THE ATHAŇASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume XI, No. 1 † January 15, 1990

Christian Militancy Now — A Must!

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

The massive rejection of the Almighty and His revealed truth, the ever more and more militant atheism, the totally unbridled sexual immorality, the widespread and extreme dishonesty of all kinds, the utter disregard and even contempt for the moral law of God on the part of multitudes — all of this surely marks the times in which we live as unprecedented in the course of the Christian centuries. While sin has been a part of the human race since the fall of Adam and Eve, it is the sheer magnitude and extreme wickedness of the immorality of our day which make it all but impossible to imagine a comparable situation in ages past. Indeed, so exceedingly wretched is the current condition relating to God and morality that there are those who believe that we are now living in the "end times" and that the day of divine retribution is not far down the road. Perhaps so.

And, given even the possibility that that frightful day of reckoning is more or less at hand, the credibility of this belief is considerably enhanced by the increasingly open and strikingly brazen attacks now occurring against Christ and Christianity and, specifically, against Roman Catholicism. True, this hostility has existed and manifested itself in countless ways — sometimes subtly, sometimes blatantly — since the Son of God trod this earth some two thousand years ago. In recent years, however, the forces of anti-Christ have become progressively ever more forthright and belligerent so that today the ridicule and vilification of Christian principles and Catholic standards of morality are commonplace in the so-called entertainment media and elsewhere. Not even Christ Himself is exempt from slander and scorn, as witnessed by the sacrilegious motion picture, *The Last Temptation of Christ*, two public showings of which took place at Notre Dame University a few months ago. (Two motion pictures, I understand, are currently in production on the subject of Christ which will apparently make the one mentioned above a moderate presentation by comparison).

As indicated in the previous issue of this newsletter, the real, the ultimate enemy today (as always) is Satan. Communism, Freemasonry, secular humanism, Modernism, etc. — these monstrous evils are but the tools, the instruments of Satan. The fundamental war is that between God and militant atheism, between the Christian forces and the powers of anti-Christ, between the Son of God and Satan. Or, as General Douglas MacArthur once phrased it, "The problem is basically theological." And, make no mistake about it, the primary and ultimate objective of the diabolical forces so plainly and aggressively on the march at the present time is the total destruction of the Roman Catholic Church (traditional Roman Catholicism).

And what are traditional Roman Catholics doing? Well, they're praying. Fine. Prayer is essential. And, we may safely assume, at least a large majority of them are striving to lead spiritual, morally good personal lives. Again, fine. But beyond that, what are they doing in terms of apostolic action in the promotion of their Faith and in its defense against the various forces of evil that are today so clearly and defiantly hell-bent on destroying it? From my observation, most of them are doing little or nothing. Through his passivity and lack of militancy, the average traditional Roman Catholic is, I submit, delinquent in the fulfillment of the moral duty incumbent upon him in these so critical days. While his Faith and his religious beliefs and his moral standards are being attacked and derided from all sides, the extent of his "opposition" is likely to consist in no more than bemoaning the sad state of affairs. The enemy assuredly loses no sleep from such "opposition."

Again, the principal objective of the satanic forces of evil is the destruction of the Roman Catholic Church. While we know that those forces can never fully accomplish this, they have made tremendous strides towards that goal, the Conciliar Church being the prime case in point. But, whether it be the overt and aggressive hostility to our Faith presently so manifest on the American scene or whether it be the extreme moral corruption which is currently poisoning our society, for both of these we traditional Roman Catholics bear a portion of the responsibility. The tragic situation which exists today is due in significant degree to default on our part. In other words, Satan and his innumerable cohorts are winning hands down, to a notable extent because of our inertia, our apathy, our failure to react in any resolute fashion. Christianity in general and Roman Catholicism in particular are here and now being attacked, maligned, ridiculed on a massive scale. A non-bloody form of persecution is taking place — and that persecution is escalating while the generality of traditional Roman Catholics deplore how terribly bad things are. And is that going to be the extent of our reaction for the duration? Are we ever going to become militant in defense of Christ and His Church and our Christian beliefs and moral principles? As the soldiers of Christ we're supposed to be, are we ever going to stand up and fight? If we are, we darn well better get started!

As for those among us — and there are some — who are sure they see the handwriting on the wall and that the point of no return has already been reached, well, I just don't know. That we are losing is beyond all question. But even if the situation is so far gone that, barring a miracle, we are doomed to go down, I have but one plea: Let's go down as true Christian warriors, fighting!

