THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume XII, No. 3 † April 15, 1991

Inside The New World Order

John Kenneth Weiskittel

In the brief span of time since our article, "The Persian Gulf Crisis And American Sovereignty," appeared in these pages (January 15, 1991), a great deal has transpired. Operation Desert Shield became Operation Desert Storm when on January 17, 1991, just two days after the United Nations (U.N.) deadline for Iraq to leave Kuwait, Baghdad was rocked by a stunning early morning aerial assault by U.N. coalition (principally American) planes. After more than a month of further preparation the ground war was initiated and proved equally devastating to the Iraqi army. The number of Americans killed in action for the entire Gulf War was remarkably kept to 125 and by early March the first troops were returning to the States.

For all the elation (and relief) that has accompanied the rapid conclusion of the conflict, there are still some loose ends waiting to be tied. As this article is being written, Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein is still at large, his Republican Guard battling insurgents in urban centers. (This fighting is a result of the fact that Iraq never surrendered but simply agreed to a cease-fire.) Israel is now being pressured to relinquish territories it has acquired in past wars, the so-called Land-for-Peace Plan, the pretext being that it would thus honor U.N. resolutions. (It would also satisfy the Soviets, who had called for *linkage* in their "peace" plan — a proposal that President Bush had rejected during the war — as well as the Iraqis, whose Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz offered it as part of a prewar compromise.) And of course there's the question concerning our armed forces: Will some of the troops stay on in the region as a permanent U.S./U.N. presence?

These and other issues that are developing in the Middle East, however important, pale in comparison to one of Bush's objectives in committing over half a million young Americans to fight — that objective being the emergence of a *New World Order*. In a televised address to the nation on the night the war began, he said: "When we are successful, and we will be, we have a real chance at this new world order, an order in which a credible United Nations can use its peacekeeping role to fulfill the promise and vision of the U.N.'s founders." One week before he made this speech, Bush explained to reporters that "(The Gulf crisis) has to do with a new world order. And that world order is only going to be enhanced if this newly activated peacekeeping function of the United Nations proves to be effective. That is the only way the new world order will be enhanced." A very clear indication of how far along the road to national ruin the United States has traveled is the fact that the President isn't receiving any sort of challenge to this thinking from the high-and-mighty in the mass media or on Capitol Hill.

At a time when Americans should seriously be considering whether or not Bush's commitment to the New World Order violates his constitutional duty as commander in chief and his oath of office, political pundits are remarking how the blitzkrieg victory in the Gulf War has guaranteed his reelection. Despite the President's persistent use of the expression, there has been no nationwide public referendum to determine whether the American people understand the New World Order concept, much less whether they support it. The present study is written to provide our readers with information needed in order to combat what is sure to be an ever-increasing barrage of New World Order propaganda.

The Gulf War — A New World Order Test Run

The war against Iraq was unique in many ways. It is the first in which the television networks extensively utilized live coverage via satellite — war as miniseries, war as spectator sport. The U.S. made extensive (and highly successful) use of some of its high-tech military equipment, including "smart" bombs and night vision goggles. And, for the first time since World War II, the U.S. and the Soviet Union were ostensibly on the same side in a conflict.

We've already seen how important President Bush considered the war as a first step towards a New World Order. What is fascinating — and more than a little disturbing — is to realize that the Soviets have said precisely the same thing. Not only has the phrase "new world order" passed through the lips of Mikhail Gorbachev, but it has also been alluded to by Yevgeny Primakov, the special Soviet envoy to the Middle East, concerning the confrontation over Kuwait. In an interview with the Moscow writers' weekly *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, Primakov was asked about how the newly proclaimed U.S.-Soviet partnership can be used in resolving regional conflicts. Primakov responded:

> All of this naturally applies to the crisis in the Persian Gulf. *This crisis is a kind of laboratory where our efforts to create a new world order after the cold war are being tested.* These efforts must include the impossibility of imposing one's will on other countries and the right of

any people to be free to choose its path of development and system of government. Unquestionably, the mechanisms of the United Nations should play a special and growing role in this process. ("The Superpowers' New Rules," *World Press Review*, December, 1990, p. 16. Emphasis added.)

