
THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume VII, No. 8 † December 1, 1986

THE HUNGARIAN REVOLT IN RETROSPECT

John Kenneth Weiskittel

In the fall of 1956, American airwaves and wire services buzzed with electrifying news coming out of Eastern Europe—an anti-Communist uprising in Hungary had successfully wrested control away from the Soviet-installed regime. Members of formerly banned parties were given posts in a coalition government, political prisoners were freed, worker councils were formed and collectivized farms abolished.

But heady elation quickly changed to stunned silence when, less than two weeks after the initial demonstrations, the USSR crushed the budding flower of freedom with a massive invasion. Thousands of Hungarians were slaughtered, sent to slave labor camps or forced to flee their native soil as refugees. What began as a people's hopeful struggle for liberty ended with a nation prostrate and broken in spirit.

It is fitting for us, on the 30th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolt, to remember the brave men and women (and even boys and girls) who made the supreme sacrifice in a tragic attempt to free their homeland. Fitting, because Hungary has been a Catholic nation for nearly 1,000 years. Even since the "Reformation" it has maintained a Catholic majority of about two thirds of the population. And also fitting inasmuch as the revolt was doomed from the start by machinations in the U.S. government and the United Nations, the mechanisms of which even more heavily impact on world affairs today.

Five Days of Freedom

On October 23, 1956, thousands of Hungarians peacefully demonstrated in the streets of Budapest in a show of support for a Polish rebellion earlier in the month, an end to Soviet colonial rule and a return of free elections. "We will never again be slaves," a line from Hungary's great nineteenth-century poet Petofi, was the rallying cry of the day. The disposition of the demonstration changed, however, "(w)hen," writes W. Cleon Skousen, "the crowds refused to disband... (and) Russian secret police were ordered to open fire on them. Thus the revolution began." (*The Naked Communist*, Ensign, 1972) As the people saw their countrymen falling, bloody, to the street, their rage gave rise to the first great exploit of the revolt and one of the truly memorable anti-Communist acts of our time: ropes were secured around a gigantic statue of the false god Stalin and it was toppled from its pedestal, to be replaced by a Hungarian flag.

The violence of the embattled natives was directed into the

burning of Communist Party headquarters and bookstores and the lynching of members of the hated AVO (the Hungarian equivalent of the KGB). And yet it was remarkably focused: there was no widespread looting or indiscriminate killing as so often accompanies such conflicts. The Soviet forces found themselves "resisted by Communist-trained Hungarian troops who defected and joined the Freedom Fighters. Many of the Soviet occupation troops also defected. As a result, the remaining Soviet troops were beaten in five days." (Ibid.)

Two days later, the Kremlin advised dictator Erno Gero to flee the country, the people clamoring for his head. Control of Hungary fell to Imre Nagy, a former Communist ruler. Between October 27-31 Nagy formed a multi-party cabinet with representatives from the (Church-supported) Smallholders, National Peasant and Social Democratic parties. (It was the feeling of the late Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty that Nagy was no longer a Communist at this time.) The fresh air of freedom brought the rise of new newspapers, while the government announced it had begun discussions for the complete withdrawal of the Soviets. Thursday, October 30, marked the release of Cardinal Mindszenty from a castle near the Yugoslav border. A Communist captive since 1948 (on a trumped-up charge of treason), he was admired by Hungarians of every creed as a symbol of the nation's faith and tenacity in the face of militant atheism. In a radio address given four days later and translated into every major language, Cardinal Mindszenty told the world that "this fight was not a revolution but a fight for freedom" so Hungary could "decide freely on how it should live." The Gero regime had fallen, he continued, because it failed to see society's "religious-moral basis" and to build the state around this. So, he concluded, not only was this a battle for national sovereignty and "private ownership," but also for the restoration of "Christian religious instruction" and the rights of the Roman Catholic Church.

Meanwhile, Nagy's government proclaimed its Warsaw Pact ties dissolved and its desire for Hungary to be a neutral country. This desire would go unfulfilled for, on November 4, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev ordered an all-out invasion involving 5,000 tanks and 250,000 soldiers. Janos Kadar, the USSR puppet who claimed to be the lawful Hungarian ruler, called on the soldiers to "smash the sinister forces of reaction." The partisans met this massive attack "with spirited resistance," writes Harvard Kremlin scholar

Adam B. Ulam, "but the poorly armed workers militia and the few Hungarian military units could be no match for Soviet tanks and heavy guns." (*Expansion and Coexistence: Soviet Foreign Policy, 1917-1973*, Praeger, 2nd ed., 1975) Desperate was the fighting, and a most piteous sight: "The youth of Hungary fought bravely, often with kitchen knives and clubs against tanks, flamethrowers and mortar fire." (Dan N. Jacobs, *The Masks of Communism*, Harper & Row, 1963) So outgunned and outnumbered were the Freedom Fighters that the Reds recaptured Budapest and other cities in a matter of hours. From the time of the liberation of Cardinal Mindszenty, Hungary would enjoy the light of liberty for a few fleeting days before seeing it snuffed out by ruthless invaders. There have been no further outbursts from that enslaved people in the ensuing 30 years.

