THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume XIII, No. 7 † October 15, 1992

America's Descent Into Paganism (Part I)

John Kenneth Weiskittel

When the historians of the future look back on American society in the final quarter of the twentieth century, what will be the hallmarks that make up such studies? Upon which aspects of our society will such chroniclers focus? And what kinds of conclusions will they make about us as a people? The answers to these questions will depend, of course, on who those historians are and the particular perspective that each brings to the subject, since the emphasis largely will rely on the viewpoint.

Whatever the slant, however, certain issues would have to be cited in any truly comprehensive analysis: environmental concerns, the controversy over abortion and euthanasia/assisted suicide, the emergence of the New Age movement, attempts to redefine the family, the sweeping rejection of established religious and moral principles, and the drive for a New World Order, to name a few of the more obvious examples. Likewise, our twenty-first century analysts would need to devote space in their histories to the license in entertainment — no matter how vile, obscene, blasphemous or inflammatory the message produced for public consumption, anything goes (so long as a profit is to be made).

In addition, attention must be given to the intellectual underpinnings that have made modern society what it is. These would include: *humanism* — man is self-sufficient in all things and so the very idea of God is, at best, optional, and paradise is to be sought in the creation of an earthly utopia; *relativism* — man may think and do as he pleases (one man's opinion is as good as another's), the only "absolute" being that there *are* no absolutes; *egalitarianism* — all men are equal, and authority is regarded as an artificially-maintained evil; and so-called *realism* (or *naturalism*) — the only things considered real and to be desired are those that can be detected by the senses, so the belief of ordering one's life according to God's Commandments is called empty idealism and a waste of time, Heaven is mocked as a pipe dream, and hell is ridiculed as a medieval horror story invented to control simple minds. In short, while consideration could be made of the influence of various Christian denominations, the truthful historian would be forced to conclude that, by and large, little more than lip service was accorded them, and that the overall picture points to a "post-Christian" society. (The term *post-Christian* must be regarded as an accurate description only in the sense that a sizable portion of the population has discarded all but the nominal title "Christian," rejecting the rule of Christ in the life of their nation. Nevertheless, in the broader sense, *all* history has been *Christian* — and will continue to be so to the end of time — from the moment of the Incarnation, even in those countries which never embraced the Gospel or those that once did only to reject it, since Christ is the divine sovereign of all mankind.)

Bowing Down To Strange Gods

What conclusions the historians of tomorrow might make is anyone's guess but, from the *traditional Catholic perspective*, the upshot of all this social turmoil is that America of the 1990s has become unmistakably *pagan* in its day-to-day life. No doubt many Christians would find such a judgment harsh, but are they really facing reality? Let the evidence speak for itself.

Before examining that evidence, it is worthwhile to consider what is meant by paganism and in what way it can be fairly said to apply to modern society. For the theological definition, Father C. C. Martindale, in his article on the subject in the 1913 edition of *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, writes:

> Paganism, in the broadest sense, includes all religions other than the true one revealed by God and, in a narrower sense, all except Christianity, Judaism and Mohammedanism. It is also used as the equivalent of Polytheism [that is, the belief in more than one god, as opposed to monotheism or the belief in one God — JKW]. It is derived from

> the Latin *pagus*, whence *pagani* (that is, those who live in the country), a name given to the country folk who remained heathen after the cities had become Christian...

The names of the ancient gods and goddesses have come down through history. Baal, Molech, Astaroth, Diana, Jupiter and Mercury are among those false deities mentioned in the Bible; today, their long-abandoned altars are buried far beneath the sands of time. Other peoples in every part of the world have offered sacrifices to Odin, Shiva, Chango, Buddha, Osiris and Quetzacoatl. Some *still do*.

