P. 3

THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume XI, No. 5 † July 15, 1990

To Prove That John Paul II Is Not A True Pope — How Many Examples Are Required?

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

Were it not for his paramount importance on the world scene and the tremendous influence he exerts upon multitudes of people the world over in his position as the head of the Conciliar Church, I would be inclined to apologize for my very frequent repetition of the subject of John Paul II in the pages of this newsletter. However, because I am so completely convinced not only that he is a bogus Pope but that he is one of the most powerful forces of evil on the face of the earth, I feel that it is imperative that I persevere in doing my part to expose him to the best of my ability. Perhaps, I am forever hoping, there is something I may write about John Paul II which will cause some readers who do not share my convictions to have second thoughts about him and eventually (the sooner, the better) to join the ranks of the *only authentic* traditional Roman Catholics, the sedevacantists. As I have written from time to time in past issues of *The Athanasian*, if even a beginning of the restoration of the Church (humanly speaking) is to be made, it is essential, I contend, that John Paul II first be unmasked and identified as the counterfeit Pope he is. Unless and until this stark fact can be firmly accepted and circulated widely enough in whatever time remains, John Paul II will continue both his abominable charade as the Vicar of Christ and his nefarious "ecumenical" efforts towards the establishment of a One World Church and One World Order.

The writing of this particular article was prompted by yet another example of the true character of John Paul II which recently came to my attention. In the April 30, 1990 issue of *The Remnant*, an article by Solange Hertz quotes a French publication, *Monde et Vie*, which reads in part as follows: "In addition to the new liturgically Africanized or Indianized Mass rites, for over a year now in Africa the Pope has permitted bread to be replaced by cakes made of millet or cassava root, and grape wine by corn wine." Now it is the clear teaching of the Roman Catholic Church that the valid matter of the Holy Eucharist is wheat bread and grape wine. In his *Moral Theology* (1961), Father H. Jone states that "bread made of any other grain...is invalid matter" and he specifically mentions millet as one of several examples of invalid matter. As for the Mass wine, Father Jone writes: "The wine, to be valid, must be made of ripe grapes." (He notes elsewhere that raisin wine "may be lawfully used for sacramental purposes.")

The message of the above paragraph is surely self-explanatory, is it not? While the Masses in Africa referred to above may have been invalid or doubtfully valid for one or more other reasons, the action of John Paul II removes all doubt as to their possible validity. The Church's teaching is crystal clear on the subject of what constitutes valid matter for the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and *no one* may make any substantive change of that matter without invalidating the Mass. The fact that John Paul II did make such a change comes, of course, as no surprise to us sedevacantists but it should provide further food for thought to those conservative, "traditional Catholic" priests and laymen who persist in their belief that he is a true Pope (Society of Saint Pius X, Tridentine Rite Conference, Society of Saint Peter, Michael Davies, etc.) How can they and *The Wanderer* and *The Remnant* and *The Angelus* and the *New Jersey Catholic News* and similar publications possibly justify such an action on the part of "His Holiness"? To suppose that an authentic Pope would render invalid the very Consecration of the Mass — is not this totally contrary to the most elementary common sense? Is not such a supposition utterly absurd? Assuredly it is and no theological expertise whatsoever is required to arrive at that conclusion.

And so, how long more, I wonder, before those conservative "traditional Catholics" cited above will finally face up to reality and acknowledge the glaring fact that John Paul II is not a true Pope. Were they to do so, they would at long last be accepting the position of sedevacantism. There is no other alternative. In relation to John Paul II there is but one sound, logical, realistic position that can be taken today — and that is sedevacantism. (There are a number of other priests around the country who are also sedevacantists but, with rare exceptions, they refrain from publicly identifying themselves as such. This, to my mind, is very regrettable. A clear declaration on their part, publicly made, that they are sedevacantists would contribute much to popularize and to advance the vital truth of sedevacantism.) †