Khrushchev the Stalinist

No, the title here isn't a typographical error. Khrushchev *the Stalinist*. This would seem at odds with the popular notion that he was a great reformer who denounced his predecessor, Joseph Stalin, and removed some of the more repressive measures previously suffered by the Russian people. The fallacy of this belief (assumed as a historical fact in certain circles of academia, mass media and government) is nowhere better refuted than in the "amazing and treacherous series of events...personally supervised by Nikita Khrushchev" (Skousen) during the Hungarian revolt.

At the 20th Party Congress in February, 1956, Khrushchev had decried the crimes of Stalin and promoted "de-Stalinization" of the party. But while distancing himself from atrocities already well known around the world, he did so while skirting the issue of his *own* complicity; he was in fact Stalin's henchman in the two most brutal USSR operations during the 1930's—the forced famine in the Ukraine and the great purges within the Soviet Government.

Khrushchev communicated to the Nagy Government his desire to negotiate the withdrawal of the occupation troops which at that time were being soundly beaten by Hungarian nationals. On November 2, 1956, Nagy notified his Military Commander, General Bela Kiraly, who had spent five years in Red prisons, that the Russian Ambassador (and later, Soviet Premier) Yuri Andropov had contacted him to the effect that the USSR's Budapest Embassy was being threatened by mobs. Andropov stated that, if Nagy couldn't control the unrest, Soviet troops would be used. Kiraly dispatched a tank and mechanized battalion to quell the unrest but when they arrived the streets were empty. In *Betrayal at the U.N.: The Story of Paul Bang-Jensen*, (Devin-Adair, 1961), DeWitt Copp and Marshall Peck, who interviewed Kiraly, report that he went to the embassy where he found Andropov all smiles as though it had been a joke. "I realize now," he told the authors, "that the move was simply a device to find out how ready we were to act, how well organized, and the Soviet Ambassador, in finding us prepared, immediately changed his approach." Kiraly

recalls that Andropov was very friendly and reassured him that "the real purpose" of having him come was to set up arrangements to negotiate a troop pullout. Actually, the Russians "were simply stalling for time."

[The House Committee on Un-American Activities, in its 1959 report "The Crimes of Khrushchev," quoted the following testimony of Bela Kiraly:

To avoid the annihilation of the Soviet units, Khrushchev himself carried out one of his most sinister actions. He sent to Budapest his first deputy, (Anastas) Mikoyan; and he sent Mr. (Mikhail) Suslov from the party leadership. These two Soviet men sat down with the revolutionary government. They found they were defeated. After talking with Khrushchev by means of the telephone and, by the approval of Khrushchev, (they) concluded an armistice...Diplomatic actions were further developed...It was positively declared that the aim of further diplomatic negotiations (would be) how to withdraw Soviet troops from Hungary and how to allow Hungary to regain her national independence. (cited, Skousen)]

Kiraly informed Nagy of Andropov's suggestion and a meeting took place in the Parliament Building. Strangely enough, however, the two sides were not able to agree on a pullout date. "The Soviet representatives proposed that the final details," writes Cleon Skousen, "be drawn up at the Soviet headquarters in Tokol, a village south of Budapest." The entire Hungarian delegation (including a hero of the struggle later named a Minister of War, Pal Maleter) arrived at the headquarters at about 10 p.m. on November 3. Just after their arrival, Maleter phone Kiraly to say all was going well. When Kiraly tried to return the call he got no answer. Fearing the worst, he sent men to Tokol and maintained radio contact with them. When they reached the Soviet command, the radio went dead. (see Copp/Peck) Cardinal Mindszenty, who had given his famous address earlier in the day, learned what had happened shortly after midnight and supplies us with an illuminating bit of information: "No less a personage than General (Ivan) Serov, chief of the Soviet secret police, had come from Moscow to see to these arrests." (This and all of his quotes, *Memoirs*, Macmillan, 1974) Communication with the Kremlin of the arrests of these key military and government officials was immediate for "(s)imultaneously a new all-out attack was ordered by Khrushchev against the whole Hungarian population." (Skousen) The captured men were sent to Russia and never heard from again. Nagy and other leaders were taken and executed. Cardinal Mindszenty found refuge in the American Embassy and remained there until Paul VI and President Richard Nixon conspired to remove him in 1971. (See *Memoirs*) And Kiraly fought on, leaving, finally, on the 16th of November, 1956, as one of more than 200,000 refugees.