Sacred Scripture is quite clear on the subject of pagan gods. Through Moses God commanded the children of Israel, whom He knew were given to abandoning Him for the deities of the heathen: "And they shall no more sacrifice their victims to devils, with whom they have committed fornication. It shall be an ordinance forever to them and their posterity." (Lev. 17:7) Again, in his canticle for remembrance of God's law, Moses declares:

> They provoked Him by strange gods, and stirred Him up to anger with their abominations. They sacrificed to devils and not to God: to gods whom they knew not: that were newly come up, whom their fathers worshipped not. Thou hast forsaken the God that begot thee, and hast forgotten the Lord that created thee. (Deut. 32:16-18)

David, in a great song of praise to God for the future coming of Christ and His Kingdom, proclaims: "For the Lord is great, and exceedingly to be praised: He is to be feared above all gods. For all the gods of the gentiles are devils: but the Lord made the heavens." (Ps. 95:4-5) In the New Testament, Saint Paul elaborates on this, pointing out that while the idols before which the pagans prostrate themselves are merely graven objects, the *spirits* that stir up such unholy devotion are indeed quite real, quite alive, and quite evil:

> What then? Do I say, that what is offered in sacrifice to idols, is anything? Or, that the idol is anything? But the things which the heathens sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God. And I would not that you should be made partakers with devils. You cannot drink the chalice of the Lord, and the chalice of devils: you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils. (I Cor. 10:19-21)

Many Christians in Western countries, who have never made visits to lands where the old gods are still worshiped, regard paganism as little more than quaint mythology: Cupid on Saint Valentine's Day; the subject of art, plays and operas, such as Wagner's four-opera cycle, *Der Ring des Niebelungen*, about Germanic deities; the root of many English words (for example, March from the Roman god *Mars*; Thursday from the Norse god *Thor*), etc. Nothing, then, to take seriously. But this is a mistaken notion. Monsignor Leon Cristiani, in *Evidence of Satan in the Modern World*, warns:

> We cannot stress too often the fact that in the Gospels Satan is given the incredible title of *Prince of this world*, yet the title must be justified, since Christ Himself accords it. Yet such a title could not be given to Satan if the pagan deities were not purely and simply devils. The Fathers of the Church were unanimously agreed that this was so. The pagan oracles of Delphi and Dodona, and others that were less celebrated, were demonic oracles and manifestations.
>
> Christian theology has naturally adopted this point of view. The historical description of paganism, whether ancient or modern, is not, for us, an intellectual amusement, a form of literary curiosity, but the unhappy observation of Satan's dominion over man.

In his closing words of the passage cited above, Saint Paul echoed Christ Who, in the Sermon on the Mount, teaches: "No man can serve two masters. For either he will hate the one and love the other: or he will sustain the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon." (Matt. 6:24) Our Lord's statement bears more than a little relevance to the modern pagan upsurge. He admonishes us not to trust in earthly riches so they become a god for us — had He lived in our times He might have phrased it: "You cannot serve God and the dollar, which for some is 'almighty'." Significantly, many later writers in the Church personified "Mammon" as a demon of greed. And how greatly has this wicked pursuit of the "good things in life" *at any cost* become an all-consuming passion for millions. It becomes a *religion* for social climbers, who get their weekly jet-set "sermons" from television's *Lifestyles of the Rich & Famous*, but whose frantic reach for the golden ring that will "end all cares" and "make life *real*"

frequently involves selling out their family, friends, church and country to achieve their goal. "The greatest temptation for the Christians of our times," writes Monsignor Cristiani, "and no petty temptation at that, but the most widespread, general and dangerous of temptations, is that of *preferring things to God*."

This leads to the conclusion that paganism can be found in forms other than the specific worship of false deities, such as any excessive self-love or attachment to the things of this world. It is certain from Scripture that the devil can transform himself "into an angel of light," (II Cor. 11:14) and there is much truth to the contemporary statement that Satan's greatest triumph in modern times is to convince the world that he does not exist. Before the time of Christ, babies were sacrificed in fire to placate the god Molech. Today, unborn babies are sacrificed in abortion mills before the altar of the gods Choice and Convenience. Although the modern "worshipers" would probably scoff at belief in the ancient deities, they are nonetheless very much under the sway of the gods of humanism.