P. S.: *Don't give up your guns*!

Martin Luther King, Jr.: The Continuing Cover-Up

John Kenneth Weiskittel

On January 15, 1990 — the date of this issue of the newsletter — the United States commemorates the official national holiday honoring the late civil rights leader, Martin Luther King, Jr. The fifth such observance for the controversial minister, it has already been marred by scandalous revelations by one of his closest associates.

The man who has revealed these intimate secrets is the Reverend Ralph David Abernathy, a fellow Baptist preacher whose friendship and association with King dated back to the Montgomery, Alabama, bus boycott of 1955, and continued until the latter's death thirteen years later. It was Abernathy who is said to have cradled King's dying body in his arms after the charismatic "apostle of nonviolence" had been shot by an assassin's bullet, and who succeeded him as head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC). Despite his unswerving loyalty to King, Abernathy has now drawn fire for his less than flattering description of King's last days.

And The Walls Came Tumbling Down, Abernathy's autobiography, is the occasion for the rumblings by other King associates. In the book, published last October, it is related how King, on the night before he died, "...consorted with one woman in a private Memphis home, with a second — a woman legislator from Kentucky — in his motel, and then got into an early-morning fight with yet a third woman who had been looking for him during the night. King 'knocked her across the bed,' Abernathy writes." (*Time*, "Tattletale Memoir," October 23, 1989, p. 42)

Abernathy, 63, has defended his mention of this by noting that the matter of King's philandering was public knowledge already and that his reference to it is only to show that King "had a particularly difficult time" repelling adulterous advances. "I am not a Judas," declares Abernathy, "I have written nothing in malice and omitted nothing out of cowardice." (Cited, *ibid*.)

But to some black leaders, Abernathy *is* a traitor or, at best, as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People's Benjamin Hooks has put it, is a man suffering from the effect of two recent strokes and from "more than 35 years of struggles, beatings and physical abuse" during his civil rights work. (Cited, *USA Today*, "Nationline" column, October 13, 1989, p. 3A). Friends and associates of King sent Abernathy a telegram urging him to "repudiate" his account. Among the comments coming from individuals were the following: the Reverend Jesse Jackson stated that Dr. King will be vindicated "when all the dust clears"; the Reverend John Lewis (D-Atlanta) said he was "surprised, disappointed and hurt" that a friend of King would try to discredit him; and John Adams of the National Congress of Black Churches charged that the book is "riddled with gross inaccuracies." (Cited, *ibid*.)

Regular readers of this newsletter will not be shocked by the Abernathy disclosures. In the October 15, 1986 issue of *The Athanasian* we reported that the FBI's wiretapes of King had "...revealed in the six years of gathering evidence: a sordid string of prostitutes employed; a drunken orgy thrown; adulterous affairs engaged in; and civil rights contributions embezzled or misapplied. Some of the material in the sealed files is labeled 'OBSCENE'." ("The Truth About The Real Martin Luther King, Jr.") If the career of the Reverend Martin Luther King was marked by these and other questionable activities, then his subsequent glorification has been accompanied by one of the most massive cover-ups in American history. The majority of Americans have little grasp of what King really advocated, so extensive has this cover-up been. For this reason, even the slightest lifting of the cover is met with a shrill chorus of detractors clamoring for the head of the bearer of bad news. Mythmakers, after all, are loathe to have anyone reveal that their vaunted hero had feet of clay.

As might be expected the mass media has largely ignored the story, aside from reporting on the reactions of Jackson and his comrades. The Abernathy book should raise interest in unlocking the sealed FBI files on King but scarcely a whimper has been heard so far. Even conservative columnist Joseph Sobran doesn't bring up the issue in his piece on the subject. Although he does question why it took Abernathy so long to expose the affairs and keenly observes that the attacks on the book came from men who realize that "the truth seems to devalue their own investment in the King mythology," Sobran ends by writing that "the revelation hardly negates King's accomplishments as a public figure." (*Colorado Springs Gazette Telegraph*, "Some Can't Accept Fact That King Was A Mortal," October 25, 1989, p. B11). When Sobran, whom many have come to trust, can avoid the issue, is there much reason for optimism? But whatever, we must continue to do what the major news sources will not do — and that is to print the *whole truth* about the dubious Dr. King.

Pulitzer Prize Winning Deception

David J. Garrow is a professor of political science at the City College of New York and a major Establishment scholar on the civil rights movement. He was senior adviser of the PBS-TV (government broadcasting) series, *Eyes on the Prize*, and has written *The FBI and Martin Luther King, Jr.* (cited later in this study) and *Protest at Selma*. His Establishment credentials are impeccable: an appointment

from the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton and a Ford Foundation grant.