Khrushchev's deception at Tokol succeeded because the Hungarians erred in believing their foes could be counted

on as honorable men. (Such credulity unfortunately afflicts too many in the West even now.) The real affinity Khrushchev had with Stalin is evident as well from remarks he made after the Hungarian Revolt. In *Khrushchev: A Career* (Viking ed., 1966), Edward Crankshaw notes that the despot warned some “rebellious Soviet writers” that the revolt “would never have taken place had there been a little preliminary shooting of the Hungarian intellectuals.” On December 31, 1956, Khrushchev boasted about his part in the rape of Hungary, saying that “(w)hen it is a question of fighting against imperialism (sic) we can state with conviction that we are all Stalinists,” and two weeks later—less than a year after his “anti-Stalin” speech—that “in our opinion Stalinism, like Stalin himself, is inseparable from Communism.” (cited, *Ibid.*) This same man would visit the U.S. in 1959 on a “goodwill tour,” where he played the grandfather, taking upon his lap President Dwight D. Eisenhower’s grandchildren.

The Bang-Jensen Chapter

In every tragedy of this magnitude there are countless smaller, personal tragedies. One of the most unusual of these was the case of Povl (Paul) Bang-Jensen, who was not a Hungarian but, rather, a Dane. He fought in his nation’s underground against the Nazis and Communists during World War II, but it was in his role as a United Nations diplomat that he would face his toughest battle—a battle in which he would ultimately lose his life.

It was at the U.N. that Bang-Jensen was appointed deputy secretary of a committee formed to study the revolt in Hungary. The move to name such a group was significant because, instead of using the invasion as an opportunity to “expel Russia and put the high-sounding phrases of the U.N. to work,” the decision to make a mere search for facts “gave pro-Soviet forces an additional chance to pull sensitive strings in the U.N. and further obscure the vicious conquest of Hungary.” (Skousen)

From his vantage point in Budapest, Cardinal Mindzenty sadly observed that the U.N. “rested content with rhetoric.” And no one was more painfully aware of this than Bang-Jensen. When a commitment—*any* commitment—promptly to recognize Hungary’s sovereignty and expressed neutrality was literally a matter of life or death, the U.N. dragged its feet. “Delay, delay, delay, and the purpose is served!” exclaimed an exasperated Bang-Jensen. (cited, Copp/Peck. By every account, he was an idealist who sincerely believed the U.N. had a noble purpose.)

All the talk of “self-determination” and “anti-colonialism” so prevalent when the United Nations backs Red takeovers in “Third World” countries was nowhere evident, however, in this instance where such terms would be quite applicable. Even more than this silence, he found the committee’s official report had errors that would allow the Russians to discredit it and omitted facts that proved Soviet responsibility. When the committee chairman refused to correct it, Bang-

Jensen sent letters of protest to the committee and to Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld. Despite his concern, the committee adopted a “get-soft” policy toward Kadar’s regime.

Worst of all, however, Hammarskjöld demanded that Bang-Jensen give him a list containing the names of refugees who gave testimony on the way the Reds had conducted the invasion. This was totally out of the question, the Secretary-General was told, as the witnesses had been guaranteed full confidentiality. Bang-Jensen had promised them that, and he wasn’t a man to go back on his word. Only one of 81 witnesses waived anonymity. It scarcely need be said that these people feared for themselves and their families should the Communists get the list. At least two former high-ranking officials in the Hungarian Communist Party specified that they “would testify only on the condition the Secretary-General would never know their names.” (“Mr. K.” quoted, *Ibid.*) In light of Dag Hammarskjöld’s career, which a few years later included the sending of U.N. troops to help Communists fight pro-Christian, pro-American Freedom Fighters in the Congo, such reluctance is understandable. Bang-Jensen eventually burned the list.

