

ROMAN CATHOLIC CRUSADING IN TEN YEARS  
OF *TRIUMPH*, 1966-1976: A HISTORY OF A LAY-  
DIRECTED, RADICAL CATHOLIC JOURNAL

By

MARK DAVID POPOWSKI

Bachelor of Science in History  
Minnesota State University, Mankato  
Mankato, Minnesota  
2001

Master of Arts in History  
Emporia State University  
Emporia, Kansas  
2003

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
December, 2008

ROMAN CATHOLIC CRUSADING IN TEN YEARS  
OF *TRIUMPH*, 1966-1976: A HISTORY OF A LAY-  
DIRECTED, RADICAL CATHOLIC JOURNAL

Dissertation Approved:

Dr. Ronald A. Petrin

---

Dissertation Adviser

---

Dr. Laura A. Belmonte

---

Dr. Joseph F. Byrnes

---

Dr. Patricia Hipsher

---

Dr. Michael M. Smith

---

Dr. A. Gordon Emslie

---

Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members—Dr. Ronald A. Petrin, Dr. Laura A. Belmonte, Dr. Joseph F. Byrnes, Dr. Patricia Hipsher, and Dr. Michael M. Smith—for reading, editing, and commenting on my dissertation and for providing insightful suggestions on how to improve my study. I especially would like to thank Dr. Petrin, my adviser and mentor, whose extensive knowledge on Catholic social thought has improved my own understanding of it; and Dr. Byrnes and Dr. Smith, along with Dr. Petrin, for providing models of professionalism and excellence in the professoriate. I also would like to thank my wife, Amber, and father, David—another academic model—for reading and editing first drafts.

I also would like to thank Dr. Patrick N. Allitt, Goodrich C. White Professor of History at Emory University, who was kind enough to give me transcripts of interviews he conducted with L. Brent Bozell, Patricia Bozell, Michael Lawrence, Gary K. Potter, and Charles Rice. I would like to acknowledge the help of Mrs. Doris Miller, whose kind donation to the Oklahoma State University Foundation supports the graduate fellowship that allowed me to finish my research and writing. I also would like to acknowledge the OSU history department for its financial support, in the forms of departmental scholarships and a position as a graduate teaching associate—both of which allowed me to complete my graduate studies.

I also would like to thank my family for their support, including my parents, Dave and Sharon, my in-laws, Tim and Cathy, and especially my wife, Amber. Her constant support, in innumerable ways, has made not only the completion of my dissertation, but many long years of graduate study, possible. To her I owe my degree and dedicate this dissertation.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE LAST ROAR OF THE CHURCH MILITANT IN AMERICA? .....	1
Triumph .....	3
Roman Catholic Radicals .....	7
Historiography .....	12
II. ORIGINS OF <i>TRIUMPH</i> , PART I.....	23
L. Brent Bozell and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen .....	26
Post-World War II Anticommunist and Anti-liberal Revolt .....	30
Disaffection with American Conservatism .....	58
III. ORIGINS OF <i>TRIUMPH</i> , PART II.....	84
Liberal Catholics and the Second Vatican Council.....	84
Spain and Carlism.....	99
Founding .....	112
IV. CHURCH AFFAIRS .....	134
The Catholic Church in America.....	141
Protestants and Jews .....	146
Pauline Mass.....	154
Priests and Nuns.....	174
V. THE SOVEREIGNTY OF CHRIST OR CHAOS.....	202
Secular Liberalism (and Conservatism) .....	203
Confessional Tribe .....	213
Confessional State .....	221
Politics.....	231
Economics.....	237
Racial Strife.....	243
Education .....	247

Chapter	Page
VI. TO MAKE CHRISTENDOM .....	287
Cold War .....	288
Vietnam War .....	294
Nuclear Weapons.....	311
The Solution .....	320
Mirrors of Christendom.....	323
Global South .....	332
VII. REDEEMED TO HIS LIKENESS .....	364
Contraception.....	366
Abortion.....	388
Feminism.....	411
VIII. CONCLUSION .....	443
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	449

## CHAPTER I

### THE LAST ROAR OF THE CHURCH MILITANT IN AMERICA?

We will make America Catholic as the *conquistadores* made half the world Catholic.

—Frederick D. Wilhelmsen<sup>1</sup>

On the morning of June 6, 1970, approximately three hundred people gathered for a pro-life demonstration across the street from George Washington University Clinic in Washington, D.C. Many of them carried either processional crucifixes or self-made wooden crosses, while others held banners and placards—one read: “If killing babies is legal, what isn’t?”<sup>2</sup> The most striking visual was a contingent of young men dressed in khaki pants and shirts. They wore red berets, rosaries around their necks, and patches of the Sacred Heart of Jesus on their breast pockets. Many of them clutched the yellow and white papal flag, adorned with crossed keys and the ornate papal crown.

The crowd had congregated around an equestrian statue of George Washington. At its base stood a middle-aged man with thick, curly dark hair; his face personified fury. He spoke to the crowd:

There is a judgment passed on the nations by the Lord of time. . . . And when America faces its God on that awesome day and when He asks America ‘What did you do for these the least of My little ones?’ America will answer ‘Lord, we killed them while they were indeed the least of Thy little ones so that they could not be a nuisance to us.’ And then the Lord

God, our Incarnate King, Christ, will answer: 'Go you, America, into outer darkness where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth. I and all my angels vomit you out because you have done this to Me and to My Mother, your Queen.' America, *you* have become a nuisance to God.<sup>3</sup>

At the conclusion of his speech he held out a silver cross and exclaimed:

And therefore we take upon ourselves this morning, and we swear not to lay it down in our lifetime, the Holy Cross of crusade against the enemies of life and its Creator . . . Dear God—give us the grace to embrace this Cross. *Christus vivit. Christus regnat. Christus imperat.* Long live Christ the King! *Viva Cristo Rey!*<sup>4</sup>

The uniformed men answered, "*Viva Cristo Rey,*" which the crowd then repeated.<sup>5</sup>

Next, a tall, lanky redhead stood at the base of the Washington statue and addressed the crowd as he pointed to the clinic across the street:

Christians will go to that building this morning in the name of their King . . . A delegation of them will go inside the walls to receive from the executioners a promise that the King's reign will be honored in that place. They will seek enforcement of His command, Thou shalt not murder; they will seek to baptize and to bury in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost. . . . They will not leave willingly until the King's rule has returned.<sup>6</sup>

He pulled on a red beret, grabbed a large wooden cross, and led the crowd across the street toward the clinic. Five of the demonstrators, including the lanky redhead, entered the clinic and scuffled with police officers. Outside, the uniformed men prayed the rosary on their knees. The five men who had infiltrated the clinic were arrested; they shouted "*Viva Cristo Rey*" as they were led outside to a police wagon—the crowd roared "*Viva Cristo Rey*" in response.<sup>7</sup>

This pro-life demonstration was an extraordinary event for a number of reasons. First, it was exotic; the contingent of uniformed demonstrators were *Los Hijos de Tormenta* (the Sons of Thunder), a group modeled after the

Carlists—a Catholic traditionalist movement indigenous to Spain. Bystanders were likely bewildered by the Hispanic flair.<sup>8</sup> Second, the demonstration was an unabashed display of militant Roman Catholicism. These men and women were unapologetically Catholic; indeed, they had emerged boldly from the so-called Catholic ghetto. Third, and most important, if the demonstration was a sign of Catholic bravado, it was different from that discussed in most histories of American Catholicism. These Catholics were not interested in assimilation. They were not interested in pluralism. They were rejecting both.