A Few Observations

*** One of the best current examples of the controlled press in the USA is the lying propaganda regarding Nelson Mandela with which the American public has been saturated for quite some time now. The truth about him is far different. In 1964, he was convicted and imprisoned, not for his opposition to apartheid but for advocating the violent overthrow of the South African government. Evidence in his trial included a pamphlet he wrote, "How to be a Good Communist." Although he never rejected violence as a political instrument and although he is a major force in the Communist-dominated African National Congress, he was released from prison some five months ago by the government of South Africa. This is the man who was the guest of "our" President George Bush last month. In July, 1988, John Paul II publicly praised Nelson Mandela for his "greatness" of character. And, on June 15 of this year, John Paul II had a private meeting with Mandela at the Vatican after which the "Pope" again gave public praise to Mandela. Imagine a true Vicar of Christ, say, Pope Pius XI, extolling before the world so disreputable a character. And then there is Mandela's wife, Winnie, a "charming" individual known to many for her advocacy of the "necklace" treatment for her enemies, an especially gruesome form of torture which we prefer to refrain from describing. So much could be written about the contemptible Mandelas but the above will suffice here.

*** But how could George Bush invite such a despicable individual as Nelson Mandela to America as a guest and how could John Paul II praise such a character? Do they not know the truth about him? Of course they do. Here, as in scores of other instances involving the promotion of evil in one form or another, George Bush and John Paul II know very well what they are doing — and any honorable person who doubts this is either uninformed or is exceedingly naive. To endeavor to defend this or that action of these men on the ground that they made a mistake or exercised poor judgment or were the victims of bad advice — such excuses are futile and baseless to those who know the score.

*** So far gone are the American bishops of the non-Catholic Conciliar Church that they have hired a secular public relations firm to promote the moral law of God!

*** While it might be a difficult decision for some to make, if I had to name which one of the several hundred bishops of the Conciliar Church in America was, in my opinion, the worst of the lot, I would name Bishop Thomas Gumbleton of Detroit. While there are a number of those bishops who are quite abominable for one or more reasons — and not one of them, of course, is a Roman Catholic — yet I do believe that, all things considered, Bishop Gumbleton is the most repugnant of them all.

*** From time to time the observation has been made in this newsletter that the real, the fundamental war being waged today is not Communism versus anti-Communism or freedom versus slavery but rather it is God against Satan, Christ versus anti-Christ and militant atheism, Christianity against paganism, morality versus immorality. That this conflict is now coming to a head is beyond all question — and the forces of evil are winning hands down. The ultimate objective of those forces is the total elimination of God and His moral law and the destruction of the Roman Catholic Church. While such an objective, we know, can never be completely attained, yet an era of indescribable chaos is in the making and well along towards fulfillment, an era in which Satan and his cohorts will reign supreme for some indeterminate period. Is such a nightmare inevitable? Apart from the always possible divine intervention, I am strongly inclined to answer in the affirmative — unless a massive insurgence of Christian militancy is soon forthcoming. And, by the way, don't give up your guns!

Fr. F. Fenton

The ACLU And American Liberties

John Kenneth Weiskittel

In recent issues of *The Athanasian* we have examined various aspects of the growth of the anti-Christian Liberal movement in our country. One article delved into the basic ideas put forth by Liberalism and how they are in opposition to the reign of Christ the King, while another focused upon the manner in which the controlled news media take these same ideas and plant them in news reports in order to reshape the thinking of Americans into the Liberal mold.

Our previous studies dealt primarily with Liberalism as a system of thought; with its chief tenets and one of the ways they are being disseminated. And yet, however wicked the ideas considered, they remain but the pipe dreams of social planners in ivory towers until they are embraced by people who will give them life in the *real* world. This is accomplished in large part by either changing the laws of the land or the way those laws are interpreted. The former is accomplished in legislatures, from city councils all the way up to the Congress, while the latter is decided by the courts. (Some readers may question the notion that interpretations of the law belong to judges, arguing that those who framed the law are responsible for whatever intent is to be found in it. True as this may be, in the practical order of things such decisions *are* commonly made by judges. We need only recall *Roe vs. Wade*.)