Late in 1957, Under Secretary-General Ralph Bunche, a notorious leftist from the United States, launched an assault on Bang-Jensen. In the form of a memo, he used a standard anti-anti-Communist tactic, claiming that the Dane showed signs of “hysteria” brought on from too much work; that he had “an obsession about sabotage” (of the report), and that he was “mentally ill.” (cited, Copp/Peck) Those who knew Bang-Jensen well also knew well that there was not a shred of truth to any of this. No matter, his enemies had the upper hand—he was suspended and then fired.

This was in September. Two months later, Bang-Jensen wrote a memorandum to his wife Helen. It is an extraordinary document. Therein, he tells of how he was asked to visit a U.N. doctor. He was told by the doctor that word of his “great nervous strain” had gotten around and that psychiatric help was available. Bang-Jensen replied that it was easier for some to accuse him of insanity than question his honesty regarding his committee work. After conversing for a while, the doctor concluded that he was “doing better than most.” Bang-Jensen finished the memo in what seems an odd way, by reminding his wife that (1) “under no circumstances whatsoever would I ever commit suicide” as this (2) “would be completely contrary to my whole nature and to my religious convictions” and (3) “any note found to the opposite effect... would be a fake.” (cited, *Ibid.* From his experience in Danish resistance he was well acquainted with the expertise of Nazis and Reds in staging “suicides.”)

On Thanksgiving Day, 1959—almost two years to the day of his memo—Paul Bang-Jensen was found dead in a New York park. Everything pointed to suicide—gun in hand; bullet in head; suicide note in pocket. Well, the Bunche memo had warned that the diplomat’s mental state “could

lead to physical violence, either to himself or to others." But was it suicide or a "perfect murder"? Official police reports pointed to self-inflicted death but those who discovered the body found the arms crossed above the head, an unlikely position under the circumstances. (Copp/Peck. When the police arrived, the body was lying facedown with the arms *under* it.) Professional investigators disputed the finding and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, after studying the case for 18 months, said that there was "incomplete evidence" as far as suicide was concerned and also "too many serious reasons for suspecting Soviet motivation and the possibility of Soviet implication" to rule out murder. (cited, John Stormer, *None Dare Call It Treason*, Liberty Bell, 1964) And the motive? Bang-Jensen had been communicating with a Russian who wanted to defect to the West and who had information about Soviet infiltration at the U.N.

The U.S. and Hungary: Rollback or "Rollover"?

"Hold on. Your friends in the West are coming." This message, broadcast on radio during the early days of the Hungarian Revolt, must have been reassuring to the Freedom Fighters. They held on, anxiously awaiting the promised aid that never came. And then darkness fell over them.

Sending the message of hope from Radio Free Europe-Voice of America studios in Munich was its director, Frank Wisner. In seeking an airlift of arms and troops, he was trying to animate Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' call for a "rollback" of Red domination and the "liberation" of the captive nations. (Leonard Mosley, *Dulles: A Biography of Eleanor, Allen and John Foster Dulles and Their Family Network*, Dell, 1979)

As the days passed and it became clear that the United States was not prepared to back the rhetoric, Wisner frantically contacted CIA Director Allen Dulles to see if he could get action. Leonard Mosley writes:

Allen tried gently to explain that it just wasn't in the cards. With a presidential election on his hands, the Secretary (of State) wasn't about to advise the President to do anything. Except talk, of course. Speeches in the U.N. condemning Soviet barbarism and words of encouragement to the "brave slave nations of Eastern Europe" were good for the ethnic vote. But action was dangerous. It could rebound in the voting booths, and was to be strictly eschewed...it slowly sank into Wisner's head that nothing was going to happen, that Soviet tanks were going to be allowed to grind down the rebels in Budapest. (emphasis added)

So it was. President Eisenhower spoke of how "(t)he heart of America goes out to the people of Hungary" but, as Robert Welch stated in his excellent book, *The Politician* (Belmont, 1964): "If there was anything the Hungarians didn't need it was 'heart'—their needs were arms."

Thus it was business as usual at the State Department.

When, in 1953, there was an East German outbreak, and West Germany's President Konrad Adenauer asked if the U.S. would intercede based on the "rollback" policy, he received a firm "no." And a few days before the Hungarian Revolt, when American assistance could have helped the people of Poland, and "even while the Soviet Union was weighing alternatives," writes U.N. hand John G. Stoessinger in *The Might of Nations* (Random House, 5th ed., 1975), "Secretary Dulles announced on the radio on October 21 that, in the case of Soviet military intervention, the United States would take no action."