While the demonstration represented a shedding of a ghetto mentality, it also signified a desire to fashion a new one in which Catholics righteously set themselves apart from American society, but who were outward-looking, expansionist, and imperialist—eager to conquer American society for the Roman Catholic Church.<sup>9</sup> They were interested in making the public order conform to the moral law, or as the tall, lanky redhead phrased it, they were intent on making sure that the “King’s reign will be honored” in America—the purpose of *Triumph’s* editors.

## Triumph

In 1966, L. Brent Bozell, the lanky redhead, founded *Triumph*—a lay-directed, Roman Catholic journal. Bozell, a convert and a Yale-trained lawyer, and preeminent Thomistic philosopher Frederick D. Wilhelmsen—the man whose face personified fury—were *Triumph’s* principal editors and guiding intellects. In

addition to Wilhelmsen, the other scholar on the original editorial board was Thomas Molnar, a Hungarian émigré, professor of French literature, political philosopher, and prolific writer. Two other Catholic converts on the editorial staff were John Wisner, a decorated World War II veteran, and Gary K. Potter. The longest-serving editor, excepting Bozell and Wilhelmsen, was Michael Lawrence, a graduate of the Catholic University of America Law School.<sup>10</sup>

*Triumph* was born out of the post-World War II conservative intellectual revival. Its future founding editors aligned themselves in the 1950s with other diverse conservative forces that disdained secular liberalism's rise to consensus ideology and sought not the containment but rather the destruction of Soviet-led global communism. Yet, *Triumph's* founding editors came to reject American conservatism—specifically the movement's flagship, *National Review*—for its libertarian character. Neither could they find expression in the liberal-dominated Catholic presses; by the mid-1960s, the editors of both *America* and *Commonweal* refused to enter into any dialogue with their traditionalist brethren. The Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) also was a factor in the creation of *Triumph*. The editors believed that liberal Catholics would use the Council's call to update the Church to implement secularizing reforms. Thus, *Triumph* was formed to combat any further secularization of the Catholic faith, but it also was a product of the Council's call to Christianize society. The creation of *Triumph* also had roots in Francisco Franco's Catholic Spain, especially in Bozell's and Wilhelmsen's encounters with Carlism.

*Triumph's* editors believed that the United States was morally decadent and that the source of its corruption was secular liberalism, which, they believed, was the prevailing American creed. They defined secular liberalism as the viewpoint that humankind, through positivistic reasoning alone, was completely self-sufficient and capable of perfecting itself and society. Humankind, in other words, did not need God to assist its development. Explicit in such a view was the process of divinizing humankind—the sole agent of its own transformation. The secular-liberal view, then, promoted an anthropocentric rather than a theocentric society.

The editors equated this secularization with barbarization. To disconnect humankind from God was to disconnect it from the Source and Sustainer of all order. Man's and woman's purpose was to know, love, and serve God—to glorify Him in all things—to gain eternal beatitude with Him in heaven. Without this purpose, they set their gaze not upon God but upon themselves and became self-seeking, the source of disorder.

Fully secularized humankind was the apex of the modern dialectic. Both secular liberalism and communism were thesis and antithesis evolving toward synthesis—the enthronement of humankind. The editors believed that this trajectory was destined to fail as it would lead to humankind's barbarization and the eventual sacking of civilization. Indeed, they believed that secular-liberal America was on the verge of collapse. On its rubble, they hoped to construct a sacral society—an order in which all things were rendered unto Jesus Christ; all things, that is, were conformed to His truth, as expressed through His Church,

the Roman Catholic faith. They sought, then, the enthronement of Christ—to reinstitute His Kingship over all things.

They believed that the Protestant and American experiment of an individualist and privatized faith had failed—to individualize one's faith was to privatize one's faith and thus privatize Christ. Such an experiment amounted to the compartmentalization of Christ and had precipitated the secularization of society. This was not, the editors thundered, what Christ intended when He commanded His apostles to go and teach all nations. The Catholic faith was catholic, or exoteric; in consonance, that is, with the Divine Will to impart to all the means of salvation—to bring Christ to all men. The more ways man and woman could be directed to the Roman Catholic faith, the more they knew Christ, the closer they could come to eternal beatitude with Him. Was this not Christ's intention? Did He not, the editors posited, become the incarnate God to redeem man and provide him with the truth for his salvation?

For the editors, this Christian purpose entailed the very contra-American notion that politics were to conform to the universal moral law as communicated by the Roman Catholic Church. The political order that confessed the faith promoted the salvation of its members. Not to speak of the faith, not to spread it, was to limit its reach, which was deadly. The faith must be heard. The editors noted that the confessional state was an act of love—as its purpose was to direct man and woman toward Christ—it was charity incarnated in the political order. Just as it was illogical for man to keep his faith private—as if he were divided upon himself and could act as two people, as a man of Christ and a man of the

secular order—so it was illogical for a political order to erect a dichotomy between the faith of its members and its public expression. If man could not act as Christ in all things then he could not act as Christ. In twentieth-century America, this was a radical concept.

### Roman Catholic Radicals

The thesis of this dissertation is that *Triumph's* editors were radical.<sup>11</sup> They rejected the American political order, which was, they contended, an inherently secular-liberal order because it placed authority in the hands of the people, rather than in Christ. They sought to convert the United States to the Roman Catholic faith and construct a confessional state in which ultimate authority was rendered unto Christ's Vicar, the Holy Roman Pontiff.

*Triumph's* editors promoted a traditional or orthodox understanding of the Church in matters of faith and morals and advanced its traditional or ideal teaching on the political and social orders. Contrary to contemporary thinking, however, this did not make them conservatives or even traditionalists. Their strict adherence to Catholic orthodoxy and tradition put them in a radical counter-cultural stance. In an age of unorthodoxy—in a pluralist system designed to cultivate diversity of opinion—their orthodoxy, their traditionalism, their dogmatism, made them radicals. The editors helped readers conceptualize this apparent paradox in an article on the Sons of Thunder, who were dedicated to the editors' objectives. In 1969, a contingent from Georgetown University went to

a hotel hoping to meet with some of the bishops before their semi-annual fall meeting in Washington, D.C. They went, the editors wrote, “to kiss their Excellencies’ rings and bend their Excellencies’ ears” in hopes of procuring a more militant pro-life stance, irrespective of any pluralist concerns.<sup>12</sup> The *Washington Post*, the editors noted, referred to them as “a militant conservative youth group,” but they believed that to the “punctilious bishops they must have appeared as ‘conservative’ as Godzilla did to the Japanese when he emerged from Tokyo Bay.”<sup>13</sup> “Here,” they wrote, “was a group of red-bereted, rosary-adorned militant *young* people, asking the bishops to be *more* bishop-like, not less.”<sup>14</sup>

Lawrence, an Irish-Catholic who grew up in Queens, New York, and was educated at the Jesuit-run Fairfield University and the Catholic University of America, exemplified the same paradox when reflecting upon raising his children.<sup>15</sup> He remarked that he could not expect their faith “to be buttressed and refined and strengthened by the public life of America;” rather, he wrote, “I must expect my children to see their faith implicitly dismissed as irrelevant whenever they venture out into the world—at best; at worst I must fear that their faith will be mocked, even attacked.”<sup>16</sup> “Acquiring a wife and children is supposed to make a man settle down, become conservative,” he stated—“But for me, to have a family in America . . . is to have imposed on oneself the obligation of radical politics.”<sup>17</sup>

