THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of
Traditional Catholics of America, Inc.
Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL

Vol. II, No. 6
September 1, 1981

THE THREAT OF COMMUNISM

— *Fr. Francis E. Fenton*

Communism is an international, criminal, militant, atheistic conspiracy which - under the control of an amoral, power-hungry elite - aims to subjugate and enslave the world, and which will employ any and every means at its disposal to accomplish that objective. Today this diabolical conspiracy dominates the largest land mass and the greatest number of people ever brought under a single control in all mortal history. At last count 53 nations of the world were estimated to be under total Communist control, with nearly that number again being relatively close to it. Indeed, I deem it no exaggeration to state that the threat posed by Communism to the extinction of freedom worldwide has never been more ominous than it is at the present time.

Now there are many, I know, in the USA who would take exception to that last sentence in the paragraph above on the score that we now have in the country a staunchly anti-Communist administration in Washington and, that being the case, the Communist threat to the world in general and to our nation in particular is thereby substantially lessened. Is that so? Well, I, for one - and there are innumerable others - think otherwise.

True enough, the present federal administration is, at least it would appear, a distinct improvement over the preceding one in relation to Communism. But anyone, however well intentioned, is uninformed or naive to suppose that all is now well because Mr. Reagan is in the White House. Any number of his appointments alone disprove that supposition. Apart from that, among other examples that could be offered, there is the matter of the current administration's dealings with Red China and Taiwan. The former, whose leaders have put to death a minimum of 34 million of their own people within the last several decades, is likely the most ruthless tyranny in all history - and this remains true despite the recent more or less superficial changes there. The latter, Taiwan, is one of the few remaining nations in the free world. Red China is a Communist nation; Taiwan is one of the strongest anti-Communist countries on earth. And what is the present relationship of the USA with these two countries? Why, Red China is one of our "allies" while Taiwan, which has always been a true friend of the USA, is being given rather shabby treatment at best by the Reagan administration. Does this make any sense, morally or otherwise? The reason given for this American-Red Chinese alliance is the alleged necessity of such a union in any future confrontation with Soviet Russia. The fact of the matter, of course, is that Communist Russia and Communist China are both far more committed to the destruction of that "last bastion of capitalism", the United States, than they are to fighting and destroying each other.

Without dealing with it here in any detail, another example of the questionable extent of the anti-Communism of the Reagan administration in Washington involves the situation in El Salvador. The American government is aiding and abetting the regime currently in power there which, as any informed person well knows, is a Communist regime, albeit less so than the Reds who are striving to overthrow it. Why, one may reasonably ask, doesn't the American government support the anti-Communist forces in El Salvador?

Although it has often been said that America will never be destroyed from without but from within (a belief to which I have long subscribed), the reality of Communist Cuba and Nicaragua and the ever increasing Communist presence and strength throughout Latin America (and there's pro-Com-

continued on page 2

Page 2 is missing

This page was not included in the available scans.

This notice keeps the PDF page numbers aligned with the printed issue.

Page 3 is missing

This page was not included in the available scans.

This notice keeps the PDF page numbers aligned with the printed issue.

"National Defense Policy" continued from page 3

instability to Eastern Europe. Without the unity provided by the Catholic Faith and the Catholic Hapsburg dynasty this last vestige of the Holy Roman Empire and Christendom would later become prey for the new socialist empire builders, Hitler and Stalin.

Woodrow Wilson is shown by several historians to be a very foolish diplomat who somehow saw fit to leave Col. Edward House, an agent of international banking interests, in charge at Versailles while he returned to the United States to lobby for the pending treaty. It would appear that the only lasting result of the war was the establishment of a base for militant atheistic socialism in Russia. Given the criteria for a just war it would be very difficult to build a case for Catholic support of American involvement in World War I.

One astute observer has noted that the larger national governments grow, the more violent and destructive wars become. America is, of course, a good example. The Federal Reserve Act of 1913 gave the federal government the vehicle necessary to expand and inflate currency. The income tax amendment the same year increased the potential source of revenue dramatically. Add to these a draft law and we have the necessary components for involvement in a world war: money and men.

The prelude to American entry into World War II was even more thoroughly engineered. Catholic Spain found no ally in America during its war against Communism. (It is worthy of note that, while the Franco regime accepted aid from fascist Germany and Italy, Spain remained neutral during World War II.) The moral position of the United States would have been much more tenable had America remained neutral. But the work of Charles Lindbergh, John Flynn and the America First Committee had strong and experienced opposition. The Roosevelt administration, filled with internationalists, sought to involve America in the war at all costs. Germany was repeatedly provoked. Well before Pearl Harbor our navy was escorting British ships in the North Atlantic, destroyers were transferred to the British navy, the U.S. Navy was even given orders to fire on German ships - all at the very same time that the British were blockading Germany.