No discussion of the social and political changes that have transformed the United States in this century is complete without consideration of the role the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) has played in the process. University of Nebraska (Omaha) criminal justice professor Samuel Walker, a member of the ACLU's board of directors, states in his book, *In Defense of American Liberties: A History of the ACLU* (Oxford U. Press, 1990):

> The ACLU can legitimately claim much of the credit — or be assigned the blame, if you prefer — for the growth of modern Constitutional law. Consult a standard constitutional law textbook and note the cases deemed important enough to be listed in the table of contents — the proverbial "landmark" cases. The ACLU was involved in over 80 percent of them; in several critical cases, the Supreme Court opinion was drawn directly from the ACLU brief. As even its critics have charged, the ACLU has exerted "an influence out of all proportion to its size." (p. 4; at least one ACLU member, Felix Frankfurter, has served on the Supreme Court.)

Such a record, he writes, "has made it one of the most important and, at times, unpopular organizations in the country." (p. 3) Despite its self-proclaimed position as guardian of American freedoms, the ACLU has succeeded in drawing the wrath of the fundamentally conservative majority of citizens it professes to represent. Judge Robert H. Bork, whose 1987 nomination to the Supreme Court was shot down in part through ACLU protests, targets it as the "primary litigating arm of the adversary culture" (described elsewhere by the author as "the left-liberal culture" — JKW). (*The Tempting of America: The Political Seduction of the Law*, Free Press, 1990, p. 243)

(Dis) Order In The Court

The ACLU has over 270,000 members (between 4,000 and 5,000 of whom are voluntary "cooperating" attorneys), 60 paid staff attorneys and 11 full-time lobbyists. It has a national office in New York City and a legislative office in Washington, D.C. (Walker, p. 4) "With some justification, the ACLU calls itself 'the nation's largest law firm.' At any given moment it is involved in an estimated one thousand cases, and it appears before the Supreme Court more often than does any organization except the federal government." (*Ibid.*)

And the ACLU is quite likely the country's most prosperous "law firm" as well. According to Daniel J. Popeo, founder and general counsel of the Washington Legal Foundation (a public interest law institution organized to go "head to head against the American Civil Liberties Union on a continuing basis" at the national level) "the ACLU has a budget of more than $15 million a year." (*Not Our America... The ACLU Exposed*!, Washington Legal Foundation, 1989, p. 4) In addition:

> The state affiliates, which are supposedly autonomous, have a combined budget of approximately another $10 million. Then there's (sic) the millions of dollars in pro bono legal work provided by leading liberal law firms. (*Ibid.*)

As Popeo concludes, this "adds up to a war chest that is difficult, if not impossible to match." (Some funding also comes from the pornographers it regularly defends.)

The influence of the ACLU is, then, undeniable. The question is: How has the group used it? Here, the answer depends a good deal on who is responding. ACLU director Walker proudly asserts:

> ...the ACLU can claim to have shaped contemporary values. Principles of individual freedom, protection against arbitrary government action, equal protection, and privacy have pervaded our society. When the ACLU was founded in 1920, the promises of the Bill of Rights had little practical meaning for ordinary people. Today, there is a substantial body of law in all major areas of civil liberties: freedom of speech and press, separation of church and state, free exercise of religion, due process of law, equal protection, and privacy.

> The growth of civil liberties since World War I represents one of the most important long-term developments in modern American history, a revolution in the law and public attitudes toward individual liberty. Some have called it the "rights revolution"; we prefer to call it the civil liberties revolution... (p. 3)

It's nice of Walker to provide such a "valuable" service by informing us of the ACLU's crucial function in restoring unaccountably lost civil liberties, since it isn't likely that too many Americans would have any awareness of such a "hidden" history. Frankly, few would be comfortable equating the Bill of Rights with the "civil liberties revolution."

