

February, 1954

POINTERS

In the October, 1953, issue of *The Point*, we reported how the *Catholic Digest* had been rebuked by the Bishop of Saint Augustine, Florida, for some bad theology in one of its articles. We advised the *Digest* to stay away from anything theological in the future and to stick to its usual features in the fields of medicine, sociology, and household hints.

But our advice went unheeded. Last month the *Catholic Digest* published another religious article, this time in the field of moral theology, and, sure enough, it had to be slapped down again. The piece was a contribution from the English Dominican, Gerald Vann. The archdiocese of Detroit issued an official protest against Father Vann's religious ethics, saying that his article contained "several errors," and "flaws that tend to be dangerous to a high degree."

The Point neither subscribes to, nor purchases, the *Catholic Digest*. We see it only when someone in the neighborhood calls one of its erroneous articles to our attention. Of late, there is someone at our door nearly every month.

* * * * *

Recent reports from Paris, and the very welcome statement by Cardinal Lienart of Lille, indicate that the French priest-worker movement is now just about over. Deo Gratias!

And what Cardinal Lienart says about the priest-workers ("To be a priest and to be a worker are different functions, two different states of life, and it is not possible to unite them in the same person without changing the idea of the priesthood") applies quite as much to those functions which are currently being hyphenated with the priesthood of our American priests.

How about priest-sociologists, priest-television stars, priest-financiers? Or how about our American priest-anthropologists whose "two different states of life," the sacerdotal and the scientific, lead them to abandon cassocks for overalls, sanctuaries for silt deposits, and Catholic colleges for secular universities, so as to discredit the account of creation given us in the inspired Book of Genesis?

HELL-BENT FOR HEAVEN

If there is one thing the spokesmen for American Catholicism are convinced of, it is that the present state of this country is thoroughly and flagrantly hellish. And, from Cardinal Spellman to Joe Breig, they proclaim this conviction constantly, insistently, and with endless variety.

They write books on our national insanity; they launch diocesan-newspaper attacks against our filthy literature; they issue official statements deploring the condition of family life in America; they give sermons and lectures on our unrestrained selfishness and greed.

Each week Bishop Sheen speaks to fifteen million people, who presumably are in the depths of despair — if not actually contemplating suicide — and tries to persuade them that life is worth living. Even smiling Father James Keller, urging his Christophers to light candles rather than curse the darkness, manages to convey the impression that there is a lot of darkness to curse.

The most notable thing in the statements of these Catholic spokesmen, however, is not what they say; — the existence of the evils they describe is a matter of universal observation and acknowledgment — rather, it is what they leave unsaid. For there is one strange, glaring omission in all their accusations, one inescapable conclusion which they are determined to escape.

They will call the American people drunken, divorced, delinquent, debauched; but they will not say that unless the American people amend their ways they are going to lose their souls. They will denounce, deplore, reprehend, rail against the iniquity of our country; but they will not say the one thing that might shock, frighten the country out of its iniquity: they will not say that it is headed for Hell.

And not only will they not say this, but they become terribly upset if anyone else says it. “Judge not,” they snap, not bothering that they have already judged, and you are just making the necessary conclusion from their judgment.

These Catholic complainers have drawn a sharp, impassable line between matters which they think concern only the temporal, social sphere, and those which they think concern the Faith. And they keep their discussion of American iniquity determinedly in the former category. This arrangement accounts for the fact that the same people who are painted as being so horrible and degenerate in one article, become suddenly, when the subject of salvation is brought up, “fundamentally good and sincere people whom God in His mercy would not permit to be lost.” They act on the principle that it is all right to say anything you please about the American people, just so long as you are careful to preserve for them a place in Heaven.

The barrier between what belongs to man’s social and what belongs to his spiritual welfare, also explains why it is that so many prominent Catholics are willing to condemn, say, Harvard for being Communistic. But they would never condemn Harvard for being

against Jesus and Mary. That, they are afraid, would be considered bigotry and religious fanaticism.

Though these spokesmen for temporized Catholicism decry the present state of the nation and say they want a change, it is hard to see why they should. As long as people like their present way of life, and as long as they are assured that everything will work out fine in the end as far as their salvation is concerned, what difference should it make what state things are in?

Bishop Sheen complains that no one knows how to think, and says he is going to teach them how. But why should people bother thinking when he gives them nothing worthwhile to think about? (It is his firm policy to stay off the subject of the Faith and to talk only of large, inoffensive generalities.) How is thinking an improvement over non-thinking, unless you have the right thoughts?

Father Keller wants his Christophers to change the world, but it is not at all clear what he wants them to change it to, or what advantage his new world will have over the present one.

The remedies that these priests prescribe for getting rid of the evils of the world will never be effective, or even be tried, because they have no strength in them, no value, no purpose. (How much influence has Father Keller's friendship had on Bing Crosby, who has just had to be reprimanded by the Catholic press for the filthiness of his television program?)

All these temporizers vitiate their own accusations against America by their refusal to back them up with the threat of eternal damnation. And consequently, no one takes them seriously. For all their frantic yelling, the situation keeps getting worse and worse. And it will continue to get worse as long as America is dominated by priests like Bishop Sheen and Father Keller.

Let us pray, then, for courageous priests who will tell America that the cause of its wholesale iniquity is its wholesale rejection of the Catholic Faith, and that the only way it can be saved is to accept the Faith. And let us pray that these priests will be listened to, so that our country may at last become in fact what it has long been in dedication — the land of the Immaculate Conception.

BY FATHER FEENEY

Catholicism is not only a matter: a truth to be told; it is also a manner: a way of telling it. Manner makes meaning quite as much as matter does. To say what Christ said, but not in the way He said it, (that is to say: without enthusiasm, determination, excitement, wonder, challenge, indignation, summons and alarm) is an evasion and an apostasy. The Christian Gospel is good news, but with an emphasis on the news. It is exciting enough to

have had the Heavens open at Our Lord's birth for its sake, and to have had angels in the sky shouting and singing it to shepherds.

There is also a Protestant manner. If it cannot be defined or described, at least it may be identified. It is the manner in which it is utterly impossible to profess any clear or vital Christian certitude. Its credentials in academic circles (which will vouch for its kindred behavior everywhere) are: the subdued voice, the indefinite reference, the qualified statement, the sustained smile. There is not a single Scripture Text that can survive on the support of such a symposium.

The Protestant manner in religious discussion never has anything revelational to disclose, only something unrevealed to protect. Its cult is that of personal integrity. In the midst of controversy, when it is not saying, "Please don't argue!", its constant incantation is: "I hope you do not think I am insincere!"

The Protestant manner has no dogma to disclose, but it is capable of a liturgy of sorts. Its liturgical urges range all the way from the static repose of the Quaker to the dynamic ubiquity of the Holy Roller. The happy mean between these extremes in contemplative and active performance, is the unhappy Anglo-Catholic: the superstitious Protestant with good taste.

MEET DOCTOR LIVERMORE

Meet Doctor Grosvenor Livermore,
That most discreet psychopathic M. D.;
Greet him and tell him what you most abhor,
And let him look at you suspiciously.

He'll be unsurprised as anything;
He will always have known you of yore;
And a nice little vice, disguised as anything:
Well, that's what Doctor Livermore is for.

So sit down, and listen to him chatter,
While he tells you what to tell him is the matter;
And if you fear what he's afraid that you have got:
If you're a split personality nut;
A completely unmotivated mutt;
If your innate decency is everything but —

There is no need to shiver more,
Once you meet Doctor Livermore.

THE HAMMER OF FREEMASONS

The Catholics of the United States of America need never fear a Mason-inspired revolution of the kind that French Catholics suffered in the eighteenth century, or that Italian Catholics suffered in the nineteenth century, or that Mexican Catholics have just now in our own day suffered. This is because, unlike France, Italy, Mexico, or any place else, the United States of America was under strong Masonic influence from the start.

There was in attendance, as America was born, an eminently versatile group of lodge-members. Among them, there were capable rousers of the people, like Brother Thomas Paine and Grand Master Paul Revere. And there were coarse men with only their muskets and their aprons to recommend them, like Brother Ethan Allen. But, most important, there were Masons of the international variety, of the highest councils of Masonry, control-men like Brother Benjamin Franklin, the publisher of Masonic handbooks, the bargainer who had access to every Masonic gathering on the Continent, the delight of the Illuminati, and of Talleyrand, Mirabeau, and Lafayette.

From the days of these men to the present, American Masonry has never lost the share of power it so well secured at the outset. Half of our Presidents have openly admitted they were Freemasons. The Great Seal of the United States is composed of Masonic symbols and embellished with a motto which is Masonry's supreme goal, "Novus Ordo Seclorum." (This plea in Latin for a "new world order" may be found on all current one-dollar bills.) Given the opportunity, the controlling Masons will always involve our country in the intrigues of their Brothers throughout the world. Usually, the aid they offer takes the form of the aforesaid dollars, though in cases like the Mexican revolt, it can be extended to include guns, food, and pats-on-the-back from President Wilson.

To Catholics who love their country, and therefore want to see it become Catholic, the realization of this Masonic hold on America is often discouraging, for there is no other one group so ably intent on keeping America not Catholic as are the American Masons.

This year, however, American Catholics who want a Catholic America are getting some encouragement in their necessary battle against the Masons. It has been announced that, during the Marian Year, His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, will canonize Blessed Gaspar del Bufalo, the Italian priest who is known by the glorious title, "Hammer of Freemasons."

At Rome, in the year 1810, Blessed Gaspar del Bufalo was sentenced to the dungeons at Imola for refusing, out of obedience to the Pope, to take an oath of allegiance to Napoleon. After four years of imprisonment, Blessed Gaspar returned to Rome and founded his order, "The Missionaries of the Most Precious Blood." By every device, the Italian Masons tried to undo his work. They first tried to get Pope Leo XII to suspend him. Ultimately, this failed. The next plot of his enemies was defeated by Blessed Gaspar's holy shrewdness. He saw that in securing for him an appointment as papal nuncio to Brazil, they were easing both him and his attacks on Masonry out of the country. Blessed Gaspar refused to go. But the final plan of his enemies did succeed. In the year 1830, the "Hammer of Freemasons" was silenced by Pope Pius VIII, his faculties were taken away from him, and his order was all but abolished. When he died, seven

years later, he had been allowed to say Mass again, but his order was still not functioning with full papal approval.

Blessed Gaspar, after all these misfortunes, is in for some successes this year. Not the least of them will be the countless invocations from hopeful American Catholics: “Hammer of Freemasons, pray for us!”

[Point Magazine Index](#)

[Site Map](#)

March, 1954

POINTERS

Nearly a hundred years ago, His Holiness, Pope Pius IX, in the *Syllabus of Modern Errors*, condemned the three following statements, and also any theologian in the Church who believed them.

- a) In the observance of any religion, men can find the way of eternal salvation and attain eternal salvation.
- b) One can at least have good hope for the eternal salvation of all those who do not at all dwell in the true Church of Christ.
- c) Protestantism is nothing else than a different form of the same Christian religion, in which, equally as in the Catholic Church, it is given to please God.

If you were searching for statements which would indicate the tenor of current Liberal Catholic theology in the United States, it would be difficult to find more representative ones than these.

* * * * *

Saint Thomas Aquinas has many and varied admirers. Few of them, however, have strayed beyond the *Summa Theologica*. Because this represents only a small portion of the saint's complete writings, we are this month printing, in the interests of a wider knowledge of Saint Thomas, the following extract from his letter to the Duchess of Brabant:

“And is it correct that all Jews in your realm should be obliged to bear some special sign to distinguish them from the Christians? To this the answer is easy and in conformity with the decision given by the General Council. Jews of both sexes and in all Christian lands should on all occasions be distinguished from other people by some particular dress.”

In the light of this, we can suggest an excellent gift for some fellow Thomist to present to Mr. Mortimer Adler, of the University of Chicago; namely, an orange hat. It could be worn by Adler during his lectures on Saint Thomas, as his silent Jewish tribute to the thought of his master.

* * * * *

President Eisenhower recently attended a Red Mass sponsored by Washington, D. C., lawyers in a Washington Catholic Church. Monsignor Cartwright, who spoke at the Mass, never once urged the President to adore the Blessed Sacrament, in Whose Divine Presence it was our President's privilege to be. Instead, the monsignor congratulated President Eisenhower for being such a good church-goer — even though he knew that there is no Blessed Sacrament in the churches that our Chief Executive attends each Sunday.

We do not excuse President Eisenhower for failing to see the challenge of the Real Presence of Our Lord in a Catholic Church. And we do not believe Our Lord will excuse Monsignor Cartwright for failing to mention it.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN BULL

When the Reformation came to England, it cut like a knife, severing the country cleanly from the Faith, from the traditions and culture of Europe, and from its own past. In the space of just a few lifetimes, the England that had been — that carefree, joyous country with its tender love for the Mother of God — was obliterated. And in its place there arose something new: Protestant England — mistress of the seas, merchant of the world, mother of the Empire.

What had once been called Our Lady's Dowry became, in apostasy, the most un-Mary-like of nations. It became cold, haughty, ambitious and, when necessary, officially ruthless. It developed a lust for empire, a passion to impose its government, its culture, its ideas on the rest of the world. It became, in its interests and aspirations, no longer merely English, but British.

Among the products which this Protestant empire has been responsible for is British Catholicism. Though this is not the Faith of all English Catholics, it is the official, By-appointment-to-Her-Majesty version. It is represented mainly in the writings of certain articulate Britons who, for reasons of their own, decided to join the Church.

The fact that these writers should be the spokesmen, self-appointed or otherwise, of the Faith in England is the most conclusive evidence of how the Reformation has triumphed in that country. An examination of some of them, therefore, ought to be instructive for more than just what it reveals about themselves.

The outstanding Catholic novelists writing in the English language today are, by the consensus of all unbelieving critics, Evelyn Waugh and Graham Greene. These two have developed a convenient technique: they deny that they are writing as Catholics when they see that such a commitment would hamper their free expression, but advertise their Faith when they are trying to get the Catholic public to buy their books. In the latter case they

assure their readers that what they are writing is not simply pornography, but pornography with a point; that it has a very moral and Catholic purpose, and will probably lead thousands to the truth.

The Bible in England comes clothed in the vocabulary and the manner of Monsignor Ronald A. Knox. “Ronnie,” as the Oxford students used to call him, is otherwise known for his clever quips and his superficiality in theology. He is known as a man who is willing to sacrifice any value, any truth for the sake of scoring a point against an intellectual adversary. Here is a typical instance, in which it happens to be the singularity of Our Lady’s sinlessness that falls by the way. In refutation of a noted blasphemer who says he does not believe in the Immaculate Conception, Knox remarks: “Does he believe in original sin? I imagine not; and if he does not believe in original sin, then he believes in the Immaculate Conception; not merely in the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady, but in the immaculate conception of everybody else.”

We should like to point out to Monsignor Knox that it is the preservation from original sin, not the non-existence of original sin, that accounts for the Immaculate Conception. If one does not believe in original sin, one does not believe that anyone, not even Our Lady, was immaculately conceived.