Wilhelmsen expressed the same paradox when contemplating the legalization of abortion. The Catholic tradition absolutely forbade abortion. Catholics were bound to prevent such an evil, he believed, regardless of the

obstacles of a secular-pluralist political system and the enshrinement of religious freedom, either in the Bill of Rights or in Catholic teaching, as of the Second Vatican Council. Against the secular trajectory of modernity, which had led to such gross disregard for the moral law, Catholics must turn to their eternal and exoteric faith and convert the world to Christ. “Orthodoxy, in truth,” Wilhelmssen wrote, “is the only possible rebellion of tomorrow. And the rebellion will begin when an aroused Catholic laity beholds in the very helplessness of the Cross the shape of a sword.”<sup>18</sup>

*Triumph's* editors, then, were not only radical in thought but also in action. They militantly sought the conversion of American society to the Roman Catholic faith. A sub-thesis of this dissertation is that *Triumph* was not only a journal but it was also a movement. The editors set themselves apart from American society and encouraged fellow Catholics to do the same. They intended to construct a Catholic confessional tribe that was *in* but not *of* the United States in order to protect and build up the faith to begin the construction of a confessional order. They did not seek separation as a retreat to isolation; rather, they sought to invade the secular-liberal order and convert its members. The Catholic faith, after all, was exoteric. It was their central mission as Catholics to be missionaries—to bring all things to Christ. “Our goal,” the editors exclaimed in a pilot issue, “is the resurrection of Christian civilization, the Triumph of God’s Church, the Future: Christ Himself.”<sup>19</sup>

Part of their apostolate to convert the United States to the Cross involved an effort to educate, organize, and mobilize like-minded Catholics in order to

accomplish this formidable objective. In addition to founding *Triumph*, the editors established the Society for the Christian Commonwealth (SCC)—*Triumph's* parent organization—which was dedicated to cultivating a Christian order. The SCC published newsletters on ecclesiastical affairs and the pro-life movement and established a guild program and an institute to form militant apostles dedicated to instituting the Kingship of Christ in America.

The editors' radicalism made *Triumph* an important journal—another sub-thesis of this dissertation. Admittedly, their radicalism made *Triumph* a sectarian journal—its highest circulation in 1969 reached only 28,000; but their view that Catholics must be loyal ultimately to Christ's Church, His vicar, before the secular order was and is a pertinent issue to Catholics in the United States.<sup>20</sup> If Catholics were called to be loyal to their countries, they were (and are) called first to be missionaries of another Kingdom and were (and are) directed to Christianize their surroundings—a particularly vexing issue for American Catholics, who live in a pluralist and increasingly secular order. *Triumph's* editors, in contrast to the prevailing American Catholic opinion, believed that the Church called innately on the faithful to conform the secular law to the moral law. Their idealism, if outside the mainstream, magnified this complex issue. For them, the Catholic's obligation in the moral-law breaking, secular state was one of converting the secular state to the Catholic faith. This was, they believed, the only faithful response. Was Roman Catholicism in the United States, the editors asked, to be an exoteric or esoteric faith? If it was to be the latter, they reasoned, it would collapse. There could be no room for pluralistic niceties when

the secular law violated the moral law. Either Catholics possessed universal truths to be imparted to all (as Christ was the head of their Church) or they did not (and they were not Christ's Church). Could the Catholic faith in the United States survive, they exhorted, if it repudiated Christ's mandate to be the light and judge of all nations? Did Catholics want to ignore their indelible mark of royalty—their anointment into the royal priesthood of Christ? Did they hope to blend inconsequentially into Protestant America as any other interest group, save for a peculiar form of private worship? Did Catholics love their non-Catholic countrymen as Christ? If so, they reasoned, why not impart to them the full means of salvation, for beatitude with Christ, which, they reasoned, was the fullest expression of love. In their radicalism—in their view that all authority must be rendered to Christ's Church—*Triumph's* editors posited these questions to American Catholics then (and now) who lived (and live) under an increasingly secularized political order that routinely violates the moral law as communicated through the Roman Catholic Church; an order in which life in the womb, for example, has been codified as dispensable.

The radicalism of *Triumph's* editors made them appear absurd to many contemporary Americans. This author will not try to argue otherwise; but it is in their absurdity that their importance becomes manifest.<sup>21</sup> They represent the counter-cultural possibility that all Catholics, then and now—given that their Church is *in* but not *of* this world—face in an increasingly secularized world. Indeed, if there is to be a Catholic revival in this country, and if it were to be rooted in some counter-cultural stance—rooted, that is, in the Church's awkward

relationship to secular modernity—then such a revival, in part, could rightly be traced to *Triumph*, which, after all, provided a thundering example of a Catholic counter-cultural stance.<sup>22</sup>

### Historiography

This study of *Triumph* intersects historical issues in both American Catholic history and the history of American conservatism. Both George H. Nash, in *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America*, and Patrick Allitt, in *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics*, demonstrate that Catholics had a significant influence on the post-World War II American conservative intellectual revival.<sup>23</sup> Allitt takes the argument a step further and posits that Catholicism, rather than “evangelical Protestantism or libertarian economic theories,” was not only significant but rather the primary component of postwar American conservative thought.<sup>24</sup> This study, by implication, contributes to the view that Catholics had a significant influence on postwar anti-liberal thought by examining a group of Catholics who enriched the anti-liberal revolt.

Yet, while Allitt’s thesis implies that there were strong parallels between American conservatism and Catholicism, this analysis of *Triumph* explicates a variety of Catholic thought that was hostile to American conservatism. Although *Triumph*’s editors were aligned with the conservative movement in their shared disdain for communism and secular liberalism, they were not of the American right.

This study examines also the ideological origins of *Triumph* and, by extension, the ideological origins of the conservative intellectual revival. *Triumph's* ideological origins had many parallels with the conservative intellectual renaissance. In addition, this study helps define American conservatism. On the one hand, it contributes to Nash's thesis that the conservative intellectual revival was an eclectic body of thought and not traceable or reducible to any specific ideological sketch.<sup>25</sup> This study exhibits yet another unique way of thinking that comprised the diverse body of anti-liberal and anti-communist thought in post-World War II America. On the other hand, such a study contributes to the difficulty in defining American conservatism because *Triumph's* editors can be identified as conservative only by continuing to broaden the definition to a point of meaninglessness. This study will help set parameters for a general definition of conservatism by detailing what American conservatism *was not*. The movement's rejection of *Triumph* demonstrates that it was not dogmatic. It was pragmatic and rooted more in compromise with its diverse elements—anticommunists, Catholics, evangelicals, libertarians, traditionalists, and neoconservatives—than it was committed to any dogmatic assertion of political ideology or religious orthodoxy.

In addition, this study of *Triumph* contributes to an understanding of the European influences on the anticommunist and anti-liberal intellectual revival. There is not yet a study that focuses on the transnational character of post-World War II American conservatism, but both Nash and Allitt document its importance. *Triumph* is yet another example of the transnational character of post-war

American anti-liberal and anti-communist thought. Both Bozell and Wilhelmsen were influenced by Spain, and Molnar, a *Triumph* editor, was an Hungarian émigré and a Francophile. Potter, another editor and contributor, also was a Francophile. In addition, *Triumph* had a number of European contributors.