There is something chilling about Primakov's choice of words. He calls the crisis "a kind of *laboratory* where our efforts to *create* a new world order... are being *tested*." Now a laboratory is a place where *experiments* are performed and in which new compounds are *created*. Above all, what distinguishes a laboratory is that it represents a *thoroughly controlled environment* in which scientists start with a *plan by which to reach a desired goal* and then proceed to *variously alter, combine and manipulate the materials at hand to realize that goal*. In the Gulf crisis there is evidence that Saddam Hussein was lured into Kuwait by hints from the U.S. that we would do nothing more than complain were he to invade and by encouragement from the Soviets of continued support. (Just before the Iraqi invasion Secretary of State James Baker was in Siberia for talks with former Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze — were the two comparing lab notes?)

Primakov spoke of the desirability of "Soviet-U.S. solidarity on joint political actions, if they are possible, and on mutual restraint in the event that planned military measures could pose a risk to the security of states and peoples." (*Ibid.*) Lest it be believed that this is mere Communist posturing, consider the fact that, as early as August 6, 1990, Baker had approached Shevardnadze about the possibility of having Soviet armed forces participate in any buildup against Saddam. According to Margaret Garrard Warner of *Newsweek*, this suggestion was simply made in the course of their conversation, but the Secretary of State later sought to make the offer official. Warner writes:

> Baker consulted Bush and General Colin Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, about possible (Soviet) military involvement in the Gulf crisis. Both liked the idea. Baker called Shevardnadze back to say that Bush was interested in pursuing the matter and that — officially this time — the United States had no problem with a Soviet naval or land presence in the region. The moment was unprecedented in postwar U.S.-Soviet relations. "If President Bush is interested, then I'll raise it with President Gorbachev," Shevardnadze replied. ("The Moscow Connection," September 17, 1990, pp. 25-26. It should be noted that ultimately it was Gorbachev, and not Bush, who rejected the idea.)

Although the U.S.S.R. was not one of the more than 40 nations comprising the anti-Iraq coalition, there is little reason to doubt that its troops could soon be fighting next to ours as part of a U.N. "peacekeeping" force. Indeed, the notion of a standing United Nations army is very much central to the vision of the New World Order.

The U.N. Envisioned By Its Founders

When Shevardnadze was given the offer by Baker mentioned above, he reportedly countered: "How about using the (United Nations) Military Staff Committee?" (*Ibid.*) This is but another indication that the Soviets and Americans are operating on the same geopolitical wavelength. One need look no further than President Bush to find a tireless advocate of the U.N. as the solution to international dilemmas. We do well to remember that Bush committed our troops to combat on the basis of U.N. resolutions that called for the ouster of Saddam from Kuwait by any means necessary, force included. Congress, instead of issuing a declaration of war, simply authorized this unconstitutional use of our armed services and, in effect, rubber-stamped the start of a potentially suicidal course of action for our sovereignty. And yet it is Bush who has done the most to advance the globalist agenda.

Two of the President's statements concerning the U.N. and its relationship to the New World Order have been cited earlier in this article and are sufficient to illustrate his dedication to internationalism but, to bring his obsession even more closely into focus, consider the following. In a televised speech given on September 11, 1990, he expounded a scenario to be manifest in the midst of the Middle East "laboratory": "Out of these troubled times, our fifth objective — a new world order — can emerge... We are now in sight of a United Nations that performs as envisioned by its founders." On January 7 of this year, *U.S. News & World Report* cited this observation by Bush:

> I think what's at stake here is the new world order. What's at stake here is whether we can have disputes peacefully resolved in the future by an invigorated United Nations. Or will the United Nations, its peacekeeping function having been elevated to its most promising height since 1948, be sent back to the Dark Ages because we failed to fulfill its mandate?

The common theme of all four quotes is that the U.N. and the New World Order are bound tightly together and that, *in order for the New World Order to come into being, the United Nations must have the power to defend it.*

So Bush wants to give the U.N. the teeth its founders sought for it. But *who* were these founders? Well, to begin with, there's Alger Hiss, who headed the American delegation to the U.N. organizing conference in 1945 at San Francisco and served as the Acting Secretary-General. A FDR appointee to the State Department, Hiss was convicted of perjury in 1950 over statements relating to his activities as a Communist and he served forty-four months in a federal penitentiary. Hiss was one of seventeen men from the State and Treasury Departments picked to help in the creation of the United Nations. G. Edward Griffin, in his classic critique of the U.N., *The Fearful Master: A Second Look at the United Nations* (Western Islands, 1964), reveals that "(w)ith the single exception of Dean Acheson *all of these men have since been identified in sworn testimony as secret Communist agents!*"

