THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume XIII, No. 6 † September 1, 1992

The Kingship Of Christ And Presidential Candidates

John Kenneth Weiskittel

For some decades, beginning with the administrations of William Howard Taft (1909-1913) and Woodrow Wilson (1913-1921), reaching a fever pitch during Franklin Delano Roosevelt's administration (1933-1945) and continuing into the present — politically conservative Americans have decried what they perceive as the erosion of the Constitution by forces seeking an all-powerful federal government. Taft's administration drafted amendments for the direct election of senators and income tax, and instituted the Department of Labor; Wilson's pushed the U.S. into World War I "to make the world safe for democracy," and agitated (unsuccessfully) for the League of Nations; and FDR's introduced a swarm of federal agencies on the pretense of leading the nation out of the Great Depression, maneuvered America into World War II (its second foreign conflict in less than thirty years), claimed the Soviet Union for an ally, and demonstrated this friendship at wartime conferences by giving the Communists Eastern Europe. And every president since Roosevelt has to some degree embraced this sellout of values, with George Bush providing its culmination by his zealous advancement of the New World Order.

Throughout the period mentioned the power of the federal government has continued to grow, to the point that it has precious little in common with that which the Founding Fathers established over two centuries ago. Today, myriad government bureaus, committees, commissions, departments, offices, programs, etc., have so proliferated that it well might take a document the size of this newsletter just to name them all. The Grace Commission, formed by President Ronald Reagan to study government waste, discovered no fewer than 963 social programs operating in Washington at taxpayer expense — and that was nearly ten years ago! The same report noted:

> The federal government is the world's largest power producer, insurer, lender, borrower, hospital system operator, landowner, tenant, holder of grazing land, timber seller, grain owner, warehouse operator, ship owner, and truck fleet operator. The federal government owns and operates 436,000 nonmilitary vehicles. It has over 17,000 computers, 332 accounting systems, and over 100 payroll systems.

In this vast bureaucracy can be discerned the portrait of a government out of control, and when — discounting necessary government functions as well as merely wasteful or frivolous expenditures — certain uses of tax dollars are considered, the image takes on vulgar, ghastly features: money for the funding of organizations like the pro-birth control, pro-abortion Planned Parenthood; money for pornographic and anti-Christian "art"; money for promoting One-World propaganda in the schools; money to sponsor the South African terrorist Nelson Mandela's tour of the U.S.; money to "loan" Communist dictatorships around the globe. And so on, *ad nauseum*.

While not all of the blame can be leveled at the Executive Branch, since both the Judiciary and Legislature share in the guilt, the power of the presidency has long been an instrument for the promotion of socialism/fascism at home, the betrayal of trusted allies abroad, and the creation of godless global government. In November voters will be asked to cast their ballots to decide who will occupy the White House for the next four years; four years that will be fateful in the nation's history; four years in which the New World Order likely will take a more distinct and menacing shape. Do traditional Catholics have a real choice in this year's election? Do the candidates articulate policies and principles consistent with the social and moral teachings of the Church? How, for example, do the candidates measure up to the standard enunciated by Pope Pius XI in his encyclical, *Quas Primas* (On The Kingship of Christ), namely, that "not only private individuals but State officials and rulers are bound by the obligation of worshiping Christ publicly and rendering Him obedience"? (It hardly needs mentioning that the *obedience* to which His Holiness alludes has reference to *the governance of the ruler*; hence, the familiar "I'm personally opposed to abortion, but..." dodge is absolutely contrary to the mind of the Church.)

Obedience to Christ the King, then, will be the balance in which this article sizes up the candidates. Besides George Bush and Bill Clinton, mention will be made of Ross Perot. Although he has announced he has dropped from the race, millions of supporters are urging him to continue and enough signatures have been collected — at last count — for

his name to appear on the ballot in twenty-four states. His surprise popularity should be considered, if for no other reason, because of what it suggests about the concerns of American voters. Although Perot *never formally announced* that he was running for the presidency, he was the subject of as many articles and broadcast reports as Bush or Clinton, and also appeared in as many interviews. But more on that later.