Excepting Nash and Allitt, who both provide brief examinations of *Triumph*, little has been published on the journal. There is no published monograph on the journal.<sup>26</sup> In addition, little has been written about the journal's principal editors, Bozell and Wilhelmsen, influential figures in the postwar anti-liberal revolt.<sup>27</sup>

The dearth of publications on *Triumph* and its principal editors is a problem also in American Catholic history. *Triumph* was an important Catholic publication, and Bozell and Wilhelmsen were significant Catholic intellectuals. In general, there is a shortage of studies on what may problematically be labeled the Catholic Right.<sup>28</sup>

Furthermore, many historians of American Catholicism provide a progressive interpretation. These scholars argue that the Catholic Church in the United States has benefited from its relationship with American society—that it has gained from its Americanization. The United States' democratic, pluralist, and secular-liberal culture, they reason, has democratized, secularized, liberalized, and thus, modernized the Catholic Church in the United States. A pluralist Church, they reason, is more inclusive and democratic and, thus, more catholic. While it is true that this progressive argument is much more implicit than explicit, it is found readily enough in many general histories of American

Catholicism.<sup>29</sup> This study of *Triumph* demonstrates that the Americanization of the Catholic Church was not wholly beneficial and that to be a faithful American contradicted in important ways one's commitment to the Roman Catholic faith. This study of *Triumph* exhibits a group of Catholics who resented and resisted the Americanization of their faith. They did not believe that one could be both a faithful Catholic and a faithful American if the latter entailed resigning one's self to a private objection to but ultimately a public acceptance of any political violation of the moral law.

This study demonstrates the turmoil that Vatican II fostered in the Catholic Church in the United States. It provides an under-documented view of American lay Catholicism in the 1960s and 1970s. There are, for example, a number of studies on the Catholic Left, and it may be assumed that most perceptions of Catholic radicalism in the sixties are visions of radical priests Daniel and Philip Berrigan and the symbolic demonstrations they staged against the Vietnam War. Yet, the thesis of this study is that *Triumph's* editors, if often ignored, were the genuine Catholic radicals in the 1960s and 1970s.

In the more general category of religious history, *Triumph* was another manifestation of the religious revival in Cold War America; it was part of the "Fourth Great Awakening."<sup>30</sup> *Triumph* also was an example of the restructuring of religion that took place in the post-World War II United States—the shift away from denominational conflicts and toward conflicts between the Left and Right wings of the different denominations.<sup>31</sup> *Triumph's* editors, for example, were

willing to align with Protestants in the pro-life movement and regularly criticized their liberal Catholic brethren.

The second and third chapters detail *Triumph's* origins, including the post-war anti-liberal and anticommunist intellectual revival, the Second Vatican Council, Spain and Carlism, and the actual founding of the journal. The fourth chapter covers the staff's views on liturgical affairs in the post-Vatican II Church. The fifth chapter examines the editors' political views, and the sixth chapter examines their foreign policy perspectives. The seventh chapter explicates their views on contraception, abortion, and feminism. All of the chapters highlight *Triumph's* radicalism, which is manifest in the obvious contrast between the editors' ideas and the prevailing views of the period.

Also evident will be a persistent crusading theme. *Triumph's* editors were crusaders. To be a crusader was to set upon a mission of conquering and converting. To be a crusader was to hold a triumphant view of the faith. To be a crusader, then, in an age of dialogue and ecumenism, was to set one's self apart from the mainstream, to be a contrast to the times; it was, in effect, to draw swords against them. If Catholicism was "about swords," as Wilhelmsen remarked, so *Triumph* was about swords—clashing, with a conventional-shattering clangor, against the conventionally unorthodox forces of late twentieth-century America.<sup>32</sup> The editors exclaimed the following in a pilot issue of *Triumph*: "We offer our swords to the Cross, center of Christendom and the heart of Being. And to Christ: Our Resurrection: The Future: His Triumph."<sup>33</sup>

A mass for the repose of the soul of Wilhelmsen was held at the gothic Cathedral in Seville, Spain—“one of the grandest churches in Christendom.”<sup>34</sup> In addition to being Christopher Columbus’s final resting place, the Cathedral also is the tomb of Saint Ferdinand III (1198-1252), the former thirteenth-century king of Castile and León. The pious and apostolic Saint Ferdinand etched his name in history by waging a relentless war against the Muslim invaders who occupied the Iberian Peninsula—he was a crusader in his very being. It was fitting that a mass of this sort was held in such a place for Wilhelmsen, who, along with Bozell, stood in the same tradition; both were latter-day crusaders.

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "A Parting of Friends," *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 25.

<sup>2</sup> The author's recollection of this pro-life demonstration is derived from the following sources: Michael Lawrence, "Present Imperfect," *Triumph* 5, no. 7 (July, 1970): 7-10, 42; L. Brent Bozell, *Mustard Seeds A Conservative Becomes a Catholic: Collected Essays* (Manassas, VA: Trinity Communications, 1986), 350-360; Unsigned, ed., *Frederick Daniel Wilhelmsen (Eminent Professor and Catholic Intellectual): A Tribute from the University of Dallas* (Dallas: University of Dallas, 1998), 63-64; Barry Kalb, "Catholic Anti-Abortion Group Scuffles with Police at GW," *Evening Star*, June 7, 1970; and Unsigned, "Foes of Abortion Turn to Violence" *Baltimore Sun*, June 6, 1970; and Editors, "Abortion," *National Review* 22 (June 30, 1970): 658-659.

<sup>3</sup> Unsigned, ed., *Frederick Daniel Wilhelmsen*, 63. Wilhelmsen also said the following: "America—land of the scraped womb. You are about to abort your future because you are daggering to death your unborn tomorrow. The very cleanliness of your sterilized murder factories gives off the stench of death . . . Christ became man and dies upon the cross in order that men might be ushered into eternity and there live in the mansions of the Lord. We men here below can lighten, but at a cost, the weight of that cross by becoming co-creators with God. We do this by begetting children from out of the loins of love. And we do this too by stopping the hammer which would nail yet another wound into His holy and lacerated body." Bozell, *Mustard Seeds*, 355-356.

<sup>4</sup> Lawrence, "Present Imperfect," 9. The Latin reads: Christ lives, Christ reigns, Christ commands; the Spanish reads: "long live Christ the King."

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 10.

<sup>7</sup> Of the five men arrested, four of them—Joseph Baker, L. Brent Bozell, Charles Procida, and Robert Harrington—were charged with simple assault, destruction of property, and unlawful entry. The fifth man, Bradley Evans, was charged only with destruction of property and unlawful entry. All five of the men were convicted but served suspended sentences. See Lawrence, "Present Imperfect," 42; and Michael Lawrence, "The Trial," *Triumph* 5 no. 8 (October, 1970): 11-14.

<sup>8</sup> Yet, Americans were accustomed to odd demonstrations in the 1960s and seventies; indeed, even a colorful public demonstration by Catholics was not unknown to the American public. For an examination of the activities of the (Daniel and Philip) Berrigan-wing of the American Catholic Left, see Charles A. Meconis, *With Clumsy Grace: The American Catholic Left, 1961-1975* (New York: Seabury, 1979).