In 1986, Garrow published his *magnum opus*, the 800-page *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference*. This book has been praised by Anthony Lewis of the *New York Times* and his liberal counterparts at the *Washington Post, Boston Globe, Philadelphia Inquirer* and *San Francisco Chronicle*, to name but a few publications. *Bearing the Cross* earned for its author the Pulitzer Prize and the Seventh Annual Robert F. Kennedy Book Award.

The average reader is likely to be in awe of the veneer of scholarship to be found in this work. There aren't many books available for popular consumption that include over one hundred pages of bibliographical material and detailed notes. How, one asks, could Garrow have left anything out? But the fact is that there is a good deal that is downplayed or omitted altogether from *Bearing the Cross*. Let us review some of the contacts made by King that were cited in our previous article and compare the treatment of the same by Garrow:

Highlander Folk School: We reported that King attended a meeting at the Highlander Folk School at Monteagle, Tennessee, over Labor Day weekend, 1957, less than a month after he founded SCLC. Highlander was a transplant of Commonwealth College, an Arkansas facility that was cited as a Communist front by the U.S. Attorney General in 1949. Also in attendance with King at the meeting, we noted, were Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA) Central Committee official Abner Berry and Pete Seeger, a folksinger with two dozen or more Communist group affiliations. But Garrow makes no reference to Highlander's radical background, describing it only as an "interracial institution" that "had developed a citizenship training program." (*Bearing the Cross*, Vintage ed., 1988, pp. 98, 120). Seeger is mentioned as having performed his song "We Shall Overcome" (later to become an anthem of the movement) at the meeting but not even a hint of his background is given. (p. 98) Nor is any mention made of Abner Berry.

Carl and Anne Braden: We documented how an FBI undercover agent had identified the Bradens as Communists in 1954, the same year that Carl was convicted of sedition in the bombing of the home of a black man. The same agent later named him as a CPUSA organizer in the South. We linked the Bradens to King at a 1962 meeting of SCLC, four years after King had urged the couple to join the group permanently. Garrow is again elusive. Anne was a "white activist" that King met at Highlander in 1957. (p. 98) The closest Garrow comes to revealing the Bradens' Red ties is in the following passage, which is worth citing in detail because it illustrates the firm bond they enjoyed with King. The occasion was when Anne contacted King in 1961 in hopes of having him sign a clemency petition for her husband:

> ...Carl Braden had been convicted of contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions before the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HCUA). King hesitated to add his name to the petition, and Braden heard nothing. Her husband was scheduled to begin his one-year prison term on Monday, May 1, and Braden wanted to release the petition when he surrendered... Early Sunday morning her phone rang. It was King. "Anne, I want you to put my name on that petition. I prayed about this most of the night, and I want you to put my name on it." Braden was immensely pleased, and King had nothing to gain from taking such a controversial stand, nor did the other SCLC leaders who signed with him. King "came down on the right side, although it may have taken him a while to get there," Braden observed. (p. 155)

No effort is made by Garrow to dispute Anne Braden's "right side" claim, leading us to wonder if he actually *agrees* with her. Garrow does not, in any event, note Carl's earlier bombing conviction or that he was identified as an organizer for the CPUSA.

Bayard Rustin: Rustin was a man whose Communist ties went as far back as the 1930's when he was a Young Communist League organizer. He made a formal break with the group in 1941, protesting the war. But as we went on to note in the 1986 article, he attended the CPUSA's 1957 National Convention as an "impartial observer" and, a year before this, he introduced King to his friend Stanley Levison, a New York attorney who was a financial conduit from the Soviet Union to the CPUSA as late as 1955. *Bearing the Cross* does state that Rustin's "public record ... included a brief membership in the Young Communist League [from 1936-41, to be exact — JKW], a prison term for draft resistance, and a conviction three years earlier for homosexual activity with two other men in a parked car," and that an aide said of King that Rustin's sexuality "didn't bother him" (pp. 304, 648n) Here, as elsewhere, Garrow seems to display an implicit trust: if King associates have checkered pasts, then merely being in the presence of this "great" man is enough to exonerate them. Yet ought not Americans raise their eyebrows if a Bayard Rustin is advising King at the same time he is attending CPUSA functions (over ten years after his alleged break) and is still in close contact with other "former" Reds like Levison?