Nor does State Department perfidy end here. When it learned that an agreement had been reached whereby West Germany would permit Spanish planes airlifting arms to Hungary to refuel in Germany, it advised Ike to put the clamps on Adenauer and General Franco. The shipments were never made. (Welch) And it sent the following cable to Tito on November 2, 1956: "THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES DOES NOT LOOK WITH FAVOR UPON GOVERNMENTS UNFRIENDLY TO THE SOVIET UNION ON THE BORDERS OF THE SOVIET UNION." Knowledge of this communique was suppressed in the U.S. until 1960. At the time of its release, Representative Michael A. Feighan (D-Ohio) noted that it was "the go-ahead sign to the Russians (to attack)" and that it took less than 40 hours for Tito "to relay this message of treason to his superiors in the Kremlin." (cited, Welch) In a 1959 speech in Budapest, Khrushchev admitted his indecision about attacking and that, had America "made a show of force or even granted diplomatic recognition, the Kremlin would have abandoned Hungary." (Stormer) Representatives of the Kadar government attended Eisenhower's Second Inauguration in 1957, "almost before the dead bodies of Hungarian fighters for freedom," writes Robert Welch, "killed by these Kadar Communists, have been picked up from the streets of Budapest." (plenty of diplomatic recognition *there*.)

The Lessons of Hungary

"People of the world, listen to our call! Help us not with words, but with soldiers and arms. Please do not forget that this wild attack of Bolshevism will not stop. You may be the next victim. Save us! SOS. SOS." (cited, Skousen) This anguished cry for help was made by Freedom Fighters over the radio just hours before they were defeated. Later, they came back on the air with a last gasp: "...Our ship is sinking. The light vanishes. The shadows grow darker from hour to hour. Listen to our cry... God be with us—and with you." (cited, Skousen) Then, silence. The next voices heard from that frequency were Kadar propagandists.

After Hungary fell, Pope Pius XII, his shepherd's heart pierced by the events, made three radio appeals in which he castigated the West's apathy, asking, "May the world remain indifferent when the blood of so many innocents has been
continued on page 7

SAINT JOAN OF ARC

Jill Wiesner

Early in the fifteenth century the Church went through a period of tribulation known as the Great Schism. For forty years there were two claimants to the throne of Saint Peter, each elected by a separate college of cardinals. To further complicate the situation a council of cardinals at Pisa elected a third pope, the dishonest and immoral John XXIII. In 1417, the Roman pope, Gregory XII, convoked the Council of Constance, which accepted his resignation, forced the resignation of John XXIII and deposed the Avignon pope. The Council then elected Pope Martin V, ending the division within the Church. But the effects of the division reverberated throughout Europe.

Wars and dissension among the Catholic nations had increased in the absence of the steady influence of the Church. European princes, driven by hunger for power, made war upon one another, aided by plotting and scheming nobles. The English king, Edward III, decided to add France to his domain, beginning a long struggle known as the Hundred Years War. One French stronghold after another succumbed to the English forces. Crecy was overrun and then Poitiers and, when the French were defeated at Agincourt, a general feeling of doom spread throughout the nation.

In 1422, Charles VII succeeded to the French throne but remained uncrowned because Paris, the seat of the French government, and Rheims, the traditional city of coronation, were in enemy hands. As long as he remained uncrowned, Charles was only the dauphin (crown prince). Though he maintained his court south of the Loire River, as long as he remained the dauphin, the English could claim that France had no reigning king.

In addition to being under seige from England, France was divided against itself, as the Duke of Burgundy and his vassals supported the English, hoping to rid themselves of Charles so that Burgundy could rule France.

Indecisive and timid by nature, and surrounded by advisers of dubious loyalty, Charles watched his army suffer one defeat after another, uncertain about how to help them. To the French people, subjugation to the English seemed inevitable. They implored God for deliverance.

In the village of Domremy a little girl named Joan was being taught by her mother to pray every night: "O God, save France." Born on the Feast of the Epiphany, 1412, to James d'Arc and his wife Isabel, Joan was a quiet and gentle child and, like the other children of her station, she grew up tending sheep with her brothers, milking the cows and helping her mother with the household duties.

The summer after her thirteenth birthday, while playing

in the meadow with friends, Joan heard a child call her, saying, "Your mother needs you." She hurried home but found that her mother had not sent for her. As she went back outside she heard the voice again. She turned and was startled by a dazzling light, terrifying in its intensity, and in the center of it she saw an impressive figure—the Archangel Michael. Instructing her first to "go often to church" and to "be a good and virtuous child always," he spoke of "the great pity that was over France" and told her that she was the one who was to deliver France from the English.