Provocations of the Japanese were also abundant, for example, various embargoes and the freezing of Japanese assets in American banks. The attack on Pearl Harbor was at least allowed to happen, Franklin Roosevelt needing a dramatic event to request a declaration of war from Congress. Admiral Theobald's *Final Secret of Pearl Harbor* deals with this quite well, as do recent interviews with former Congressman Hamilton Fish and numerous other sources.

The actual waging of the war was in many ways immoral from a Catholic point of view. The moderation that theologians advise was almost totally absent during the Second World War. At least the carnage of WWI was limited to a great extent to the armies involved. Not so with WWII. More civilians were killed than soldiers. And the Allies were responsible to a great degree. British military historian B.H. Liddel Hart points out that Churchill's government repeatedly ordered the bombing of German population centers before the Germans retaliated in kind - a policy continued by the United States and not condemned by American Catholic theologians until years after the war.

Demands for unconditional surrender are also violations of Catholic moral teaching because they give a foe reason to fight on, fearing that there is nothing to be gained by surrender. Both Germany and Japan were faced with these demands and so continued to fight, prolonging the war. As Pope Pius XII said, "No nation would accept that. To threaten Germany with it will only lengthen the war." The saturation fire bombing of Dresden, with the deaths of over 120,000 men, women, and children in one night, and the almost total destruction of Berlin were the immoral actions of the Allies that resulted from the insanity of demanding unconditional surrender. President Harry Truman, a Mason, ordered the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, two Japanese cities with very large Catholic populations. Over 80,000 died at Hiroshima alone.

Pope Pius XII, on Christmas 1942, repeated his plea for a return to divine law and the peace and order it fosters, begging the warring nations to remember ". . . the thousands upon thousands of noncombatants, women, children, the sick and the aged, those whom the air war - and we have, from the outset, often denounced its horrors - has deprived, without distinction, of life, possessions, health, homes, refuges and places of worship." The response of the Allies and the Axis was to intensify the indiscriminate carnage.

The Japanese had made several peace gestures in the months before the use of the atomic bombs. Persons close to the imperial family had contacted the U.S. Navy but, since they wanted some guarantees as to their treatment, they were ultimately ignored. (This was especially sad because General MacArthur eventually treated the Japanese very humanely.) Other Japanese surrender overtures were made to the Russians. This was logical because of the fact that they were our allies (?!) and because Russia did not declare war on Japan until after Hiroshima and Nagasaki were bombed. But these peace gestures were never relayed to the United States because the Russians wanted American interests and forces to split,

"National Defense Policy" continued from page 4

giving them a freer hand in Europe. The Soviet Union, Hitler's ally in the rape of Poland, became the ally of the United States. And, aided by the United States, the Soviet Union was made into a world power, the most devastating result of World War II.

Is it any wonder that Pope Pius XII never endorsed the Allied cause during the war? How could he when that would mean giving approval to the Soviet Union and Allied atrocities? Francisco Franco's government, as mentioned, remained neutral during the war, displaying a southern European passivity that infuriated Hitler **and** the Allies. But Pope Pius XII called Franco a "Christian gentleman"! It is not surprising that both men are repeatedly maligned as pro-Nazi and anti-semitic - especially Pope Pius XII in the play, *The Deputy*, by Rolf Hochhuth. But there appears to be not one American bishop or theologian who, during the war, openly supported the position of the Pope. Father Robert Leiber, S.J., the Pope's personal secretary during the war, recounts how Pope Pius XII suspended the clausura rules for all religious communities, thus permitting them to hide thousands of Jews. Dr. Raffaele Cantoni, the leader of Jews in Rome, praised the material aid given by the Pope to his people. Cantoni understood the Pope's position better than Americans at the time. Cantoni was convinced that loud protestations by the Vatican would have only made conditions worse. Remember that Italy was under Nazi domination and civil liberties did not really exist. As it was, any statement that the Pope did make was immediately used as propaganda by both sides during the war. Silence frequently was the best option.

The immorality of the Cairo, Yalta and Potsdam conferences merely added to the indictment of the Allies. The only lasting effects of the war were the establishment of the Soviet Union as a world power, the abandonment of Central and Eastern Europe to Communism, and guaranteed instability in Asia.

Nor did Allied atrocities cease after the war. Those committed by the Soviets might be considered out of America's control and, therefore, not to America's blame. But the turnover of most of Europe to the Russians was done with the assent of the West. And Operation Keelhaul, the **forced** repatriation of refugees to Russia and the eventual murder of hundreds of thousands of them, was carried out with the official approval of General Dwight Eisenhower and the cooperation of American forces under his command.