In the 1988 presidential campaign, Republican candidate George Bush scored points with conservative voters by charging that his Democratic opponent, Michael Dukakis, was "a card-carrying member of the ACLU." This tactic, if Walker is correct, was the first time "a candidate's membership in a single organization (had) been a prominent issue in a campaign." (p. 368) Dukakis' subsequent failure to defend his patriotism against this attack was a key to his downfall. Apparently, he failed to see the danger of his foe's simple but true assertion. The result was a triumph of modern political know-how for, by using marketing research techniques, "Bush strategists had discovered that the ACLU's name evoked strong negative reactions among voters." (*Ibid.*)

But if the ACLU is the guardian and savior of our freedoms, as it would have us believe, then why was its mere mention the kiss of death for Michael Dukakis? Consider for a moment the following catalog of ACLU views Judge Bork has compiled:

> ...The ACLU opposes laws outlawing gambling, the use of some narcotics (marijuana use is said to be constitutionally protected), homosexual conduct, pornography, abortion, and suicide. The ACLU thinks that in child custody proceedings, homosexuality may not even be considered in determining the best interests of the child. The organization opposes state regulation of abortion. It thinks that while the production of child pornography may be prohibited, once it is produced, the first amendment requires its distribution free of state interference. The ACLU opposes laws that zone pornographic theatres away from churches and schools as well as laws that allow citizens to have the postmaster remove their names from mailing lists for pornographic material. It opposes metal detectors in airports. It does not favor mandatory incarceration, without the possiblity of a sentence of probation, except perhaps for murder or treason and, of course, contends that the death penalty is unconstitutional. The ACLU has sued to declare unconstitutional: the tax exempt status of churches and synagogues; the employment of chaplains by Congress, prisons, and the armed services; all displays of nativity scenes on public property; the singing of "Silent Night" in the classroom; and the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance. (p. 243n; and, we may add to this, its opposition to private gun ownership.)

Small wonder that the Bush staff pounced at the opportunity to collar the challenger with the ACLU label. In reviewing the above list of positions the group holds, we find ourselves asking: Just *who* are these "ordinary people" with whom it is so concerned, and why is the ACLU so keen on defending them? Part of the solution will be found by exploring the organization's background.

"(A) Supporter Of All Subversive Movements"

When the Supreme Court in 1987 gave the ACLU what Walker calls "a particularly sweet victory" by overturning a Louisiana law permitting nonevolutionary theories of creation to be taught in public schools ("Catholic" Justice William Brennan found the law particularly odious since its aim "was clearly to advance the religious viewpoint that a supernatural being created humankind"), a reporter asked ACLU director Ira Glasser how long they had been fighting the case. "Sixty-two years," replied Glasser. (Walker, p. 343)

The "case" mentioned here is actually Glasser's allusion to the ACLU's long-standing opposition to any reference to God in the schools, an opposition traceable to the group's support for a Tennessee teacher, John T. Scopes, charged with introducing Darwinian evolution into the classroom. The Scopes Trial took place in 1925 and is one of the most celebrated legal proceedings in our nation's history. Clarence Darrow, an ACLU lawyer and self-professed atheist, defended Scopes, while fundamentalist William Jennings Bryan acted as prosecuting attorney. Although Darrow lost the case (a ruling overturned by the state supreme court in 1927), the trial proved to be "a publicity bonanza" for the ACLU which was catapulted into national prominence. (*Ibid.*, p. 73) Popeo, commenting on the first "equal time" law (passed in Arkansas in 1981), notes that "whereas 56 years earlier they had fought to defend the teaching of evolution as an "alternative" theory, this time they fought to make evolution the *only* theory to teach." (p. 11)

This so-called "Monkey Trial," however, came five years after the forming of the organization. The ACLU actually was begun to replace a similar group, the National Civil Liberties Bureau (NCLB). It is worth taking a brief look at the activities of the NCLB, especially because one of its leaders, Roger Baldwin, helped found the ACLU and played a vital role in its existence until his death in 1981 at the ripe old age of 97.

Baldwin organized the NCLB in 1917 primarily to fight against America's entrance into the First World War and against a military draft. The thought of committing U.S. troops to what was widely seen as a strictly European conflict did not meet with great public support at first. President Woodrow Wilson recognized this by using "He kept us out of war!" as the slogan of his successful 1916 re-election campaign. When, however, the nation declared war on Germany, the vast majority of citizens rallied behind our armed forces.