Ronald Knox’s British reply to this correction would probably be: “I was only pulling his leg”; to which we add our American reply: “And you were also pulling a bone.”

Another outstanding English apologist, and a disciple of Monsignor Knox, is Mr. Arnold Lunn. His little vagary is a predilection toward certain Modernists, particularly the condemned English priest, George Tyrrell. Lunn quotes Tyrrell approvingly and at length in his books. But Lunn is far too cagey to go on record as openly favoring a Modernist; and so, by way of excusing Tyrrell and exonerating himself, he offers this: “Tyrrell’s poor tortured diseased liver was largely responsible for his Modernism.”

Alfred Noyes has the distinction of being the only one of these British writers to have a book of his condemned by the Holy Office during his lifetime. The book is *Voltaire*, Noyes’ friendly account of that notorious hater of Christ and His Church.

Some British government office lost an excellent clerk when Donald Attwater entered the Church and found a lucrative occupation in compiling various sorts of Catholic dictionaries. Despite his conversion, however, his heart has always remained true to the realm. Here is what he has to say on the subject of Pope Saint Pius V: “By the *Regnans in excelsis*, he excommunicated Elizabeth of England, declaring her deposed and releasing her subjects from their allegiance. It was a great error of judgment.”

Having thus surveyed the authors of British Catholicism — though there are others, these are sufficient to delineate the type — we have just one further thing to note. Indeed, for us in America, it is the most significant thing: the fact that these writers’ influence is not confined to England, or even to the Empire, but extends to this country. Consequently, to all the peculiarly American expressions of lack of faith, we have the added burden of this

imported mongrelism. (A good deal of which is brought to this country by an *ad hoc* little outfit in New York, named Sheed & Ward, founded by a disgruntled lawyer from Australia, in partnership with an English wife.)

There is a long road to travel before America will ever become a Catholic country. However, the first clear sign that we have begun will be when we see America rid of British Catholicism, its authors and its advocates. That ought to be the first step. And, considering our national traditions, it ought to be the easiest.

BY FATHER FEENEY

I should like to protest against the proposed project for the fluoridation of our water. My reason for protesting is a religious one. I want to protect water in its prime purpose, its religious purpose, as the material agent for Christian regeneration in the Sacrament of Baptism.

In the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism, it is required that the water used be natural water, the *aqua naturalis* spoken of by Catholic theologians. The amount of chlorine already put in natural water is not sufficient to invalidate it for sacramental purposes. Neither will the amount of fluorine to be put in, if this present project is voted through, be sufficient to do so. But it is quite clear to everyone that a positive tampering with natural water has now begun. The chlorine already added to water is intended to rid it of germs. The fluorine now proposed is intended to rid us of tooth decay.

If fluorine can be put in water to stop tooth decay, more and more chemicals and drugs can be added to suit the phobias or the whim of the latest scientific experimenter. If fluorine is needed to take care of our teeth, why not keep adding medicines of one kind or another, until water ceases to have a purpose all its own, but must be given drug-store value through additions of new substances needed for our health? Why not add vitamins, cough syrup, sedatives — to our reservoirs?

A great number of our legislators, being men with no sound Christian belief — for example, Jews and Unitarians — would not in the least be averse to the character of water being spoiled for the religious purpose to which a true Christian, a true Catholic, wants to put it. Therefore, as a Catholic priest, I protest.

BROTHERHOOD AND MOTHERHOOD

When the world was a *whole* world, sustained in its wholeness by the Catholic Faith, the men of one nation could look upon the men of another nation as their brothers, sharing, as they did, the common Blessed Mother who was given them by the Jesus Whom they both knew to be God.

Over all the rulers of Europe (and Europe meant the world), there was once a “Holy Father,” who saw to it that Christian kings remained the children of their Mother in

Heaven. It was he who settled their quarrels, reproved, counseled, and blessed them. It was he who sent them to the East to reclaim the Holy Land; he who apportioned among them the New World they found to the West.

The New World is, now, only an historical reference, and so is the “whole” world of the ages of Faith. When the Faith went out, its by-product, unity, went with it. We are left with a split world which has decided that for survival it must adopt the Masonic-Jewish proposal, “Internationalism” — forming leagues, writing charters, building buildings, hoping that, thereby, men of different countries will believe they are brothers, and will act that way.

That world leaders in a divided world are trying to do what will certainly fail — build a united world upon a fiction like Internationalism — is not *The Point*’s concern right now. Our concern is rather this: that there are men of the Catholic Faith, prelates even, who are actually promoting Masonic-Jewish Internationalism. Witness the manner in which they are willing, these past few years, to adulterate in public utterances that sacred principle which formed the supernatural (and supranational) brotherhood of the Ages of Faith, namely, the Motherhood of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

In all the world, there is nothing held to be so singular as the Motherhood of Mary. She is the Mother of God, and so much is she literally Mother that we count it the greatest praise of her to proclaim incessantly in our Hail Marys, “Blessed is the fruit of thy womb.”

This virginal Mother has but one child from her womb. Only in so far as we are incorporated into the single fruit of Mary’s womb, Jesus, do we Catholics dare to say that Mary is our Mother. It was only after the beloved Saint John had received into his own body, in Holy Communion, the fruit of Mary’s womb, that Jesus could say to him from the Cross, “Behold thy mother.” It was only because of the God in the Eucharist, consumed by Saint John, that the Mother of God could ever look toward someone who was not of himself God, and hear God say to her, “Woman, behold thy son.” This is the sacrosanctity of the Motherhood of Mary as it has been guarded by her Eucharistic children for twenty centuries. And this is the chastity which is being violated.

Most outspoken of those Catholics who would hand over Mary’s Motherhood, to the use of the Internationalists, is the Bishop of Worcester, Massachusetts, John J. Wright. It is his plan that now, in what he calls “The Age of Internationalism,” the Mother of God should be passed off as the “Mother of Mankind” — that the singular character of her Motherhood should be promiscuously extended to make her the mother of Christ-haters, the mother of infidels, the mother, indeed, of the seed of Satan!

There is probably no nation on earth, now, where the Blessed Virgin does not have children, through mystical incorporation into the Body and Blood of her Divine Child. And the Catholic Faith calls them truly her children. But to say, with Bishop Wright, that every man, in every nation of the world, is a child of Mary, thus to impute to Mary children who are not hers, is the supreme unchastity, in what we might name, “The Age of Lust.”

The Point

Edited Under Fr. Leonard Feeney M.I.C.M. — Saint Benedict Center

April, 1954

POINTERS

Brotherhood, the religion of it-makes-no-difference-what-you-believe, continues to receive more and more public praise from public people. Brotherhood's parent, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and its grand-parent, the Jewish Masons of B'nai B'rith, are of course delighted.

To familiarize our readers with the attitude of the Catholic Church toward Brotherhood, Interfaith, inter-creedalism, etc., we print the following courageous pronouncement by His Holiness, Pope Pius VII.

“By the fact that freedom of all forms of worship is proclaimed, truth is confused with error, and the Holy and Immaculate Spouse of Christ, outside of which there is no salvation, is placed on the same level as heretical sects and even as Jewish perfidy!”

* * * * *

It might surprise our readers to learn that they could go to any current copy of *Who's Who in American Jewry* and find listed there the names of some Catholic priests. The willingness of converted Jews (even those with Holy Orders) to remain part of the Jewish scene has always been a worry to our Holy Mother the Church. And perhaps this explains why, since the days of the Apostles, the Church has never found a converted Jew it could canonize.

* * * * *

Speaking of converted Jews, we hear that Eugenio Zolli, former Grand Rabbi of Rome, is to teach at the Pontifical Biblical Institute. We would feel more at ease about Zolli's presence there if, before assuming his duties, he would do one thing: become the first Jewish convert of modern times to denounce the unspeakable anti-Christian blasphemies contained in the Jewish Talmud.

* * * * *

Ever since six Catholic Brothers from Saint Benedict Center visited the University of Notre Dame last summer, and told the University that it was letting down Our Blessed Lady, there have emanated from South Bend repeated attempts at self-exoneration.

The latest of these comes in the midst of a “farewell” article written by Notre Dame’s departing football coach, Frank Leahy. With obvious coaching from Notre Dame’s department of Apologetics, Leahy says proudly, “Since 1941, I think there have been 167 conversions at school, six of them football players.”

Some very elementary mathematics would reveal that Leahy’s figures mean a disgraceful conversion-rate of one convert and a half per priest every thirteen years at the University of Notre Dame.

TIME OUT FOR HARVARD

Except for a small segment who are impressed by its wealth, or its age, or its influence, most people in this country have for Harvard College nothing but contempt. They think of it as a place filled with sissies and psychotics, a breeding ground of depravity, disloyalty, and despair. And though they have come to their conclusions not through any direct dealings with Harvard, but only through a kind of canny intuition, it does not require much probing to discover that their conclusions are correct.

Even its most superficial aspects somehow symbolize or reveal what Harvard is. Take, for example, its physical plant, which provides the setting for whatever goes on at the college. Most Harvard buildings, you will notice, are covered with ivy — mercifully so; for they are monuments to ugliness. Not even Harvard’s million-dollar front, the Georgian-style houses arrogantly arrayed along the Charles River, can create a lasting impression of beauty. For Harvard is set in the midst of slums — squalid, miserable, Harvard-owned slums. And wherever these slums get the chance, they poke their crude fingers into Harvard’s sanctuary, destroying its composure, and rendering its classes in sociology uncomfortably vivid.

If you want an unforgettable picture of what the courses taught at Harvard can do to one’s expression, simply take a walk through Harvard Square and observe the faces of the students there. Even the beards which certain individualists affect are unable to conceal their dull, glazed Harvard look; the beards on the faces being far less effective cover-ups than the ivy on the buildings. A walk through the Square will also enable you to get glimpses of the Harvard faculty, a congenial fraternity, some of whose members incline toward scholarship, and others toward suicide.

During the past few months, everyone at Harvard has been noticeably on edge. The cause is some sharp and steady needling Senator Joseph McCarthy has been giving the university for not firing certain teachers who admitted they had been Communists and who have refused to aid the government in its investigations. Harvard, however, has been adamant; it is determined that it will not be told what to do by any Irish-Catholic junior senator from Wisconsin.

This McCarthy attack, and the widespread criticism that has come to Harvard as a result of it, last month prompted *Time* magazine to come to the university’s support. It put a

picture of Harvard's President Pusey on its cover and, on the inside, devoted five *fortissimo* pages to singing the praises of the place.

Why *Time* should have made this awkward leap to the defense of Harvard is anybody's guess. Perhaps it is due to the fact that *Time*'s number-two man, Roy Larsen, was one of the half-dozen finalists in the race for Harvard President; and he chose this way to assure Pusey he didn't hold any grudge for having been nosed out. Or perhaps, and more probably, it was inspired by those purely Masonic considerations which *Time* and Harvard share.

But whatever the reason, *Time* was certainly willing to clamber way out on a limb to try and make Harvard look good. Here is its statement on the teachers who admitted they held Communist party cards: "If a scholar is to operate effectively on the frontiers of his field, he must also be accorded the rights of any other citizen to differ and dissent outside that field."

That *Time* should indulge in exactly the kind of double-talk that the fellow-traveler defenders of American Communists use, indicates at least one thing clearly: its advertised opposition to Communism is a much less compelling motive than its secret loyalty to Harvard.

However, there is one predicament which the Masons who run Harvard have gotten into, and which not even the Masons who run *Time* can get them out of. Menacing though McCarthy is, there is an enemy far more dangerous to Harvard than he: an enemy attacking the college not from the outside, but gnawing at it from within — namely, the Jews in attendance there.

Up till a decade or so ago, Harvard kept the number of its Jews carefully and determinedly low. Then, somehow, by someone, its tight semitic quota was relaxed, and out of the high schools of New York, the Jews started pouring in. Today, they dominate the student body and have made great inroads into the faculty. And Masonic Harvard, which is official Harvard, is at a loss to know what to do about Jewish Harvard. But it knows that unless it does something quick, Jewish Harvard will become official Harvard.

The Harvard Masons do not dare show strength in trying to get rid of the Jews, for fear of the charge of "anti-semitism" with which the Jewish press would blast them. And the Jews will not be persuaded to budge by moderate measures. Pusey, who hails from such an unsemitic place as Iowa, was imported to see if he could pry them loose gently. But there were more Jewish applications for admission to the college this year than ever before.

This is the Harvard dilemma. The Jews are corrupting the place; official Harvard knows that they are; but it is, by its principles, helpless to do anything about it. What the future holds for Harvard, possibly *Time* will tell.

BY FATHER FEENEY

It is a mortal sin for a Catholic priest to participate in an Interfaith meeting. Any Catholic priest who has participated in an Interfaith meeting should go to confession at once, and should accuse himself of a mortal sin, and should promise to amend the scandal he has given, and should assure his confessor that he will never take part in an Interfaith meeting again. If, as a penitent in confession, he does not give this promise and this assurance, the priest who hears his confession should refuse him absolution, or else he, himself, will commit a mortal sin.

It is impossible for any Catholic priest to assist at an Interfaith meeting and not know that it is a mortal sin to do so. A priest who would not know this to be a mortal sin, would simply not know what a mortal sin was at all, either among his own faults or those of his penitents. If participation by a Catholic priest in an Interfaith meeting is not an occasion of sin to be avoided under pain of mortal sin, by reason of the compromise of the Faith, the scandal, and the occasion of sin to others it affords, then nothing in a Catholic's life could ever be called an occasion of sin, nor could anyone ever be commanded to avoid an occasion of sin.

No bishop can give a priest permission to participate in an Interfaith meeting. Any bishop who does so commits a mortal sin himself, and his permission should not be accepted. It is not lawful in the Catholic Church to commit mortal sin "with permission." Nor is it lawful for any bishop to command a priest to commit a mortal sin, or to give a scandal.

Every Catholic priest who reads what I now say knows I am telling the truth. I know a priest's mind. In matters of such fundamental moral observance, a priest needs only to be told the truth in order to see it. I also know the fastidiousness of a priest's heart in matters connected with sin. Any priest who will pretend to himself, or to others, that what I am now saying is not sound Catholic moral theology will later repent of this. And he will accuse himself in confession of having done wrong. And he should be given a penance proportionate to the heinousness of what he does when he either participates in, or says one may participate in, for any reason whatsoever, an Interfaith meeting, which is the joint presentation of religious beliefs by a Catholic priest, a Protestant minister, and a Jewish rabbi.

LETTER TO REVEREND FATHER JAMES G. KELLER

Saint Benedict Center
23 Arrow Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Dear Father Keller,

We have delayed this letter for a long while, hoping that as time went by we would hear the welcome news that would make a letter like this unnecessary. But that news has not yet come, and so at last we are writing to say to you what has been in our hearts, and in the hearts of so many of the Catholic people you used to know.

Please, dear Father, before it is too late, please, come back!