American involvement in the wars in Korea and Vietnam do not lessen the indictment of American "defense". Again, this is hard to accept when the heroic actions of American young men are considered. If anything, the sacrifices made by servicemen in these wars only add to the immorality of the policies promulgated in Washington - policies which prevented the military solution to the problems where a military solution would have been swift, honorable and moral.

(to be continued in next issue of newsletter)

†††††††††††††††††††††††

"The Threat of Communism" continued from page 2

munist effort at this time, then, would be, to say the least, extremely ill-advised - and, in the present circumstances, could prove to be a major setback in the fight against Communism. Among all the world's nations, the conquest of the USA remains the primary objective of the Communist apparatus in its unrelenting drive towards world domination. While the climate in this country is certainly a more patriotic one today than it has been in many years, it would be utterly foolhardy for the anti-Communist forces to let down their guard or to let up on their fight because of this. To suppose that the current American government is an anti-Communist one is an assumption which the reality of the situation proves false. Let us then - with a firm reliance upon the power of prayer and taking encouragement from the progress already made - let us get on with the task of opposing and exposing the satanic conspiracy of Communism with every morally lawful means at our disposal. And let us not allow ourselves to be deceived by conservative, anti-Communist rhetoric, whatever its source. It's deeds, not words, that count.

†††††††††††††††††††††††

pray the rosary daily

THE CONCILIAR "CATHOLIC" CHURCH PRESS AND COMMUNISM

— *John Kenneth Weiskittel*

"Marxist fever", a term coined by a news reporter of international affairs and enjoying a growing popularity by other journalists, represents the Gerasene rush of so many Latin American countries to Communism. And it is, alas, a fitting description of the trend towards a Marxist interpretation of contemporary events by much of the Conciliar Church press.

Anyone with even the most cursory knowledge of the authentic teaching of the Roman Catholic Church regarding Communism (the same teaching that the Conciliar Church press claims to uphold) is surely aware that the Church has condemned it repeatedly, beginning in 1846 with *Qui Pluribus*, the encyclical of Pope Pius IX (printed two years **before** the *Communist Manifesto* was published). Ninety-one years after the condemnation by that pontiff, and long after Marx' half-mad dreams gave birth to nightmare reality, Pope Pius XI rebuked the secular press - in his encyclical *Divini Redemptoris* - for its unconscionable, deafening "conspiracy of silence" about the atrocities that the Communists were committing around the world.

Mercifully, God spared Pope Pius XI a good deal of alarm for, had that gentle successor to St. Peter seen beyond his own times, he would have witnessed not only the spread throughout the world of what he called "the Communist plague" - an occurrence which could never have happened without the aid of the secular press - but a far more troubling phenomenon: the generous support given to the International Communist Conspiracy by ostensibly Catholic journalists. This is not to say that that wise Pope did not warn the Church in his day of the satanic deceits to which the Marxists would resort in their efforts to destroy all that is Godly. In the encyclical cited, His Holiness warned that "they try perfidiously to worm their way even into professedly Catholic and religious organizations."[1] As we hope to show, nowhere have the Communists succeeded so well as in their insidious subversion of Catholic news media.

To understand the current crisis one must examine some recent Church history. We were unable, while researching this study, to secure many examples from Church publications of the 1930-1950 time frame that we believe should ideally be here. Nevertheless, using other sources concerning those times, we feel able to make some intelligent inferences.

First, it should be noted that as early as 1931 Pope Pius XI denounced those Catholics who "have deserted the camp of the Church and passed over to the ranks of Socialism."[2] In the same encyclical - *Quadragesino Anno* - he warned that Socialists seek to deceive and indoctrinate "under the guise of friendship" and, further, he insisted that "'Religious Socialism', 'Christian Socialism' are expressions implying a contradiction in terms."[3] (How then, if this is the case, can certain elements of today's Conciliar Church identify themselves as "Christian Marxists" and not fear a similar papal refutation from Pope John Paul II?) Later, in his encyclical on Communism - cited above - the same pontiff stated that some Catholics were "tainted" with Communism. From this we can see that those violating clear Catholic teaching regarding this matter, those Catholics friendly to the two-headed dragon, Socialism-Communism, have been at it for some time.