During the next three years the angel returned to her frequently, accompanied by Saint Catherine of Alexandria (the virgin martyr who at the age of 18 had converted an assembly of pagan philosophers sent by the Emperor Maximian to persuade her to idolatry, and who was beheaded by Maximian in the year 310) and Saint Margaret of Antioch (the virgin who suffered martyrdom for the Faith in the persecution between 255 and 275).

Out of caution Joan resisted speaking to them but her heart was drawn to them so strongly that, whenever they left her, she would weep. Finally, when she was 16 she yielded to them and, at their direction, obtained permission to speak to the dauphin at Chinon.

Charles tested her by putting one of his nobles in the royal chair while he mingled with the crowd of several hundred who were present at court. Without hesitation Joan approached Charles, ignoring the decoy. She then drew him aside from the others and told him that his worries over the rumors that he was illegitimate and not the true heir of the king of France were unfounded. Since he had spoken to no one of his fears, he believed that Joan was, as she said, under the command of the "King of Heaven and Earth." However, her request for troops to relieve the besieged city of Orleans was met with opposition by Charles' advisers, who preferred their methods of diplomacy and intrigue. But Joan persisted and, seeing the situation at Orleans grow daily more desperate, Charles agreed.

By the end of April in the year 1429, the army set out for Orleans under the command of the Maid, as seventeen-year-old Joan was called by her men. Carrying her white standard emblazoned with the motto, "Jesus, Mary," she was accompanied by her brothers John and Peter and by her confessor, Father Pasqueral. According to Christian custom she sent a letter to the English Duke of Bedford at Orleans, warning that, if he did not yield to her and leave France, "in whatever place we find you we will strike great swings and make such a rough-and-tumble as has not been raised in France this thousand years." Bedford's reply was to hold the messenger prisoner.

On the Thursday before the Ascension the Maid and her troops arrived at the walled city of Orleans and found it in desperate straits, as the English forces which surrounded it had cut off the supply route, bringing those within to the brink of starvation. Joan planned a direct attack but her captains delayed, explaining that their experience and wisdom outweighed hers. Telling them, "(t)hey who guide me are wiser far," she prevailed and, in one day's fighting, raised the long siege of Orleans. From Orleans she turned her troops northward and swiftly defeated one English garrison after another. The way to the coronation city of Rheims was cleared and Rheims was restored to French hands. But, as before, Joan had to convince Charles, over the protests of his advisers, to make the journey from Chinon to Rheims. He finally agreed and, on Sunday, July 18, 1429, he was crowned and anointed in the cathedral at Rheims. Beside him stood the white standard of the Maid, reminding all that he was "by God's grace... true King of France."

After the coronation Joan planned to march on Paris but Charles' counselors intervened, convinced that they could do better by negotiating with the traitorous Burgundy. As the delay caused a sense of foreboding among her troops and in the recently rescued towns, Joan sent them a message, telling them, "Good friends and loyal men of France and true, the Maid sends you news of herself that never in life will she abandon you."

Finally permitted to march against the enemy at Paris, Joan found little support from Charles, as he and his court had returned to Chinon, abandoning the newly-won territory. They ignored Joan's entreaties to send reinforcements to the strategically important city of Compiègne, as they were busy negotiating with Burgundy who was at the same time preparing for an attack on Compiègne.

At Paris Joan was wounded and, without adequate reinforcements, she broke off the siege. Unable to get help from Charles, she gathered a small company and went to the aid of Compiègne in May of 1430. Her heavenly voices had informed her in April that "(b)efore Midsummer Day you will be taken captive, for so it is decreed. But do not fear nor travail, but take all well, for God will be your aid."

On May 23, Joan and her men were surrounded by a huge Burgundian force. The Maid, whom all the English and Burgundians feared, was finally in their hands. Her captor, a vassal of the Duke of Burgundy, did not wait for Charles to ransom her but sold her to the English for \$100,000. Exultant, the Duke of Bedford arranged for the malignant Cauchon, Bishop of Beauvais, to try her for heresy and witchcraft. Under Christian law, conviction carried the penalty of death. Bedford stated that, if she should be found innocent, "it was his intention to regain possession of the said Joan."

The trial that Bishop Cauchon arranged was a masterpiece

of villany. He packed the court with judges from the pro-English University of Paris and devised a method of forcing her to renounce her heavenly advisers. In violation of Church law he put her in chains in a filthy lay prison at Rouen where she had to fight her guards to protect her purity. She was not allowed counsel; her appeal to Pope Eugenius IV never reached him.