(p. 87) And Hiss, as Acting Secretary-General, reported the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, "was 'unofficially' influential in the employment of 494 persons by the United Nations on its initial staff." (p. 97) Griffin notes that during the Korean War the Senate's Judiciary Committee began investigation of Communist penetration into the American staff at the U.N., upon which some 200 members of said staff *resigned*. Senator Eastland, hearing the testimony of other staffers, declared: "I am appalled at the extensive evidence indicating that there is today in the U.N., among the American employees there, *the greatest concentration of Communists that this Committee has ever encountered*. (Cited, p. 98)

So much for the U.S. founders — but what about their counterparts from elsewhere? Trygve Lie, the first elected Secretary-General, "had been a high-ranking member of Norway's Social Democratic Labor Party which was an offshoot of the early Communist International." (Robert W. Lee, *The United Nations Conspiracy*, Western Islands, 1981, p. 17) Acting as Minister of Justice of his country, Lie carried out the wishes of Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin and had the latter's rival, Leon Trotsky, imprisoned and later deported for his exposes of Stalin's ruthlessness. (*Ibid.*) It should come as no surprise, then, that the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research could state in its 1965 report on the U.N.: "The Soviet Union strongly supported Trygve Lie as the first Secretary-General of the United Nations. Andrei Gromyko (Soviet Ambassador — JKW) nominated Lie for the position..." (Cited, *ibid.*, p. 18) And Gromyko was a key player in the formation of the U.N. Griffin writes:

> Gromyko was asked during a press conference in 1958 whether he considered it a violation of the Charter for a country to send its forces into the territory of another. He replied: "Believe me, I sit here as one who helped draft the U.N. Charter and I had a distinct part in drafting this part of the Charter with my own hands." (p. 89)

Considering the U.N.'s duplicity when it comes to invasions, Gromyko's claim is entirely believable.

The Soviet nature of certain aspects of the U.N. Charter is of particular interest when we consider the latest "peacekeeping" that took place in the Middle East in response to Saddam's "naked aggression" against Kuwait. The part of the Charter to which Gromyko presumably alluded would be Article 2, which states as its fourth principle that "(a)ll members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations." While the first part of this statement sounds fine, the closing clause represents a major qualification to all that precedes it. Commenting on it in 1945, Secretary of State Edward Stettinius noted: "This means that force may be used in an organized manner under the authority of the United Nations to prevent and remove threats to the peace and to suppress acts of aggression." (Cited, Lee, p. 47) The problem in defending such a definition is that, even with the qualifying phrase, U.N. armed action against Katanga and its providing of supplies to terrorists in Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) fall into the category of *aggression*. But such U.N. sanctioned aggression is not covered by the definition approved in 1967 by its General Assembly, part of which reads: "Aggression is the use of armed force by a State against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of another State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations." However, Lee points out that "this would not preclude the use of armed force by a conglomerate of states (that is, the U.N. itself), nor the use of aggressive force when it is *consistent* with the U.N. Charter." (p. 49) Hence, we find that the Soviets invasion of Afghanistan was not seen as aggression, nor its more recent attacks on the Baltic nations (*not* Baltic Republics or States, as the mass media likes to call them, since these labels cover up the fact that the Communists seized these countries and incorporated them by force into the U.S.S.R.) The claim in the latter instance — as well as China's Tiananmen Square massacre — is that it can be waved off as an "internal affair." All of which ought to raise grave concern over a President who promotes the "newly activated peackeeping function of the United Nations."

There are two other aspects of the U.N. founding that need to be recalled. From its inception the U.N. has been an object of great importance to the long-range goals of the Communists. In the April, 1945 issue of *Political Affairs*, the monthly theoretical journal of the Communist Party USA, readers were exhorted: "Great popular support and enthusiasm for the United Nations' policies should be built up, well organized and fully articulate... The opposition must be rendered so impotent that it will be unable to gather any significant support in the Senate against the United Nations Charter and the treaties which will follow." (Cited, Lee, p. 72)