This leads us to the second point. It follows logically that, if such disobedience was occurring at that time (1931), then a certain amount of the same thinking must have inevitably found its way into journalistic and literary circles since a pride peculiar to the intelligentia seems to be an essential element in the make-up of the subversive personality. And indeed we do find such thinking represented in Catholic literature less than a decade later for, under the general editorship of Donald Attwater (this is not to impute any unsavory motives to him but only to indicate how pervasive were false or inaccurate notions about certain organizations, and how such thought was readily accepted by even the finest Catholic writers and was able to slip past the keen-eyed Church censors of the day), the book entitled *A Catholic Dictionary* contained the following erroneous passage under the heading "Socialism":

> ". . . In England the word (socialism) has unfortunately been attached to more moderate reforming movements, such as the Fabian Society and the British Labour Party . . . In so far as such movements do not profess the principles or advocate the methods condemned, Catholics, while deploring the use of an ambiguous title, are free to take part in them."[4]

Let us pause here a moment to explore this passage and its implications as it is vital to an understanding of how things have gotten so far

away from true Catholic doctrines in much of the Conciliar Church press. In that article both the Fabians and Britain's Labour Party are falsely identified as "moderate reform groups." Nothing could be further from the truth. The Fabian Society, founded in the 1880's, has as its goal the transformation of England into a Marxist state through parliamentary procedure; however, it has always sought to conceal its real motives. These "moderate reformers" do not seek simply a new politico-economic system. To them, Socialism is far more. Robert Blatchford, the Fabian journalist, wrote: "If Socialism is to live and conquer, it must be a religion"; while John Bruce Glasier, a close associate of the Society, called Socialism "an all-sufficing religion of itself."[5][6] What about their supposed deep-felt concern for the worker by the Fabians? In *The Fabians*, authors Norman and Jeanne MacKenzie state that Fabian George Bernard Shaw, in his novel, *The Unsocial Socialist* (universally heralded by literary critics as the first work of English fiction, in the words of the MacKenzies, "to be directly influenced by Marx"), called "the proletariat . . . a useless tool for the would-be revolutionary: the world could be changed only by those who had superior brains and organizing skills."[7]

All of the above would be enough to prohibit Catholic participation with the Fabians, but there are far more disturbing features of that group which ought to be considered. Of particular interest here is the affinity that the Fabians have shown for totalitarianism. Beatrice Webb, for example, wrote in her diary in 1931 that in comparing the political systems of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, "without a doubt we are on the side of Russia."[8] She also called the Soviet system - as did her husband and fellow Fabian conspirator Sidney Webb - "the Religion of Scientific Humanism"; and, when she visited Russia in 1932, she chose to identify the Stalinism there as the "new religious order".[9] The Webbs remained staunch Fabians to the end of their lives, and their 1942 letter to R. Palme Dutt, leader of the Communist Party of England, was occasion for them to identify themselves as "non-party Communists."[10] No less exhuberant was their life-long commitment to the perpetuation of the Soviet slave state. The MacKenzies, in the opus cited above, paint the following picture of the last years of marriage shared by the Webbs: "In the final years of their partnership their only political interest was in the survival of the Soviet state which they saw as the Fabian utopia." [11] Also mentioned by the MacKenzies is Fabian Society "moderate" Bernard Shaw's visit to the Soviet Union in 1931 with Lady Astor, from which he returned to London "full of enthusiasm, declaring that the Stalin regime was nothing but applied Fabianism."[12] Lest anyone feel that perhaps Shaw really didn't mean to sound so much in favor of the Soviet slavery, and that perhaps he should not have compared it to his own brand of Socialism, consider the following quote from his book, *The Intelligent Woman's Guide To Socialism and Capitalism*:

> "Under Socialism . . . you would be forcibly fed, clothed, lodged, taught, and employed whether you liked it or not. If it were discovered that you had not character and industry enough to be worth all this trouble, you might possibly be executed in a kindly manner."[13]

Where can one find a better description of the Communist system?

So much for the notion that Fabian Socialism can reasonably be called a moderate reform movement. We see, rather, that Fabianism is merely a euphemism for Marxism. What, then, of the Labour Party in Britain, also identified as a moderate group? Despite the fact that a member of the opposition Conservative Party heads the government in England, the economic crisis that threatens civil order in that nation is not due to the present policies, but rather is demonstrably the legacy of the Socialism of the Labourites which has steadily eroded Britain's fiscal solvency. Recently, the relentlessly Marxist leadership of the Labour Party caused a schism. In his excellent analysis of the events of the past year, "Western Europe: Socialism and Federation Prepare the Way" (in the July-August issue of *American Opinion*) , Robert W. Lee described the event thus: "Labour's extreme left-wing faction took control of the Party in January. The so-called 'moderate faction' subsequently launched a new Social Democratic Party on March twenty-sixth."[14] Extremists are not new in the Labour Party. In 1916 Fabian Sidney Webb became that group's representative within the Labour Party and wrote a Party manifesto entitled "Labour and the New Social Order." In that statement he said that the "individualist system" was outmoded and that it must now yield to a comprehensive socialist program. Thus Fabianism had become the official policy of the Labour Party.[15] Nobel winner Friedrich Hayek, in his study on social planning entitled *The Road to Serfdom*, discusses the aversion the Labourites have had to ordinary republican governmental procedure. He quotes former Labour chairman Harold Laski as saying that not only would the Socialist government of the Labourites "take vast powers and legislate under them by ordinance and decree" but that it would "suspend the classic formulae of normal opposition" to