George Bush — The Consummate Insider

It is hard to imagine any traditional Catholic, however staunch a Republican, voting for George Bush. It is unthinkable that a *well-informed* one would do so. Bush's membership in secret/anti-Catholic/internationalist groups is adequate proof that he does not live up to what should be expected of a Christian ruler. Joining the quasi-Masonic Skull & Bones while at Yale, he has gone on to belong to the Freemasons, the Trilateral Commission (TC) and the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), for which he served as a director. When his membership in the latter two became an issue in the 1980 campaign he resigned, but in 1988 he received the endorsement of David Rockefeller (CFR and a TC founder), who stated, "He [Bush] has since spoken to the Council and the Trilateral and has been fully supportive of their activities. Even though he resigned, he hasn't walked away from them." And George Bush's tenure as president has done nothing to indicate otherwise. His vision of a New World Order has fallen perfectly into place with the goals for which the TC and CFR have long been striving — *goals that end up with a fully operative world government.*

The most spectacular manifestation of Bush's globalism took place in the desert sands of the Middle East when U.S. military personnel were called into action against the Iraqis in the Gulf War. This conflict, without a declaration of war from Congress, was initiated in response to a United Nations resolution and the Americans who fought did so as part of a forty-nation U.N. "peacekeeping" force. Despite the fact that Iraq posed no threat to this country, save for nebulous "national interests," President Bush put over 200,000 American lives in harm's way. (In reality, the interests advanced were much more those of the *U.N.* than of the *U.S.*) The Iraqis were no match for the high-tech blitzkrieg thrown at them, so the fighting lasted just over three months and the death total was kept mercifully low.

The stunning victory created a wave of patriotic euphoria that swept over the nation, and film clips of Operation Desert Storm will no doubt be replayed endlessly in Bush reelection commercials — that is, unless a *second* conflict with Iraq preempts them (Desert Storm II?). As this article is being written, there are signals that make this a distinct possibility. On August 2, the second anniversary of its invasion of Kuwait, the Iraqi government and state-run "news" media hailed its act of aggression as a "glorious day" and vowed to work for recapture of that nation. The following day, Iraq declared that the Gulf War will continue as long as U.N. sanctions against it remain in force. On August 4, nearly 2,000 Marines came ashore in Kuwait — the first of over 5,000 U.S. troops from all branches of service who are ostensibly to take part in "military exercises" with that nation's armed forces; two weeks of "routine training." (Let me go on record, sticking my neck out a bit, as predicting that there will still be U.S. troops in the area when you read this in September.)

Would Bush dare use the American presence in the Middle East (or, also as part of a U.N. force, monitoring the Croatian/Serbian conflict) as a springboard to reelection? Only he can answer that question. But it may be of more than historical significance to reflect on the fact that no president who sought reelection during wartime was ever defeated at the polls (those chief executives are: Madison — War of 1812; Lincoln — Civil War; FDR — World War II; and Nixon — Vietnam War). What George Bush undoubtedly knows is that in such a situation the U.S. invariably rallies together as a nation and that the designation *commander-in-chief* takes on a far deeper meaning to its citizens. The deplorable side of this, as it has been in all of this century's wars, the same citizens have blindly supported struggles that advance the formation of a one world government. Sadly, there is no reason to expect any change at the present time.

If any further proof of America's continuing decline is necessary, consider this sobering thought: *George Bush's strongest argument for reelection will surely be his foreign policy record.* In a campaign speech in Jacksonville, Florida, on August 3 he set the tone, stating: "The changes we've worked for have come to pass: the end of the Cold War, the collapse of imperial communism; a new birth of freedom, from Managua to Moscow; a new world of hope for ourselves and for our kids." He went on to speak of "a safer world," saying that "(w)e have done so much to reduce the threat of nuclear war." Regular readers of *The Athanasian* will already be aware that the fraudulent Communist reforms have no greater cheerleader in the West than Bush (unless it be Gorbachev's partner, John Paul II), that he welcomed Mandela to the White House, and that his "safer world"

includes Favored Nation trade status to the bloodthirsty Red Chinese government (Bush had the nerve to question the *morality* of opponents to the policy).

