vice or sin of dishonesty is one of the most destructive evils of our day and one of the primary causes of the present utterly horrendous condition of the USA. Multitudes there are for whom the virtue of honesty or veracity means nothing and who will not hesitate to deceive in word or action if it is to their benefit to do so or if the truth hurts — and they couldn't care less that dishonesty is a violation of the moral law and offensive to God. Honor, truth, integrity, principle, duty — how uncommon are these qualities in the lives of countless individuals both among the rank and file of people and those in positions of power and influence. But it is those very qualities which are an essential part of the backbone of society while their absence on a massive scale is a guarantee that that society is destined to disintegration. And is not this the stark tragedy unfolding today in the moral collapse of the USA? Please God, the integrity and the high level of honor and respect for truth of traditional Roman Catholics are such that they do not in any manner contribute to that tragedy. Whenever circumstances demand it and regardless of the consequences, may they always have the courage to tell the truth! †

CAPSULE COMMENTS

†††

While animals are creatures of God, they were created by Him for man and are under man's dominion. (Genesis 1:26) Animals have no rights. Only human beings have rights — and they come from God, not from government. Man, however, does have the obligation to refrain from cruelty towards animals and to avoid inflicting unnecessary suffering upon them.

†††

Homosexuality is not an inherited condition but has been acquired by an individual through his or her aberrant behavior. This has been conclusively determined, both scientifically and medically.

†††

The confiscation of the guns of its citizens is an essential preliminary step in the subjugation of the USA. The movement towards that objective is steadily escalating on the American scene. So, don't give up your guns! "When the strong man, fully armed, guards his courtyard, his property is undisturbed." (Luke 11:21)

Freemasonry and John Paul II are major forces in the camp of the Master Conspiracy in its ongoing formation of the One World Order. How very unfortunate that these two evils remain so largely unexposed in comparison to the exposure given to other segments of that Conspiracy.

†††

A few days after the death of Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre a form letter, signed by Bishop Richard Williamson of the Society of Saint Pius X (SSPX), contained the astounding information that the archbishop was already in heaven. Perhaps he is — or at least well on his way there. Apart, however, from those instances wherein the Church has officially declared through the process of canonization that a particular individual is in heaven (and in certain other cases), we mortals do not know who is in heaven and who is not — and for Bishop Williamson to write as he did on this matter regarding Archbishop Lefebvre is entirely out of order because it is contrary to the mind of the Roman Catholic Church. Rather does it reflect the mentality of the Conciliar Church with which the SSPX is affiliated.

†††

Pray the Rosary Daily

The enclosed white envelope is for the convenience of those who may wish to send a donation to the TCA. If a blue envelope is also enclosed, that is to be used for subscription renewal.

SUBSCRIPTON RENEWALS

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

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

THE ATHANASIAN

Published by Traditional Catholics of America

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

Subscriptions: $12 per year (via First Class Mail) for the USA, Canada and Mexico; $16 per year (via Air Mail) for all other countries.

Additional Copies: Single copy - $1.50; 10 copies - $12.00; 40 or more to same address - $1.00 each

Mailing Address: P. O. Box 38335, Colorado Springs, CO 80937 **Telephone:** (719) 636-1575

Articles appearing in this newsletter may be reproduced providing no changes of any kind are made in those articles and adequate credit is given to *The Athanasian* for them. The adequate credit preferred would be the inclusion with the articles reproduced of the information contained in this box.

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