achieve this suspension, and that the Labour Party would procure "guarantees from the Conservative Party that its (i.e., the Labour government's) work of transformation would not be disrupted by repeal in the event of its defeat at the polls."[16] By the end of World War II the Labour Party expressed openly its strong desire to see Britain's heavily socialized wartime economy remain intact **after** the war had ended.[17] Professor Hayek's brilliant colleague, the late Ludwig von Mises, noted the inherent deceptions in the Labourites' power plays when he wrote in his masterwork, *Human Action*:

> "He (Laski) wanted to do away with the democracy of the market and to establish the absolute right of the production tsar. Perhaps he believed that he was right from a higher point of view, and that as a superman he was called upon to impose his own valuations on the masses of inferior men. But then he ought to have been frank enough to say so plainly."[18]

The foregoing references to the Labour Party should give the reader a fair amount of information to indicate that group's desires for Britain's future. Nevertheless, we feel that one last example will be of greatest value in determining the Labour Party's true position on the political spectrum. For that example we turn to an entirely different source of information: Milovan Djilas. Mr. Djilas, once vice-president of Yugoslavia under Tito and also head of Parliament in that Soviet client state, wrote in *Conversations with Stalin* the following regarding the opinions of the Labour Party that Stalin privately shared with Tito and Djilas:

> "At one point Tito brought out that there were new phenomena in socialism (read "Communism") and that socialism was now being achieved in ways different from those of the past, which gave Stalin an opportunity to say: 'Today socialism is possible even under the English monarchy. Revolution is no longer necessary everywhere. Just recently a delegation of British Labourites was here, and we talked about this in particular. Yes, there is much that is new. Yes, socialism is possible even under an English king.'
>
> "As is well known, Stalin never upheld such a view publicly . . ."[19]

Thus, we have seen that far from being "moderate reforming movements", the Fabian Society and the British Labour Party prove, at best, to be extreme Socialist groups and, at worst, clandestine Marxist ones. To be charitable, since key figures of the above groups were not always publicly candid about their real beliefs, we should presume, until proven otherwise, that the writer of that article on Socialism in *A Catholic Dictionary* and the editors and censors were simply ignorant of the true aims of those groups. Indeed, if any of them were aware of the true nature of these movements, they would be rejecting the expressed mind of the Church, just as many in the modern Conciliar Church seem intent upon doing.

Such disobedience could not but help encourage disobedience in the laity. In America, this waywardness evidenced itself early. The Pope called for the prayers of the people for Spain during the Communist persecutions of the 1930's. American bishops, naturally, followed these papal wishes in their dioceses and, when the Spanish Catholics - no longer able to suffer the atrocities that were being carried out with increasing fervor - began to throw off the yoke of that satanic force, the bishops supported the anti-Communist Generalissimo Franco, and encouraged those whom they shepherded to do so also. Father Donald F. Crosby, S.J., writing in the leftist Conciliar journal, *Commonweal*, describes Catholic response to the bishops' plea for support: "As early as the Spanish Civil War (1936-39), a majority of Catholics polled in national surveys indicated that they disagreed with the American hierarchy in its public stand on the war . . ."[20] Obviously, while the value of those polls is certainly limited as applied to the present article, we feel that they do indicate that a large number of U.S. Catholics were misled even then (over 40 years ago). The question here is: **who** misled them? Was it the secular press that the Pope had so rightly condemned? Or were certain Catholic publications disassociating themselves from honest Catholicism? Those questions cannot be answered here, for the reason mentioned above, but are raised to readdress the issue. As we advance toward the present in this study, however, examples become more obvious.

By the early 1950's, American Catholics were relying on the secular press for much of their news. A survey taken in 1954 revealed that, of those Catholics asked whether they regularly read a Catholic newspaper or periodical, 56 percent indicated that they did not do so.[21] In time, this gradual secularization of Catholics would inevitably lead to all the problems that beplague the Church of the 1980's. The Catholics who did read the Catholic press at that time (the 50's) were probably reading solid publications such as the then-conservative *Our Sunday Visitor*, and many diocesan newspapers that were staunchly anti-Communist. One glaring exception to the overwhelmingly traditional Catholic press of that period was *Commonweal*.