<sup>9</sup> Editors, "School, Family, Church: The Future," *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (July, 1972): 31.

<sup>10</sup> The masthead of the inaugural issue in September, 1966 included the following: L. Brent Bozell, Thomas Molnar, Frederick Wilhelmsen, and John Wisner as editors; Gary K. Potter as assistant editor; Patricia B. Bozell as managing editor; Philip Burnham, Colin Clark, Christopher Dawson, William Fitzpatrick, Otto von Hapsburg, Jeffrey Hart, Dietrich von Hildebrand, Charles Cardinal Journet, Willmoore Kendall, Russell Kirk, Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, Arnold Lunn, William Oliver Martin, Vincent Miceli, S.J., Gerhart Niemeyer, and Francis Wilson as contributors; and Julio Meinville, Jacques Ploncard D'Assac, Christopher Derrick, Anacleto Gonzales Flores, Mario Marcolla, Fausto Gianfranceschi, Joseph Pittau, S.J., and Alfredo Cattabiani as foreign correspondents. The business manager was Michael Lawrence, *Triumph's*

---

future editor, and the advertising director was Lee Edwards. Bozell, Lawrence, Molnar, Wilhelmsen, and Wisner were the original editors. Lawrence was added as an editor in November, 1967; Wisner was listed only as contributor by October, 1968; Potter became an editor in September, 1969 and by April, 1970 Molnar was no longer listed as an editor. By June, 1970, Gary Potter, who had problems with the editors' fascination with Carlism, left the magazine to start his own journal, *The Rough Beast*. He was joined by John Wisner. By October, 1970, Michael Lawrence was listed as the sole editor, while Bozell and Wilhelmsen were listed as senior editors. This was the principal editorial configuration for the remainder of *Triumph's* existence. Potter, a convert, was turned to the faith by a four-year stay in France. *The Rough Beast*, Potter's Catholic journal, was named after the rough beast in William Butler Yeats's poem, "The Second Coming." The title was changed eventually to *Truth and Justice*. It was a monthly journal that ran from 1970 to 1974. Potter stated: "Ours was a Catholic journal not in dealing with ecclesiastical affairs, but in looking at the affairs of the world from a traditional Catholic point of view, and trying to apply Church teachings to the political and social domains." Gary Potter, interview by Patrick Allitt, 4 March 1991, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA. The editors wrote the following of the *Rough Beast*: "The new publication, though slouching ultimately toward Bethlehem, hopes to appeal to every man, woman and child in the land whose simply human instincts recoil at the increasingly open assaults on life, and the possibility of living it humanly, in America today. *Rough Beast* does not propose to be a gentle publication; but, then, it proposes to make war." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Rough Beast," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 10. When *The Rough Beast* ceased publication in 1974, Potter returned to *Triumph*.

<sup>11</sup> Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn wrote: "*Triumph* is invariably described as a 'conservative Catholic' magazine. We dislike the description; on many matters, secular as well as religious, its connotations are misleading. We have said that if we must be called something we prefer to be known as 'radical Christians.'" Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, "Radial Christianity," *Triumph* 2 no. 2 (February, 1967): 19-20. This author made the mistake of labeling *Triumph's* editors "conservative" in a preliminary paper on them, but found the term to be inaccurate in representing their views, especially in a political sense. One could make the argument that they were trying to conserve elements of pre-Vatican II Catholicism, but even in this case their views sharply contrasted the general views of the post-Vatican II faithful—the trend was toward change—but they had no intentions of reinstating the pre-Vatican II Church. They accepted change and development of ritual so long as Catholic truth was incarnated, if in different forms, but not adapted to current trends. The appellation "radical" is sometimes applied to the Berrigan-wing of the Catholic Left. But actually, their radical experimentation with Catholic worship aligned them, politically, with the Left. Or as *Triumph's* editors viewed them, they were merely part of the modern, secular dialectic. Their emphasis on heterodoxy in worship and hopes for adaptation to secular forms of ritual blended with the pluralism and secularism of the modern dialectic. It is important to note that most of them, as Charles Meconis points out, ended up leaving the Church and promoting secular issues, such as abortion, communism, and feminism. Meconis, *With Clumsy Grace*, 135-139. Meconis argues, however, that they had a very important impact on ending the Vietnam War!

<sup>12</sup> Editors, "Bishops and Sons," *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 8.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Michael Lawrence, interview by Patrick Allitt, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

---

<sup>16</sup> Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: Politics of Christmas," *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 21.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Empty Womb, Empty Altar," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 21.

<sup>19</sup> Pilot issue of *Future*, December 8, 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers, Record Series 15/18/24, Box 1, Folder: "Catholic Conservatives (organization; magazine), 1965-1966," University of Illinois Archives, Urbana.

<sup>20</sup> Patrick Allitt, "Triumph 1966-1976," in *The Conservative Press in Twentieth-Century America*, eds. Ronald Lora and William Henry Longton (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), 208.

<sup>21</sup> *Triumph* has been dismissed by mainstream conservatives as "theocratic." Jeffrey Hart, *The Making of the American Conservative Mind: National Review and Its Times* (Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2005), 6. Such a dismissal is a rebuttal to *Triumph's* contention that American conservatism was merely right-wing liberalism; that is, conservatives were merely conserving an inherently secular-liberal system. In effect, *Triumph's* editors implied the bastardization of American conservatism. The confessional state that *Triumph's* editors promoted was not theocratic as the right contended. In a theological sense Christ was the King of the confessional order, but in a political understanding the confessional state theory supports a separation between Church and state. This separation actually is crucial to the theory. There are two separate orders, but the secular order should conform to the spiritual order. While ultimate authority belongs to the Church, power is held by the secular order. Ideally, such power is to be rendered unto God, the Church's authority. Yet, the confessional state theory is predicated on the concept of a Catholic culture that confesses the faith innately. Thus, a king, executive, legislature, or court, conforming itself to the moral law is as theocratic, in theory, as those Americans would be who subscribe to a Judeo-Christian ethic as the principal reason they abstain, for example, from committing theft (they are ruled by their faith). The confessional state is a manifestation of a Catholic culture and its benefit, the editors argued, was to promote the faith—to continually speak of it, spread it, and preserve it.

<sup>22</sup> This view was expressed also in a review of L. Brent Bozell's *Mustard Seeds: A Conservative Becomes a Catholic*. See Kevin Lynch, "Mission of Mercy," *National Review* (June 5, 1987): 45-46. *Triumph's* views have become even more counter-cultural as American society continues to move from a theocentric, to an agnostic, to a secularized society. Merely presenting a paper on the views of its editors can evoke a visceral reaction even in the academic and "objective" setting of a conference on history. A commentator at a historical conference wrote the following of a paper, presented by this author, on Bozell, who he called a "postwar mullah." "Thinkers like Bozell scare me to death," he wrote. "As a person who celebrates religious diversity, as a person who wants to build a towering wall between church and state, as a person who sees contraception as an important step in human freedom, I find the vision of Bozell profoundly distasteful." The commentator noted that Bozell's views seemed "hopelessly out of the mainstream and largely irrelevant to American Catholic thought," and he even implied a connection between Bozell's views and his mental illness—a not-so-subtle point. These were written remarks submitted by the commentator for the panel on "Cold War Culture and Catholicism" at the Mid-America Conference on History at Lawrence, Kansas in September, 2005.