The other point to consider is the little known but crucially important U.N. post of Undersecretary for Political and Security Council Affairs, which controls all military and police functions of the "peacekeeping" forces, supervises disarmament by member nations and controls all nuclear energy entrusted to the U.N. for peaceful and "other" purposes. This position has always been filled by a Communist from Eastern Europe, most often a Soviet. Didn't we protest such an arrangement? Hardly. Trygve Lie recounted it as follows: "The preservation of international peace and security was the Organization's (the U.N.'s — JKW) highest responsibility, and it was to entrusting the direction of the Secretariat department most concerned with this to a Soviet national that the Americans had agreed." (Cited, *ibid.*, p. 79; also, Griffin, p. 86) During the Gulf War President Bush may have been commander in chief of American forces and General Norman Schwartzkopf may have been commander of all allied troops in Operation Desert Storm, but Schwartzkopf was not only under Bush but also under U.N. Undersecretary for Political and Security Council

Affairs, presently Vasiliy S. Safronchuk of the U.S.S.R. Thanks to the plotting done almost a half century ago, the principal apparatus for enforcing the New World Order is in the hands of our "allies," the Soviets. Should the international conspirators succeed in moving to the next phase of establishing a world government, we may begin to see the sort of "peacekeeping" on a global basis that the U.S.S.R. has carried out in Latvia and Lithuania.

How New *Is* The New World Order?

If we were to accept the mass news media as providing a comprehensive analysis of the events and policies shaping our world, then we must be willing to believe that the publishers, producers, editors and reporters are as in the dark about the New World Order as the rest of the American people. It also requires us to accept the foolish assumption that these same media types are selfless, honest seekers of truth and not propagandists serving the enemies of traditional Christian values.

And yet this is precisely the sort of nonsense that is being successfully foisted upon our neighbors. *Newsweek* suggests that the concept came to the President in a flash of inspiration: "As George Bush fished, golfed and pondered the post-cold-war world in Maine some two months ago, his aides say he began to imagine a new order." (Douglas Waller & Margaret Garrard Warner, "Bush imagines a new world order — but will Moscow play along?", September 17, 1990, p. 27. The authors go on to say that Bush's vision is of "the U.S. and the Soviet Union united for crisis management around the globe.") This kind of falsification (whether by error or by design) is more than the usual nebulous explanation that the New World Order relates to the openings for change in Eastern Europe, "the death of Communism" and the spread of global "peace," "security" and "democracy."

One of the few journalists writing for a major publication who has been the least bit willing to explore the origins of the phrase *New World Order* is William Safire, a national columnist carried by the New York Times News Service. In his "On Language" feature, Safire speculates where Bush came up with it. Among possible candidates he cites Gorbachev who, in April, 1990, declared: "We are only at the beginning of the process of shaping a new world order"; a story in the May 22, 1986 issue of *The Financial Times*, entitled "Toward a New World Order"; former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger in the mid-1970's alluding to "a new structure of stability, a new order of peace" (this metaphor, argues Safire, was later used by Gorbachev as "restructuring" — perestroika); the 1974 U.N. Plan to redistribute the world's wealth, which it called the New International Economic Order (it later came up with a New World Information and Communications Order); and Adolf Hitler's objective of a Nazified Europe, which he identified as *die neue ordnung* or "the new order." ("the *new* new world order," *Miami Herald*, February 17, 1991, p. 3c) Safire declined an attempt at defining the term, however, saying that it's up to Bush to explain what he means by it.

William Safire is a good deal more open about the background of the New World Order than most of his profession, and more honest as well. Nevertheless, he would benefit from a bit more research on the topic since the phrase has been around for at least two centuries and the sense of it meaning a neo-pagan world government has always been present. It is impossible to consider the New World Order without remembering the part played in it by the secret societies for it is from these dark cabals that it takes its very life.

In 1776, such a group was established in Bavaria by a professor named Adam Weishaupt. This order, aligned with Freemasonry and calling itself the *Illuminati* ("enlightened ones"), was suppressed by the Bavarian government in 1786, which reported: "the express aim of this Order was to abolish Christianity and overthrow all civil government." (Cited, Father Clarence Kelly, *Conspiracy Against God and Man*, Western Islands, 1974, p. 125) In documents seized by the authorities Weishaupt has written: "It is necessary to establish a universal regime and empire over the whole world..." (Cited, *ibid.*, p. 200) Unfortunately, the attempt to eradicate the Illuminati was unsuccessful and it spread its errors through Europe, playing a leading role in the French Revolution as well as revolts in Italy, Spain and Germany. Some of its agents succeeded in bringing it to the United States. A central figure in American Illuminism was Albert Pike who, in *Morals & Dogma* (a work still held in reverence by Scottish Rite and other Masons), declares:

> ...the World will soon come to us for its Sovereigns (apparently referring to its governmental leaders) and Pontiffs (apparently meaning its religious leaders).
>
> We shall constitute the equilibrium of the universe and be rulers over the Masters of the World. (Cited, A. Ralph Epperson, *The New World Order*, Publius Press, 1990, p. 3. Parenthetical material added by Epperson.)