Nothing more clearly demonstrates the dichotomy

between the majority of the Catholic press and *Commonweal* in the 1950's than the article entitled "McCarthyism and Catholicism", written by Fr. Crosby and cited above, that appeared in the July 21, 1978 issue of that magazine. Fr. Crosby's task at hand seems to have been nothing but to exhume the political corpse of the late Catholic senator from Wisconsin, Joseph McCarthy, and, seeing that to politically assassinate the man for a second time was clearly out of the question, he satisfies himself by kicking the remains around a bit, and reminding his readers of *Commonweal's* consistent record of anti-anti-Communism.

One occasion that shows this well, and which Fr. Crosby mentions in his article, involves not McCarthy but ex-Communist Louis F. Budenz, the former editor of the *Daily Worker* who returned to the Church in 1945. Budenz was called by the United States government to testify regarding Communist infiltration in the State Department in 1950. As could be expected, "Liberals" raged at Budenz who stated that the welfare of the Church was equally important to his testimony. *Commonweal* was joined in the attack against a devout Catholic and patriotic citizen by the *Washington Post*; Elmer Davis; Monsignor George Higgins; the Catholic Senator Dennis Chavez of New Mexico; as well as the usual voices of the Left. Most vicious of these attacks came from Senator Chavez. So vile were the accusations made by Chavez that Fordham University president Fr. Lawrence J. McGinley, S.J. called him a "modern Pharisee," the sort who is "always ready to point a self-righteous finger at their fellow man" - and numerous Catholic journals shared Father McGinley's indignation. Their point of view is exemplified by the columnist for the diocesan newspaper, *Los Angeles Tidings*, who wrote that, if the attack on Budenz had been by a Communist, it would be understandable, but "for a Catholic to do this to one of our Prodigal Sons - amid the joyous howls of all the atheistic conspirators against God and mankind - is in my view unspeakably low."[22] We at *The Athanasian* feel that the matter could hardly have been better expressed, and we also believe that the event denounced by the *Tidings* writer is a commonplace occurrence in the Conciliar Church press.

The truth, of course, is that **all** Catholics have the moral obligation to oppose Communism. Were we living in saner times it would not even be necessary to mention, much less continually reiterate, this. Tell that to *Commonweal*, though, and you will likely be told that "Anti-Communism has brought us disaster after disaster at home and abroad . . . We (the U.S. Government) should drop it (anti-Communism as a foreign policy) officially."[23] If the reader thinks that is bad, consider the following quote by *Commonweal* columnist Michael Novak:

> "American Catholics down the years have commited grevious sins of rabid anti-Communism. Consequently, one of the main imperatives of Catholics at present is to puncture the popular myths, biases, and prejudices about Communism that distort American political debate. On the international scene, the time has come for Christians and Marxists no longer merely to ignore or to destroy one another, but to learn from one another and criticize one another. The shedding of one another's blood is useless, the ignoring of one another is empty."[24]

So, not only are we told in *Commonweal* that maybe anti-Communism is not such a good idea; we are told that it is **morally wrong** to oppose Communism!

Two Conciliar publications that are ever challenging to orbit further and further left (even beyond *Commonweal*) - and hence further from Church principles - are *National Catholic Reporter* and *Maryknoll* magazine. (We have not included the late Dorothy Day's *The Catholic Worker* here; though it is as far left as those mentioned, it probably commands nowhere near the national following of the others.)

The policies of the *Reporter* are seen in the drawing in it that showed Christ bearing his cross and, next to him, Marx bearing a hammer and sickle in the shape of a cross, the caption asking the blasphemous question: "Fellow travelers?" One need only read through the *Reporter* to realize that its answer is "yes". *Maryknoll* has written articles praising Mao Tse-Tung and attacking anti-Communist governments from South Korea to South Africa, taking time along the way to swipe at America. A low point was reached with its "Religion in Cuba" issue, which was page after page of Castroite propaganda, culminating with an interview with Castro himself.

(to be continued in next issue of newsletter)

FOOTNOTES

1. *Five Great Encyclicals* (New York: Paulist Press, 1951) p. 198
2. Ibid., p. 159
3. Ibid., p. 158
4. Donald Attwater, *A Catholic Dictionary* (New York: MacMillan, 1942), p. 495
5. N. & J. MacKenzie, *The Fabians* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1977), p. 185
6. Ibid., p. 187
7. Ibid., p. 43
8. Ibid., p. 406