Where Bush is seen to be vulnerable is in domestic issues. Of course, Democratic challenger Bill Clinton will harp on the state of the economy, though the Congress — controlled by his own party — is primarily responsible. It will be hard for Bush to squirm out from under his "Read my lips — no new taxes" promise. And yet, from the moral perspective, there are far greater failures. While steadfastly claiming to be a "born again" pro-lifer, Bush chose David Souter as one of his Supreme Court nominees and Souter sides with the majority opinion that reaffirmed *Roe vs. Wade*. Confirmed pro-lifers who support Bush, while deploring the careless selection, will no doubt point out that another justice selected by the president, Clarence Thomas, voted against it. This amounts to a whitewash, however, that does not excuse the "lapse of judgment" regarding Souter for, *if* Bush were as strongly anti-abortion as he suggests, he would have made very certain, before backing them, that *all* of his judicial nominees were *equally committed* to the rights of the unborn in this life-and-death struggle.

On the campaign trail, Bush has defended his record by pointing out that he vetoed pro-abortion legislation seven times in his first term as president. Ordinarily, such actions could be taken at face value and praised as commendable. But when one recalls Souter, however, there is reason to speculate about even this seemingly strong commitment. After all, a crafty politician can easily and safely project a false pro-life image when he *knows* that the overwhelmingly pro-abortion Congress will *override* any veto he throws its way. Vice President Dan Quayle has sent a similarly mixed message, remarking that, should his thirteen-year-old daughter become pregnant, he would advise her to have the baby but would *support* her decision, no matter what it may be. In other words, one of America's top "conservative" leaders has indicated before the whole nation that he is ultimately pro-choice as regards his own flesh and blood, and that the girl is free to decide for herself on a gravely moral issue as though the question was of no more consequence that deciding what dress she wants to wear. (The benign interpretation, I suppose, is that this is but more example of his skill — *a la* the "potatoe" incident — of putting his foot in his mouth.)

Similarly, when, in 1990, grants from the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) for blasphemous and obscene works became a controversial issue, Bush showed his mastery for speaking out of both sides of his mouth: he said he shared the outrage of many Americans over the question, but added that at the same time he wanted to protect these "artists" First Amendment right to free speech. Had he really wished to stand up for the morality and "family values" he espouses from the soapbox, he would have forbidden the showing of these anti-Christian, antifamily monstrosities, and fired then-NEA Chairman John Frohnmayer *on the spot*. He did neither. Instead, Frohnmayer was allowed to continue on in that capacity. This past February, Bush, in an election year, finally decided to remove him... long after the damage was done! (Is it rash to speculate whether this was simply the cynical move of a seasoned politician who wants conservatives to trust him for four more years?) Voters would do well to remember those instances where the *real* "family values" of George Bush are revealed.

Bill Clinton: The "Moderate" Liberal

In July the Democratic Party held its convention in New York and formally endorsed the Bill Clinton/Al Gore ticket. Far more interesting than the convention, however, has been the response from news commentators. The Democrats unveiled a new image, they tell us, having sluffed off their longtime left-wing apparel for a more middle-of-the-road look. This is a quite extraordinary claim from the media since, as anyone who watched or read about the convention knows, it is a contention that does not even *remotely* resemble what transpired in the Big Apple.

The tone for the convention was set in the opening speech by the governor of Texas, who began her remarks: "I'm Ann Richards, I'm from Texas, and I'm pro-choice!" The gathered "moderates" responded with a deafening round of cheers and applause. Like many of the assembled delegates, Richards wore a white ribbon to signify her "solidarity" with AIDS victims (surely the first "politically correct" disease in history). When Bill Clinton finally took center stage for his acceptance speech, the new-found Democratic "restraint" was all the more on display. He earned his biggest ovations with promises to keep abortion legal, to defend homosexuals and lesbians, and to push for more federal spending in AIDS research.