Other examples stand out as well. Earlier this year in Florida, the judge in a murder trial ordered that a framed copy of the Ten Commandments hanging on a wall outside the courtroom *be covered* (this is not being made up!) lest the jury be unduly *prejudiced* against the defendant. Pre-Christian Rome had its bread and circuses; modern America, its Big Macs and Super Bowls (this is not to say that such things are wrong in and of themselves but only that they have become obsessive in the minds of many). Then there are the extremists in the ecology movement that insist on calling Earth "Gaia" after the goddess of ancient Greece (they talk about a "spirit" pervading the globe, making it all *one* — guess where that is leading). But wait! These are only the "moderate" extremists; a group in the Northwest has now proposed that *the entire human race* commit *species suicide* because of all the horrendous atrocities committed against the planet (again, this is *really happening*). And the push for homosexual "rights" is merely an updating of the pagan belief of ancient Greece that the sexually perverted were somehow in communion with the gods — now they are foisted upon the public as being somehow more caring, sensitive and artistic than others. Of course, there are quite a few pagans of the more classical mold, who *do* chant to Krishna, conduct witches' sabbaths for Diana and cast spells for Satan. All part of that wonderful "pluralistic" society of America in the '90s!

America's Legacy: Religious Indifferentism

It comes as a shock to many Americans to find their beloved country in such a sorry state. But should it? After all, one of the cornerstones upon which its social life is built is the premise that anyone should be able to preach and practice whatever belief he or she pleases. (The *practicing* what one believes is less guaranteed: late in the 1800s the Supreme Court forbade polygamy amongst the Mormons, and more recent court rulings have prohibited parents in faith healing sects from refusing medical care for critically ill children. Still, if the current trend continues in the U.S., it seem only a matter of time before little else but *human sacrifice* — abortion excepted, of course — will be off limits). It was only a matter of time before this policy of religious indifferentism caught up with America.

When the United States was established over two centuries ago, it immediately became unique among those nations which were overwhelmingly Christian in population. The European settlers in the colonies had come from every imaginable denomination, and the newly formed government made *religious neutrality* a key tenet, so that the First Amendment of the Constitution begins: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof..." But the neutrality expressed by the Founding Fathers went far beyond this to the point of denying Christianity as even *the basis* of the system of government of the new nation. In fact, this rejection was made official only five years after the Bill of Rights was signed. As part of a 1796 treaty with Tripoli the adminstration of President (and Freemason) George Washington declared: "The government of the United States of American is not, *in any sense* [italics added], founded upon the Christian religion."

So, almost from the very beginning of America, the teachings of Our Lord were cast out of the halls of government as *having no place there*, and the seeds of religious indifferentism, which have produced a now fully grown noxious weed, were sown. Father Konrad Algermissen, writing nearly fifty years ago in his book *Christian Denominations*, touches on this potentially fatal

flaw in the American system, as well as another reason it could fall prey to paganism:

> After the American colonies obtained their independence from England, the equal rights of all religions became a principle in the States. Thus the various Christian Churches and denominations could develop without restriction upon American soil. This liberty brought in its train consequences that were not always desirable... The height of the Christian spirit [in the U.S. — JKW] is largely gauged by the number of Bibles distributed and the amount of money amassed. To this pronounced, practical, fundamental American idea is added the lack of a religious tradition and of an ancient Christian and medieval culture. American Catholicism possesses this tradition by virtue of its living connection with the Church universal, its *magisterium*, its canon law, its worship, and its head. The Protestantism of Europe possesses it in the pre-Reformation history, which is the history of a homgeneous Church. But the Protestantism of America does not possess it, or at least has very little of it. American Protestantism lacks the clarity and the keenness of scholastic speculation, as well as the depth and fervor of genuine mysticism...