Those who sought the services of the NCLB were primarily the members of far-left groups and of pacifistic religious sects (for example, the Quakers). But make no mistake, the radicals were — as they later would be during the Vietnam

War — very much in control of the anti-war movement. Walker states: "The American Socialist party was the center of organized opposition." (p. 13) In September, 1917, the Justice Department staged mass raids on the offices of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), a socialist union, indicting 169 of its top leaders under the Espionage Act. The NCLB helped raise legal funds for the IWW. (*Ibid.*, p. 25) A little more than a year later Baldwin was himself found guilty of draft evasion and was jailed until July of 1919, at which time he joined the IWW.

The career of Roger Baldwin so shaped the organization and subsequent operation of the ACLU that his name is virtually synonymous with the group. Born in 1884 in a Boston suburb to a wealthy Unitarian family and educated at Harvard, Baldwin is a classic example of the radical in the pinstripe suit. He was, according to Walker, a man with prejudices, "a bit of a snob" and held "an elitist view of his role in society." (p. 31) His earliest free speech defenses, while a sociology professor at St. Louis' Washington University, included one for anarchist Emma Goldwin in 1910 and one for Planned Parenthood founder Margaret Sanger two years later. (*Ibid.*, p. 34)

After his release from prison, Baldwin went to "Pittsburgh in the midst of a steel strike,...(and) worked in a mill at the request of strike organizer (and future Communist Party leader) William Z. Foster to investigate the productivity of the strikebreakers." (Walker, p. 46) Then, in January, 1920, he reorganized the NCLB as the ACLU. Popeo writes: "His first board of directors included Elizabeth Gurley Flynn (Baldwin met her while supporting the IWW in 1917 — JKW) and William Z. Foster, both of whom would later head the Communist Party in America; radical communist Scott Nearing and several others (left-wing extremists — JKW), including Socialist Party head Norman Thomas." (pp. 8-9; Walker acknowledges Flynn as an ACLU founder but omits mention of Foster in this connection).

Today the ACLU conveys an image of lawyers in three-piece suits but in its early days it did little to hide its militant activism for radical causes. In May, 1920, the residents of Duquesne, Pennsylvania, witnessed "an ACLU-sponsored demonstration in support of steel workers." (Walker, p. 52) Five years later in Los Angeles an ACLU attorney was "dragged" from a podium near city hall, the police chief explaining that he'd "not allow any man to deny the existence of God down there on the plaza." (*Ibid.*) The formation of two clandestine Communist parties afforded the ACLU's executive committee the opportunity to issue a policy statement in 1921 that attempted to explain its relation with them. While denouncing their secrecy and the perjury of their members, it blamed "political repression" as responsible for such behavior, arguing that, if the parties were "left free to express their political views in the open, there will be no longer any reason for underground activity." (Cited, *ibid.*, p. 63) On the question of whether the first amendment protects the right to advocate revolution, Walker reports that "the ACLU hedged." (Only one year later, in a letter to the Attorney General, the group defended the "right" of anyone "to advocate the overthrow of government by force or violence," and in 1920 Baldwin testified before a House committee on Communist activities that advocacy of violence, murder or assassination in general — but not the overt act — was constitutionally protected. See Walker, pp. 65, 120.)

The ACLU was beginning to make quite a reputation for itself. In the 1920's, the Industrial Defense Association accused the ACLU of being "the legal agency of the Communist Party of Russia." (Cited, Walker, p. 57) The ACLU and its supporters would like to have this brushed off as merely the anti-labor rhetoric of a manufacturers' lobby. Unfortunately, leading moderate union figures were saying much the same: AFL head Samuel Gompers assailed it for aiding "revolutionary" groups and United Mine Workers leader John L. Lewis called it "communistic." (*Ibid.*) And the first in-depth governmental investigation of Communists in America, the New York State Legislature's Lusk Committee, in its four-volume report *Revolutionary Radicalism* (published in 1920), called the ACLU "a supporter of all subversive movements,...its propaganda is detrimental to the interests of the State. It attempts not only to protect crime but to encourage attacks upon our institutions in every form." (*Ibid.*) Some things, it seems, never change.