Throughout her trial and imprisonment Joan stood firm against her accusers. Cauchon attempted ridicule, asking her if Saint Margaret spoke English. To which Joan replied, "Why should she, when she is not of the English faction?" Trying to elicit an heretical answer, one of the judges asked her if she was sure she was in a state of grace. Joan answered, "If I am in a state of grace, may God keep me in it. If I am not in a state of grace, may God speedily place me therein." Threats of burning only caused her to say, "If I saw the flames before me, I should still answer the same." They finally tried putting an allegedly sympathetic fellow-prisoner in her cell but she recognized him as a fraud and avoided him.

The sleepless nights, during which she had to be constantly on guard, and the courtroom ordeal by day, in which she had to parry insidious questions, began to take their toll. Her voices no longer counseled her, becoming silent, as they had before Compiègne. So, when a kindly Dominican admonished her for jeopardizing her soul by trusting apparitions that were "enemies who seek each day to distract men by taking the figures of angels and saints, saying they are from heaven," instead of "accepting the opinions of those learned in law and Holy Scriptures," she was besieged with doubts.

Found guilty of "contempt of her parents, presumption, lying, superstition, despair and attempted suicide, blood-thirsty passion, diabolism, heresy and schism," she signed a public abjuration, wanting to be obedient to the Church but confused, alone and extremely tired.

Again they betrayed her. Substituting a long list of admissions for the six-line abjuration she had signed, they proclaimed that she had admitted guilt on all counts. They had promised her that, once she recanted, she would be transferred to a Church prison with women attendants and would be allowed, after almost a year, to hear Mass. But this too was a lie for they returned her to the same dungeon, with the same drunken guards. The only change was the long gray dress they gave her to wear, telling her that to resume boy's attire would be proof of relapse in heresy. When she arose in the morning, however, the dress was gone from her cell and her tattered boy's clothing in its place. She had no choice but to put it on, sealing her fate.

On the morning of May 30, 1431, the two Dominicans who had been with her at the trial told her that she was sentenced to the stake. Joan burst into tears but, recovering herself, she placed her fate in the hands of God. Her voices

returned to comfort her and she realized that Saint Michael's promise that she would be free by the end of May had not been broken after all. She would be freed—by martyrdom. When the gloating Cauchon entered her cell, she regarded him with a steady gaze and said, "Bishop, it is by you that I die!"

Clothed in a white robe, she was led out into the market square of Rouen. Her confessor, Father Martin, brought her a crucifix and held it before her at her request, as they chained her to the stake. When the faggots were lighted her face filled with concern for him. "Go down, Reverend Father, go down at once!" she told him. "You will be hurt! Go, and hold the blessed cross before my eyes until the thing is done!"

As the flames rose the onlookers heard her proclaim in a clear voice that her mission was of God. Her last word, spoken so loudly that all heard it above the crackling of the fire, was the Holy Name of Jesus.

Nineteen years later, after the English had been driven from France, Charles VII ordered a trial of rehabilitation for Joan. At Rouen, on July 7, 1456, with the approval of Pope Calixtus III, the charges against her were declared invalid on every count. On May 13, 1920, Joan of Arc was raised by Pope Benedict XV to the highest honor the Church can bestow—sainthood.

Saint Joan of Arc, who gave up her life at age nineteen, set an outstanding example of courage and perseverance. A young girl, she led an army to victory; a peasant, she confounded the machinations of her highly educated antagonists; betrayed and mistreated almost beyond human endurance, she remained ever loyal to the Faith. Guided by her love for God, Saint Joan triumphed over all the forces of evil arrayed against her. How desperately needed in these days of unprecedented crisis for the Church—another Saint Joan of Arc. †

Pray the Rosary Daily

"The Hungarian Revolt" continued from page 4

shed? When once more so much sorrow and so much killing has been inflicted?" (cited, *Memoirs*) Perhaps then His Holiness saw the hard facts: the world leaders were *worldly* in the absolutely worst sense of the word by seeking to place themselves over *God's* order.

Even before the tragedy of Hungary, while Poland was still aflame, Robert Welch (in the November 1956 issue of *One Man's Opinion*) foresaw the possibility that these revolts were set up by the Communists to draw out anti-Communists for liquidation. (He also noted that many spies left Hungary as "refugees.") Cardinal Mindszenty felt much the same, writing: "It is not impossible that Moscow itself promoted the uprising in order to have a pretext for intervening with overt force and quenching all opposition with blood. No one in Hungary was sufficiently alert to see this trap."