Stanley Levison: Alluded to in the previous section, Levison was named by a FBI informant in 1953 as middle man in the transfer of Soviet funds to a U.S. affiliate. He formally severed ties with the Reds two years later and was to become a speechwriter for King as well as one of his closest advisers. Garrow provides some useful information here. Apparently, Levison rejoined the Communists for mention is made of his later 1963 "break" with them. (p. 235) The following passage is valuable not only because it indicates the concern of President John Kennedy in 1962 over the King allegations but also because it underlines a vital point about all of his radical associates:

> While King continued his criticism of the administration, the Kennedys were in private

consternation about FBI reports that American Communist Party leaders were claiming that old ally Stanley Levison nowadays was the number one adviser to Martin Luther King. In fact, the reports said, word in the Party had it that Levison was writing many of King's most important speeches, such as one he had given in December [1961 — JKW] to an AFL-CIO convention in Miami. Though the FBI's informants had no dependable information that Levison was still loyal to the Party's commands, they did know that he continued to give it modest financial support even after severing direct ties. The FBI suspected that Levison's 1955 departure from Party activity might have been a cover, and that Levison's friendship with King might be a secret assignment undertaken at the behest of American Communists and their Soviet sponsors. International Communism, through the shadowy figure of Levison, might be exerting influence over this new leader of the civil rights movement... (pp. 194-195)

Of course, Garrow will have none of this: "...the wiretaps on Levison never had confirmed that his closeness to King was motivated by adherence to the Soviet Union or to the American Communist Party..." (p. 361) Presently we will show that there was, and is, ample reason to believe that such a motive existed.

Hunter Pitts "Jack" O'Dell: We provided documentation in 1986 showing that O'Dell, a Communist since the 1940's, was listed as a member of the National Committee of CPUSA in 1962 by HCUA. He was introduced to King by Levison and was on the SCLC staff from 1960 on. King, we added, deceived President Kennedy, who had warned of O'Dell and Levison ("They're Communists, you've got to get rid of them."), by sending the former to a different office and remaining in touch with the latter through a third party. Garrow doesn't seem fazed by any of this, aside from noting that "Levison's recommendation of him [O'Dell — JKW] for a job close to King intensified FBI suspicion about Levison's motives." (p. 201) If Garrow weren't such a true believer in and staunch defender of the King myth, he would have reached at least two conclusions we find inescapable: (1) That we must look for some explanation other than coincidence for a plausible reason why Rustin (a man with Communist ties) just happens to introduce King to Levison (a man with Communist ties), who, in turn, just happens to introduce him to O'Dell (a man with Communist ties); and (2) That, if Levison had truly broken free from Communism, he wouldn't have led King to select a CPUSA functionary for his staff.It strains credulity to think otherwise.

James Dombrowski, SCEF and the National Lawyers Guild: In our previous article we told of King's association with identified Communist James Dombrowski, administrator of the New Orleans - based Southern Conference Education Fund (SCEF). In 1961, raids on SCEF headquarters uncovered an affidavit King signed attesting to the good character of Dombrowski and others in the group. Louisiana's Committee on Un-American Activities provided King with proof of SCEF's "Communist connections and leadership" so he could repudiate it. He never did. Garrow makes no mention of either the SCEF or Dombrowski. Among King's speeches of 1962 was one he made to the National Lawyers Guild. In 1950, HCUA identified the National Lawyers Guild as the CPUSA's "foremost legal bulwark" and it was included for 11 years by the same committee in its *Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications*. No reference to this group is made by Garrow.

The Elusive Dr. King

In *Bearing the Cross* we see a profile of Martin Luther King that is essentially the one that the Establishment *wishes* us to see. Rarely does David Garrow let his guard down and touch on topics that might give the reader a different view of King. Hence, we don't read of his praise for Vietnamese Communist Ho Chi Minh or of the mutual admiration he shared with the black American Communist W. E. B. DuBois. It is either a case — appearances aside — of shabby scholarship or a deliberate attempt to perpetuate a myth.

Nevertheless, there are instances where certain damning facts do appear, though some of these instances require a knowledge of the One World Conspiracy to be fully appreciated. Garrow notes that, after SCLC received a $230,000 Ford Foundation grant, King made it clear that he was after something more than just the laudable goal of equal rights with which he was identified in the average American mind. "Something is wrong with capitalism as it now stands in the United States," declared King. "We are not interested in being integrated into *this* value structure. Power must be relocated, a radical redistribution of power must take place. We must do something to these men to change them." (p. 581) It was at this time that King was advocating a guaranteed annual income.