Readers familiar with our earlier writings on Pike and Masonry will recall that foremost among the enemies of the committed Mason (as opposed to the casual joiner who never learns the Lodge's secret teachings) is the Roman Catholic Church, the civilization it has engendered and the Savior Whose benevolent rule it represents. As Pope Leo XIII declared in *Humanum Genus*: "Their ultimate purpose... (is) the overthrow of that whole religious and political order of the world which the Christian teaching has produced and the substitution of a new state of things in accordance with their ideas, of which the foundations shall be drawn from mere naturalism." In short, they seek to replace the "Old (existing Christian) World Order" with a New (neo-pagan) World Order.

Americans are in contact with the New World Order in a tangible way but never give it a second thought. By this we mean the handling of the dollar bill, on the back of which is found the Great Seal of the United States, the reverse side featuring an unfinished pyramid surmounted by the all-seeing eye and the inscription below: *Novus Ordus Seclorum*. Why is

there this cryptic engraving and its companion slogan on our currency? In Volume Two of his *A New Age Now Begins: A People's History of the American Revolution* (McGraw-Hill, 1977), historian Page Smith writes:

> At the bottom of the Great Seal are the three words from Virgil's *Eclogues, Novus Ordo Seclorum*, "a new age now begins." It was that that the American Revolution and its consummation, the Federal Constitution, was to accomplish: a new age, a new human order, in which no man was sentenced by the chance of birth to subordination and exploitation and no class of men was ordained to rule over others. These were America's revolutionary credentials — a new dispensation for the human race, a new hope for humanity. And so the world indeed understood it. (p. 1817)

This no doubt sums up the outward goals sought by the Founding Fathers but only hints at the Illuminist influence that had already secured its place in the Revolutionary-era government by the time the design for the Great Seal was approved in 1782. Manly P. Hall, a prolific author and 33° Scottish Rite Mason, proudly notes that "(c)areful analysis of the seal discloses a mass of occult and Masonic symbols..." (Cited, Epperson, p. 137) The all-seeing eye, according to Hall and Pike and several other Masonic authorities, does not represent the Christian Trinity (as some have suggested) but, rather, the ancient Egyptian sun god, Osiris. (See *ibid.*, p. 141, for citations.) This explanation certainly makes sense given the pyramid beneath the eye. The fact that the pyramid is unfinished indicates that the goal has not been reached, a goal long sought by secret societies, namely, what Hall calls "the establishment of an enlightened democracy among the nations of the world." (Cited, *ibid.*, p. 133) The inscription above the eye, *Annuit Coeptis*, translates to "he favors our undertaking." At the pyramid's bottom "1776" appears in Roman numerals. Not only was the Great Seal designed and approved by Masons in our government but, 153 years later, it was placed on the back of the dollar under the presidency of Franklin Roosevelt, a 32° Mason, at the suggestion of Vice President Henry Wallace, also a 32° Mason and an occultist. (See Epperson, p. 145) Finally, returning to the phrase *Novus Ordo Seclorum*, it will be noted that alternate translations of this are: "New Order of the Ages" and "New World Order."

Establishing Global Tyranny

How is this anti-Christian "world democracy" to be brought about? James Warburg, the international banker and son of Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) founder Paul Warburg, confidently told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1950: "We shall have world government whether or not we like it. The only question is whether world government will be achieved by consent or by conquest." (Cited, William P. Hoar, *Architects of Conspiracy*, Western Islands, 1984, p. 317) The desire of world peace has always been one of the pretexts that the One Worlders use to promote their objectives. One might call it a form of the carrot-and-stick approach: the carrot being a utopian picture of a world without war, suffering, hunger, etc., and the stick being the revolutions that are bankrolled by these same conspirators. William T. Still, in *New World Order: The Ancient Plan of Secret Societies* (Huntington House, 1990), relates the correspondence that took place between Albert Pike and his Italian coconspirator, Giuseppe Mazzini, in the 1870's. One of Mazzini's letters, written in 1871 and on display for many years at the British Museum Library in London, states Still, "outlined the final three-part plan of the Illuminati: their grand design for ridding not just Europe but the entire world of Christianity, and bringing it under the 'illuminated' dictatorship of Luciferianism." (p. 127) This was to be accomplished with the carrot-and-stick. Still writes:

> Mazzini proposed a series of world wars. These wars were to embroil every nation in a conflict so bloody and chaotic that eventually every nation would surrender its sovereignty to an international government, like the League of Nations or the second attempt — the current United Nations — in order to prevent subsequent global bloodletting. One Masonic scholar wrote in 1987: "The true birth of World Democracy from its prenatal national confinement is even now in progress. A war-torn, bleeding World is in the midst of labor pains, preceding the ordeal of birth. Labor pains in the birth of a New Age!"

The Mazzini plan called for three such wars: the first, writes Still, sought "to topple the Czarist government of Russia and establish an Illuminised dictatorship — a new level in the game of control of populations"; the second, to "allow the new Soviet Russia to capture Europe — or as it turned out, half of it"; and the third, "would be in the Middle East between the Moslems and the Jews, and would bring about the biblical Armageddon." (*Ibid.*) The outcome, Still concludes, will find "the battle-weary nations... ready to accept any proposal as long as it promised peace, uniting the entire world under the fatal banner of the Luciferian New World Order." (*Ibid.*) This pleased Pike considerably and he wrote back to Mazzini that, as a result of the Third World War, there would follow "a formidable social cataclysm... and the most bloody turmoil," out of which the multitude would not only destroy the revolutionaries (though not their hidden sponsors) but also become "disillusioned with Christianity; at this point, these same masses will receive "the pure doctrine of Lucifer" and "Christianity and atheism... both (will be) conquered and exterminated at the same time." (Cited, *ibid.*, p. 128)

Karl Marx was a friend of Mazzini's and a member of the secret League of Just Men (believed by some researchers to be the Illuminati with a "face-lift"). Like his friend, Marx advocated world revolution to bring about an anti-Christian social order. Indeed, the father of atheistic Communism used language similar to what we have already heard to describe his

vision of the future: "There is but one way of simplifying, shortening, concentrating the death agony of the old society as well as the bloody labor of the world's birth — Revolutionary Terror." (Cited, Still, p. 133)

Of course, while these and other advocates of violent change inflamed their followers, others have taken the "peaceful revolution" approach. Groups, such as the CFR, the Atlantic Union, United World Federalists, Trilateral Commission, etc., have worked tirelessly to make all the connections necessary for the One World Government. For example, in 1959 the CFR issued Study No. 7 which advocates "building a new international order (which) must be responsive to world aspirations for peace (and) for social and economic change... an international order (code word for world government) ...including states labeling themselves as "Socialist" (Communist)." (Cited, Larry Abraham, *Call It Conspiracy*, Double A Pub., 1985, p. 97. Parenthetical material added by Abraham. Still quotes the same study as urging the U.S. to "maintain and gradually increase the authority of the U.N.", p. 157.) In 1976, a group calling itself the World Affairs Council sponsored a document entitled, "A Declaration of INTERdependence," and penned by historian and CFR member Henry Steele Commager. This anti-patriotic tract, meant to replace the Declaration of Independence, stated in part:

> Two centuries ago our forefathers brought forth a new nation; now we must join with others to bring forth a new world order... To establish a new world order of compassion, peace, justice and security, it is essential that mankind free itself from the limitations of national prejudice and acknowledge that... all people are part of one global community. (Cited, Still, p. 188)

Over 100 Senators and Congressmen signed this, including Senators Alan Cranston, Charles Mathias and Claiborne Pell — *all three were CFR members.*