Let us never forget the memory of the brave people of Hungary who fought and died for freedom. Their blood still cries out to God and to us after three decades. Rather let us fight side by side with them, their warning ringing in our ears: "*You may be the next victim. God be with you—and with us.*" †

A REMINDER

Please remember Christmas gift subscriptions to *The Athanasian*. Details were given in the previous issue (October 15, 1986).

SUBSCRIPTION RENEWALS

The date on the envelope address label indicates the month and year in which the recipient's subscription is due for renewal. At the proper time, a subscription envelope will be enclosed with the newsletter. One may enter a new subscription at any time, of course, and will then receive the eight following newsletter issues. †

HELP SPREAD THE TRUTH!

The previous issue of *The Athanasian* contained a four-page article on Martin Luther King, Jr. The sordid record of this man is in marked contrast to the glowing picture of him given to the American public by the news media. We appeal to our newsletter subscribers to help us to get the true story of Martin Luther King, Jr., as widely circulated as possible through the distribution of the King article. That there is a national holiday in his honor is a national disgrace!

THE ONE-WORLD CHURCH

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

“The coming of a world state is longed for, and confidently expected, by all the worst and most distorted elements. This state, based on the principles of absolute equality of men and a community of possessions, would banish all national loyalties. In it no acknowledgement would be made of the authority of a father over his children, or of God over human society. If these ideas are put into practice, there will inevitably follow a reign of unheard-of terror.”

The above words are those of Pope Benedict XV on July 25, 1920 (66 years ago). They refer, of course, to a One-World Government which was even then, and long before, in the making and of which the United Nations is the predecessor. And so also has a One-World Church been long since in the making. In recent years the development of that “Church” has become increasingly manifest, in large part as a consequence of the powerful impetus given to it by the Conciliar “Catholic” Church. The “ecumenical spirit” and the heresy of religious indifferentism and the false doctrine of religious liberty preached and practiced by the Conciliar Church have made an incalculable contribution towards the formation of the One-World Church.

The foremost contributor, to be sure, is the charismatic and ubiquitous John Paul II. By his words and actions around the world over the past eight years he may well have done more to advance the cause of a One-World Church than any other individual. The latest and perhaps the most substantial and far-reaching step in that direction to date was the meeting, convened by John Paul II, of the heads of the world’s religions in Assisi, Italy, on October 27, 1986.

The One-World Church will be aligned with the One-World Government (with both being a part of the New World Order) and totally subservient to that government. It will bear no resemblance to any Church in the historical sense of the term. It will be a godless, amoral, man-centered monstrosity whose “religion” will be that of secular

humanism. All worship of the true God will be outlawed and every effort will be made to eradicate belief in Him from the mind of man. The observance of the moral law of God will likewise be abolished. The state or government will be “God” and right and wrong will be what the state says it is. If anyone will not conform and belong to this “religion” he will pay the horrible price in one way or another, Communist style.

Such is the idea of what is in store for humanity if the promoters of the One-World Church accomplish their satanic objective. Towards the realization of this “Church” the “top brass” of Freemasonry and Communism has been working for many years—and, in recent years, the New Age Movement. Merely by substituting “world church” for “world state,” the words of Pope Benedict XV at the beginning of this article could apply verbatim to the One-World Church.

If a One-World Church materializes in the not-too-distant future, as it may, surely this will be a crowning victory for the satanic forces of evil on the world scene. What more powerful incentive, then, do we traditional Roman Catholics need to go all out in defense of our beloved Church and God-given Faith and to oppose and to expose to the best of our ability such evil individuals and organizations as those involved in the formation of this One-World Church?

To destroy the Roman Catholic Church, make no mistake about it, has long been their pernicious objective and consuming desire. But we traditional Roman Catholics are all that remain of that Church today. Nor is there the slightest doubt but that we will be the prime targets for persecution and extermination by the “one worlders” if and when their nightmarish objectives become a reality. Regardless, whatever the future may hold in store for us, may we, by the grace of God, stand loyal and true to our glorious Faith until death! “I know not what the future holds but I know Who holds the future.” †

THE ATHANASIAN

Published by Traditional Catholics of America

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

Subscriptions: \$ 8.00 per year (via First Class Mail) for the USA, Canada and Mexico; \$12.00 per year (via Air Mail) for all other countries

Additional copies: single copy - \$1.00; 10 copies - \$8.00; 40 or more to same address - \$.70 each

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

Telephone: (303) 636-1575

Manuscripts sent to us for possible publication in *The Athanasian* should be typewritten, double-spaced and no more than seven pages in length. If not accepted, they will be returned to the sender. No articles from this newsletter may be reproduced either in whole or in part without the written permission of the TCA.