There are those who say smugly that our appeal will be useless; that in founding your new Christopher religion you are another Martin Luther. We know that is not true. We know, Father, and this gives us hope, that you have never publicly attacked, as did Luther, our Catholic devotions, or our Holy Father the Pope. Never have you ranted against indulgences. Nor have you ever descended to the moral degeneracy, the complete dissipation of the priest who founded Lutheranism.

As the months go by, dear Father, and we hear of all the new books, new awards, new movies being sponsored by you and your busy followers, we sometimes wonder if what you really need isn't just a good rest — a chance to sit back and take a leisurely look at yourself.

If you could only do that, the whole picture might come clear. You might be able to see the "Father Keller case" as it has unfolded before concerned American Catholics: How you first got popular attention by quoting Confucius, urging people to light candles and to seek new careers. How your ideas developed into a sect known as the Christophers, "the Christ-bearers," and how you accommodated the Protestants and Jews who wanted to join you by allowing that Christ could be God, or not God, or mere man, or just a general good feeling — depending on the preference of the individual Christopher. And then came the pressure of Jewish contributions, forcing you to abandon your Catholic belief in Original Sin and to state that, "We are all born Children of God," making Baptism therefore quite unnecessary. And, finally, came the realization of how very much the Jewish element in your sect is prevailing when we heard that you were giving a television show with your Jewish follower, Jack Benny, *at three O' Clock on Good Friday afternoon*.

Somewhere inside you, Father, beyond the range of flash bulbs and spotlights, is the Catholic boy who one day decided to enter Maryknoll, to dedicate his life to the work of the missions, and change the pagan world into a Catholic one. And we still want you to do that, Father. Just think of the work for conversions you still could do. More now, we might say, than you ever could before.

You would be in a position to understand, more than many another priest, the problems of those who are not within the fold. For you have actually known what it is to wander from the Faith of one's childhood days. You have experienced the restlessness of those who look to new beliefs for consolation. And is it not likely that some of the same people whom you have made Christophers would follow you back to Holy Mother Church and let you make Catholics of them?

We are sending along to you, dear Father, a green scapular. If you would rather not wear it, place it in your wallet or your pocket. Let it serve as a reminder that still, no matter how far you have strayed, we Catholics want you back.

Please, Father Keller, while there time, come back home.

Hopefully,

The Editors of *The Point*

The Point

Edited Under Fr. Leonard Feeney M.I.C.M. — Saint Benedict Center

May, 1954

POINTERS

Auxiliary Bishop Bernard Sheil of Chicago was recently photographed receiving a “blessing” from a rabbi. Not long ago, he established a scholarship fund to send Catholic boys to study at Brandeis, New England’s Jewish university.

This month the Bishop was still at it. Recognizing the fact that most uncovered Communists turn out to be Jews, he delivered a bitter blast against his fellow-Catholic, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. By hampering or discrediting McCarthy’s investigations, Bishop Sheil hoped to render still another valuable service to Judaism.

* * * * *

In a recent issue of *The Listener*, the official magazine of the British Broadcasting Corporation, occurs an echo of a blast heard here in Boston five years ago. It is by way of a letter, and then a reply, and a second letter, in subsequent issues of that London paper:

Sir. — Mr. Hodgson, commenting on Dr. Gilbert Murray’s reminiscences, is, I think, mistaken about the famous dogma that outside the Church there is no salvation. Here in England, *in partibus infidelium*, the dogma has been explained away and watered down to meaninglessness; but a whole catena of papal and conciliar decrees could be quoted to prove that the words mean exactly what they say.

To mention only a few: in the year 1215, the fourth Lateran Council, cap. 1, *De Fide Catholica*, decreed that, ‘there is one universal Church of the faithful outside which absolutely no one is saved.’ Boniface VIII, in the bull, *Unam Sanctam* (1302), speaking, if ever a Pope spoke, *ex cathedra*, made this solemn utterance: ‘Furthermore, we declare, say, define, and pronounce that it is wholly necessary for the salvation of every human

creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.' And, within living memory, Leo XIII, in his encyclical, *Satis cognitum*, used these words: 'The Church of Christ is, then, the only one and the perpetual one; whosoever are outside it depart from the will and commands of Christ the Lord; they have left the way of salvation and gone aside to destruction.'

— Yours, etc.,
Harold Binns
Bournemouth

Sir. — I am sure that most Catholics are grateful to Mr. Harold Binns for showing us so clearly what the Catholic Church really teaches concerning the salvation of those who will not accept the authority of the Church. It is salutary to be reminded occasionally that the Catholic Church really does mean what she says. Even so, these Papal pronouncements must be viewed in their proper context, and in the light of the circumstances in which they were uttered; also they are *de jure* and directive. And when a Catholic says that this does not mean that particular souls are condemned to Hell he is offending no doctrine of his Church — on this aspect we have no need of Mr. Binns' directives. No squaring of the circle is necessary — only a little common sense, and perhaps a little tolerance!

The position is quite clear even to the average Catholic: does Mr. Binns imagine that all the attempts on the part of Catholics, both here and abroad, to solve the differences that divide the churches are based on the assumption that 'our separated brethren' are *de facto* damned? The present Pope has even permitted that in certain circumstances prayers may be said in common. Perhaps Mr. Binns would like to lecture the Pope now?

— Yours, etc.,
Catholicus

Sir, — I should like to thank 'Catholicus' for bringing out my meaning so clearly. He has put my point better than I could put it myself. I quoted papal and conciliar decrees to prove that the words of the famous dogma, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, though taken quite literally in medieval times and regarded as *de fide*, are now, for propaganda purposes, whittled away to meaninglessness. 'Catholicus' very obligingly confirms this. Such papal pronouncements, he says, are merely 'directive.'

Let us see what this means. More than one hundred years after Boniface VIII had declared, *ex cathedra*, that 'submission to the Roman Pontiff is for every human creature an absolute necessity of salvation,' Eugenius IV, in his bull, *Cantate Domino* (1441), gave a fierce fire-and-brimstone 'directive' interpretation of the dogma:

‘The Holy Roman Church firmly believes, professes, and teaches that none of those who are not within the Catholic Church can ever be partakers of eternal life, but are to go into the eternal fire “prepared for the devil and his angels” unless before the close of their lives they shall have entered into that Church.’

The fact, of course, is that this rigid sheep-and-goat dichotomy between Roman Catholics and the overwhelming majority of the human race is so repugnant to common sense that papal declarations, however ‘infallible’, have to be explained away, and the ‘fresh-poured red wine of a mighty pulse’ watered down to its very thinnest and pinkest tint.

— Yours, etc.,
Harold Binns
Bournemouth

We do not know who Mr. Harold Binns is, or what his motives were in writing his letters. We only know that he has stated the true Catholic doctrine on salvation. And he had better believe it if he wants to save his own soul.

SIGNS OF SPRING IN BOSTON

In addition to the bean and the cod, Boston is also the home of several hundred thousand Catholics. Despite the fact, however, that these are by far the city’s largest religious group, they have never, except in a numerical or political sense, been able to make Boston a Catholic city. The reason for this is a simple one. Because the Catholics of Boston did not make their Faith the central, primary issue in their lives, they were not able to withstand the assault of those who were determined that Boston remain essentially un-Catholic.

The assault began the moment the first timid Catholics reared their heads in Boston, around the year 1700. Immediately, the city’s primal squatters, the Puritans, slapped a statute into the books declaring that any priest who set foot in the territory of Massachusetts would be confined to life imprisonment. In 1834, the heretics of Boston met the challenge of the Catholic immigrants who were pouring into the city, by burning down a sisters’ convent; and in 1855, the Massachusetts Legislature, still in the grand old Protestant tradition, established a Committee for the Inspection of Nunneries.

Yet none of these strong-arm tactics worked. Catholic immigrants continued flooding Boston, and before long outnumbered the Protestant aborigines. And so, instead of the purely Protestant device of active persecution, a more subtle, Masonic scheme — designed especially for controlling Catholic majorities — was henceforth employed. The scheme was to keep the Catholics divided against each other, so that they would never act with their full, united strength. And the principle of division was to be nationality.

There is a warm, beautiful love of one's country and its traditions that the Faith encourages and brings to flower. But there is also a selfish, suspicious, belligerent kind of nationalism that sets Irish against Italians, Italians against French, French against Poles, causing each group to distrust and despise the other. This was the nationalism the Masons promoted and the Catholics of Boston sinfully submitted to.

The strategy consisted in never giving Catholics that status of unqualified "American" which the heretics attained the moment they stepped off the boat. No matter how long they had been in this country, Catholics were always referred to as aliens. Their Americanism was always hyphenated; they were Irish-Americans, Italian-Americans, and Polish-Americans. Eventually, the Catholics of Boston came to feel, from having it so incessantly drummed into them, that the thing that set them apart from other Bostonians was not their Faith, but simply their nationality. Having achieved this, the Masons then played one national group against another, encouraging antagonisms, with the net effect that instead of all the Catholics being united by their common reception of the Body and Blood of Jesus, they were divided by reason of their disparate origins.

A prime example of this program in action is the way, with Masonic encouragement and Irish thick-headedness, Saint Patrick's Day was turned from a religious celebration into a national one. The outsiders invited to take part in it became not the non-Irish Catholics, but the non-Catholic Irish. An Italian had no place in South Boston on Saint Patrick's Day, but any Yankee heretic who would put on a green tie and become Irish for a day was welcomed to the festivities.

Finally, to ensure Boston's remaining un-Catholic, there has been the latter-day assault by the Jews. Their role has been the old and eagerly-undertaken one of corruption: propagating their impurity, undermining every Christian value, trying to obscure every Christian feast-day.

We have put this discussion of what has happened in Boston in the past tense. And with good reason. For the Catholic people of Boston are at last beginning to arise. There is an undercurrent, a surging wave of discontent, and anger, and resentment at what Boston has become under the influence of Masonic schemes and Jewish filth. The signs become more clear and manifold every day. There are signs of growing impatience — like the fact that in Boston's latest city elections not a single Jew was put in office; and of growing courage — like the way a Catholic city official this month called upon Catholic parents to keep their children home from school on Holy Thursday, so that they might commemorate and honor the institution of the Holy Eucharist.

But the greatest and surest sign that Boston is on the upgrade is that there is in Boston, at long last, a voice preaching the Catholic Faith without fear or qualification, in all its beauty and challenge and excitement. That voice is Father Leonard Feeney, speaking to crowds of thousands each Sunday afternoon on Boston Common. It is such a voice that the Masons and Jews have always dreaded and always tried to prevent. For they have realized, with a kind of diabolic instinct for survival, what we can realize through our Faith: If the Catholic people of Boston ever make the Mother of God and Her Son the

great interest and crusade of their lives, then they will be united; and Boston will become, in its heart, in its culture, in its warmth and gaiety and love, a Catholic city.

A PHILADELPHIA STORY

In the year 1787, when the delegates were met in Philadelphia for the Constitutional Convention, Mr. Benjamin Franklin addressed that distinguished assembly in the following words:

“In whatever country Jews have settled in any great numbers, they have lowered its moral tone, depreciated its commercial integrity, have segregated themselves and have not been assimilated, have sneered at and tried to undermine the Christian religion, have built up a state within a state, and have, when opposed, tried to strangle that country financially ...

“If you do not exclude them, in less than two hundred years our descendants will be working in the fields to furnish the substance while they will be in the counting house rubbing their hands. I warn you, gentlemen, if you do not exclude the Jews for all time, your children will curse you in your graves.”

At the time he made these remarks, Mr. Benjamin Franklin was not yet the well-commemorated gentleman on postage stamps and U. S. currency, whose name is attached to so many of our streets, parks and schools; not to mention stoves, the *Saturday Evening Post*, and all of Philadelphia, Pa. In 1787 Mr. Franklin was a Protestant and, most devotedly, a Freemason. And his near-hysteria about things Jewish arose from intimate knowledge of how far the Jews had advanced since the Protestant revolt set them up, and of how much they were gaining control of Freemasonry — which was his own (and he felt ought to be America’s) secret power in public affairs.

Mr. Franklin’s Protestant-Masonic anti-semitism has found abundant survival in America. Though not always manifesting itself in such bed-sheeted boldness as the Ku Klux Klan, Mr. Franklin’s kind of anti-semitism always bears the same message at its core. Kick out the kikes before they grab up all the money and leave none for us! Whether it is enunciated over cocktails at Harvard’s Porcellian Club, or over a barrel of corn whiskey in the hills of Tennessee, Protestant anti-semitism is just that little removed from the jungle.

At this point, some eager Protestant history student would probably like to interject, “Yah! but you Catholics hated Jews long before the Protestants did!”

We answer: In every page of Catholic history there is certainly evidence to conclude that Catholicism and Jews don’t go together. Saint Pius V, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Saint Edward the Confessor, Saint Louis of France, Saint Henry of Germany (the list is endless) could all be easily accused of having no affection for Jews. Public burning of the

Talmud, the outlawing of synagogues, the demand that Jews be at all times distinguished by their dress, and a hundred other such practices, are standard procedure for any Catholic kingdom in the history books.

But to conclude from this that we are going to rally to Mr. Franklin's crusade, is to miss the point entirely. Catholic anti-semitism, and that is a poor word for it, is traditionally a religious matter. It has never offered a "Hitler solution" for the Jew problem. Its consistent remedy has been ghettos and, perhaps surprisingly, a frequent willingness to have Jews around, in controllable numbers. For Jews (Mr. Franklin is very much out of this now) have a decided theological value. As Saint Bernard says, they are dispersed by God in Christian lands to be a constant reminder to us of the treachery of the first Good Friday, which treachery they are cursed to keep repeating, through their children.

One morning last month we were especially struck by the theological value of the Jew-at-hand. Precisely because we were living in an America that has not excluded Jews, we Catholics truly appreciated, on last Good Friday, the Church's annual prayer "for the perfidious Jews." History indicates that Mr. Franklin never prayed for them — and would have been even less inclined to had he known that Catholics did!

The Point

Edited Under Fr. Leonard Feeney M.I.C.M. — Saint Benedict Center

June, 1954

RECENT HALO IN THE VATICAN

From the time of Saint Peter until the beginning of the sixth century, every Pope was a saint. During the next thousand years, twenty-eight more saints, and seven blessed, ruled the Church. But the last was Saint Pius V, who died in 1572. After him came a long pause.

Last month the pause was finally broken. On May 29, at Saint Peter's in Rome, Pope Pius XII proclaimed, *urbi et orbi*, that his predecessor, Pope Pius X, had been raised to the altars of the Church.

For anyone, anywhere in the Church to be a saint is a great and edifying thing; but when the Supreme Pontiff is a saint — he who holds the keys of the kingdom, who feeds Christ's flock, who has the power to build up and cast down — the whole Church shines in his light. And, just as inevitably, when a Pope fails to be holy, he casts a shadow over all his people.

The four hundred years between the death of Saint Pius V and the coming of Saint Pius X — an interval of non-saint Popes — caused a decline in the Church. It was four hundred years during which many Catholics, high and low, grew apologetic for the Faith which had made and been the glory of Europe, and sought to accommodate it to the scientific, cultural and social vagaries of the times.