9. Ibid., p. 407
10. Ibid., p. 408
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid., p. 406
13. Quoted, Gary Allen, "Social Security" *American Opinion*, March, 1981
14. Ibid., July-August, 1981
15. Op. Cit., MacKenzie, pp. 397-398
16. Friedrich Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 63
17. Ibid., p. 200
18. Ludwig von Mises, *Human Action* (Chicago: Henry Regney, 1960), p. 731
19. Milovan Djilas, *Conversations with Stalin* (trans. by Michael Petrovitch) (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1962), p. 113
20. Fr. Donald F. Crosby, S.J., "McCarthyism and Catholicism", *Commonweal*, July 21, 1978, p. 468
21. Ibid., p. 468
22. Ibid., p. 460
23. Frank Getlein, "Washington Report: Question Foreign Aid", p. 460
24. Michael Novak, reprinted in *Politics: Realism and Imagination* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1971) p. 91

†††††††††††††††††††††††

CHRIST THE KING SCHOOL INTRODUCES ITS STAFF

The Traditional Catholics of America and Christ the King School, under the direction of Father Francis E. Fenton, take great pleasure in presenting the faculty for the 1981-82 school term:

Mr. William S. Zeitz - high school principal, history, civics and economics.

Mr. W. Dean Gray - elementary school principal, seventh and eighth grade teacher, high school general science and biology.

Sister Mary Conrad - (Sisters of Humility of Mary) third and fourth grade teacher.

Miss Rita Holland - (formerly Sister Mary Colette of the Sisters of St. Joseph) - fifth and sixth grade teacher.

Miss Ruth Blechel - (formerly Sister Mary Cecilia of the Sisters of St. Agnes) - first and second grade teacher.

Mrs. Maxine Brown - kindergarten, and high school algebra and geometry.

Mr. Don Marquez - Latin, Spanish, French and Music.

Mrs. William Zeitz - English grammar, literature courses.

Mrs. Dean Gray - school secretary, typing instructor.

Mr. Jerry Mahoney - librarian, instructor of altar boys.

†††††††††††††††††††††††

PLEASE NOTE

Following is the address and telephone number of Christ the King School. Henceforth they should be used for all correspondence and telephone calls relating to the school.

Christ the King School
P.O. Box 6428
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80934-6428
(303) 635-9183

†††††††††††††††††††††††

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.

†††††††††††††††††††††††

TCA BUMPER STICKER

In red and black lettering on a white background, it reads: "Traditional Catholics of America — Save the Traditional Mass". Also included is our TCA address. The cost of these bumper stickers is two for $1.00 (minimum order). The price covers postage, and payment must accompany order.

†††††††††††††††††††††††

(The following sermon, with minor revisions, was delivered by Father Fenton at Mass in Colorado Springs, Colorado on Sunday, August 16, 1981.)

Only a minority of those who are today described as traditional Roman Catholics make any genuine sacrifice for the Faith. Thus it has always been but I once naively thought it would be different when it came to the matter of the survival of our beloved Church. The majority of traditional Roman Catholics make precious little sacrifice for the preservation and promotion of our divine Faith, whether that sacrifice be one of time or labor or money. So few sacrifice so much; so many do so little.

What prompts these remarks is the difficulty we are having in raising sufficient funds for our Christ the King School, surely one of the most worthy projects in the very challenging task of the preservation of the Faith. We are indeed getting financial support from around the country - but nowhere near what we need. Hundreds of people have sent us five and ten and 25 dollar contributions - and occasionally we receive fifty and hundred dollar donations - but rare indeed are the contributions beyond that. Those in a position to give, say, one or two or five thousand dollars, with some five or six exceptions, have not done so. We get "pounds" of highly favorable and complimentary comments in the mail for the noble work we have undertaken but, regrettably - while we appreciate those comments - we are unable to convert them into dollars and cents.

Current bills for our school total some $8,000. Once school opens on September 1, expenses will be approximately $12,000 each month. In addition, the lease on the school is $2,000 per month. (That lease, thank God, has been paid through next March - $16,000.)

When I think of the literally millions of our fellow Catholics who have given their lives as martyrs all down through the centuries in testimony to their God-given Faith - and when I think of the multitudes of others who are being starved and tortured and murdered today in Communist prisons and concentration camps for the "crime" of believing in God and professing the Roman Catholic Faith - and when I think of, and in some cases know firsthand, the sacrifices some of our fellow Catholics are making in various ways in this country - and right here in Colorado Springs - to preserve and to advance our Divine Faith - when I think of these things it both saddens and angers me why those traditional Roman Catholics who have been asked, and who can afford, to give some more or less substantial monetary support to our Christ the King School refrain from doing so.

Speaking of sacrifices for the Faith, some few weeks back one of the priests working with our TCA drove some 200 miles to bring the Sacraments to a dying person. Another priest associated with the TCA drives some 500 miles nearly every weekend to bring the Mass and Sacraments to two of our Mass locations. In my own case (a small example but perhaps it may have some value in the context of this sermon), apart from the 1975 Maverick I own and the few possessions of furniture and clothing I have in my residence, my total worth is presently about $600.00. Much of what I might have had has gone into the traditional Catholic movement over the past few years. (This is not an appeal to start a Father Fenton fund but, hopefully, it may provide some incentive to others to help our Christ the King School.)