Counsel For The Comrades

The previous section only touches upon the ties that the American Civil Liberties Union has had with the Communist movement in the United States. When the House of Representatives formed its Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities (mentioned earlier) in 1930, Hamilton Fish, who chaired the committee, charged that the ACLU was "closely affiliated with the Communist movement in the United States and fully 90 percent of its efforts are on behalf of Communists." (Cited, Walker, p. 120)

And what of the charges? Roger Baldwin's long association with radicals of all shades from shocking pink to blood red made such associations inevitable. There is no evidence that he ever was a member himself although certain of his statements and activities gives one reason to wonder. He was a member of the Friends of the Soviet Union (Popeo, p. 8) and worked with Communists in organizing the Popular Front, a coalition of liberals and Reds that included such groups as the American League for Peace and Democracy, the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, the American Student Union and the National Committee to Aid Striking Workers. (Walker, p. 118)

Walker's presentation of ACLU-Communist ties is not always convincing. For example, he writes that "(a)ll the ACLU leaders were repelled by Communist ideology and tactics..." (p. 63; even Flynn and Foster?) Yet on the same page he informs us:

> ...Baldwin and others in the ACLU were also deeply sympathetic to the Soviet Union which, in the pre-Stalinist years, captured the imagination of many disaffected Americans as a bold experiment in economic democracy (sic). Baldwin spent two months there in 1927 and wrote an informative book entitled

Liberty Under the Soviets. He also organized support for the Kuzbas, an American industrial colony in Russia — an activity that right-wingers took as conclusive proof of his Communist affiliation.

But even with this admission, Walker isn't telling the whole story for, as Popeo observes:

> Baldwin had a special interest in and appreciation for the Soviet Union. He made his first trip to Russia in 1923 and was *invited back* for a second visit four years later. (p. 10, emphasis added)

Such behavior is consistent with that of the British Fabian Socialists who seek to bring about Marxian socialism through nonviolent change. Indeed, Rose L. Martin, in her comprehensive study on the subject, *Fabian Freeway: High Road to Socialism in the U.S.A.* Fidelis, 1968), identifies the ACLU and Baldwin as American Fabians. She cites a book Baldwin coauthored, *Civil Liberties & Industrial Conflict*, published in 1938 by Harvard University Press, a book in which he calls civil liberties "means for nonviolent progress," defining *progress* as "the extension of the control of social institutions by progressively larger classes until human society ultimately abolishes the violence of class conflict." (p. 233) If this isn't sufficiently clear, Martin includes quotes from two other Baldwin statements from the same decade: at a teachers' conference in 1936 he upheld "the forces working for the democratization of industry by extending public ownership and control, which alone will abolish the power of the relative few who own the wealth"; and in an article the following year he defined "real democracy" as "strong trade unions, government regulation of business, ownership by the people of industries that serve the public." (*Ibid.*, p. 234) This is all nothing less than a blueprint for Big Brother socialism behind the usual flowery platitudes about "democracy," "ownership by the people" and "public ownership and control." We see this in the ACLU's refusal to recognize as civil liberties the rights to property or freedom of contract. Economic freedom to them seems to apply only to bureaucrats, welfare recipients and big labor bosses; they oppose right-to-work laws. Popeo points out that the ACLU prides itself on its opposition to searches without warrants and then he quotes an editorial in *Barron's* which stated: "Yet in 1978, it decided not to file a brief for an Idaho businessman who barred the Occupational Safety and Health Administration from performing a safety inspection of his plant until it obtained a search warrant." (p. 75; what, we cannot help but wonder, would have been the outcome had he been a cocaine dealer whose crack house had been raided by police!)