It was a period when the Church was reduced to making repeated concordats with strutting little tyrants who were puffed up for a day, then burst like balloons; and when Catholics throughout the western world tried, by every concession and cordiality, to get along smoothly in a society dominated by Protestants and Jews. It was four hundred years during which, in many areas, the well of Catholic devotion dried up into Jansenistic scrupulosity; when theology became an esoteric affair relegated to a small clique of experts, and the clear, blazing teachings of Christ and the Apostles were reduced to a dull, dreary welter of cautious qualifications that sapped much of the apostolic zeal from seminarians and sent congregations to sleep in their pews.

Such was the state of the Catholic world when, in August, 1903, Giuseppe Sarto, Archbishop of Venice, became the Vicar of Christ and took the name Pope Pius X. Such

was the mire out of which he arose, against which he struggled, above which he shone. And the thing that distinguished his pontificate and made him a saint was this: Pius X was thoroughly, dedicatedly, and undistractedly, a priest. Everything he said during the eleven years that he reigned was grounded in and motivated by his priesthood. Not diplomacy, nor social betterment, nor philanthropy, but the salvation and sanctification of his people were his perpetual concerns. He ruled the Church as though he were a simple pastor and Christendom were his parish.

Nowhere did Pius X exhibit his priestliness so abundantly and perfectly as in his desire to feed his people with the Bread of Life. With sure, decisive measures he cleared away the dead wood of Jansenism and decreed that everyone in the state of grace should be allowed and encouraged to receive Holy Communion daily. He further decreed that children, who previously had had to wait until they were thirteen or fourteen years old, should be allowed to make their First Communions as soon as they were able to have “some knowledge” of Whom they were receiving.

And having given the Holy Eucharist to his people, he told them: “Holy Communion is the shortest way to Heaven. There are others, innocence for instance, but that is for little children; penance, but we are afraid of it; generous endurance of the trials of life, but when they approach us, we weep and pray to be delivered. Once for all, beloved children, the surest, easiest, shortest way is by the Holy Eucharist.”

And yet, though we have all that Pope Pius X bequeathed to us — the Holy Eucharist as our daily Bread and the Bread of our children, all his words and pontifical acts — still it is plain to see that the state of the Church is even worse today than it was fifty years ago. Nothing shows this so conclusively as the survival of the heresy of Modernism, against which Pius X waged his greatest combat, and which has reappeared in the form of religious Liberalism.

As Modernism was a heresy which tried to conform the doctrines of the Church to the dictates of modern science, so Liberalism tries to conform her doctrines to the precepts and taboos of modern society. As Modernism particularly attacked such scientifically unacceptable dogmas as the Creation, the inspiration of Holy Scripture, the nature of faith, etc., so Liberalism attacks the socially unacceptable dogma that it *does* matter what a man’s religion is, that there is only one true Church, ruled by Our Holy Father the Pope, and all those remaining outside it are reprobate.

One of the most important things that the canonization of Pope Pius X will compel us to remember is the firm, determined way in which he dealt with the heresy of Modernism. He not only condemned it and forbade further speculation as to its merits, he also required every priest thenceforth to take an oath against Modernism. And anyone who does not know that, were he ruling the Church today, Pius X would deal in the same swift, strong, fearless way with the heresy of Liberalism, knows neither Modernism, Liberalism, nor Pope Saint Pius X.

POINTERS

Periodically, a prospective convert expresses surprise that his “Protestant” Baptism and (if he is married to a baptized wife) his “Protestant” marriage are treated by the Church as Sacraments. As a point of information for our readers, here is Saint Bonaventure, the great Franciscan Doctor, speaking in his *Breviloquium* on this matter of Catholic Sacraments in non-Catholic churches.

“Because outside the unity of faith and love which makes us sons and members of the Church, no one can be saved, hence if the Sacraments are received outside the Church, they are not effective for salvation, although they are true Sacraments. However, they can become useful if one returns to Holy Mother the Church, the only Spouse of Christ, whose sons alone Christ deems worthy of eternal inheritance.”

* * * * *

Harvard’s chief anthropologist, E. A. Hooton, died last month after a long career of protesting that he, his students, and people in general, were all (however much removed from the tree-tops) displaced monkeys. But alas, at his death, the time when he would want most to be remembered for what he was, a spokesman for Harvard threw Hooton’s life-long efforts out the window and said of the would-be simian professor, “He was a real human being.”

* * * * *

The Unitarians, America’s leading proponents of liturgical atheism, met here in Boston last month for a convention. During their stay, they came out against the current mention of “God” found on U. S. postage stamps and coins. The motive behind this action was explained later by Dr. J. G. MacKinnon, Unitarian minister. He confessed that what *really* was worrying his sect was the recent proposal that the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, should be honored on an American postage stamp commemorating the Marian Year!

BY FATHER FEENEY

A Jew-promoted, Mason-approved organization for the liquidation of the Catholic Faith in the United States is known as the “National Conference of Christians and Jews.” Its headquarters are in Washington, D. C.

Subordinate versions of the above, somewhat more loosely organized, are found in the various sections of the country. The one here in Boston is known as “The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.” Though it was not organized by, it has the approval of, our ailing Archbishop. Its publicity agent and local promoter is Boston’s leading racial and social sycophant, Mr. Michael T. Kelleher.

The Kelleher group of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews recently held a Brotherhood banquet at Boston's largest hotel. Rabbis and Monsignors, Christian Scientists and Jesuits, Unitarians and Catholic Seminary Professors, Anglicans and Franciscans, were judiciously intermingled and photographed. They wine and dine and listened to uninterrupted and impassioned orations on the religious theme of "Brotherhood."

There were strong attacks made on dissenters and on dividers of religious unity. There were strong scorings of intolerance and bigotry, of the kind, for instance, that would be judged to have occurred should one of the Monsignors, Jesuits, Seminary Professors or Friars Minor have stood up at the Hotel Statler and declared dogmatically, "There is no salvation outside the Catholic Church, or without personal submission to our Holy Father the Pope."

I forgot to mention that there was also present a Greek Schismatic priest. He was one of Mr. Michael Kelleher's special guests. He dressed like a Catholic, talked like a Protestant, and looked like a Jew.

A REPLY TO LADY ABRAHAMS

We have lately received a note from a reader in London, a Jewish lady, who, by the grace of God and the politics of empire, now finds herself a Catholic and a member of the lesser peerage. Lady Abrahams, as our correspondent signs herself, spoke out against *The Point*'s "virulent anti-Semitism." Her Ladyship bade us be mindful of "the charity of Jesus Christ," Whom she called, in a rhetorical finale meant to wither us, "the greatest Jew of all time!"

Lady Abrahams' evaluation of the adorable Word-made-flesh is, we cannot deny, arresting. We wonder just how such a judgment was arrived at, and we are tempted to envision her Ladyship lining up the contenders for her title of "greatest Jew." One by one, with much deliberation, Philo Judaeus, Rabbi Hillel, Benjamin Disraeli, and Bernard Baruch, all get eliminated — and Jesus of Nazareth wins the contest.

In justice to our Catholic reader, in England, we must make it clear that by no means does *The Point* find Lady Abrahams guilty of originality in this matter; we do not accuse English Catholics of harboring a new Judaeo-heresiarch in their midst. Her Ladyship is but following the fashion, so tragically unprotected of late, by which converts from Judaism try to give the impression that their previous attendance at the synagogue is an enhancement to their current Christianity, since, after all, Christ was a Jew, too.

Christ, indeed, was a Jew. But anyone who is making an appeal to Christians to go all out for the Jews, would do well to leave Christ out of the argument. Christ was a Jew Who claimed to be God, and thereby so outraged His fellow-Jews that they had Him put to death. Christ was the rightful King of the Jews, Who dared to defy the religious tyrannies of the Jewish Pharisees. Christ was the Divine Jew Who got spat upon by His own people, and was labeled a "blasphemer" by the Jewish high priest.

In introducing the fact that Christ was a Jew, Lady Abrahams' chief purpose was, clearly, to imply that Christ was the kind of Jew she knew, a fact which would bear with it such religious consequences as: going to Sabbath services and reading, not from the Old Testament, but from the Talmud; scoffing at the idea of a Jewish virgin being the Mother of God; believing that the Messias-to-come was not a Divine Person, but an era of Jewish prosperity.

Without further illustration, we may conclude that, in the matter of belief, Christ was a Jew of the kind that ceased to exist nineteen hundred years ago.

The unanswered question in all of the foregoing is, of course, how about Lady Abrahams' indisputably Jewish blood? Doesn't that give her, through race and ancestry, a privileged relationship to Our Lord?

The sacredness of Jewish blood throughout the Old Testament, and its jealous preservation, was for the one sublime purpose of keeping clear the human route by which the Word of God was to "become flesh and dwell amongst us." That is why the Gospel writers take such care to present to us the genealogical blood-line of Our Lord — Saint Matthew recording it from Abraham down to Joseph, and Saint Luke retracing it from Bethlehem back to Eden. Once Good Friday has occurred, however, and Our Lord's Precious Blood has been shed to its redemptive purpose, Jewish blood, as a Divine interest, is finished.

All that was promised to the House of David, all that was awaited from the tribe of Juda, is gathered in the Precious Eucharistic Blood on our Catholic altars. It is not Lady Abrahams' ancestral connection with the Temple of Jerusalem that counts now with God. It is her Ladyship's proximity to an altar rail in London, where she, and the gentiles kneeling beside her, become, through Holy Communion, the true fulfillment of Our Blessed Lady's *Magnificat* prophecy, "To Abraham and to his seed forever."

The Point

Edited Under Fr. Leonard Feeney M.I.C.M. — Saint Benedict Center

July, 1954

POINTERS

It is a matter of clear record that the Freemasons in power in America's government and business ten to thirty years ago allowed Communists to infiltrate the State Department, shipped war materials to Communist countries, supported Communist revolutionaries in Mexico and Communist rulers in Spain.

Today, America's ruling Masons — in many cases, the identical men cited above — are posing as fierce foes of Communism. We hope no American Catholics will be fooled by this turnabout and suppose the Masons now to be their friends and allies. To guard against such notions, we print a point for meditation from the encyclical *Humanum Genus* of Pope Leo XIII:

“Freemasonry is not only not opposed to the plans of Socialists and Communists, but it looks upon them with the greatest favor, as its leading principles are identical with theirs.”

* * * * *

Some weeks ago, the *Harvard Crimson*, the university's Jew-staffed daily, reported that at this year's commencement exercises an honorary degree would be presented to the late Doctor Roosevelt's wife, Eleanor. Assuming it to be an “inside scoop,” Boston papers and the national news agencies picked up the *Crimson* story and published it widely.

Last month, however, as commencement grew nearer, it became quite clear that Harvard had no intention of comforting a poor widow's declining years with one of its sheepskin handouts. Unruffled, the local Hebrew element told Mrs. Roosevelt to come up to Boston just the same.

Upon arrival, she was escorted out to Waltham, Massachusetts, and presented with her consolation prize — an honorary degree from Jew-owned-and-operated Brandeis University.

* * * * *

During the pontificate of lately-canonized Pope Pius X, a dispute arose as to whether Confucius, the Chinese philosopher, saved his soul when he died. In the year 1907, the

matter was brought to the attention of the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith. Under the direction of Saint Pius X, the Congregation ruled:

“It is not allowed to affirm that Confucius was saved. Christians, when interrogated, must answer that those who die as infidels are damned!”

IN SHEPHERDS’ CLOTHING

Early in the seventeenth century, just a hundred years after Luther’s revolt, there were unmistakable signs that all Europe might again become Catholic. One after another, those German states which had been the staunch backbone of Protestantism were abandoning their heresies and, with the encouragement and protection of the Emperor of Austria, returning to the Church.

But suddenly, at its height, the movement was stopped. Because one man feared and envied the Austrian Emperor’s growing influence, he paid five tubs of gold to the King of Sweden, a Protestant and a military genius, to persuade him to war against Austria. As a result of this plot, the Emperor’s conquests, which had been gathering nation after nation back into the Church, were abruptly checked; and a firm, inimical Protestant bloc was thenceforth established in Europe. And the man who by his gold and political intrigue was responsible for accomplishing all this was Armand Jean Cardinal de Richelieu, First Minister of France and Bishop of the Catholic Church.

Since the time when Jesus chose His twelve Apostles, His first Bishops, and one of them betrayed Him, He has suffered continuously and bitterly at the hands of those in His Church most empowered to protect Him. For let no one suppose that Cardinal Richelieu was unique. Prominent though his perfidy may have been, he remains but one member of a great unhallowed host. He was but observing an ancient precedent: the precedent of Judas. And in every age, in every place where the Church has established herself, this precedent has had abundant followers.

There was Nestorius, fifth century Bishop of Constantinople, who stood up in his Cathedral and proclaimed that Our Lady was not the Mother of God; and Sergius, Bishop of that same troubled city two centuries later, who taught his flock that Our Lord had no human will, and so was not truly man.

There was Bishop Cauchon of France, who, for the sake of gratifying his political friends, declared that Joan of Arc, whom God had sent to save France for the Faith, was a heretic and a witch, and had her burned at the stake. There was Cardinal Wolsey of England, Archbishop of York and Lord Chancellor of the Realm, who spent his life rendering unto Caesar (in this case, King Henry VIII) the things that were God’s. And less than a decade after Wolsey, there was every Bishop in England, except Saint John Fisher, willing to allow that the King and not the Vicar of Christ was the head of the Church.

The catalogue of such Bishops is endless. They have been in the East and in the West, in the ages of Faith and the ages of infidelity; they have been men who won the praise and

glory of the world and men who lived in loneliness and frustration; they have been proud men and ambitious men and vain, worldly men. But wherever and whenever these Bishops have been, whatever has been their motive, or manner, or provocation, the essential fact remains the same: Judas-wise, they have betrayed Jesus.

It is true that with other men betrayal is not so sure and discernible as with a Bishop. But a Bishop is not like other men; he is a successor of the Apostles. He has the primary responsibility for teaching and spreading the Faith, and is divinely guaranteed that he will be given whatever grace he needs to perform his task with absolute singleness of purpose. He is constituted a shepherd, and, for better or for worse, culpably or not, his people are inclined to believe, to trust, and to follow him. Saint John Chrysostom says, “He (a Bishop) is answerable for the sins of others. To pass over everything else: if but one soul dies without Baptism, does it not entirely endanger his own salvation?”

And this leads us inevitably to the subject of here and now.

That the state of the Faith in America today is at a subterranean level — with wholesale ignorance, indifference, and apostasy — is a fact only a spiritual moron could miss. Certainly the American Bishops have not missed it. Periodically they issue broadsides against “secularism,” and “the disintegration of family life,” and kindred abstractions, which they earnestly assure us are the root of the evil. Despite this frantic pointing elsewhere, however, it is plain to see that the chief responsibility for the loss of the Faith in this country belongs to no one or nothing but the American Bishops themselves. And, however reluctant they or we might be to admit it, it seems fairly certain that future generations of Catholics are going to read in the history books that there were in the middle of the twentieth century certain Bishops ruling the Church in America who, by compromise and concealment of the dogmas they were consecrated to teach, wounded the Church just as grievously and betrayed Jesus just as surely as Richelieu or anyone else before them.