From the time we first began making plans for our school I was fairly certain that, barring at least a minor miracle, it would be most difficult to secure a truly traditional priest to be affiliated with the school - and that miracle has not thus far occurred. But I did not at all foresee that the raising of sufficient funds for the school would pose any major problem. After all, this is to be a school which would be thoroughly traditional and fully Roman Catholic in every respect - a rather uncommon educational institution on the American scene today. Surely this school would be welcomed by untold numbers of traditional Roman Catholics across the country (so many of whom I personally knew and even thought they were friends of mine), and ample support for it would, of course, be a foregone conclusion. Were not, I reasoned, these people deeply devoted to the preservation of the true Faith and is not the traditional Roman Catholic school one of the practical necessities for the preservation of that Faith in these chaotic times? And so raising funds for this worthy project would surely present no significant problem. So I figured.

Well, it hasn't worked out that way so far. Again, we have received numerous relatively small contributions but, with the rare exceptions I have mentioned, those who could give rather substantial donations have not done so. The result is that our financial condition is presently a serious one.

If religious persecution should ever come to this country - and the idea is not a particularly far-fetched one - traditional Roman Catholics will most certainly bear the brunt of that persecution. Make no mistake of that. And if, God forbid, that persecution should come, I often wonder how those traditional Catholics of wealth or, say, of more or less quite ample financial means - I often wonder how some of them will fare in such circumstances. Not willing to give even a fair portion of their money in support of an authentic Roman Catholic school - and thereby assist in a very concrete manner the preservation and promotion of our precious Faith - will such people be willing to put their lives on the line as martyrs in testimony to that same Faith? I wonder.

Well, with undaunted confidence in Almighty God and in the power of prayer, we fully intend to proceed straight ahead with our Christ the King School. And we aim to make it, in due time and by the grace of God, as fine a traditional Roman Catholic grade and high school as can be found in the USA. We very much need, however, far more financial assistance. Many of those in this congregation have already made some contribution, giving perhaps to the best of their ability. But there are some in this congregation too who could help us rather substantially. It is my fervent plea to them that they will soon see fit to do so.

COLORADO

AURORA (Denver area)
OUR LADY OF VICTORY CHAPEL
2566 Sable Boulevard
(303) 364-8040
Masses at 9 & 11 a.m. (every Sunday)
Weekday Masses at 8:00 a.m.

COLORADO SPRINGS
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY
Four Seasons Motor Inn
2886 S. Circle Drive, I-25 and Harrison
(303) 636-1575 - call between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday
Mass at 10:00 a.m. Sept. 6, Sept. 20, Oct. 4

DURANGO
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY
Durango Savings and Loan
1101 E. Second Ave.
(303) 884-2878
Mass at 10:00 a.m. Call for date of Mass

STRATTON
OUR LADY OF FATIMA CHAPEL
(303) 348-5454
Call for time of Mass Oct. 25

FLORIDA

PORT RICHEY (Tampa area)
ST. JOSEPH'S
Gulf Highland Club House
900 Gulf Highland Drive
(813) 868-0166
Mass at 7:00 p.m. on 3rd and 5th Sundays of month

LOUISIANA

OPELOUSAS (Lafayette area)
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY CHAPEL
Route 1, Box 195
(318) 942-9053
Mass at 6:00 p.m. on 2nd and 4th Sundays of month

MINNESOTA

ROCHESTER
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY CHAPEL
5820 Viola Road, NE
(507) 282-5163 or 289-8522
Mass at 10:00 a.m. Sept. 6, Oct. 4, Oct. 18

MONTANA

GREAT FALLS
IMMACULATE HEART OF MARY CHAPEL
2020 Second Avenue North
(406) 452-8826
Mass at 10:00 a.m. Sept. 13
Mass at 11:00 a.m. Oct. 25

PENNSYLVANIA

ESSINGTON (Philadelphia area)
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY
Holiday Inn
45 Industrial Highway (one mile from airport)
(215) 876-8737
Mass at 10:00 a.m. Sept. 20, Oct. 18

UTAH

SALT LAKE CITY
OUR LADY OF PERPETUAL HELP
Hilton Inn
154 West 600 South
(801) 278-7501
Mass at 11:00 a.m. Sept. 27
Call for date and time of Mass in October

VIRGINIA

RICHMOND
OUR LADY OF FATIMA CHAPEL
5217 Futura Avenue
(804) 737-8211 or 262-4354
Mass at 11:00 a.m.
Sept. 13, Sept. 27, Oct. 11, Oct. 25