This lack of any much religious tradition worthy of the name, when coupled with the inbred rebellion of Protestants against the principle of ecclesiastical authority; religious indifferentism and official rejection of Christ by the government; and the eagerness with which many American Catholics embraced their nation's heritage of religious liberalism and, ultimately, the Vatican II revolt — all this practically assured the present state of affairs. One would not needed to have been a prophet, but only a keen-eyed student of history and current events, to have foreseen the direction in which America was heading.

The preceeding points are not meant to suggest that the influence of Christianity (here used to include non-Catholic denominations) in America's past was insignificant but only that it had no official status. In truth, all the things we proudly can hail in our country's public morality bear the unmistakable imprint of that influence. This can be seen in laws protecting the rights of blacks, native Americans and other minorities held by some to be little more than animals; in laws prior to 1973 protecting the lives of unborn babies held by some to be *less* than animals; in those statutes earlier in this century that forbade the dissemination of birth control devices and literature promoting them; in the banning of immoral books and movies; and in those policies aimed at repelling the subversive activities of Communists and other anti-Christian and un-American forces, both without and within the country. Then there have been countless acts of private charity either on the individual or institutional level. And, as Catholics, we can be thankful to live in a nation where we are permitted to practice our Faith in relative freedom and peace. (Ironically, traditional Catholics have actually benefited in a sense from the religious liberalism, insomuch as no one is forced to attend Conciliar "Catholic" churches and may speak out against them. How long this situation is allowed to continue, however, remains to be seen. There is already a movement to restrict what can be said from the pulpit to *politically correct* "theology," such as that which would be pro-homosexual, pro-abortion, would reconstruct the words of the Passion in a manner that would absolve the Jewish authorities of all blame in the Crucifixion, etc.)

But it is important to note here that almost all the examples cited in the preceding paragraph represent the public morality of America's *past*. One need only contrast them with what passes for today's "ethical principles" to see that whatever faults the nation had in earlier eras (for example, by 1915 its divorce rate, though nowhere near what it is at present, had already grown to one divorce filed for every ten marriages), they are dwarfed by the current flood of corruption and immorality. In the span of a generation the situation rapidly grew worse — *dramatically worse*.

Rebels Without A Cause

The decade of the 1960s was a period of unprecedented change in the history of the United States. Wherever one turned could be found protest demonstrations. Marchers took to the streets to call for the abolishment of the House Committee on Un-American Activities (unfortunately, this Communist-endorsed protest was successful); denounce discrimination against blacks (although the goal was laudable, some of its key leaders, like the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., exploited it to advance a radical agenda); better the condition of farm workers (here used by Cesar Chavez *ala King*); promote "free speech" (that is, *dirty language*) on college campuses; and, above all, push for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. Radicalism

became fashionable for some middle-class university students who joined the SDS and other openly pro-Communist groups. They could be seen sporting wire-rimmed "Trotsky" glasses, wearing protest buttons with the "peace symbol" design or "NLF" (National Liberation Front) to show solidarity with the North Vietnamese Communists, and carrying around "the little red book" — *Quotations of Chairman Mao*.

Still, political upheaval was only a phase of this rebellion, and not necessarily the most important one. A more lasting type of unrest was that aimed against traditional morality — its slogan: "do your own thing." Many of the same students who participated in these marches also influenced other, less politically motivated youths by their promotion of a new set of values, including drugs, "free love," communes and Eastern religions. This "Age of Aquarius," as advertised in the song of the same name, promised a new age in which America's youths would be freed from the shackles of their parents' "outdated" beliefs. For them, Christ was not the Savior but a "superstar" — part hippie, part revolutionary, part New Age master — Whose life and teachings were twisted to conform to the crazed ideology of the radicals. The values revolt had succeeded largely due to the realization of the subversives behind it (sometimes members of the very Establishment against whom the students believed they were fighting) that, for the anarchy to have a *lasting effect* on society, it must concentrate on young people, whose characters were still in a formative stage and could thus be molded into social rebels. If the transformation was permanent, then this newly created "change agent" would be able to adversely affect society in the future as well.