Finally, in order for a world government to be more easily accepted by Americans, our government must be so modified as to be easily submerged into the New World Order. In 1974, Rexford Guy Tugwell, a former New Deal planner for FDR, published a "Constitution for the Newstates of America which, according to *The Phyllis Schlafly Report,* advocates: "The government be empowered to abridge freedom of expression, communication, movement and assembly in a 'declared emergency.' The practice of religion would be considered a 'privilege.'" (Cited, Still, p. 19) "Since 1975," writes Still, "as many as forty draft versions of the revised Constitution have been prepared." (p. 188) One group that has fashioned its own "improved" Constitution is the Committee on the Constitutional System (CCS). Changes it envisions would include giving the President the power to dissolve Congress, overturn the 22nd Amendment (which limits the President to two terms) and having Presidential and Congressional elections held at irregular intervals (ostensibly to save money). The CCS board of directors is made up of individuals with ties to the Establishment (a third are CFR members). Historian James MacGregor Burns, a CCS board member, in 1984 wrote the following candid analysis for group members: "Let us face reality. The framers (of the Constitution) have simply been too shrewd for us... They designed separate institutions that cannot be unified by mechanical linkages, frail bridges (or) tinkering. If we are to turn the founders upside down... we must directly confront the Constitutional structure they erected." (Cited, *ibid.*, p. 189) If the conspirators succeed in overturning the Constitution, their plan for a New World Order will be close to completion and the capstone for the Great Seal's unfinished pyramid will finally be in place.

Speaking of pyramids, it is interesting to find that President Bush has one in mind for the future. An Associated Press story for January 3, 1989, relates: "President-elect Bush is spending this New Year's holiday at Camp David, Maryland, but in 10 years he may be in Egypt." Organizers of the Millenium Society say he's already committed to ushering in the next century at the Great Pyramids of Cheops in Giza. (Cited, Epperson, p. 294. As Epperson notes, the article is mistaken in saying the next century is to be celebrated — it's the next *millenium*, as the group's name indicates. The article quotes Bush's telegram to the society, saying he's "looking forward to your celebration in Egypt in 1999.") A little more than two months later Bush gave a speech in which he asked, "What are we doing to prepare ourselves for the new world coming just 11 short years from now?" God give us the strength to answer: "Opposing it with all our might!"

Whose World Order?

The New World Order, according to the President, is a rejection of "the rule of the jungle" and the adoption, in its place, of the "rule of law." Lofty sounding aspirations coming from a man whose nation butchers 1.5 million unborn each year! Bush draped himself in the cloak of an avenger of "right," "justice" and "morality" in his war against Iraq — but let us never forget that he sent his CFR cronies to China for trade talks just weeks after the Tiananmen Square massacres and only spoke of being "disturbed" when his New World Order partner Gorbachev had his troops gunning down freedom-starved people in the Baltic countries.

And yet Bush speaks of peace! The late Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani summed up such hypocrisy some 30 years ago when he said:

> While Cain can still massacre Abel without anyone's noticing it; while entire nations are still held in slavery without anyone coming to the assistance of the oppressed; while... years after the Hungarian revolt, the bloodletting still continues with the condemnation to death of students, peasants and workers guilty of having loved a freedom that was stamped out by foreign tanks, without the world showing any horror at so great a crime — while such things persist, it is impossible to speak of a true peace, but only of a consent to a

massacre. (Cited, Griffin, p. 223) How can such acceptance of evil go unchallenged?

The heart of the problem is that which is at the root of all sin, a willful preference of self over the Creator. On a large scale the false philosophy of *naturalism*, which argues that human self-sufficiency can bypass God, promotes the myth of a man-centered world utopia. The atrocities of "allies" can be excused since "the ends justify the means." The growing acceptance of the New World Order should be seen in the light of what Pope Pius XI wrote in 1937: "It can surprise no one that the Communistic fallacy should be spreading in a world already to a large extent de-Christianized."

Such being the case, it behooves us to do all that we can to see that the world is *re-Christianized*. Only when the community of nations accepts the divine Kingship of Christ as the foundation of their laws and dealings with one another will there ever be anything approximating true peace and security. And only then will there be a world order worthy of the name. †

††

"The coming of the world state is longed for, and confidently expected, by all the worst and most distorted elements. This state, based on the principles of absolute equality of men and a community of possessions, would banish all national loyalties. In it no acknowledgement would be made of the authority of a father over his children, or of God over human society. If these ideas are put into practice there will inevitably follow a reign of unheard-of terror."

— Pope Benedict XV (July 25, 1920)

††

A REQUEST

The New World Order is today an issue of surpassing importance.

If our newsletter subscribers agree with me that Mr. Weiskittel's foregoing article on the subject is in every respect an excellent one, my request is simply that they make a special effort to do their part to give it the wide circulation it assuredly deserves.

— Fr. F. Fenton

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 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.