As columnist Joseph Sobran writes: "The commentators kept marveling at how 'moderate' the Democrats had become this year. Given that kind of friendly journalism, you had to watch closely to see the real story." He notes:

NOW, the NEA [National Education Association — JKW], the NAACP, gay activists, public employees — these are the Democratic Party now. The platform calls for gay rights, limitless (and publicly funded) abortions, universal health insurance, child care, more spending for public works, higher taxes on the wealthy, more environmental regulation, increases in the minimum wage, subsidies for artists, new job programs, education programs, housing for the homeless, plus whatever it takes to find a cure for AIDS — the usual menu.

In other words, a menu filled with the usual entrees of socialistic welfare state junk food. One is forced to ask: With "moderates" like these, who needs *liberals*?

Clinton appeal to party leaders can be attributed, in part, to his being seen as an amalgam of two successful Democratic candidates. First, there is a harkening back to the appeal of the youthful, fair-haired John F. Kennedy. In 1960, at 43 years of age, JFK became the youngest man ever to be elected president. Bill Clinton is only 45 and, with his thick shock of hair, bears a resemblance to Kennedy. Then, there is Jimmy Carter, governor of a Southern state — Georgia — who came from out of nowhere to capture the White House in 1976. Clinton has run Arkansas for a decade but was little known outside of his region.

Unlike Kennedy and especially Carter, however, who were touted by the national news media as fresh faces and "outsiders" to Establishment politics, Clinton's Insider credentials are more obvious. He joined the CFR in 1989 and is also a TC member. Last year he was invited to the highly secretive and exclusive Bilderberger meeting in Europe, a rite of passage for aspiring internationalists. On whatever other issues he may disagree with Bush, the New World Order is *not* one of them. Clinton is on record supporting the congressional resolution authorizing the use of U.S. troops during the Gulf War. And, more recently, he has voiced his approval — as has Bush (and, incidentally, John Paul II) — of sending American/United Nations fighters into the Serbo-Croatian conflict.

Getting The Candidates We Deserve?

"Today I make the same appeal to you that I make to every voter. Look beneath the rhetoric," George Bush instructed assembled Knights of Columbus at a meeting in New York on August 5; "take a look at the ideas to determine who has the courage to stand up for the changes that are morally right for America." This is a reasonable test of candidates, one that should be applied in any election year. But it is one, I fear, which Bush can no more pass than Clinton. If, as Republicans have rightly charged, Clinton is no more than a liberal masquerading as a moderate, what is Bush but a liberal posing as a conservative? Or, recalling the caption of a *New Yorker* cartoon showing Alice standing before Tweedle-Dee and Tweedle-Dum in Wonderland: "I beg your pardon," said Alice, "but which of you is the Democrat?"

It was this sort of doubt that led to the early success of Ross Perot. Americans voiced their dissatisfaction with the major parties — Party 1A and Party 1B — by putting him ahead of both Bush and Clinton in spring polls. Frustrated with "politics as usual," this voting bloc had given over one-third of the survey's total to a man who had not declared his candidacy, and who had no political experience and no party organization behind him. Perot capitalized on this sense of disenfranchisement by promising to clean up Washington — no more "politics as usual" for our elected officials, but a crack-the-whip, nose-to-the-grindstone approach from a man who knows how to run a successful business.

When the Democratic Party convened in July, Perot suddenly pulled out of the race, saying that the unity of the Democrats convinced him that he had no hope of winning, and adding that he did not want the Electoral College to decide the victor. He also alluded to "personal reasons" for dropping out. Perot's decision left thousands of dedicated campaign volunteers high and dry and more than a little disillusioned. While it is perhaps unrealistic to think that Perot could have won, it is nonetheless true that, had he remained in the race, he would have surpassed George Wallace's third party record of nearly 10 million popular votes in the 1968 election and would have had an influence on who emerged victorious.