Back in the '60s, Harvard professor-turned-LSD propagandist Timothy Leary "enlightened" young people to "turn on, tune in, and drop out." And they heeded him... for awhile. Many of yesterday's hippies have since discarded their sandals and love beads for three-piece suits. They became "yuppies" (young urban professionals), who have worked their way up to the highest levels of media, corporate, educational and governmental ladders. Tom Hayden, the student anti-war agitator who declared, "We are all Vietcong!", is today a successful politician in California. His ex-wife, actress Jane Fonda, who was nicknamed "Hanoi Jane" by GIs infuriated at her friendly visits into the enemy's camp, is now the wife of New Age television magnate Ted Turner and a business force in her own right, thanks to her bestselling workout videos.

Publications like *Rolling Stone* and *Mother Earth News*, begun as organs of the "counterculture," later became staples of almost any newsstand. Twenty years ago, to observe "Earth Day" was looked upon as the activity of kooks; now it is a nationally promoted holiday. Then, only ex-druggies looking for a "better high" sought out the "wisdom" of Hindu swamis; today, corporations and schools encourage "meditation" as a way to achieve better production.

In entertainment, there is an effort by performers, writers and producers to see if they can top the previous year's crop of movies, books, recordings, etc., in their capacity to shock and outrage. Television shows regularly attack fundamental values. For example, in the popular animated sitcom *The Simpsons*, much of the "humor" is derived from the way the boy Bart disobeys and ridicules his father, whom he regularly calls "Homer." Bart — whose likeness is now featured in toys, T-shirts, school notebooks, etc., and who appears in a candy bar commercial — has become a *role model* for countless teens and preteens around the country. At the theatres, *The Little Mermaid*, a "family" movie (rated *G*) that was released by Disney Productions, has as its title character, Ariel, who is far from a *little* mermaid; she is, instead, a well-endowed young woman (from the waist up) in a bikini top, who foolishly makes a pact with an octopus witch so that her romantic yearnings for a human young man might be answered. Who was supposed to be the audience for this? The plot would be next to meaningless for small children, but the older ones get the message that it is all right for girls to dress in skimpy clothes — after all, if such a sympathetic figure as Ariel can do it...

Movies with New Age themes are not uncommon. The *Star Wars* trilogy helped popularize some of the movement's concepts (it perverted "May God be with you" to "May the Force be with you"; the Illinois State Lottery has taken this blasphemous step further by having an animated wizard declare: "May the odds be with you"). *Dead Again* has a plot that blends whodunit with reincarnation. And in the past ten years there has been a disturbing number of anti-Catholic films released in the U.S., such as *Monsignor*, *Hail Mary*, *Sister Act*, *Agnes of God*, *Nuns on the Run* and *The Last Temptation of Christ*. It would seem that Catholic-bashing is one of the few socially-accepted

forms of prejudice tolerated in America today (in general, anyone who takes a stand against abortion, homosexuality, pornography, promiscuous sex and other vices must be prepared for public ridicule — it comes with the territory). The Conciliar "Catholic" Church, of course, is helping fuel the anti-Catholic bigots' attack against the priesthood with the alarmingly high number of clerical pedophiles its seminaries are churning out. (In Chicago alone, 21 Novus Ordo "priests" are under investigation after allegations that they sexually molested children!)

While society once rejected abortion and nonmarital cohabitation as immoral, now they are accorded legal protection (for example, in the U.S. more than a quarter of live births in 1988 were to unwed mothers — a high price for "free love"). The divorce rate has risen from about one per three marriages in 1970 to the current ratio of one for every two (only recently have secular "experts" started to declare publicly that the chances of a couple living together before marriage will divorce after marriage are much higher than for those who wait until after the wedding). In many areas, then, there has been a discernible shift towards an acceptance of what only two decades ago was considered outside the norm. This shift has been brought about largely because those who two decades ago identified themselves as anti-Establishment, in great measure, have become the Establishment or at least have shown themselves capable of significantly influencing it. Granted, the America of twenty years ago — or even fifty years ago — had problems that could be justly attributed to its leaders, they usually gave at least a grudging nod in the direction of traditional values. The ruse shamelessly exploited in this year's presidential election revolved around the term "family values," which was used cynically by politicians whose only purpose was to attract votes.