Church, Country And The Mass Media

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

Within the past three decades we have witnessed the gradual destruction of the Roman Catholic Church as the powerful force for truth and morality which it formerly was on the world scene. And in recent years we have likewise witnessed the ongoing destruction of the USA as a free and sovereign nation. While the former is the overwhelmingly greater, both are tragedies of profound gravity whose horrendous consequences will, from all indications, become ever more vividly apparent. We live in very perilous times indeed, an age in which Satan and his cohorts appear to be the all but undisputed masters. While the ultimate victory of the Almighty is a foregone conclusion, there is every reason to expect an exceedingly rough road ahead in the meantime. Following are a few relevant observations which may be worthwhile.

[1] In neither case is the present dire situation of the Roman Catholic Church and the USA an accident or the result of prolonged poor judgment on the part of good men in positions of power over the years. Quite the contrary. Although the signs of destruction may have become generally evident only in relatively recent times, the enemies of both Church and country have been working hard towards their nefarious goals for many years, say, perhaps some 200 as regards the Church and maybe 70 regarding the country. Certainly the subversives (Communists, Freemasons, Modernists, etc.) had effectively penetrated the Church long before Vatican Council II but it was not until the period of that infamous Council (1962-1965) that the disastrous consequences of their efforts began clearly to surface — and becoming ever more and more repugnantly obvious during the years since then. And the same overall pattern can be seen in the piecemeal destruction of this nation. While the subverters and destroyers have long been in the woodwork of the American government, it is only in fairly recent years that the results of their evil machinations have become increasingly evident. So successful have their efforts been that they no longer deem it necessary to conceal them so that today even the President of the United States can openly promote the repugnant United Nations and audaciously proclaim the "glories" of the godless and inhuman New World Order without hesitation. If ever there was a truly abominable character in the White House, it is George Bush, a man who has no more genuine concern for the survival of the USA than his Communist friend, Mikhail Gorbachev. And how distressing it is to realize that there are multitudes of good people in this country who, even at this late date, still harbor the potentially fatal illusion that the American government is in the hands of honorable men. Nothing could be further from the truth. Yes, the enemies of God and freedom have done and continue to do their evil work extremely well.

[2] Worth noting too is the fact that the tragedies that have befallen the Roman Catholic Church and the USA are by no means separate or distinct from each other. Rather is there an undeniable relationship or overlapping between the two. Not only have both Church and country had pretty much the same enemies down through the years but, far more to the point, today's Conciliar Church (especially at its higher echelons) is in alliance with the powers that be in the planning and plotting of the New World Order by way of the United Nations (which "Pope" Paul VI described as "the world's greatest" hope and at the founding session of which in 1945 a total of 16 members of the U.S. delegation were Communists). As was noted in the December 1, 1990 issue of this newsletter, John Paul II discusses world affairs via telephone on a weekly basis with both George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev. (Although John Paul II understandably keeps a rather low profile as regards the New World Order, there is no doubt to my mind of his commitment to it.)

[3] And then there is that detestable instrument of mass deception, the American news media (radio, TV, magazines, newspapers), the greatest lie machine in the world. Controlled as it is by those who couldn't care less about the freedom and sovereignty of the USA, the lies and half-truths and subtle propaganda (to say nothing of its suppression of truth) which that media incessantly pours forth — this is assuredly one of the major causes of the present very critical situation in this country. (The same observation can be made of many of the publications associated with the Conciliar Church, particularly in matters pertaining to religion.) What a world of difference there would be — as between night and day — if the media of communication told the truth! With rare exceptions it does not — and with the result that ignorance of the most vital matters abounds on the American scene, multitudes of morally good, God-fearing men and women having not even a remote awareness of what is happening, that they are being sold out by their leaders and that this sellout is now in high gear and well along towards fruition. For this the reprehensible mass media of *dis*information rightfully deserves a copious share of the blame.

The nightmare that is progressively unfolding on the national and world scenes today is the consequence of man's rejection on a massive scale of God and His eternal truth and His moral law. In the relentless pursuit of their utterly wicked objectives, evil men in positions of power hold sway today as never before. But is it not still possible to stop their hellbent drive towards global tyranny and mass slavery? Is there no answer? Yes there is: the Roman Catholic Church and the recognition and acceptance by men and nations of the Kingship of Jesus Christ.

May our faith and trust in the inscrutable Providence of God be and remain ever steadfast! May an unwavering hope in His infinite goodness and mercy be our strength and consolation in the days ahead! †