It all sounded too good to be true. And it *was* too good to be true. When Perot began espousing his vision of America, it quickly became obvious that this "non-politician" was articulating what any Establishment candidate is expected to say. He was "pro-choice." He was for gun control. He was for socialized medicine. He was for gay "rights." He was not for dismantling big government but only for making it more cost efficient. He even wanted to revamp the Constitution, saying that the "old" version was antiquated — and here he was in full agreement with the stated views of Clinton.

Informed conservatives quickly recognized that Perot was no hope for America, and yet he had reaped an unbelievable amount of media coverage, coverage that was refused other independent candidates. Why? Was it simply Perot's billions that were doing the talking or was there Insider intrigue at play? I believe that Perot's pseudo-candidacy was for a purpose — and that purpose was for the Establishment to ascertain the degree of voter unrest in the nation, and thus determine just how much of the electorate is or is not buying into their blueprint for the New World Order. Also, it could help them fine-tune future elections.

Now that the presidential campaign has again become a two-horse race, many conservative-minded Americans are agonizing over the choice — not between Bush and Clinton, but whether or not to bother voting *at all*. Some will decide to cast a token ballot for a third party candidate, knowing full well that it amounts to nothing more than a protest vote. Others will sit this one out, hoping for a miracle in four years — a candidate worthy of their support with a *legitimate* chance of winning.

Most voters in the general classification "conservative" will, however, vote for George Bush, if only as *the lesser of two evils*. But can such a choice be really prudent? In an insightful article entitled "Republican Presidents Are More Harmful," which appeared in the February, 1991 issue of The John Birch Society's *Bulletin*, John F. McManus examined the records of the four GOP presidents elected since World War II, presenting evidence that proves his case unmistakably. Concerning Bush, he writes:

> George Bush's agenda is so liberal that two former Dukakis campaign staffers have publicly declared that, while their man may have lost the 1988 election, his program was now being implemented by the President. Rather convincingly, Michael Aaronson and Christopher J. Georges detailed in the *New York Times* for June 7, 1990 that, after ridiculing such ideas during the campaign, George Bush had co-opted Dukakis' plans for: raising taxes, hiring auditors to collect unpaid taxes, banning semiautomatic weapons, raising the EPA [Environmental Protection Agency — JKW] to cabinet status, halting offshore drilling for oil, even considering a national health insurance proposal.

Instead of the lesser of two evils, what we find is the same evil in different, more attractive packaging.

Ask the people around you what kind of government now runs the U.S., and most will answer "democracy" or "republic" or some combination of the two. Those more perceptive will respond with "oligarchy," and the ones really up on political jargon will say "technocracy." But to get right to the heart of the matter, one needs to turn to an obscure word, so obscure in fact that probably not one in a million is familiar with it. That term, *kakistocracy*, is defined by the *Oxford English Dictionary* as "(t)he government of a state by its worst citizens." And for America, which has in so many ways rejected the salvific rule of Christ the King, this is precisly the government it so richly deserves. †

† †

Pope Saint Pius X — We do not conceal the fact that We shock some people by saying that We must necessarily concern ourselves with politics. But anyone forming an equitable judgment clearly sees that the Supreme Pontiff can in no wise violently withdraw the category of politics from subjection to the supreme control of faith and morals confided to him.

Pope Saint Pius X — All must remember that nobody has the right to remain indifferent when religion or the public welfare is in danger. Those whose object is the destruction of religion and civil society aim above all at getting control, as far as possible, of the direction of public affairs and at having themselves chosen as legislators. It is therefore necessary that Catholics should strive with all their might to avoid that danger.

Pope Benedict XV — Truly, as soon as the rules and dictates of Christian wisdom, which are the assured basis of stability and peace, came to be disregarded in the ordering of public life, the very structure of the State began to be shaken to its fall; and there has also ensued so great a change of thought and conduct that, unless God comes to the rescue, the dissolution of human society itself would seem to be at hand.

Pope Pius XII — With the weakening of faith in God and in Jesus Christ, and the darkening of men's minds of the light of moral principles, there disappeared the indispensable foundation of the stability and quiet of that internal and external, private and public, order, which alone can support and safeguard the prosperity of States.