What is interesting here is to find King accepting money from the very power structure he was supposedly fighting. Yet it becomes less puzzling when we recall that, years before, Ford Foundation President H. Rowan Gaither, a member of the One World-promoting Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), told a Congressional investigator in 1953 that the tax-free foundation was operating under "directives from the White House," adding: "The substance of them [the directives — JKW] is that we should use our grant-making power so to alter our life in the United States that we can be comfortably merged with the Soviet Union." (Cited, James Perloff, *The Shadows of Power: The Council on Foreign Relations and the American Decline*, Western Islands, 1989 printing, p. 205) Why are most Americans ignorant of this admission? Simply because it was made during a private conversation and Gaither told investigator Dodd in no uncertain terms that he had no intention of making any public statements on the matter.

King was another man who was known on occasion to state his goals far more candidly in private than in public. Garrow notes that, towards the end of his life, King adopted "increasingly socialist economic views." (p. 585) Again, if this is so, why weren't we told? Quite simply, like Gaither before him, King didn't want us to know. One example cited

by Garrow, taken from an interview with a staff member of King's Operation Breadbasket group, makes this quite clear:

> Speaking to the Breadbasket staff, King "asked us to turn off the tape recorder," one participant recalled. "He talked about what he called democratic socialism, and said, 'I can't say this publicly, and if you say I said it I'm not going to admit it.' ...and he talked about the fact that he didn't believe capitalism as it was constructed could meet the needs of poor people, and that what we might need to look at was a kind of socialism but a democratic form of socialism." (pp. 591, 592)

While there is reason to believe King held his "socialist" views long before Garrow suggests, it is certain that (whenever he first made these views known) such a stand made him instantly appealing to those who would submerge our nation's sovereignty to a One World socialist system. The only question here is whether by "democratic socialism" King had in mind the model of a Western country like Sweden or of a Communist regime like East Germany (official name: "German Democratic Republic"). Today this policy continues as the only black leaders lionized by the secular news media are precisely those, such as Jesse Jackson, who promote expansion of the socialist welfare state at home and the goals of the One World conspirators abroad.

In *The FBI and Martin Luther King, Jr.*, Garrow is also selective in what he presents to readers. True, he does address the issue of the Highlander Folk School as a "Communist training school" and even mentions that Abner Berry, identified only as a "*Daily Worker* correspondent," was in attendance when King gave his Labor Day speech. (Norton, 1981, pp. 24-25) He fails, however, to note that Pete Seeger or Southern Conference Education Fund President Aubrey Williams were also there. And, while he says that the FBI never took seriously the charge that the school was a Communist front (this may have been because, as Garrow admits, the agent involved did "sloppy" work), Garrow does not tell anything about Commonwealth College — Highlander's predecessor — and its undeniable Red connection.

And Garrow totally ignores the sworn statement of FBI undercover agents like Julia Brown and Karl Prussion, both of whom had infiltrated Communist cells. Julia Brown, (a black woman who had innocently joined a Communist "civil rights" front, quit when she saw its true designs and reentered as an FBI informant) testified that "the cells that I was associated with in Cleveland were asked to raise money for Martin Luther King's activities and to support his movement... while I was in the Communist Party as a loyal American Negro, I knew Martin Luther King to be closely connected with the Communist party..." In California Karl Prussion found the same to be true in the cells he attended, writing in a sworn affidavit that, "at each and every of the aforementioned meetings, one Reverend Martin Luther King was always set forth as the individual to whom Communists should look and rally around in the Communist struggle on many racial issues" and that "King has either been a member of, or wittingly has accepted support from, over 60 Communist fronts, individuals, and/or organizations, which give aid to or espouse Communist causes."

The gist of the Garrow book, *The FBI and Martin Luther King, Jr.* (1981), is that the Bureau was an evil institution sorely needing reform and that it had a vendetta against King and his radical vision of America. For Garrow, King was unfairly harassed for "the few innocuous contacts (he) was known to have had with supposedly 'subversive' groups and individuals." (p. 24) When he defends King against this, he cites rather striking examples: "He had thanked the Socialist Workers Party for supporting the Montgomery Bus Boycott and black Communist Ben Davis, now a member of New York City's council, for giving blood after his 1958 stabbing." (*Ibid.*) We are able to find elsewhere what Garrow is reluctant to state in a straightforward manner. HCUA's 1953 report, *Organized Communism in the United States*, lists the Socialist Workers Party as a Communist "splinter group" that held that Russian revolutionist Leon Trotsky's Marxism was more authentic than that of his rival Josef Stalin. (1958 revised ed., p. 152) The same report identified Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., not merely as a Communist, as Garrow does, but as one of 11 people selected for the CPUSA's national board at a 1945 convention of its Communist Political Association in New York City. (pp. 120-122) Three years later, Davis and the others were indicted (and later convicted) of conspiring to "teach and advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence." (Nathaniel Weyl, *The Battle Againt Disloyalty*, Thomas Y. Crowell, 1951, pp. 304-305) Davis' conviction did not, as we've seen, change his views.