<sup>23</sup> See George H. Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America: Since 1945* (New York: Basic Books, 1976; Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 1998); and

---

Patrick Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America, 1950-1985* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993).

<sup>24</sup> Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics*, ix.

<sup>25</sup> The seminal examination of the intellectual aspect of the post-WWII conservative revival is Nash's *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America*. Also, see Paul Gottfried, *The Conservative Movement* rev. ed., *Social Movements Past and Present*, ed. Irwin T. Sanders (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1993); Jeffrey Hart, *The Making of the American Conservative Mind*; Craig Schiller, *The (Guilty) Conscience of a Conservative* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1978); and Melvin Thorne, *American Conservative Thought since World War II: The Core Ideas* (New York: Greenwood, 1990). For an examination of the conservative movement, see Lee Edwards, *The Conservative Revolution: The Movement that Remade America* (New York: The Free Press, 1999); Godfrey Hodgson, *The World Turned Right Side Up: The History of The Conservative Ascendancy in America* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1996); Jerome L. Himmelstein, *To the Right: The Transformation of American Conservatism* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990); Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); William A. Rusher, *The Rise of the Right* (New York: William and Morrow and Company, 1984); Gregory L. Schneider, *Cadres for Conservatism: Young Americans for Freedom and the Rise of the Contemporary Right* (New York: New York University Press, 1999); Gregory L. Schneider, ed., *Conservatism in America Since 1930: A Reader* (New York: New York University Press, 2003); and Jonathan M. Schoenwald, *A Time for Choosing: The Rise of Modern American Conservatism* (New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2001).

<sup>26</sup> For examples of studies that include examinations of *Triumph*, see Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America*, 292-301; Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics*, 141-162. Also, see Patrick Allitt, "Triumph 1966-1976," 201-208. In addition, there is an edited collection of *Triumph* articles, see Unsigned, ed., *The Best of Triumph* (Front Royal, VA: Christendom Press, 2001). There is also an edited collection of Bozell's and Wilhelmssen's published articles, including their *Triumph* articles, see L. Brent Bozell, *Mustard Seeds*, 44-263; and Frederick D. Wilhelmssen, *Citizen of Rome: Reflections from the Life of a Roman Catholic* (La Salle, IL: Sherwood Sugden & Company), 36-43, 65-73, 74-80, 126-196, 216-221, 237-242, 251-304, 326-334.

<sup>27</sup> There are edited collections of Bozell's and Wilhelmssen's published articles, see Bozell, *Mustard Seeds*; and Wilhelmssen, *Citizen of Rome*; and Frederick D. Wilhelmssen, *Christianity and Political Philosophy* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1978).

<sup>28</sup> For the most seminal investigation of the "Catholic Right"—Catholics who promoted conservative politics—see Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics*. Also, see Michael W. Cuneo, *The Smoke of Satan: Conservative and Traditionalist Dissent in Contemporary America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997; Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1999); and Mary Jo Weaver and R. Scott Appleby, eds., *Being Right: Conservative Catholics in America* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995).

<sup>29</sup> For examples, see John Tracy Ellis, *American Catholicism*, rev. ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969); Thomas T. McAvoy, *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969); Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience: A History From Colonial Times to the Present* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985); Charles R. Morris, *American Catholic: The Saints and Sinners Who Built America's Most Powerful Church* (New York: Random House, 1997); and James T. Fisher, *Communion of Immigrants: A History of Catholics in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000). Also, see Chester Gillis, *Roman Catholicism in America* (New York: Columbia University

---

Press, 1999); and Jay P. Dolan, *In Search of an American Catholicism: A History of Religion and Culture in Tension* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

<sup>30</sup> Mark Silk, *Spiritual Politics: Religion and America Since World War II* (New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1988), 38-39.

<sup>31</sup> Robert Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith since World War II* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988).

<sup>32</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Catechism V. The Child: A New Religion," *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 21.

<sup>33</sup> Pilot issue of *Future*, December 8, 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers.

<sup>34</sup> Patrick Foley, "In Memoriam, Frederick D. Wilhelmsen: One Year Later," *The Catholic Social Science Review* 2 (1997): 329.

## CHAPTER II

### ORIGINS OF TRIUMPH, PART I

Saint Michael, the Archangel, defend us in battle. Be our protection against the wickedness and snares of the Devil. May God rebuke him, we humbly pray, and do thou, O Prince of the Heavenly Host, by the Divine Power, thrust into Hell Satan and all the evil spirits who roam the world seeking the ruin of souls.

—Pope Leo XIII

In early November, 1956, Santa Clara University was alive with protest over the Soviet invasion of Hungary. A triduum of masses was held for the Hungarians—one for “Hungary’s martyrs for freedom” and the other two for Saint Michael and Saint Stephen, Hungary’s patron saints in its struggle against communism.<sup>1</sup> *The Santa Clara*, the university’s newspaper, noted that the 7:00 a.m. masses, otherwise “rarely” filled on normal weekdays, were full. At an unofficial rally, students hanged Nikita Khrushchev in effigy and paraded through campus.<sup>2</sup>

On Friday morning, November 9, hundreds of students gathered in front of the university’s old, Spanish-style Mission Church for the official rally. Some of them held placards—one read, “How about it, Ike?” and another read, “Stop Red Murders.”<sup>3</sup> Some students raised a large banner that read, “Volunteers for Hungary.”<sup>4</sup> Others waved the red, white, and green Hungarian flag.<sup>5</sup>

The students were focused on a young philosophy professor, Frederick D. Wilhelmsen. From behind a podium at the top of the Church's stairs, he addressed the students:

We are gathered here this morning to protest Soviet aggression in Hungary. We meet, I trust, not in the spirit of hate. The enormity of the crime committed by the Russian Army in Hungary cannot be measured in human terms. This crime staggers the reason and leaves it limp with incomprehension. It is as though men had surrendered their humanity, had created a vacuum in their souls—a vacuum which was filled by force from another world and from an order of things so monstrous that it simply is not commensurate to the hate of man. This crime in truth cries out, in the words of Pope Pius XII, 'to God for vengeance.'<sup>6</sup>

The Soviet invasion, he gravely stated, "was inspired—by hell itself."<sup>7</sup>

Wilhelmsen argued in his speech that the Hungarian revolutionaries, conversely, with their steeled resolve and bravery in the face of insurmountable odds, were inspired by their Christian faith, which dated back 1,000 years when Saint Stephen became Hungary's first Christian monarch. He encouraged the students to join the heroic battle and aid their fellow Catholics in their struggle against the forces of hell. The bent Cross on top of Saint Stephen's Crown, given to him by Pope Sylvester II, "symbolizes Hungary today," he noted, "its back bent under the Soviet boot. But although bent, not broken. The Cross reels today in Hungary. But reeling it stands. And like all crosses it stands arms outstretched—crying for your help and mine. Holy God," he prayed, "grant us the courage to embrace that Cross."<sup>8</sup>

Next, Jerry Kirrene, the student body president, approached the podium and read a pledge signed by over 700 students that was addressed to President Dwight D. Eisenhower:

Today . . . a cry for freedom is on the lips of every Hungarian patriot perishing by the Soviet sword. It is uttered by a Hungarian girl as she vainly tries to protect her mother and her sisters from the fire of Russian machine guns and is mercilessly cut down in the process. It is the last farewell of a 14-year-old boy as he begins his trip into Siberian exile. And it is heard in the hospitals as they are leveled by Moscow's mortars. Multiplied a hundredfold, such atrocities are serving to dim the torch of liberty; and if allowed to continue unhampered they will eventually extinguish it so that no ember remains. It is with these thoughts in mind that we, the students of the University of Santa Clara, submit this petition to you, the man whom our nation has just given a vote of confidence, President Dwight D. Eisenhower. The fact of our petitioning evidences our firm belief that you will not receive our plea with deaf ears. With a strong conviction and assurance, we believe that in the name of liberty you will take positive action to alleviate the existing situation, a situation wherein Freedom is being so completely destroyed. Further, whatever your decision we are prepared to support it to a man, even should such decision result in the taking of arms.<sup>9</sup>

Following the reading of the petition, United States Representative Charles S. Gubser was introduced and presented with the petition. Gubser promised the students that he would "'telegraph it within the hour' to President Eisenhower" and "send copies to Herbert Hoover, Jr., acting secretary of state, and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., [a] United Nations Delegate."<sup>10</sup>

Following the rally, students attended a "Solemn Benediction" for the Hungarian revolutionaries in the Mission Church. The Church was crowded with students.