Yet, there is this hope and consolation. If just one Bishop would own frankly that the collapse in this country is due primarily to the failure of the hierarchy; if he would risk making himself unpopular with Masons and Jews, and with other Bishops as well; if he would work purely and entirely to increase love for Jesus and to teach men the way of salvation — then the story of what those other American Bishops, the bad ones, have wrought would not have to be the last chapter in the history of the Church in America.

BY FATHER FEENEY

The Liberal Catholics of our country are now making another concession to Interfaith charity and Brotherhood benevolence. They are saying, “It was not the Jews who crucified Christ; it was the Romans.”

I should like to ask these Liberal Catholics a few pointed and direct questions on the subject of Our Lord’s death.

Was it the Romans who came out to seize Him in the Garden of Olives with swords and clubs on the night of His Passion, and who brought Him bound to the High Priest, and then to Pontius Pilate, demanding that He should be killed?

Was it a Roman who betrayed Jesus with a kiss, and was it to Romans He was sold for thirty pieces of silver?

Was the High Priest a Roman, who rent his garments and accused Our Lord of blasphemy when He declared Himself to be the Eternal Son of God?

Was it a Roman crowd which stood before the tribunal of Pontius Pilate and shouted: "If this man were not a malefactor we would not have handed Him over to you ... His blood be upon us and upon our children!"

Was it the Romans who disowned Jesus as the King of the Jews, and did not want the inscription placed over His head on the Cross when He hung, crowned with thorns, and with nails in His hands and His feet?

Was it God's judgment in Heaven that the Romans had killed Christ, and was that why the Power of the Almighty some thirty years later razed the Temple of Jerusalem to the ground, and left not a stone upon a stone, and has never allowed it to be rebuilt from that day to this?

In the prayers of the Mass for Good Friday of Holy Week, the priest refers to the "perfidious Jews" as the ones who betrayed and crucified Christ. Should he be saying the "perfidious Romans"? And has it been wrong for the Church to put it the first way for as long as her history?

When Our Lord hung upon the Cross His first reported words were, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Do the Liberal Catholics really think Our Lord was referring to the Jews when He said, "They know not what they do"? Was it the Jewish Chief Priests, the Scribes and the Ancients, with whom He sat daily teaching in the Temple and who, when He was crucified, wagged their heads and mocked Him and shouted: "He saved others; Himself He cannot save" — was it these who knew not what they did, and whom Our Lord asked the Father to forgive?

Saint Luke tells us clearly that Jesus said this of the Roman soldiers who "dividing his garments, cast lots." And Saint Matthew tells us that these same Romans, after Jesus expired on the Cross, cried out in one voice with their Centurion, "Indeed, this was the Son of God!"

THE MENACE OF MAGAZINES

Everyone agrees that magazines are a menace.

There is hardly a hamlet in the nation where a public-spirited committee of one kind or another has not loudly protested the evils of local periodical racks. Editorials have “exposed” the problem. Parents have bemoaned it. Politicians have promised to solve it. Repeatedly, educators, social workers, and members of the clergy have warned against the obscene publications which are on public sale in every American neighborhood.

To the many Catholics who have been leaders in alarming the country about the magazine menace, we have this to say: Because you are Catholics, you realize that purity and chastity are virtues to be guarded and fought for. But also, because you are Catholics, you know that even more precious and more to be defended than purity in the moral order, is the Apostolic purity of the Catholic Faith — that chastity of doctrine which owes its survival to twenty centuries of vigilant popes, zealous preachers, and martyrs shedding their blood.

The next time, therefore, you feel a crusading urge to go clean up the news-stands, head for one that carries the better-known Catholic periodicals. A swift glance through them will convince you that the current magazine menace is no longer threatening only the *morals* of Catholics.

To prepare you for what you will find, here is advance information on a few of the magazines which are now doing for Catholic dogma what the “drugstore publishers” have done of late for morality.

Commonweal — a weekly publication which has intellectual aspirations, scant circulation, and a layman editor named John Cogley. Realizing the ineffectiveness of his position, Mr. Cogley, when he feels he really has something to say, submits articles to the brassier picture-magazines, where he is assured of an audience for his favorite theme: American Catholics have much more in common with their Protestant compatriots than with their European co-religionists.

America — a journal which airs the political and social speculations of a misrepresentative group of American Jesuits. Chief man behind its policies is a Roman-collared Harvard graduate who has been heard to declare that, “The Catholic Church is not in the business to make converts. The Catholic Church is in the business to save souls.” Novelties like this “salvation without conversion,” however, are far too religious in theme to qualify as regular *America* fare. Recently, much publicity was given to the magazine’s “McCarthy episode,” in which the priests on *America* decided to attack the Catholic Senator, and hired a Protestant to do the job for them.

Catholic Digest — a derived monthly edited by Father Paul Bussard, whose effective way of nullifying Catholic teaching is to discredit the Divine Author of it. Current example: the *Digest* investigations of American anti-Catholicism, in which Father Bussard has spent several thousand dollars hoping to prove that when Our Lord said to

Catholics, “You shall be hated by all men for My name’s sake,” He was speaking only to non-American members of the Church.

In partnership with a layman, Father Bussard has lately exercised his magazine influence beyond the *Catholic Digest* by bringing out a picture book on the Mass. With its front-cover photograph of the Sacred Host, this publication is being sold (with Father Bussard’s consent) at all of the lowliest newsstands in the country. Anyone who recovers from the shock of seeing such a booklet displayed in the midst of pictorial filth and suggestive captions, is in for further abuse when he opens the thing and begins to read. Typical statement from the text is Father Bussard’s reference to the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass as, “the farewell banquet of an unmarried Jew in his early thirties.”

August, 1954

POINTERS

In recent years, the Jesuit residence on Mount Street in London has provided comfortable shelter for a variously notable group of English priests. Among the present occupants is one Father James Brodrick, S. J., who has somewhat made his mark in the English-reading world as a biographer of canonized Jesuit saints.

Father Brodrick's latest work in this field has been a life of St. Francis Xavier. Under Father Brodrick's auspices, we learn that Saint Francis was "a man of few nuances, intransigent, authoritative, in a way even merciless, very Iberian ... We also learn, in a treacherous string of adjectives, that the saint was "devout, selfless, chivalrous, and ruthless."

As we read further, it becomes painfully clear that Father Brodrick has no use for Saint Francis Xavier on any score. He deplores the saint's noble birth, his manner of teaching, his parish methods, his "ignorance" of Buddhism, his haste in baptizing, his clothes, his friends, his "abominable" literary style, his appraisal of men, his enthusiasm for the Inquisition.

Most especially deplorable to Father Brodrick is Saint Francis Xavier's orthodox belief that all pagans who are not brought into the Church are certainly going to Hell.

Father Brodrick's treatment of the greatest apostle since the time of Saint Paul is an alarming commentary on the state of the Faith in Mount Street. It is likewise a partial explanation of why, in the year of Our Lord 1954, England has half the percentage of Catholics that the Belgian Congo does.

* * * * *

To illustrate the difference between a Mount Street Jesuit and a canonized one, we are printing this month the doctrinal statement of Saint Peter Canisius, S. J., on the matter of salvation for those who are not members of the Catholic Church. In his famous *Catechism*, the learned Jesuit Doctor declares, "Outside of this communion (as outside the Ark of Noe) there is absolutely no salvation for mortals; not to Jews or Pagans, who never received the faith of the Church; not to heretics who, having received it, forsook or corrupted it; not to schismatics who left the peace and unity of the Church ... For the rule of Cyprian and Augustine is certain: he will not have God for his Father who would not have the Church for his Mother."

AMERICAN GENTILES AND THE JEWS

There are, at present, more Jews in the United States than in any other nation in the world. According to official Jewish statistics, there are five million of them, and however minimized this figure may be, it is still more than twice the number of Jews acknowledged to be now in Russia, four times the number in Israel, and ten times the number in pre-Hitler Germany.

Yet even without such statistics, there is ample indication that the United States has become the new Jewish homeland. The presence of five million Jews in a country is not a fact that might pass unnoticed, as the presence of, say, five million Swedes might. For the Jews are a people who inspire definite, apparent reactions in all who come in contact with them.

One might suppose that the reaction of Protestants to the Jewish invasion of America would be a feeling of kindly approval, inasmuch as it was Protestantism, in the form of Freemasonry, that originally granted the Jews unrestricted freedom to move through and corrupt Christian society. It was done partly as a slap at the Pope, who throughout history had striven to keep the Jews and their influence in check, and partly because, though the Protestants neither possessed nor understood the courage of Catholics, they were rather intrigued by the inbred audacity of the Jews. Those inclinations and interests, which they themselves always felt obliged to palliate, the Jews catered to in open, raw display; and the Protestants took a certain sniggering delight in seeing just how far the Jews would dare to go.

Despite these considerations, however, Jew-hating-and-baiting — to which the Jews have attached the nervous label “anti-semitism” — has always been a familiar part of Protestant American life. And today, with the dawning realization of just how Judaized this country has become, it is on its way to reaching a new peak. Its manifestations, though varied in intensity, bear a common stamp: whether it be the suburban anti-semitism of those who publicly parrot the Jewish slogans of Brotherhood and non-discrimination, but keep their country clubs invariably restricted and their friends invariably Gentile, or, the “Anglo-Saxon” anti-semites who hold that the Jews could never have been the chosen people because they themselves are.

Against this Protestant attitude, the Catholic position on the Jews stands out sharply. For the Church’s opposition to the Jews — and opposition it has most emphatically always been — is based on one decisive fact: the Jews’ opposition to Jesus.

To a Catholic, guided by his Faith, the presence of five million Jews in America has not primarily a sociological, or a political, or a financial significance, but a theological one. It means there are in America five million determinedly unbaptized individuals — five

million people, each one of whom is not only not a son of God, but is forbidden by his creed to become one.

Nor are the Jews significant merely as individuals. They have made themselves equally significant as a group. They have insisted that membership in the Jewish nation is each Jew's most important function, and that loyalty to that nation and its interests is his single, transcendent responsibility. And the thing that has so welded the Jews together is their rejection of Jesus, whom they crucified when He came to redeem them, and whom they have opposed ever since. That is their heritage, their mark; and it is a mark the Protestants are unable to discern.

This, then, is the crux of the matter. Protestants oppose the Jews not because of what the Jews do to Jesus, but simply because of what the Jews do to Protestants. They see the Jewish menace, but only restrictedly and in terms of themselves. They see it only in the Jews' demonstrated ability to take the Protestants' government and businesses and colleges and seaside resorts away from them. What the Protestants do not and, as long as they remain Protestants, cannot comprehend, is this: because the Jews, as a people, killed God, shouting, "His Blood be upon us and upon our children," and because they have, as a people, never repudiated or asked forgiveness for this crime, the Jews are, as a people, cursed. And all they do, is under the onus of this curse.

It is the Jews' enmity to Jesus, their lust to destroy His Kingdom and supplant it with their own, that is the deep, almost instinctive motive behind their calculated control of all media by which the thought and morals of the nation may be molded. Radio, television, movies, fashions, the press — all have become part of a well-knit, unpublicized Jewish design.

But the question still must be asked, how has it been possible for a few million Jews to take over a nation of more than a hundred million Christians? To which the only possible answer is, of course, that the Christians have let them. With Protestants, absence of Faith has left them incapable of seeing the true danger of the Jews. And with Catholics, fear and lack of instruction have rendered them helpless to protect themselves from the Jews, as the Church has traditionally urged they should.

It is unthinkable that a nation with strong and vital Faith could ever succumb to Jewish control. This, therefore, is something for Protestants to ponder and Catholics to take resolution in: ten Catholics who truly have the Faith can overcome ten thousand Jews.

BY FATHER FEENEY

No Catholic should believe in the evolution of the human body.

There is no accepted theory of the evolution of the human body from any lower form of life which will allow that only one man evolved, and that the whole human race

originated from the body of that one man. Hence, evolution, basically and completely, denies defined Catholic Faith.

There is not a single evolutionist who will allow that the body of the first woman was formed from the body of the first man. But it is of the Faith, from clear Scripture, that this is so. Were the evolution of the human body to be effected from the body of an ape, it would be required of a human soul that it fulfill the double function of “de-aping” the animal and establishing the man. No Catholic thinker of any sanity could possibly explain a substantial form in such a performance.

The theory that the human body might have evolved from the body of an ape vitiates and destroys all true notion of Original Sin. There is no allowance in it for the preternatural gifts of immortality, impassibility, and integrity with which the first man was endowed.

A belief of any kind in the evolution of the human body from a lower animal makes one completely skeptical of the narrative of the first chapter of Genesis. It immediately drives one to speculate on the age of the world in terms of millions and even billions of years.

The theory of evolution gives Our Blessed Lord and Our Blessed Lady, both, a simian ancestry.

Any Catholic who believes in the evolution of the human body does not have the Catholic Faith. His heresy will some day be anathematized by a courageous pope.

MASONIC INROADS IN ITALY

On the fourteenth of last month, the French Revolution received its annual Bastille Day commemoration. Fittingly, last month’s 165th observance of the Bastille attack was not restricted to any one nation. For the French Revolution, as a spirit extending to our own day, has become world property — a symbol of the purpose and achievement of international Freemasonry.

Coming as it did at the close of the 1700s, the French Revolution was a timely protocol for all that Freemasonry set out to accomplish in the century that followed. By means of their willing military instrument, Napoleon, the leaders of Masonry found they were able, as the 1800s began, to plant a potent Masonic germ in every quarter of Europe. And it was not long after the withdrawal of Napoleon’s troops that the Masons beheld, abundantly, the fruit of their enterprise.

Simultaneously, there began in each Catholic country on the continent the unrest and revolutions which have so distinguished the nineteenth century as a victorious one for “the enemies of the altar and the throne.” At one signal, the lodges, the sectaries, the secret societies (they are variously named) began their now familiar program of “enlightenment and progress”: desecrating the Blessed Sacrament, pillaging monasteries, burning down convents, over-throwing monarchy, secularizing the schools, legalizing

divorce and prostitution, legislating in their rabble parliaments against every tradition and observance made sacred by centuries of Christian rulers.

As the nineteenth century revolutions got under way, it was the will of World Masonry's high command (at that time the Weishaupt clique in Germany) that an especially thorough job be done in Italy. The pope, his ancient lands, and, indeed, his very person, were the first objectives of Masonry's Italian campaign. In the "Permanent Instruction" of the Alta Vendita, the control-group of Italian Masonry, this is made indisputably clear. Said the Masons, "Our final end is that of Voltaire and of the French Revolution, the destruction forever of Catholicism and even of the Christian idea, which, if left standing on the ruins of Rome, would be the resuscitation of Christianity later on."