So these are the sort of "innocuous contacts" that Garrow has in mind. Are they *really* so innocent? Come now, Mr. Garrow, do you expect us to believe that? If these were only isolated incidents that marked momentary lapses in judgment, then perhaps we could. If Dr. King had acknowledged that he was running with the wrong crowd, instead of denying it and covering it up, we would find it easier to think that he had merely been taken in by the Reds. Unfortunately, precisely the opposite was the case: from the start to the finish of King's career we find him surrounded with the same sort of people, receiving the support of the same sort of groups and espousing the same sort of aims.

One final item taken from *The FBI and Martin Luther King, Jr.*, is worthy of note. As reported above, King used the good repute of his name to assist individual Communists in the cases of Carl Braden and the SCEF staff. Garrow names another "victim" of government investigation who received King's call for clemency, Frank Wilkinson, and writes that King "said he favored the abolition of HUAC [HCUA — JKW] itself." (p. 234n) The dismantlement of the House Committee on Un-American Activities was long a major goal (called "Operation Abolition") of the Communists and their allies on the radical left, such as Eleanor Roosevelt, a goal which, sad to say, was successful. In its report, *The Communist-Led Riots Against the House Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco, May 12-14, 1960*, HCUA identifies Wilkinson as having been convicted for

refusing to answer questions before the Committee about his Communist membership and activities and as being "a top Communist coordinator of 'Operation Abolition.'" (pp. 15-16)

In one important aspect the King story is like many others we see today — and that is the way Communists and One Worlders end up on the same side. He was abetted by reporters too lazy or too corrupt to look behind the protest banners for the movement's real purpose, by opportunistic politicians eager to win a new bloc of voters, and by monopoly capitalists (or superrich socialists) who dream of the day when their power will be enhanced — and competition eliminated — by a change in our nation's economic system, a change already in the process of being implemented. These same forces conspire to overthrow governments friendly to the West, such as South Africa and El Salvador, and replace them with Communist ones (though they would never admit this). No matter how many reforms are made, say, by the South Africans, they never seem to be enough for the Establishment. But let a Communist nation give the slightest sign of "mellowing" and a chorus of media voices is ready to sing its hosannas, politicians scramble to see who'll be first in advocating it be given "favored nation" trade status and international bankers open wide the doors of their vaults to offer loans (backed by *our* tax dollars, of course). If King had lived today and his career continued along the same path, we can say with some certainty that he would be a major figure in such moves. To return to a quote in our previous study, we wholeheartedly agree with the assessment of columnist George Schuyler, a black conservative, who accused King of having the "financial backing of both the 'white power structure' and the Communists to operate revolutionary schools to train his subordinates for the bedevilment of sundry communities."

Unmasking The Real King

The secular sainthood that has been bestowed on Martin Luther King, Jr., is one of the crowning achievements of the Establishment. It is a classic example of what can happen when a disinformation campaign is permitted to go unchecked. It was indeed a masterstroke of the Conspiracy to utilize a black minister in its plans because it knew that it could silence critics with the charge of racism.

We must keep in mind that there are people whose attacks on King are motivated by racism, an evil that Catholics must oppose. Blacks in America have been mistreated and have some legitimate grievances. So it is important that we make very clear that our motivation in exposing King is based *not* on race, but on the anti-Christian movement he served.

Our concern must be with exposing the Conspiracy. This must be the emphasis, overriding even considerations on the career of Dr. King. Four weeks before his murder, King preached these words: "...You don't need to go out this morning saying that Martin Luther King is a saint; oh no; I want you to know this morning that I am a sinner like all God's children, but I want to be a good man, and I want to hear a voice saying to me one day, 'I take you in and I bless you because you tried. It was well that it was within thy heart.'" Some may argue that this was just another deceit of King's, just King playing a role in which he didn't really believe. And so it may be, but no one knows what the disposition of his heart was in the waning moments of his life. We can hope that he found peace with God at the end.