The above Baldwin remarks pale in comparison with what he wrote in his thirtieth-anniversary Harvard yearbook:

> I am for socialism, disarmament and, ultimately, for abolishing the State itself as an instrument for violence and compulsion. I seek the social ownership of property, the abolition of the propertied class and sole control of those who produce wealth. *Communism is the goal.* (Cited, Popeo, p. 9, emphasis added; Walker includes the quote, but without the first sentence, p. 119)

Baldwin also exhibited a strange view of civil liberties in Communist-enslaved nations. In 1934, he wrote an article for *Soviet Russia Today* in which he said: "When that power of the working class is once achieved, as it has been only in the Soviet Union, I am for maintaining it by any means whatsoever." (Cited, Popeo, p. 10; also Walker, p. 119)

Here we are confronted with an interesting problem. Both authors have cited the same two passages, but from diametrically opposed positions. How do they use these quotes to strengthen their respective sides? Walker, obviously, is at the disadvantage of defending the indefensible remarks of his group's founder. He had no choice but to include them if he wanted to give his book the appearance of being balanced, since he noted that they "were on public record." (p. 119) So he resorts to apologetics: true, he tells us, this was "careless rhetoric" on Baldwin's part but "(b)oth statements were atypical (he made no others like them) and were apparently a product of the desperate conditions of 1934 — the depression and the rise of Hitler." (*Ibid.*) Isn't this fitting, coming as it does from the same people who have perfected the insanity defense in murder trials, for now we are asked to believe that Baldwin, the rich anti-Semite, was so overwhelmed by the troubling state of world affairs that he lost his head and made a couple of statements that sound as though they were lifted directly from a Marxist textbook! This wild grasping for straws by Walker begs the question on some key points. First, how is it that earlier in his story Walker tells us that, *years before* these statements were made, Baldwin was "deeply sympathetic to the Soviet Union? Would this not suggest a more *lasting* interest in such ideology? Second, he writes (in the same section in which he records the quotes) that in the 1930's Baldwin's "rhetoric became explicitly more Marxist." (p. 118) Does this not at least suggest that such remarks, far from being isolated (or, as Walker seems to want us to think, *accidental*), represent part of an *ongoing intellectual process*? And third, Walker, while mentioning Baldwin's Communist friends and colleagues, his coalition-building with the Communist Party, a visit to Russia and other similar activities, appears to want the reader to believe that all of this shouldn't be considered as relevant to his public utterances. Aren't these, after all, the only times he made slips of the tongue, as Walker suggests?

The answer is that they are *not* his only comments supporting Communism. Even if we disallow the examples cited by Martin as too vague (it could be argued that Baldwin only means a non-Marxist form of socialism), there is still at least one that reinforces the others. We will let Popeo introduce it:

> In 1928, he issued a comparison of repression in democratic and socialist countries that has remained a mainstay of the ACLU's philosophy to this very day: "Repressions in Western democracies are violations of professed constitutional liberties and I condemn them as such. Repressions in Soviet Russia are weapons of struggle in a transition period to Socialism." (p. 10)

Why does Popeo consider this mentality characteristic of today's ACLU? It may have something to do with this opinion

he cites from attorney William Kunstler who currently serves on its National Advisory Council: "I do not believe in public attacks on socialist countries where violations of human rights may occur." (*Ibid.*) And we shouldn't forget the case of Walter Polovcha, the twelve-year-old Ukrainian boy visiting the U.S. a few years ago with his parents who decided that he would like to stay in the decadent West despite the protests of his parents. The ACLU, which staunchly defends the "right" of school girls to have abortions without parental consent (or even knowledge), took the case of the parents. The final twist is that the ACLU was already involved in a similar case, but this one involved a child from Chile and this time it was on the side of the child! (See Popeo, pp. 28-30)