Questions And Answers

Fr. Oswald Baker (England)

Question:

Why aren't Catholics who go to the new Mass allowed to come to our Mass?

Answer:

Sadly, those who say or attend the new "Mass" cannot truly be called Catholics. They can come to Mass but not to Holy Communion. The nature of the new "Mass" is still very widely misunderstood. It is not just some modified form of the traditional Catholic Mass. It was concocted by evil, anti-Catholic forces as a parody of the Sacrifice instituted by Our Lord at the Last Supper. To accept the new "Mass" is to accept the new Conciliar religion which it expresses, and so to abandon Catholicism.

Question:

In view of the present alarming growth in world population, is it not incumbent on the Church to make some positive suggestion instead of merely the notorious prohibitions relating to birth control?

Answer:

The positive suggestion is that the facts of the case be examined. There is nothing new in the present alarm concerning world population. The bogey of overpopulation has been raised, with varying degrees of hysteria, throughout history. In the seventh century B.C. the Greeks were panicking at the menace of overpopulation. World supplies are and always have been more than adequate. Only a fraction (one-eighth?) of the arable surface of the earth is actually under cultivation. U.S. agricultural scientists confidently claim that, given present technology and the reclamation of unused land, the world could support a population twenty times its present size. South America contains only about one-sixteenth of the world's population but almost a quarter of the world's potential agricultural land. If it were cultivated by the advanced methods of North America, South America alone could feed three times the present population of the entire world. And so on. In some underdeveloped countries agriculture is centuries behind the times. There is no over-population problem, no problem of remissness on the part of God. There is only the problem of our human inefficiency.

VIDEOTAPE OF TRADITIONAL LATIN MASS

On Sunday, February 2, 1992 (Feast of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary), Father Martin Skierka offered a Low Mass at Our Lady of the Rosary Parish in Rochester, Minnesota. Professionally videotaped, it is the historic fully traditional Latin Mass finalized or codified by Pope Saint Pius V.

Having viewed this videotape, we do not hesitate to recommend it highly. The suggested donation is $30.00 per copy (postage included). Checks should be made payable to Our Lady of the Rosary Parish and sent to:

Mr. Raymond L. Sibley
632 Eighth Street S.W.
Rochester, Minnesota 55902

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 Virtue Of Hope

Together with faith and charity, hope is one of the three greatest virtues. It is that virtue whereby we firmly trust that God, who is all-powerful and faithful to His promises, will in His mercy give us eternal happiness and the means necessary to obtain it. Through this supernatural virtue, which all and only those possess who are in the state of sanctifying grace, we can with confidence look forward to heaven as our final destiny "through the merits of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Redeemer." At the moment of death all hope comes to an end for in heaven our most ardent yearning for happiness is realized to perfection, while in hell all hope is abandoned, forever lost.

The two chief sins opposed to the virtue of hope are presumption and despair. The first of these, presumption, has it origin in the capital sin of pride and consists either in a person's taking for granted that he will attain salvation with little or no effort on his part, that God will, in effect, take care of everything; or in a person's relying upon himself and his own efforts in the working out of his salvation while ignoring God and His grace in the process. In the one case the individual presumes on the goodness and mercy of God while conveniently forgetting that the Almighty is likewise all-just and that, as Saint Augustine put it, "although God made us without us, He will not save us without us." In the latter case the individual arrogantly takes for granted that he can handle things pretty well on his own and really has little need for the help of God in the business of getting to heaven. A presumptuous person has a tendency to make his own rules and to take portions of the moral law rather lightly if they happen to conflict with his own ideas. He undoubtedly prays from time to time but probably could never be accused of overdoing it. He loves God, yes, and he certainly wants to save his soul, yes, but he is content to work at these things in moderation, periodically assuring himself that God understands.