But, however much we may be charitable with our enemies, we can in no way cease to fight against the evil they promote. In denouncing the King holiday, we can use Abernathy's revelation as a starting point. Gary Hart lost a presidential bid because of an adulterous affair and Jim Bakker's PTL empire collapsed after one such incident but King is lauded after similarly falling not once, but numerous times. Where is moral accountability when it comes to him? We should not fail to make this an issue. But this is but *one* of the reasons why Martin Luther King ought not to have his own holiday and we need to make *all* the reasons as widely known as possible. †

SUBSCRIPTION RENEWALS

The date on the envelope address label indicates the month and year in which the recipient's subscription is due for renewal.

At the proper time, a subscription envelope will be enclosed with the newsletter.

One may enter a new subscription at any time, of course, and will then receive the eight following newsletter issues.

Pray the Rosary Daily

Self-Discipline

Fr. Oswald Baker (England)

You have heard of Juvenal, the Roman poet. He flourished in the early part of the second century. Morally, he was the finest of all the Roman writers. Some of his epigrams have been preserved to our own day and will be no doubt for all time. Juvenal is also the most informative writer concerning social life in his time. He warned his degenerate Roman countrymen that they were too materialistic and that they were foolishly allowing civil government to assume too much power. The people were abdicating personal responsibility and so were becoming demoralized by a corruption that would change them from a nation of self-reliant, courageous individuals into an impotent mob, dependent on their government for everything. The people, however, went on their merry way, content that they had "never had it so good." Pleasure was all their quest and craze. When invasion came, it conquered because Rome was a hollow shell of a once mighty empire. Its grandeur was gone. The people had no stamina. They had pampered the body and neglected the soul. Their horizons had been limited by what Juvenal called "bread and circuses."

Bread and circuses, the quest for pleasure leads to slavery and ruin. No failing is so dangerous for a country or a civilisation as softness. Softness spells national suicide. This too is the sinister prospect for us, given our present triumphant selfishness, greed, indiscipline, sloth and lust. The degree of luxury enjoyed is no index of the achievement of a civilisation. Indeed, absorption in ease is one of the surest signs of decay. No fault is so destructive of personality as a want of discipline and self-restraint. The principal cause of unhappiness is unregulated desire, wanting more than is needed. Ceaseless demands for more money are often made not because the malcontents have not enough but because those who have merely worldly aspirations will *never* be satisfied. The rational way to lasting contentment is the way of subordination of our will to the will of God. The will of God is that we be sanctified by Him, in preparation for Heaven. This requires that we comply with His will and bring our instincts and passions into subjection so that they can be controlled and guided.

The more difficult you find it to practise self-denial, the greater your potential for holiness. The more passionate your nature, the holier you stand to become, in letting God redirect your energy. Our Lord did not repress the ardent vitality of Mary Magdalen. He turned her passion from love of vice to love of virtue. It is such a conversion of energies that explains why the greatest of all sinners, like Augustine, can become the greatest saints, loving God with their special intensity, not because they have been sinners but because they have strong urges. Their violent passions and flowing emotions, turned to holy purposes, now do as much good as they once did harm. Strong passions are the precious (raw) material of holiness. An unrepentant sinner cannot love God, any more than a man on dry land can swim, but, as soon as he brings his wayward energies to God to be redirected, he becomes truly happy as he was never happy before.

"If any man love the world, the charity of the Father is not in him." (I John II:15) That refers, not to the created world of nature, but to the worldly spirit — the pleasure-seeking, self-indulgent, materialistic outlook, rooted in the illusion that this life on earth is the only life. Our Lord admonishes us that we are to be pure in this world of lust, to be poor in spirit in a world of greed, to hunger and thirst after justice in a world that hollers for peace and ease, to be chastened and mortified in a world that seeks pleasure and luxury. We can attain to such Christ-like living only through constant, vigilant self-discipline. †

Thoughts On Humility

Humility is the realisation and acknowledgement of the truth about self. The adequacy of your knowledge of yourself is an extremely important factor in your happiness, both in your interior life and in your relationships.