How did the Masons propose to effect their plan? The Alta Vendita's "Instruction" continues, in part, "It is to the youth we must go." And the youth were most successfully gone to, notably by a Jewish Mason named Mazzini who, with the intensity native to his kind, organized a junior branch of Masonry called, "Young Italy."

It was with the co-operation of Italian youth that Freemasonry, before the end of the 1800s, felt it could boast: "The papacy has been mortally wounded. We are about to witness the death of Peter." All of the extensive temporal power of the Holy Father had vanished with the permanent seizure of the Papal States. And his spiritual power was counted for little, in an Italy so patently losing its Faith.

Yet, in one thing, Masonry and Mazzini miscalculated. They failed to make sufficient allowance for that most consistent and unique of all local virtues, that power which is so nearly identical with the Church's Divine guarantee of abiding holiness, namely: the unfailing ability of Italy to beget a saint.

Within the past few months, our present Holy Father has reminded the world how decidedly, through a saint, Italy had her triumph over Mazzini. Pope Pius XII has lately raised to the altars of the Church a boy named Dominic Savio, the fifteen-year-old disciple of Saint John Bosco who died in dedicated innocence at the very height of "Young Italy's" intrigues.

Saint Dominic Savio is Catholic Italy's answer to Freemasonry — an answer as guileless as a Hail Mary or a sprinkling of Holy Water, and an answer quite as effective.

[Point Magazine Index](#)

[Site Map](#)

September, 1954

POINTERS

Early this autumn, the first permanent church building for New England's Armenian Catholics will be dedicated, and present in Boston for the dedication will be His Eminence, the Cardinal-Patriarch of the Armenians. In anticipating the arrival of such a distinguished visitor, *The Point* is reminded that it was to a predecessor of this same Armenian Patriarch that His Holiness Pope Clement VI addressed one of the clearest of all papal pronouncements on the subject of salvation outside the Church. The Holy Father wrote to the Patriarch insisting, in part, that he and all the Armenians subject to him must believe, unequivocally, that "No man traveling outside the faith of the Catholic Church and the obedience to the Roman Pontiff can finally be saved," and that, "All those who set themselves up against the faith of the Roman Church and die in final impenitence will be damned and descend to the perpetual torments of Hell."

* * * * *

As America's secular universities re-open this month, there will re-open along with them the numerous student centers sponsored by the Hillel Foundation. Ostensibly nothing more than Jewish equivalents of our Catholic Newman Clubs, Hillel Houses are fast becoming an accepted part of the American college scene.

Those interested in discovering the true function of the Hillel movement, however, need not search beyond its name. America's Hillel Houses are so called in honor of the rabbi who was for years, until his death in 10 A. D., the leader of the Jerusalem Sanhedrin. As a religious adviser to King Herod, Rabbi Hillel was one of the chief promoters of the slaughter of the Holy Innocents — that mass-murder scheme which was devised in hopes of killing Our Blessed Lord when He was a newborn baby at Bethlehem.

* * * * *

In an address before the Archdiocesan Teachers' Institute held in Boston this month, it was predicted that, before long, Mass in the United States will be said in English.

That such a prediction could be made matter-of-factly, even approvingly, indicates not merely a colossal provincialism, but also a loss of Faith.

In the second issue of *The Point*, dated March, 1952, we warned of the possibility of a national schismatical church being formed in this country. We are not sure of the motives of those who advocate Mass in the vernacular, but we are sure that one of the first, necessary steps toward establishing this schismatical American Catholic Church would be to substitute English, the language of the nation, for Latin, the language of the Church.

IN SEARCH OF A CATHOLIC EDUCATION

Across the nation this month, America's great secular universities will resume production. Once more their doors will open and hundreds of thousands of eager young Americans will come flocking in, fervently convinced that to be processed by these universities, to cheer at their football games, and, ultimately, to receive their Degrees, is all one could ask by way of Higher Education.

But some young Americans will disagree with this multitude. Some, because they are Catholics, will feel that to attend the aforesaid universities would be gravely dangerous. And so, both to safeguard their Faith from the perils of secular education, and in the hope of nourishing it by a Catholic one, they will enroll themselves at those American colleges which were established in the name of the Church.

Though such motivation by no means accounts for the entire enrollment at Catholic colleges, the fact that it should account even for part of it is cause for annual September solicitude. For these students are not going to get the Catholic education they seek, but a secular education under Catholic auspices.

A Catholic education, as it was once given in those great universities that graced Europe's past, is an education in which the Faith animates and permeates all that is taught. It is an education of which Our Lady is Queen — not in any soft, pietistic sense, but in the sense that all studies are undertaken for the supreme purpose of increasing love and knowledge of Her and Her Son.

This kind of education is the birthright of the American Catholic colleges. But it is a birthright they have sold, becoming instead the mimics and toadies of colleges set up precisely in defiance of Catholic education.

The American Catholic colleges ape secular colleges both in the kinds of subjects they teach, trying to match them course for course, and in the way they teach those subjects. Whatever their secular models consider important and inviolable, they consider so, too. Thus, if they are informed that "science" disagrees with Genesis, the Catholic colleges meekly set to work to make Genesis toe the mark.

Even the classes in religion which the Catholic colleges require for their Catholic students are given with an eye to secular standards. They are devoted mainly to the study of Apologetics — i. e., not what the Faith is, but how to answer heretical and infidel objections to it. The students leave these classes outfitted with a humble apology for everything from the Crusades to Cardinal Segura.

Nothing is so indicative of the state of American Catholic colleges as the fact that they have produced not a single teacher of the kind and the caliber that once abounded in

Catholic colleges. They have, for instance, produced no great teacher of Holy Scripture, one who would know the subject thoroughly and inspire his students with a feeling and love for it. Nor have they produced a great Catholic historian, who instead of timidly and blindly following the anti-Catholic line taught in American schools, would lead his students to see history through the eyes of the Church. Nor a great theologian, who could teach the basic dogmas of the Faith in a way to make his students both understand and cherish them. These deficiencies in colleges calling themselves Catholic are at once remarkable, disgraceful, and pathetic.

Yet not only have they produced no great teachers in these fields, these are not even the fields the American Catholic colleges are interested in. They do not want to set themselves apart as distinctively Catholic. They want to make the grade with secular colleges, and are willing to perform any apostasy to do so. For example, they boast of the Protestants and Jews they have in attendance, and of the fact they never “proselytize” them — implying thereby that they have another, equally valuable truth to give their students, quite apart from the Truth of the Faith.

Still, despite all their efforts, the American Catholic colleges remain, in the eyes of their secular idols, hopelessly second-rate. And though this is glaringly evident, the Catholic colleges continue doggedly to follow the same futile path. They continue to hustle their promising young instructors off to places like Harvard and Yale, and try not to notice that places like Harvard and Yale never reciprocate.

But suppose suddenly, miraculously, the Catholic colleges were to change? Suppose when the students come back this month they were to be told that there would be no more aping of secular colleges; that from now on they would be taught thoroughly Catholic subjects in a thoroughly Catholic way? What would happen?

For one thing, it would cause more excitement in the country than an atom bomb dropped on New York City.

It would also mean that at last the Catholic colleges had stopped being the blind, though culpable, dupes of the Masons and the Jews. For, long ago, those twin enemies of the Church formulated and announced a scheme: they would rob Catholic youth of their Faith and render them submissive, by denying them a Catholic education and giving them instead one deliberately and subtly calculated to achieve Masonic and Jewish ends. This is the kind of education called in America “secular” — the kind of education now being given in America’s Catholic colleges.

BY FATHER FEENEY

There is nothing more misleading a Catholic can do than to call Christianity “the religion of love.”

Christianity is not, unqualifiedly, the religion of love. There are thousands of loves with which Christianity can have no part: love of wealth, for instance, love of honors, love of the pleasures of this world; also love of one's neighbor, in the provincial, colloquial, community sense (that it required Our Lord's parable of the Good Samaritan to explode); also, love of one's family, in the possessive, selfish sense (which drove Our Lord to declare that anyone who does not hate father and mother and his own life also, cannot be His disciple.)

Christianity is not even, in the abstract sense, the religion of the love of God. It is not the religion of the love of the God we arrive at by reason. It is the religion of the love of the God Who is revealed to us.

It is the religion of the love of God-made-man, Whom we must first accept through Faith, and then must love with our whole heart, our whole soul, our whole mind, and our whole strength: efforts of love we never could make toward God had He not become Incarnate; efforts of love we now *must* make toward Him, as to a baby in one of our stables, as to a teacher on one of our mountains, as to a victim on one of our crosses, as to a lifeless body in one of our graves; and, finally, as to a triumphant victor over our death, and a hostage in our tabernacles until the end of time.

Christianity is the love of the Word-made-flesh Who dwelt amongst us. It is a love of Him so intense that we are willing to share it with anyone who will take it, even with our enemies.

This love of Jesus, with our whole heart, our whole soul, our whole mind, and our whole strength, is the love we are called upon to share with others. It is when a stranger has become our friend through his love of Jesus, that he then deserves to be called the "neighbor" whom we are to "love as ourselves."

On the last day, one vast horde of human beings, who are going to be labeled "the goats," when separated from "the sheep," will hear our loving Jesus shout to them: "Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire." I hope that on that occasion our sentimental evangelicals, our Community-Chest Christians, our American proponents of "Preach love, brother" will not be too disappointed at the astringency of Our Lord's words.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND JEWISH CONVERTS

It was not many months ago that the public press carried a news release from Tel Aviv which stated that a certain Portuguese Jew, by the name of Jacob Amalak, was currently visiting the state of Israel in order to hire rabbis whom he would bring back to the Jewish communities in Portugal. The article explained that in the last few years several thousands of Portuguese Marranos (Jews who have become Catholics) have reverted to Judaism. What is more, at least three thousand of these Marranos are from families which

have been formally Catholic for the past four centuries, but have perpetuated, in secret, their Jewish doctrine and rituals.

For nineteen hundred years, now, the Jew has been to the Church a conscious and sustained cause of anxiety. And, ultimately considered, the worry has been less for the obstinate, Talmudic, controllable-in-a-ghetto Jew, than for the baptized one, the Jew whom the Church has established as a Christian, and set free in the Christians' world.

Only by realizing that the Church has had, equivalently, to adopt a "fingers-crossed" attitude toward most Jewish converts, is it possible to understand her historic inertia in the matter of apostolate to the Jews. Indeed, our traditions have, in the past, led not merely to hesitancy in evangelizing the Jews, they have discouraged all but the most guarded contact with them. His Holiness, Pope Innocent III, was thus echoing the common sentiment of Christendom when, in speaking about the Jews, he warned, "They repay their hosts, as the proverb says, after the fashion of the rat hidden in the sack, or the snake in the bosom, or the burning brand in one's lap."

If the Portuguese Jews we mentioned at the outset are rather a remote illustration of what Pope Innocent meant, we propose to our readers the recent and devastatingly apropos case of the American Jewish convert, Leon Paul. Writing last month in *Columbia*, the official publication of the Knights of Columbus, Mr. Paul seems almost to have anticipated us and to have reasoned that the surest way to escape being called "a snake in the bosom" is to establish, ahead of time, that the bosom is a snake, too. To accomplish this, he proceeds to explain that the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of God, is a Jewish convert, just like Leon Paul!

Mr. Paul leaves it to his readers to resolve the serpentine innuendoes in his statement. He fails to tell us, for example, at just which point in her life the Virginal Mother of God, chosen from all eternity as the bride of the Holy Ghost, immaculately conceived in the womb of Saint Ann, could be said to be without the Faith, and at just which point she received it.

Ultimately, in any discussion of the Church's astringent outlook on the Jews and their conversion, there are these two questions: Isn't it possible for a Jew to be sincerely converted and save his soul? Isn't the Jewish nation going to be converted toward the end of the world?

To neither question does the Church answer with a rousingly affirmative, "Of course!" To both questions, her answer is a deliberate, thoughtful, "Yes."

We have seen what gives the Church pause with regard to the individual Jewish convert, as she has known him down the centuries. Here, briefly, is why the Church has never been over-enthusiastic about the pending conversion of the Jewish nation. She has traditionally taught that (1) the conversion of the Jews will take place at the *very end* of the world; that (2) its primary purpose will be for a triumph over the Jews, the triumph of Christ, their rightful and long-rejected king; and that (3) to bring about this conversion,

God will have to send Saint Elias, who will find it necessary to preach, die, and resurrect (to the accompaniment of some very persuasive earthquakes) before the Jews finally accept the Catholic Faith.

[Point Magazine Index](#)

[Site Map](#)

Edited Under Fr. Leonard Feeney M.I.C.M. — Saint Benedict Center

October, 1954

POINTERS

It is approaching election time all across the nation and doubtless there are many of our readers who are faced with a situation like the one we have here in Massachusetts: a Thirty-third Degree Freemason, Christian A. Herter, is asking Catholic voters to grant him another term as governor.

From an official Catholic handbook on Freemasonry, published with the *Imprimatur* of the Archbishop of Dublin, we are warned that every Mason of Governor Herter's Scottish Rite goes through the following ceremony on his way up to the Thirty-third Degree.

The candidate is placed before a coffin, at the foot of which are arranged three skulls. The central skull, representing the Masonic hero, Jacques de Molay, is crowned with laurel. The other two skulls bear, respectively, a king's crown and a papal tiara. Before the skull of de Molay, the candidate genuflects. Then, raising a knife and chanting, "Hatred and death to despotism," he stabs, first, the skull of the king, and then the skull of the Pope!

* * * * *

It has been the consistent policy of the Catholic Church to counsel her children in political matters whenever there is a danger to Catholic Faith or Morals. Thus it happened, for example, that the Fourth Lateran Council (Cap. 69) issued this decree, which is binding on all Catholics:

"Jews should not be placed in public offices, since it is most absurd that a blasphemer of Christ should exercise power over Christians."

UNCLE SAM AND ANTI-SEMITISM

Ever since Columbus returned to Spain and told his news, America — and specifically the United States of America — has been looked on as the land of opportunity. Though this title has been variously interpreted, according to the various ambitions of men, always, for those with the Faith, it has had the basic signification of a vast new land waiting to be won to Christ and His Church.

In the beginning, while America was still being explored by the French and the Spaniards, it looked as though the country was going to become Catholic as a matter of course. But between the time America was explored and the time it was colonized,

Europe was split by a revolt from the True Church; and it was the revolvers, the heretics, who first came to establish themselves in what was to be the United States.

That explains why this country was not Catholic from the start. But there are other, later causes to explain why it has never become so. And among such causes none is more decisive than this: the gullibility of American Catholics in being taken in by the enemies of their Faith.

The natural tendency of Catholics to be unsuspicious and unskeptical has in this country been carried to the most fantastic, disastrous extremes. Living in a society fiercely anti-Christian, American Catholics have behaved like children in the care of a group of saintly nuns. They have scorned the notion that there could be any determined enemies of the Church among their fellow citizens, much more agents of a conspiracy set on its utter destruction. Credulous and trusting, they have been prey both to the Masons and, even more devastatingly, to the Jews.