This Wilhelmsen-led demonstration in support of the Hungarian revolutionaries reveals important factors that led to the creation of *Triumph*. Wilhelmsen, along with L. Brent Bozell, a like-minded Catholic, viewed the Cold War as a sacramental struggle, a war between Heaven's and Hell's proxy forces. They believed, initially, that the United States was an extension of Christian civilization and the principal defender of that tradition against Soviet-led global

communism. The Christian West was the human analogue of the divine order, while Soviet-led global communism was the human analogue of Hell. This view fostered in both men a militant anticommunism. It was the Christian mission, they believed, not only to defend the West but to strike down Soviet-led global communism.

The Hungarian Revolution provided such an opportunity. The revolt was fomented, they believed, by a Christian spirit, and it was the United States' duty, as the protector of Christian civilization, to come to the defense of Christian Hungary. But, while Wilhelmsen and over seven hundred Santa Clara students pledged to serve "as a volunteer corps alongside the embattled Hungarians," the United States government was not willing to bear such a cross—it did not come to the aid of the Hungarians.<sup>11</sup> Because of the United States' failure to defend and magnify Christian civilization, both Bozell and Wilhelmsen began to doubt its Christian mettle. Indeed, it would lead them eventually to conclude that the United States was not a Christian nation and to the decision to create *Triumph*. Their mission: the re-Christianization of American society.

#### L. Brent Bozell and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen

Bozell was *Triumph's* principal founder. "There would have been no *Triumph* without Brent Bozell, he thought of it, he brought it into being when no one else knew what it was meant to be," Michael Lawrence wrote; "his mind and spirit made it different from every other journal of its time when the times were

requiring it to be different.”<sup>12</sup> Bozell was born into an Episcopalian family in Omaha, Nebraska in 1926.<sup>13</sup> He attended a Jesuit high school (Creighton Preparatory School), which he later claimed planted “all of the seeds” necessary for his conversion to Catholicism.<sup>14</sup> At Creighton Prep, Bozell earned a scholarship to Yale by winning the National American Legion Award for Distinguished Oratory. Before attending Yale, in 1944 Bozell joined the Merchant Marines because he was too young to join the Navy; once he turned eighteen, however, he enlisted in the Navy and served until 1946. While on shore leave that same year, Bozell confessed to his father a decision to become Catholic, but he did not join the Church until his undergraduate years at Yale, which he began attending in the fall of 1946.<sup>15</sup>

It was likely Bozell’s friend at Yale, Catholic William F. Buckley, Jr.—the future founder of *National Review*—who assisted Bozell in his actual conversion.<sup>16</sup> Bozell’s friendship with Buckley, a conservative, also probably facilitated his right turn politically. At the beginning of his Yale career, Bozell, although an anticommunist, was president of Yale’s branch of the World Federalists, a Leftist organization that promoted world government.<sup>17</sup> While Buckley’s biographer, John B. Judis, concludes that Buckley was “the dominate person” in the friendship, he argues also that Bozell was the more talented of the two at Yale.<sup>18</sup> Bozell was the superior student, and though they were both stars of Yale’s debate team, it was Bozell, rather than Buckley, who won the Ten Eyck Award for public speaking in their junior and senior years.<sup>19</sup> Buckley remarked: “he [Bozell] was the most incisive political orator I ever knew. . . . His mind was

sharp and he had consummate skills in organizing thoughts in readable and persuasive language.”<sup>20</sup> It is not hard to imagine that Bozell could have become the more illustrious of the two in the burgeoning conservative revival, especially given Bozell’s decision to study law in pursuit of a political career.

In 1949, Bozell married Buckley’s sister, Patricia, a Vassar graduate. After graduating from Yale in 1950, Bozell attended Yale Law School, from which he graduated in 1953. In the spring of 1954, he moved his family to Washington, D.C., and joined in the defense of Senator Joseph McCarthy, who, after the Army-McCarthy hearings, was facing a possible censure. Bozell became a speech writer for McCarthy and collaborated with Buckley to write a book that defended the senator, *McCarthy and His Enemies* (1954).<sup>21</sup> In 1955, Bozell joined the inaugural staff of *National Review* as an associate editor and contributor.<sup>22</sup> He became an editor in January, 1957, and remained so until his resignation in June, 1963.<sup>23</sup> Bozell also ghost-wrote for Senator Barry Goldwater the famed conservative political manifesto, *Conscience of a Conservative* (1960). In 1966, the year he founded *Triumph*, he wrote a caustic critique of the Warren Court, *The Warren Revolution*.<sup>24</sup> By the mid-1960s, Bozell was a principal figure in the post-World War II conservative intellectual revival.

If Bozell’s apparent trajectory in the conservative revival was political, Wilhelmsen had chosen the path of an academic, and he would have a profound intellectual influence on Bozell and *Triumph*’s editorial staff. Lawrence writes that Wilhelmsen was “in on the creation and many, many of *Triumph*’s pages,

including many he didn't write," but were "imprinted with the force of his brain and personality."<sup>25</sup>

Wilhelmsen was born in Detroit, Michigan in 1923.<sup>26</sup> He attended the University of Detroit from 1941 to 1943, but interrupted his studies to serve three years as a medic in the United States Army. He finished his undergraduate studies in 1947 at the University of San Francisco, where he graduated with honors and a bachelor's degree in philosophy. He completed his master's degree in philosophy the following year at the University of Notre Dame. He taught at the University of Santa Clara in the early 1950s before moving to Spain on a Guggenheim Fellowship to earn his doctorate in 1958 from the University of Madrid. In the early sixties, he taught philosophy at the University of Navarra in Pamplona, Spain. Wilhelmsen returned to the United States in 1965 to become Professor of Philosophy and Politics at the University of Dallas, where he helped establish the University of Dallas's graduate Institute of Philosophic Studies. By the mid-sixties, he already was a prolific writer—publishing, for instance, numerous articles and a study of Hilaire Belloc and Thomist-inspired works on epistemology and the metaphysics of love.<sup>27</sup> By 1957, he was listed as a contributor to *National Review* and wrote articles for *America*, *Commonweal*, *Modern Age* (of which he was a member of the editorial board), and *The Catholic World*.