Now, even overt manifestations of this paganism are everywhere in evidence: a "reincarnation expert" advertises his 900 phone number on television, promising viewers knowledge of who they were in "past lives"; rival ads push the services of astrologers and "psychics"; and witches, Krishna cultists, Satan worshipers, etc., are free to openly defy God as they see fit (it is their *right*, so-called). One may publicly blaspheme Christ, His Blessed Mother, the saints and the Church, and be afforded the double protection of freedom of religion and of speech. The federal government, through its National Endowment for the Arts, has even *funded* the blatantly decadent and sacrilegious "art" of some of these anti-Christians. The "do your own thing" thinking has won the day!

(to be continued in the December 1 issue)

The State cannot be built unless the Church lays the foundation and supervises the work... You cannot build a society without God...

There is no true civilization without a moral civilization, and there is no true moral civilization without the true religion. *It is a proven truth, a historical fact.* (Excerpt from Pope Saint Pius X's "Our Apostolic Mandate")

† † † † † † † † †

...The partisans of error are sought not only among the Church's open enemies but, what is to be most dreaded and deplored, in her very bosom, and are the more mischievous the less they keep in the open. (Excerpt from Pope Saint Pius X's encyclical letter, *On the Doctrines of the Modernists)*

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.

Questions And Answers

Fr. Oswald Baker (England)

Question:

What exactly was the error taught by Vatican II concerning human liberty?

Answer:

By conscience we mean our judgement that a particular act is right or wrong, good or bad. Every normal person, having come to the use of reason, has this instinctive capacity for judging right and wrong. It is the reflection of the Will of God in our human nature. But original sin so deranged the human soul that this reflection of God's Will is distorted. Consequently, our individual judgement can be mistaken. Conscience has to be trained and formed, under the guidance of Mother Church, to operate correctly, and to ensure this is our first obligation in its regard. But, so long as we have done our best to eliminate any possible error, whatever conscience commands, this we are bound to obey. Conscience is the ultimate director of duty.

Distinct from a duty is a right, which means a claim to possession or action accorded by law. Duty and right are quite distinct and different. Duty is an obligation imposed by conscience. A right is a claim conferred by law. Rights are created by law, exclusively. A dictate of conscience is *never* the basis of a right.

Vatican II introduced a revolutionary innovation, declaring that every individual has a right to follow his conscience concerning religious practice — and, therefore, concerning everything else, for all else is of lesser gravity. Accordingly, commenting on Paul VI's *Humanae Vitae* (which repeated the perennial condemnation of contraception), the bishops of England and Wales, together with many other hierarchies, affirmed that "neither this document nor any other takes away from Catholics their duty *and right* to follow their conscience." [emphasis added] Such an error is assuredly the most diabolical enormity ever perpetrated in the name of the Church. "Right of conscience" is the error denounced by Gregory XVI as sheer "insanity." It is straight Vatican II and has undoubtedly made a dire contribution to the moral havoc now around us. (In New Delhi, India, the number of prostitutes is estimated at 4,000. A Catholic (Conciliar) nun, of the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, distributes condoms to them, on the principle that "What is medically necessary is morally right." Again, this horror is straight Vatican II. It is still not widely realized what a completely Satanic plot for the destruction of the Catholic Church was Vatican II.

Question:

In time of war citizens are entitled, even required to risk their lives in defense of the nation. In the war against disease, why is it not permissible, in the course of research, to submit oneself to risky medical experiments which may cost one's life? Or is it?

Answer:

It is not permissible. In war, risking your life is incidental to the essential purpose of fighting the enemy. It would not be permissible to stand directly in the line of fire in order to test whether your vest is bulletproof. In submitting to a possibly lethal medical experiment you directly and of set purpose, by way of a test, court the risk to your life, whereas, in engaging in war (as also, for example, in tending the victims of a contagious disease), the risk to your life is an unfortunate side issue. The difference is between *accepting* a risk involved in your essential purpose and *taking* a risk *as* your essential purpose. It is never permissible directly and of set purpose to imperil your life or health or bodily integrity. To do so is to exceed the limits of our God-given rights over our bodies.