In 1940, a purge was made of Communists from the ACLU's governing committee and, as a result, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, a leading member of both groups, was removed from her post as an ACLU director. The move was done to insure the group's survival after years of attack on this very issue, and to regain acceptance with liberals who were shocked by the Nazi-Soviet accord. (Popeo, p. 14) During the next twenty years the ACLU assumed a new posture. This involved a temporary alliance with, of all groups, the FBI. In fact, according to William A. Donohue in *The Politics of the American Civil Liberties Union,* it "voluntarily supplied information to the bureau on suspected communists..." (Cited, Popeo, p. 15; a book he also recommends) Walker naturally sees the 1950's as dark days for the ACLU but adds that it offered "free legal assistance to federal employees charged with being disloyal." (p. 178) The freewheeling 1960's made it the "in" thing to be radical. When the House Committee on Un-American Activities was abolished, the ACLU must have led the cheers — it had sought just that since the committee had been formed in 1938. (*Ibid.*, p. 121) It moved in 1967 to rescind the 1940 resolution mentioned above and voted to overturn Flynn's expulsion, praising her efforts on the "civil liberties revolution." (Popeo, pp. 14-15; he notes that she never witnessed her exoneration, having already been buried in *Moscow's Kremlin Wall.* Three years later the ACLU gave its 50th Anniversary Civil Liberties Award to the following individuals (as described by Popeo): "David Dellinger, an admitted communist; Paul Robeson, an identified communist; Julian Bond, a radical legislator; and C. Willard Heckel whose claim to fame was his active defense of avowed communist Angela Davis." (p. 16)

The trend of the rejuvenated ACLU has continued to this day in the same direction. In the Spring 1990 issue of its tabloid, *Civil Liberties,* it announced that the recipient of its annual award was Anne Braden and reported that, at the banquet honoring her, she recalled the successful fight to destroy HCUA and praised the ACLU's part in creating the kind of consciousness that made it possible. This is the same Anne Braden who has been mentioned along with her husband Carl in two articles in *The Athanasian* concerning the sordid career of Martin Luther King, Jr. There we provided documentary proof (sworn testimony from an FBI undercover agent) that the Bradens, close associates of King, were members of that fine group of "liberals," the *Communist Party of the USA.* Nowhere in the two-page *Civil Liberties* spread is there any mention of Braden's affiliation!

Verdict: Guilty of Undermining America

"There has never been an anti-American movement in the United States that did not, in one form or another, appeal to the Declaration of Independence," wrote then Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen in 1941. Included in his list of scoundrels are the "spurious defenders of civil liberties (who) tearfully quote it to justify every attack on the foundations of liberty..." When the ACLU's background and ongoing assault on the liberties it claims to protect are considered in this light, it is small wonder that Cardinal Richard Cushing in 1959 assailed it as being a "Communist Front." Although it

My contribution to the Traditional Catholics of America is $ _____

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State and Zip _____

has never been identified officially as such by any governmental investigating body, "Front" does seem closer to the mark than Walker's characterization of its "distinctive flavor" as "a complex mixture of liberal social reform impulses and conservative reverence for the Bill of Rights." (p. 30) More to the point is ACLU National Advisory Council member William Kunstler's infamous description of his role in the legal process: "I am a double agent, working within the system to bring down the system." (Cited, Popeo, p. 17; Popeo suggests that "the ACLU should consider making that their motto. At least it's honest.")

It is surely one of the supreme ironies of our age that many of the greatest attacks on our God-given rights come from a group that wraps itself in the American flag — a flag that it would allow to be desecrated — and proclaims itself the "civil liberties" guardian. But the "rights" that the American Civil Liberties Union upholds are the very offenses that have steered our country away from a Christ-centered system of rule (to whatever extent this was ever the case) into what resembles a modern Babylon. And surely Satan, in his unhallowed chambers, must find an infernal satisfaction from the realization that *his* kingship has such an able group of barristers working so effectively for him on the American scene. From a human perspective it would seem all but impossible for America to recover from this diabolical seige in view of the present "religiously neutral" mentality that pervades our culture. Unless the rule of Christ the King is openly and vigorously practiced as the rule of law in our land, the future of this nation is hopeless. †

AN EXPLANATION

Whenever a newsletter subscription is due for renewal, the subscriber receives a blue envelope to remind him of this. The enclosed white envelope is merely for the convenience of those who may wish to make a contribution to the TCA. The income we receive by way of newsletter subscriptions covers only about one-fourth of our annual expenses. For the remaining three-fourths of the funds needed we depend entirely upon voluntary contributions. †

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

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.