The great, essential fact about the Jews, patent not only in their everyday utterances and activities, but in their official documents as well, is that they are the sworn enemies of Christianity, and are constantly driven with the wild, frenzied aim of destroying it. To this fact American Catholics (not all, indeed, but enough to warrant the generalization) have been oblivious. They have fallen head over heels for those subterfuges by which the Jews shield themselves. Examples: (1) the Jewish slogan “regardless of race, color, or creed,” which implies that a man is no more responsible for the last item than for the first two, and which protects the Jews to practice their hatred of Jesus without reproach; (2) the familiar cry of “anti-semitism,” the Jews’ proclamation of “Hands off!” to any who would expose or thwart their endeavors.

Because the Jews are religiously forbidden to put any interest or loyalty above their race, they are, irremediably, a nation apart. They may inhabit a country, may be called its citizens, but they never consider themselves as belonging to it. Yet American Catholics, by virtue of their staggering gullibility, have allowed the Jews not only to pursue their Judaic ends, but to do so under the guise of being good Americans.

If, for instance, there is an important case before the courts involving a matter such as the censorship of blasphemous and obscene literature, the Jews will be found frantically concerned. Top Jewish lawyers from all over the country will appear in the courtroom, retained by no one, but there simply as “friends of the court,” to write their briefs and offer their counsel, by way of showing that censorship ought to be removed. When the Jews protest that their interest in the case is merely to preserve the American principle of “freedom of expression,” American Catholics take them at their word — unaware that the Jews’ real concern is just to drive in one more wedge to separate America from Christianity.

By being so totally off-guard, American Catholics have left themselves open to the assaults of the Jews in a hundred different ways. The clothes that Jews design, Catholics have accepted as being merely modern and American, not suspecting that these clothes

have been foisted on the country for the purpose of demoralizing and degrading it. The moving picture and television shows that the Jews present, Catholics have taken to be merely entertainment, not suspecting that these shows serve the purpose of indoctrination. The newspapers that the Jews control, Catholics have trusted to report the straight news, not suspecting that these newspapers slant the news in order to create the impressions and the interests and the attitudes that the Jews want created.

It is obvious to American Catholics that the state of their country is becoming daily more foul and corrupt. It is, or ought to be, equally obvious that the Jewish grip on the country is becoming daily tighter and more secure. So far, American Catholics have not put these two things together. But because they are becoming worried, and anxious to do something about the state of their country, the possibility looms that American Catholics might soon come to the clear, glaring conclusion implied in these premises.

And if that day comes, and American Catholics once and for all remove the wool from their eyes and set out resolutely to combat the purposes and influences of the Jews, they might succeed in converting America at last. For there is something in the character of this country that the Jews have not yet been able to reach, something that is young, and innocent, and hungry for the Faith. This is still, if we hurry, the land of opportunity.

BY FATHER FEENEY

One of the leading clerical proponents of Liberalism in this country is Monsignor Matthew Smith, Editor of the *Denver Register*, published in Colorado.

In a recent issue of the *Denver Register* under the heading: "Everybody Who Is Saved Does It In The Catholic Way," Monsignor Smith lets his readers be assured that those who live and die outside the Catholic Church can attain salvation. The defined dogmas of the Church on this subject he makes mean the very opposite of what they say.

Here are some of the statements Monsignor Smith allows to be printed in his paper, to each of which I shall give a reply.

Monsignor Smith: "If a man through no fault of his own remains outside the Church, he may be saved if he leads a God-fearing life."

Reply: This is not true. Nor is it possible for one to lead a God-fearing life rightly outside the Catholic Church. Jesus Christ is the God now to be feared in order to save one's soul. He is our Emmanuel, our God-with-us, and must be feared in the manner He has commanded. No other so-called fear of God will do. Jesus, Our Savior, has said of Himself: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life." His justices and mercies in the matter of salvation must be left to His Wisdom, and not tampered with by our own sentimentalities. An infant who dies unbaptized remains outside the Church through no fault of his own, and is not saved.

Monsignor Smith: “Such a one to all intents and purposes wishes to believe and do what God has taught.”

Reply: Faith is not a wish to believe. Faith is an act of belief arising out of a Divinely infused virtue. Nor does one get to Heaven by wishing to do what Christ commanded. One gets there by doing it.

Monsignor Smith: “The majority of men who have been brought up in heresy think they belong to the true Church.”

Reply: The majority of men who have been brought up in heresy do *not* think they belong to the true Church. All heretics maintain that there is no such thing as one true Church to which all should belong. This is quintessential American Protestantism, and the reason for its two hundred and sixty or more sects.

Monsignor Smith: “Their error is not due to hatred of God.”

Reply: Their error is due to hatred of what God has revealed, in such essentials as the supreme jurisdiction and infallibility of our Holy Father, the Pope, and the Divine Maternity of the ever-Blessed Virgin Mary. Protestants hate these two, and therefore hate the God who revealed them.

Monsignor Smith: “A man who leads a good life and has a love of God in his heart and dies repentant is saved, but he is a Catholic in desire, if not in fact.”

Reply: Every Protestant will resent Monsignor Smith’s calling him a Catholic either in desire or in fact. Imagine dragging into the Catholic Church those who loathe the very notion of it!

Monsignor Smith: “Saint Peter said, ‘In every nation he that feareth God and worketh justice is acceptable to Him.’ (Acts 10:35)”

Reply: Saint Peter, in Acts 10:35, was speaking about those who are acceptable for Baptism, and thereby for membership in the Catholic Church, as anyone can clearly see who will take the time to read the chapter Monsignor refers to.

Monsignor Smith: “Those outside the Church, however, no matter how good, are deprived of many graces obtainable only through the Church.”

Reply: Among the “many graces” of which those outside the Church are deprived, I might mention: the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the Holy Eucharist, the Holy Father, and Mary, the Mediatrix of All Graces, the Holy Mother of God who prays “for us sinners, now and at the hour of our death. Amen.”

THE MONKEYS AND THE JEWS

Across the street from us, here at Saint Benedict Center, Harvard University has settled down for another academic year. And for the first time in many such years, Harvard's faculty is minus one of its most notorious members — that supreme potentate of anthropology, the late Professor Earnest A. Hooton.

It was Dr. Hooton's fashion, each year at this time, to open the anthropology lectures with one of his stories. These varied little in their slant, and the following, by virtue of repetition, was quite likely his favorite.

With a suggestion of Oxford in his accent, Dr. Hooton would say, "I had best start, perhaps, by telling you about a conversation I had, a few years back, with a sweet young thing from our sister institution, Radcliffe. This girl — an Irish girl, I believe — approached me on the opening day of the semester and somewhat flusteredly announced that she had signed up for my course. 'But I do hope, Professor Hooton,' she went on, 'I do hope that you're not going to tell me in your anthropology lectures that my soul evolved!' Mustering what I imagined might sound like a father-confessor's most comforting tone, I reassured the red-faced young lady by saying, 'Now, now, my child, don't you fret. I'm going to tell you that you have no soul at all!' "

With the stage thus set, Earnest Hooton was launched on another season of instructing young men and women that their remote grandfathers were all soulless, simian tree-dwellers.

Who, you may well ask, is ultimately responsible for men like Hooton? Who fosters them, builds them up, and encourages the public to listen while they speak any absurdity and blasphemy that enters their heads? To whose advantage is it that Christian society be so corrupted, Christian values debunked? Whose policy is it that Christian men be made to believe they are merely animals?

Back in February of 1936, the *Catholic Gazette* of London, a monthly published by England's Catholic Missionary Society, printed an article which contains a very conclusive answer to these questions, particularly as they apply to Dr. Hooton. The article was entitled "The Jewish Peril and the Catholic Church," and it consisted of extracts from speeches made at a convention in Paris of B'nai B'rith, the exclusively Jewish branch of Freemasonry. In one of these speeches an exultant Jew went on record as saying: "We Jews have spread the spirit of revolt and false liberalism among the nations of the gentiles so as to persuade them away from their faith and even to make them ashamed of professing the precepts of their religion and obeying the commandments of their Church. We have brought many of them to boast of being atheists, and more than that, to glory in being descendants of the ape!"

Whether or not Earnest Hooton was a Jew (and there are arguments on both sides) is irrelevant. The historical fact is that he well served the cause of International Jewry in its effort to dupe the gentiles with that basic tenet of Talmudic Judaism: "We are the human beings. The gentiles are animals."

As a fitting postscript to Dr. Hooton, right after his death one of the principal Jewish hoaxes for establishing the authenticity of anthropology, was exposed. At a meeting of the Geological Society in London, it was announced that the famous “Piltdown Man,” for forty years a foundation of anthropological theory, the hero of scores of high-school “science” books, the trusted friend of hundreds of Hooton disciples, was a complete fraud! The sham was explained in detail by the director of the British Museum, who described how the skull had been “doctored up and planted,” how the teeth had been artificially colored with oil paint, and how the bone implements found with the Piltdown remains had clearly been carved with a twentieth century kitchen knife.

[Point Magazine Index](#)

[Site Map](#)

November, 1954

THE SECRET STRENGTH OF COMMUNISM

When the Communists first came to power in Russia, back in 1917, it was generally known, both in Europe and America, that the men who had brought about the revolution, and were then ruling in Russia, were Jews. Before long, however, wealthy and influential Jews in this country determined that such an awareness might well prove disastrous to the cause of Judaism. And thus it happened that Jewish pressure forced all intelligent appraisal of Communism to go underground. Nevermore was it mentioned in our press, our books, our pulpits, or even in our fiery soapbox warnings against the Communist menace, that Communism was a movement fostered and vitalized by the Jews.

The burying of this fact was the opportunity for Communism's spread. The Christian world was deceived into regarding it as simply a bad philosophy, or an undesirable economic system. The result? In less than forty years, Communism, by political conquest, has become the ruler of half the people of the world, and as an intellectual force, has insinuated itself into the policies and programs that govern most of the other half.

All of the conventional, facile explanations, such as the persuasiveness of Karl Marx's writings, or the military potential of the Russian people, or the general discontent of the working classes, fail to explain the dynamic and immediate filtering of Communism into every quarter of the globe. The only sufficient explanation, and the true one, is this: Communism was diffused by means of that ancient, international network, the Jewish people.

No one should be tempted to conclude, however, that the Jews adopted Communism because they themselves wanted to live under its regime. Communism was to the Jews an opportune weapon in their centuries-old battle against Christ and His Church. It was a chance to set up that kingdom of this world which they have sought since the time they rejected the spiritual kingdom offered them by their Messiah, Jesus, the Crucified King of the Jews.

Communism can never be defeated until we recognize it for what it is. This month, therefore, *The Point* is printing a portion of the overwhelming, factual indictment of the Jews as the motivating and sustaining force behind the Communist movement.

1. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, the authors of the *Communist Manifesto*, and the codifiers of all previous Communist thought, were both Jews.

* * * * *

2. Concerning the “trial revolution” which was staged by the Communists in Russia in 1905, as a preliminary to the successful one of 1917, the New York Zionist paper, *The Machabee*, wrote, “Revolution in Russia is a Jewish revolution ... Jews are the most active revolutionists in the Tsar’s Empire.”

* * * * *

3. Of the fifty-nine members of the Central Committee of the Politburo, which ruled Russia immediately after the Revolution of 1917, fifty-six were Jews.

* * * * *

4. The British White Paper on Bolshevism, presented to Parliament in April, 1919, by order of King George V, contained the following statement: “The immediate suppression of Bolshevism is the greatest issue now before the world ... Unless Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately, it is bound to spread in one form or another over Europe and the whole world, as it is organized and worked by Jews who have no nationality and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things.”

* * * * *

5. The American Jew, Jacob Schiff, senior partner in the Jewish banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb and Company, financed the printing of Communist propaganda leaflets and arranged for their distribution throughout the Russian Army immediately before the “trial revolution” of 1905. This same American Jew openly boasted, in 1917, that without his financial support, the Communist revolution could never have succeeded in Russia.

* * * * *

6. One of the first official acts of the Communist government of Russia, just one week after it came to power, was to declare *anti-semitism* a punishable offense against the state, on the grounds that it was “counter-revolution.”

* * * * *

7. American Jewry’s celebrated leader, the late Rabbi Stephen Wise, remarked before his death, “Some, call it Communism. I call it Judaism.”

* * * * *

8. Previous to the 1917 revolution, the Jew, Leon Trotsky (real name, Bronstein) had been delivering speeches in Yiddish on the street corners of New York’s lower East Side, advocating the overthrow of the American government. Just before the Russian Revolution broke out, Trotsky arrived in Moscow with 276 of his East Side disciples.

* * * * *

9. The London *Times* for March 29, 1919 reported: “One of the most curious features of the Bolshevik movement is the high percentage of non-Russian elements among its leaders. Not less than seventy-five per cent are Jews ... Among the minor officials, the number is legion.”

* * * * *

10. In January of 1933, the *Jewish Chronicle* of London boasted that, “More than one third of all the Jews in Russia have become Soviet Officials.” And two months later the Jewish *B’nai B’rith Magazine* of New York applauded conditions in the Soviet Union with the statement, “Under the new regime (Bolshevism) it is at last possible to be a real Jew.”

* * * * *

11. In 1935-36, the Communist government's ambassadors to the following capitals were all Jews: Paris, London, Madrid, Istanbul, Athens, Brussels, Vienna, Tokyo, Oslo, Montevideo, Stockholm, Helsinki, Berlin, Riga and Prague.

* * * * *

12. The Jew, Bela Kun (real name, Cohen) led the Communist revolution in Hungary in the spring of 1919. He murdered twenty thousand Hungarians and crucified sixty-seven Catholic priests. Said Bishop Prohaszka, veteran of the Communist domination in Hungary, "We proclaim to the world that we cannot endure the indefinite Jewish usurpation, and we shall get rid of it."

* * * * *

13. In the February 4, 1937 issue of *G. K.'s Weekly*, the noted Catholic historian, Hilaire Belloc, wrote, "As for anyone who does not know that the present revolutionary Bolshevist movement in Russia is Jewish, I can only say that he must be a man who is taken in by the suppressions of our deplorable Press."

* * * * *

14. The most recent admitted-editor of the American Communist paper, the *Daily Worker*, is the Jew, John Gates (real name, Israel Ragenstreif).

* * * * *

15. With even more readers than the *Daily Worker* is the *Morgen Freiheit* of New York City, a Communist paper printed entirely in Yiddish.

* * * * *

16. In the Spanish civil war of the mid-thirties, the anti-Franco "Loyalists" were organized and directed by Communist Jews, under the leadership of Moses Rosenberg and Bela Kun. An editorial printed in the *Morgen Freiheit* states quite clearly that, "The war that is fought today in Spain is wider than the Spanish territory. It is of life and death significance for the Jews of the world."

* * * * *

17. The New York Jew, Alexander Bittelman, said in his book, *The Jewish People Face the Post-War World*, published in 1945, "If not for the Red Army, there would be no Jews in Europe today, nor in Palestine, nor in Africa; and in the United States the length of our existence would be counted in days The Soviet Union has saved the Jewish people."