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.

CAPSULE COMMENTS

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

The 1992 version of the quadrennial political farce called the presidential election is but a few weeks away as these lines are being written. Just about the only feature which distinguishes this particular rehash of the charade from that of its many predecessors is that, with the reentrance of H. Ross Perot, there are three major actors (candidates) in this year's performance. He is, to be sure, essentially no different from George Bush and William Clinton. Among other things, he is pro-abortion, pro-gun control, pro-homosexual "rights" — and he is, I have no doubt, every bit as qualified as are the other two to be the Insiders' front man in the White House to bring the USA fully into the New World Order. Although which one of the three political superhypocrites attains that "distinction" on election day remains to be seen, the chances are that the outcome has already been determined by the powers that be.

† †

The abandonment of God and His eternal law on the part of multitudes of the American people is the root cause of the all but incredible condition of spiritual and moral degradation which currently pervades the USA. Certainly, many scores of liberal, subversive, anti-Christ, amoral organizations and movements have contributed in various ways and degrees over the past several decades to bring about the horrendous and revolting spectacle we now behold on all sides.

But there is one body of men who — though rarely, if ever, mentioned in this regard — must bear a major share of responsibility and censure for the present utterly abhorrent situation to which I refer. And they are the cardinals and archbishops and bishops of the Conciliar Church in America, practically all of them appointees of non-Popes Paul VI and John Paul II. Since these men are all members of the Conciliar Church, there is, of course, not an authentic Roman Catholic prelate in their ranks. Their record over the past thirty years or so is one of duplicity, cowardice, subversion. While there may be an occasional exception among them, they are, as a body, an absolute disgrace, a condemnible lot indeed. That some of them may well be Freemasons, I have no doubt. If only these men had remained loyal to the Faith, surely neither Church (humanly speaking) nor country would be in the shambles they are today. What a monstrous tragedy!

† †

It has long puzzled me how conservative authors — who are otherwise, I feel reasonably sure, honorable individuals — can write (sometimes at length) on, say, the subject of the French Revolution without so much as mentioning the Masons or Freemasonry. Surely the Masonic conspiracy was one of the most — if not *the* most — powerful of the forces involved in that satanic Revolution. Why, then, the blackout, the cover-up of Freemasonry by conservative writers — not only relating to the French Revolution but in other areas as well? Is there any acceptable justification for this? I am convinced there is not.

† †

From its very beginning, interminable novelty and change have been characteristic marks of the Conciliar Church. Still another example of this occurred at a Conciliar Church wedding in Oregon a few months back in which two dogs were a part of the ceremony, the bride's great dane being the ringbearer and the bridegroom's golden retriever the flowerbearer. One more step, albeit a small one, in the steady ascent of the animal world to attain its "rightful" place of equality with us humans. Since there has already been at least one Conciliar Church animal funeral, it would not surprise me if more such "funerals" were in the offing. Just about anything goes, you know, in that "wacko" Conciliar Church — and animals do have "rights," don't they?

Humility — The Foundation Of The Virtues

According to Saint Benedict, a humble person avoids singularity, knows how to be silent, observes moderation in laughter, willingly accepts menial tasks. A humble person is real; a proud person is artificial. A humble person is honest with himself and with others; a proud person is hypocritical and prone to deceive. A humble person readily faces up to truth; a proud person avoids doing so if the truth hurts.

Sacred Scripture tells us: "God resists the proud and gives His grace to the humble." Not all humble people are great but all great people are humble. If one would be truly great then — that is, in the eyes of God — he must be humble for humility is the foundation of all the virtues. As one spiritual writer has expressed it, "without humility there is no sound virtue in anyone; with humility all other virtues grow in depth and in perfection." †