No man can be truly humble who does not believe in God, who does not recognise dependence on the Power that created him. The real self is what we are before God our Maker, and what we are before ourselves in a sincere and correct examination of conscience. Humility means the truth about ourselves. It is the virtue by which one does not esteem self as more than one really is. Humility prompts us to look for the best that is in our neighbor and for the worst that is in ourselves. Saint Philip Neri and a companion saw in Rome a criminal being taken to the gallows. The companion remarked that he was receiving what he deserved. Saint Philip exclaimed, "There but for the grace of God goes Philip Neri." The Penitent Thief may have been a bad character but, so far as we know, he took the first chance of Heaven he had ever received. Promptly and humbly he prayed for it. He, Saint Dismas, the only saint to be canonised before he died, sets us an example of how to respond to God's grace.

"Jesus, meek and humble of heart, make my heart like unto Thine." With due humility we recognise how fortunate we are in having what we have. Fortunate to be alive and have this immortal soul, fortunate to be loved and to have the Faith, fortunate to have a brain and a heart, fortunate to be walking on two feet, fortunate to have God waiting for us at the end of it all. †

—Fr. O. Baker

The Catholic Concept Of Suffering

Throughout the whole course of human history only two individuals, and they only for a time, have been free from the universal law of suffering, the common lot of all creatures. These two persons were our first parents, Adam and Eve, upon whom God bestowed abundant graces which we no longer possess. Among those divine graces was the preternatural gift of immunity or freedom from suffering. This means that Adam and Eve were created by Almighty God to live upon this earth in a state of unbroken happiness, without experiencing any bodily or mental sufferings of any kind. Such would have been the portion of all other creatures as well if our first parents had remained faithful to God. However, by their commission of original sin they disobeyed God and thereby injured not only themselves but also their nature, a nature in which all other human beings participate. As a result of this sin, they and their descendants were deprived of certain gifts which otherwise would have been ours, and among those gifts was that of freedom from suffering. And that is why every human being, from Adam and Eve down to the end of time, must suffer in one form or another throughout the course of his or her mortal life.

Since, then, it is one of the consequences of original sin and since we cannot avoid it, what ought to be our attitude toward suffering? One of the most common and destructive attitudes is a resentful and negative reaction to it. Despite universal experience that no worthwhile life has ever been lived without suffering, and no greatness or nobility of character painlessly achieved, yet multitudes still think of an untroubled life as the ideal and of suffering as an intruder to be resented — to be removed if possible and, if not, simply to be tolerated as best one can. Such is the attitude of the world. It continually shuns any kind of pain or hardship and, if it cannot avoid it entirely, it merely endures it as the only alternative. To escape any and all suffering the world is ever seeking pleasure wherever it can be found, be it true or false, lawful or unlawful. And the unavoidable result of this incessant search after pleasure is mortal sin, so prevalent in the world in which we live. The result could not be otherwise.

Every rational, sensible person recognizes that trials and tribulations and hardships are inescapable facts of life. The author of one of the finest works of Catholic spirituality ever penned (*The Imitation of Christ*) well realized and expressed this fact when he wrote: "Dispose and order all things according as you will, and as seems best to you,and you will still find something to suffer, either willingly or unwillingly, and so you shall still find a cross." This is a plain fact of experience. The Catholic Church realizes the unavoidable necessity of suffering for all men, and it teaches that this suffering is indispensable for entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven. It is not a condition to be shunned, then, but an opportunity to atone for personal sin and the sins of the world. It is a glorious instrument for advancement along the path which leads to eternal happiness.

Life is meant to be a continual and progressive purification of man's fallen nature. And one of the most excellent means of purification of soul is found in the Catholic concept of suffering, the voluntary and joyful acceptance of trials and hardships as an atonement for sin and as a proof of our love for God. Saint Paul knew suffering if ever any man did and he writes that he rejoiced in his tribulations. No one in the world is exempt from carrying a cross, but it is the manner and the attitude with which it is carried that makes all the difference. "...he who does not take up his cross and follow Me is not worthy of Me" (Matthew 10:38) are the words of the Son of God.

That we suffer, then, is by no means a tragedy of life. But rather, in a world where suffering is the common lot, sure to come in some form to everyone, the tragedy is that so many take toward it a negative and defensive attitude and, consequently, get out of suffering habits of resentment and self-pity instead of recognizing in it the will of God and reacting accordingly. We are all called to be saints and, without suffering in one form or another, it is impossible to attain to sanctity in this life and to eternal salvation in the next. †

THE ATHANASIAN

Published by Traditional Catholics of America

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

Subscriptions: $12.00 per year (via First Class Mail) for the USA, Canada and Mexico;
$16.00 per year (via Air Mail) for all other countries

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

Mailing Address: P. O. Box 38335, Colorado Springs, CO 80937

Telephone: (719) 636-1575

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.