* * * * *

18. Every time our government uncovers a nest of subversive Communists, the majority of those apprehended are invariably Jews. Examples: Eleven Communists, who formed what was called the "American Politburo," were arrested in the much-publicized "Eugene Dennis Case"; six of these eleven were Jews. Later taken into custody was the twenty-one man organization which had been formed to replace the previously arrested eleven. Of these twenty-one Communists, fourteen were Jews.

* * * * *

19. Of the famous "Hollywood Ten," who were convicted of contempt of Congress for refusing to explain their Communist connections, nine were Jews. Additional Hollywood Jews who have been cited as Communist-sympathizers include: Charlie Chaplin (real name, Thonstein), Edward G. Robinson (real name, Rosenberg), Melvyn Douglas (real

name, Hesselberg), Douglas Fairbanks (real name, Ullman), Judy Holiday (real name, Tuvim), Danny Kaye (real name, Kaminsky).

* * * * *

20. The supreme leader of the Communist party in the United States (the boss behind Earl Browder, Eugene Dennis, etc.) was the Jew, Gerhardt Eisler. Chief assistant to Eisler was the Jew, J. Peters (real name, Goldherger).

* * * * *

21. Since World War II, eleven Communists have been convicted of espionage activities in the United States. Ten of these were Jews.

* * * * *

22. The Report of the Canadian Royal Commission on Communist activities, in 1946, read, in part, "It is significant that a number of documents from the Russian Embassy specifically note 'Jew' or 'Jewess' in entries on their relevant Canadian agents or prospective agents, showing that the Russian Fifth Column leaders attach particular significance to this matter."

* * * * *

23. A raid by Federal agents on the Pittsburgh Jewish Cultural Center in July of 1953 revealed that the place was the Communist training headquarters for western Pennsylvania. And in April of this year, another such raid uncovered the fact that the Miami Jewish Cultural Center was actually a front for the distribution of Communist propaganda.

* * * * *

24. The Jews can always be counted on to oppose any curbs or restrictions which are directed against Communists or Communism. Example: When the present Jewish Senator from New York, Herbert Lehman, was Governor of the State, a bill was passed resoundingly by the legislature prohibiting any Communist to hold office in the State government. This was not hypothetical legislation. The bill was aimed at known Communists then holding high positions in New York State. When the bill arrived at Governor Lehman's desk, he promptly vetoed it.

* * * * *

25. Similarly, the Jews will always attack any man who shows himself to be a true and determined enemy of Communists. This is done not only by individual Jews, but with equal dependability by the powerful Jewish organizations, whose attacks on anti-Communism are always by way of saving the public from "Hysteria!" or "Demagoguery!" or "Witch hunts!"

Occasionally, when a man has been particularly effective in fighting Communists, the Jews will even label him as "anti-semitic" — thereby revealing the Communist-Jewish tie-up which for so many years it has been their policy to keep well hidden. Example: Recently, when forty-two employees at Fort Monmouth were fired as loyalty risks, and thirty-eight of the forty-two turned out to be Jews, the Jewish Anti-Defamation League screamed, "Anti-semitism!" at the American Army in general and at the responsible officer in particular.

* * * * *

The foregoing twenty-five items are but a sampling of the irrefutable case against the Jews. But in one final matter we must caution our readers. Though the Jews are behind Communism, they are not committed to it. The cause to which they are essentially bound is not pro-Communism. It is, rather, anti-Christianity. Communism is merely their weapon of the moment.

Therefore, it is possible that Jews will be seen opposing Communism. Should this happen, it may be that such opposition is only a diversionary move, calculated to throw the Gentiles off the track. It may be, however, that the Jews will have found that Communism has lost its effectiveness, and they are dropping it in favor of some new, more useful tool. In that event, Communism would decline into being just another political-economic movement, an abandoned child obliged to fend for itself.

As long as Communism remains an international menace, however, totally unexplainable by political or economic standards, an insidious, rapacious enemy, more terrible to the Church even than to the state, then we may be sure that the Jews are still behind the Communist movement.

December, 1954

POINTERS

From all over America, representing millions of Catholic mothers, sisters, wives, daughters, maiden aunts, and nieces, there arrived in Boston last month the delegates to the twenty-seventh nationwide convention of the National Council of Catholic Women. Of all the people who, in so many varied capacities, attended this sizeable gathering, the following are remembered by *The Point* 's convention observers.

* * * * *

Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, speaker at a morning session of the convention in Boston's Symphony Hall. This was Eisenhower's second visit to Boston since his election to the Presidency and his conversion to Presbyterianism. He read, without color, but with a certain earnestness, the speech prepared for him, and then appeared alternately embarrassed and incredulous as Boston's Archbishop Cushing said of him that it was not his ability as a president or a general that made Dwight Eisenhower great. It was, rather, his "love of God!"

* * * * *

Mr. Rabb, adviser to Eisenhower, who accompanied the President, held his coat, and whispered instructions. On the Symphony Hall stage, Rabb sat directly behind an impressive row of Bishops, none of whom seem to have been warned that the slick-haired Mr. Rabb (real name, Rabinowitz) was to be there.

* * * * *

His Excellency, Henry Cabot Lodge, United States Ambassador to the United Nations, a man's speaker, who spoke at an evening session of the convention. He pleased the delegates by promising that the next time the U. N. runs a war, the burden of supplying an army will be shared by a larger number of countries, and thereby American mothers will stand to lose fewer sons than they did in Korea.

* * * * *

His Excellency, John J. Wright, Bishop of Worcester, Massachusetts, who gave a talk endorsing the United Nations, after Ambassador Lodge had left the stage. Bishop Wright is a ladies' speaker.

* * * * *

An enthusiastic, unidentified, but unmistakably Catholic young lady, from the International Catholic Truth Society, in Brooklyn. She stood in the outer lobby of Symphony Hall prior to the pro-U. N. speeches of Lodge and Bishop Wright, and handed out some extremely damaging anti-U. N. literature.

* * * * *

Liberace, a manicured piano player in grey silk suit, who arrived at Boston's Hotel Statler, headquarters of the convention, and promptly received a phone-call from Boston's Archbishop Cushing. Would Liberace please play for the ladies of the

convention, asked the Archbishop? No, said Liberace. Well, then, said the Archbishop, could Liberace pay a visit to the Archi-episcopal residence some time during his Boston stay? Yes, said the piano-player. Newsmen received ample warning of the proposed visit and were plentifully on hand when the Archbishop put his arm around Liberace's shoulder and called him an "exemplary Catholic."

The forces which control Boston's press were delighted, two days later, to quote Archbishop Cushing's exemplary Catholic as saying, to a concert hall audience, "I don't talk loud. I'm the sexy type."

THE BUYERS AND SELLERS AT CHRISTMAS

The Jews would like to get rid of Christmas. But so far they have not succeeded. For reasons of Faith (the Catholics), or motives of sentiment (the Protestants), certain Americans have refused to shrug the day off. And so, the Jews have been obliged to fall back on that well-tried principle of theirs, "When you can't beat a movement, join it."

Today, in America, the Jews have become Christmas boosters. But their acceptance of the day, like their acceptance of any non-Jewish thing, is for the purpose of making it over to their own image and likeness. Accordingly, the Jews are trying to establish a Judaized Christmas. They want a Christmas stripped of all commemoration of the Birth of our Saviour, and reduced to a purely secular festival.

To ensure that no Christian meaning of Christmas will be perpetuated through civic recognition of it, the Jews protest loudly against such practices as community-sponsored Christmas carols. They demand that no Nativity plays be presented in public schools. "Christological expressions" (the Jews' phrase for dismissing any reference to their rejected Messiah) must be banned from the holiday messages of public officials. "We want all this Christmas propaganda stopped!" shrilled the New York Jewish newspaper, *The Day*. "Public schools must be kept clear of Christmas carols and other Christmas influence. The educational system of New York City — and other cities with large Jewish populations — please take notice!"

But common though this kind of agitation has been, it is not the main Jewish attack on Christmas. The Jews well realize that in making these direct, naked demands there is always the risk that some day they will arouse Christian wrath. Consequently, they rely chiefly on a less obvious weapon, but one which is far more deadly. The Jews are saturating the American atmosphere with their infidel slant on Christmas.

By magazine articles, department store displays, newspaper advertisements, by radio and television and moving picture entertainments, by the popular songs which they write and publish, and by a thousand other subtle and insidious means, the Jews are conveying the impression that Christmas is nothing more than a happy holiday — a time for tinsel and

mistletoe and big red ribbons; a time for hilarity and handouts, stimulated by bottled spirits.

Furthermore, by their perfect coordination of press, entertainment, and commerce, the Jews are creating the illusion that their version of Christmas is universally accepted — that “everybody but everybody” agrees that this is the way the feast should be celebrated.

In the event the modicum of Christian observance still clinging to Christmas in America should grow, or become dangerous, the Jews have a final weapon. This weapon they have already begun to use. It is an appeal to the “Americanism” of the stubborn Christians. In the name of democracy, they (who are congenitally incapable of any loyalty other than to Judaism) ask that Christmas be taken from the realm of sectarianism and made a day for all Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed. They argue that the day has too much national importance to commemorate merely the Birth of Jesus. They say it should stand for some program of their own Jewish devising, some large and deliberately un-Christian concept, such as “Brotherhood.”

One postscript: Touring the country this December will be a moving picture entitled *White Christmas*. It was written by three Jews named Krasna, Panama, and Frank. Its music was composed by a Jew named Balin, who calls himself Berlin. It stars a Jew named Kaminsky, who calls himself Kaye. It is this year’s main single effort to divert Christians from the true significance of Christmas. And the Jews expect it to be especially successful; for, to co-star in the movie, they have procured the services of an aging crooner, the one-time darling of American Catholicism. In exchange for his endorsement and abetting of their anti-Christmas purposes, the Jews may toss this pitiful Catholic a little conscience salve. Perhaps they will allow him to sing *Adeste Fideles* or “Silent Night” in the movie. The Jews know they can well afford to make such a concession, since any Christian sentiment expressed in the song will be quite blotted out in the welter of Jewish vulgarity.

LIGHT IN THE NIGHT

Cold, it is told, did our world enfold
The night that Our Lord was born;
Our sheep who were deep in a midnight sleep
Awoke and believed it morn.

Our hay, so they say, in a manger lay
To make Him a warm, soft bed:
When close to the earth at the hour of His birth
Our Saviour reclined His head.

Light in the night that was clear and bright
Drew westward three Eastern kings;
And royal the way that they knelt to pray,
All covered with crowns and rings.

Archangels in throngs with celestial songs
Proclaimed ere the dawn began,
In valley, on hill, unto men of good will,
Their joy in our God made man.

BY FATHER FEENEY

At the request of our readers — who have now come to know the things for which I stand — I shall put down a few of the things which I am very much against.

I am very much against a Catholic's attending an Interfaith meeting of any kind.

I think it is a sin for priests to become workers and try to enter the life of a nation in overalls instead of in cassocks and surplices.

I think that ninety percent of the writings of recently converted Catholic authors should be put on the Index or burned.

I think the U. N. is a movement for setting up in the secular order a rival to the Catholic Church in the spiritual order, and for eventually effecting the end of all Faith (Church) and all patriotisms (State).

I think the National Conference of Christians and Jews is the kind of sodality that every Catholic should be forbidden to attend, support, or sympathize with, under pain of mortal sin.

I am one of the leading opponents of the Anti-Defamation League. I am one of the chief people the Anti-Defamation League has gone out of its way to abuse. I think it is an honor to be defamed by the Anti-Defamation League.

I am very much against the underground war that is daily going on against the police forces in our leading cities, especially those in which so many fine and handsome Catholic policemen are found. I am against the efforts of petty gossip and petty scandal to demoralize some of the finest groups of men I have ever met, and I am very much against those who have not the courage to stop it.

I think that the United States is in a worse condition, spiritually and politically, than the nations of Europe were before the war. I think that the reasons for this are the same as they were in Europe, and that these same reasons have arrived in America recently by way of immigration.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF CARDINAL NEWMAN

Q. What is it about John Henry Newman, English convert and Cardinal, that Catholics chiefly remember?

A. His mastery of English prose.

Q. What is it about John Henry Newman that Catholics of our day generally forget?

A. They forget, or never have been told of, his Jewish descent.

Q. If we Catholics were to bear in mind Newman's real ancestry when we are appraising his literary ability, could we not then boast that we have had in our fold the greatest Jewish writer in the English language?

A. We could — except for the fact that there have been in the English language other Jewish writers, like Robert Browning, Max Beerbohm, and Philip Guedalla, who never once thought of joining the Catholic Church.

Q. Apart from his literary abilities, did not Newman make a good conversion to the Catholic Church?

A. He made a nostalgic conversion.

Q. What sort of conversion is that?

A. It is a conversion effected in a typical Old Testament manner, in which one is always sighing after the "flesh-pots" of things one has abandoned, and which in Newman's case required an *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, an apology for his own life, to justify.

Q. After his conversion, and his ordination to the priesthood, is it really true that Newman used often to forego theological studies and pastoral pursuits in order to devote more time to reading from the pagan Greeks?

A. Biographers disagree. Newman's only comment in the matter was his repeated remark, "I shall never be a saint, for I love the pagan classics too intensely."

Q. Did not the blood which he inherited, from the Jewish moneylender who was his father, allow Newman to bring to the Faith some of those same racial qualities possessed by the very earliest Christians, by Our Lord's own Apostles and disciples?

A. The Jewish qualities which Newman brought to the Faith have been very tidily set in order by Canon William Barry, S. T. D., the eminent English authority on Newman. Canon Barry reports that to Newman's "Hebrew affinities" the following qualities are attributed: "... his cast of features, his remarkable skill in music and mathematics, his dislike of metaphysical speculations, his grasp of the concrete, and his nervous temperament."

Q. What was it that Newman called those fellow Catholics of his who, at the time of the Vatican Council, were in favor of having the Pope's personal infallibility defined?

A. Newman nervously called them, "an aggressive and insolent faction."

Q. Was this attitude toward the definition of Papal infallibility the reason why Pope Pius IX so totally mistrusted Newman?

A. It was one of the reasons.

Q. If Pope Pius IX so frowned upon him, why was Newman made a Cardinal?

A. Newman was made a Cardinal after Pope Pius IX died, when the Catholic Duke of Norfolk prevailed upon the newly installed Leo XIII to brighten the aged Newman's final years with a red hat.

Q. Is it in England that Cardinal Newman's spirit best survives today?

A. It is not. Modern Catholic Englishmen, without analyzing it, sense that Cardinal Newman was, religiously, the kind of interloper in their midst that Prime Minister Disraeli was politically.

Q. Where then have Newman's name and fame been most perpetuated?

A. In America, in the form of clubs. Newman Clubs, they are called.

Q. What is a Newman Club?

A. It is an organized excuse for the presence, the sinful presence, of Catholic students at secular universities founded and fostered by Masons and, lately, indoctrinated by Jews.