And then there is the sin against the theological virtue of hope which is despair, the giving up, or the loss, of confidence and trust that God will grant to us all of the help necessary to do His will and to save our souls. But the fact is that, whatever we have a moral obligation to do, God gives us the grace to accomplish. If we fail to do God's will in a particular matter, it is simply because we did not, or did not sufficiently, cooperate with the grace of God in one way or another. And even if we fail habitually, it is assuredly *not* the will of God that we give up, that we become discouraged, that we lose heart. Such a reaction is or leads to despair and, if the conditions for mortal sin are present, to the loss of the virtue of hope. Although temptations to despair may well come our way from time to time, never must we permit them to gain a foothold or to take root within us. Whatever else may be involved in the solution in a particular case, let us, when tempted to discouragement, turn at once with humility and confidence to God in prayer Who, as Saint Paul assures us, will never permit us to be tempted beyond our strength. Indeed, the words of Holy Scripture are very much to the point: "Pray always and *do not lose heart.*"

Now it may well be that, for obvious reasons, the sin of despair or at least the temptation to despair is far more prevalent today than in various times past. And so, grave concern, anxiety, distress — these are understandable in present circumstances. But despair is something else again. To give up, to abandon hope, to despair — the very thought of this, regardless of the situation, is to be shunned for deliberate despair manifests a grave lack of trust in the goodness and mercy and power of God and is a sin against one of the most fundamental of all virtues, the theological virtue of hope. While temptations to despair, to succumb to a sense of hopelessness are bound to come, the sound traditional Catholic will not allow such temptations to linger but, by the grace of God, will dispel them without delay.

Despite, then, the very trying circumstances in which we traditional Roman Catholics find ourselves today, especially in our efforts to preserve our divine Faith, let even the mere thought of despair be far removed from us. Rather, let us lift up our hearts and souls to the God of all consolation and take courage from the words of Saint Paul in his Epistle to the Romans (8, 18) that "the sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come..." Fortified by the supernatural virtue of hope, may we never lose heart but remain loyal and true to our beloved Faith until death! "We know not what the future holds but we know Who holds the future." †

CAPSULE COMMENTS

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

On October 22, 1964, Archbishop Karol Wojtyla of Cracow, Poland, (now John Paul II) uttered the following statement at the third session of Vatican Council II: "It is not the Church's place to teach unbelievers. She must seek in common with the world..." And this blatantly non-Catholic declaration from a man who was to become the "Vicar of Christ"!

† †

Has the anti-Christ yet appeared upon the world scene. I do not know. There have been, to be sure, some characters in recent times who seemed, at least partially, to qualify for that unique distinction. From time to time I have heard individuals remark that, in their opinion, Paul VI manifested a number of such traits. Anyway, word has it that initial steps are presently being taken in Rome towards the "canonization" of Paul VI by non-Pope John Paul II. That figures, of course. How appropriate indeed were Paul VI to become, say, the patron "saint" of the Conciliar Church!

† †

An article in the July 26, 1992, Australian publication, *Sunday Telegraph*, was placed therein by The New South Wales Government. Following are excerpts from that article: "Personal protection is *no* reason to have a gun... If you own a gun which you keep to protect yourself, your family, or your property, you must dispose of it legally... Possession and use of any firearm for personal or property protection is illegal and will attract severe penalties... No exceptions, no excuses." (If the promoters of gun control win out here in the USA, similar warnings from civil authorities could well appear one day in the mass media of America. Don't give up your guns!)

† †

In line with the above, there is, you know, a patron saint for the owners of firearms, specifically, for handgunners: Saint Gabriel Possenti, who died in 1862 and was canonized by Pope Benedict XV in 1920. Devotion to that particular saint is certainly one way to counteract those forces working today towards the disarmament of the rank and file of the American people.

† †

Perhaps no one reading Mr. Weiskittel's article in this issue of *The Athanasian* would be inclined to label it "political." But, just in case, it most definitely is not. Rather is it an article dealing in large part with the immorality of politicians, specifically those three who have been in the limelight as candidates for the presidency of the United States. Of the umpteen examples which can readily be given of the incredibly deplorable current condition of this country, surely one of the best is the fact that men of the likes of Bush, Clinton and Perot could even be seriously considered as presidential candidates. Such is the repulsive reality though, so far gone is the USA.

† †

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.