Bozell and Wilhelmsen, the future guiding intellects of *Triumph*, were affiliated in the 1950s and early 1960s with the anti-communist and anti-liberal intellectual revival, otherwise known as the post-World War II conservative

renaissance. *Triumph* was a product of this revival. Its founding editors shared the broader movement's militant anticommunism and anti-liberalism, but the journal's origins were found also in Bozell's and Wilhelmsen's disaffection with American conservatism.

### Post-World War II Anti-Communist and Anti-Liberal Revolt

The mass destruction and organized genocide of the Second World War, and the resulting political, geopolitical, and ideological ramifications, most notably the rise of the Soviet Union and Soviet-led global communism and the prevalence of liberalism in America—and the subsequent drift toward secularism and statism—fostered a revival of conservative thought. Such developments convinced a number of intellectuals that progressive philosophies and ideologies were marching humankind not toward a blissful and enlightened future, but toward the dissolution of freedom and order—the two pillars of Western civilization.

This group of intellectuals consisted of anticommunists, libertarians, and traditionalists who were united by very little other than a common disdain for communism and liberalism.<sup>28</sup> They believed that both ideologies were utopian and had intoxicated humankind with the illusion that human nature and, by extension, society were perfectible. Eric Voegelin, in *The New Science of Politics* (1952), argued that “the essence of modernity [was] the growth of gnosticism”—the “immanentization of the Christian eschaton.”<sup>29</sup> Communists

and liberals envisioned and sought heaven incarnated, but their reckless dreaming, Voegelin argued, led to a totalitarian nightmare. The efforts of “Gnostic activists” to perfect society “through world-immanent action” led humankind to move away “from the life of the spirit”—God—the “source of order in man and society” and led ultimately to social dissolution, which was compensated for by totalitarian government as a vain attempt to reassert order.<sup>30</sup> “Totalitarianism, defined as the existential rule of Gnostic activists,” Voegelin wrote, “is the end form of progressive civilization.”<sup>31</sup>

Libertarians lamented the threat that communism and liberalism posed to human freedom. They believed that individual freedom, meaning essentially the right to self-initiative in most human acts—principally in political and economic action—was the natural and desired condition of humankind. Such liberty, they believed, was had in proportion to the level of government intrusion in one’s life—the smaller the state, the greater the individual freedom.

The prerequisite for a small and limited state—a necessary evil for maintaining law and order and national defense—was a free-market economy. “Economic control is not merely control of a sector of human life, which can be separated from the rest,” Austrian émigré Friedrich Hayek noted, “it is the control of the means for all our ends.”<sup>32</sup> If the state regulated the economy, it controlled human life.

Libertarians, then, feared the faith liberals and communists placed in the modern, centralized bureaucratic state to solve all social problems, especially the unequal distribution of wealth, which had led to its precipitous growth and

intrusion into the economy. The state's effort to achieve what libertarians deemed a utopian leveling of wealth was not natural and thus had to be coerced. Furthermore, such grand social engineering, to be even remotely feasible, required a conceptualization of humankind as an indistinguishable herd rather than as a composite of different individuals. How else, libertarians asked, could the state engage in such grand social planning if it had to take into account the individuality of each human? The modern, centralized bureaucratic state threatened to extinguish human initiative and individuality.

Social engineering was ominous in another regard. It was rooted in a utilitarian logic in which the means were justified by the intended results—an equalitarian society. This problematic course of action was compounded by the fact, libertarians maintained, that an equalitarian society was an impossible achievement. Communist and Liberal ideologues, they argued, were not discouraged by any empirical evidence of their failures, because they operated from abstractions, and would meet failure with greater efforts of social engineering. It was a dangerous cycle; the inevitable failure to achieve economic equality would lead to greater social engineering, broken only by the emergence of an omnipotent, totalitarian state, the end point of all individual freedom. This trajectory began, they argued, with the modest objectives of the welfare state.

Traditionalists—sometimes referred to as “new conservatives” (in contrast to the fiscal, isolationist, and small government conservatives of the prewar period)—lamented the threat that communists and liberals posed to order. *Both* ideologies, they contended, scorned tradition because they were predicated on a

wholly materialist, rationalist, and progressive view of humankind and its social development. But to attempt to rule humankind without tradition, traditionalists believed, was the beginning of all disorder, because it was to uproot man and woman from a transcendental moral order—an order discerned in the corporeal world through tradition, or the cultural, political, and social prescriptions derived from a society’s experiences and religious beliefs. Such an order guided humankind, which had an immutable and fallen nature, toward its purpose, spiritual salvation. The Western tradition, they believed, was the depository of Christian truth, or as Wilhelmsen labeled it, the “human analogue of the Eternal Morning Who is the End of us all,” which helped man and woman conform to their true, God-oriented nature and purpose.<sup>33</sup> Without such guidance and purpose, man was, Richard Weaver noted, a “moral idiot” and thus capable of all evil.<sup>34</sup>

By undermining tradition (humankind’s moral guides), communists and liberals undermined order, which fostered totalitarian government—the end result of compensating for such disorder. The rise of totalitarianism was rooted, traditionalists argued, not in the curtailment of human freedom, as libertarians posited, but from too much freedom—the freedom from traditional moral restraint. Traditionalists believed that the liberal welfare state, predicated on materialist, rational, and progressive assumptions of humankind, was the path to the totalitarian state.

This nascent but amorphous anticommunist and anti-liberal intellectual revolt received definition primarily by the formation of *National Review*—a

conservative biweekly founded by Buckley in 1955. It served as the revolt's ideological crucible. The magazine's editors promoted both the concept of a virile and liberationist anticommunism—in contrast to liberal containment anticommunism—and a strident anti-liberalism. Such a strategy allowed these *National Review* conservatives to unite, albeit precariously, the disparate and isolated contingents of anticommunist and anti-liberal intellectuals. Later, under the direction of editor Frank S. Meyer, the magazine promoted a philosophical fusion of libertarian and traditionalist thought. This composite helped give “identity” to an array of anticommunist and anti-liberal thought—it was a makeshift ideological construct from which conservatives could forge a political movement.<sup>35</sup> Throughout the fifties and sixties, Buckley, as editor and chief of *National Review*, served as the pope of American conservatism—granting the imprimatur to those with similar views and excommunicating those with more sectarian ideas—and directed the small, and at one time ostracized, movement to mainstream acceptance.<sup>36</sup>

Catholic intellectuals significantly influenced the conservative revival. In addition to Bozell, Buckley, and Wilhelmsen, important conservative intellectuals, such as Jeffrey Hart, Willmoore Kendall, Russell Kirk, Stanley Parry, Peter Stanlis, Stephen Tonsor, Gary Wills, and Francis Wilson, and European émigrés such as John Lukacs and Thomas Molnar, were Roman Catholics. *National Review* also exhibited this Roman Catholic character; Buckley was the magazines' owner and editor-in-chief; Bozell, Hart, and Kendall were editors; and Tonsor, Wills, Molnar, and Wilhelmsen, among other Catholic intellectuals, were

contributors.<sup>37</sup> “One is even tempted to say,” George H. Nash writes, “that the new conservatism was, in part, an intellectual cutting edge of the postwar ‘coming of age’ of America’s Catholic minority.”<sup>38</sup>

Catholic participation in the anticommunist and anti-liberal revolt—the so-called conservative revival—was natural. The Roman Catholic Church was anticommunist and anti-liberal. Indeed, the Church’s steadfast condemnation of such ideologies made Catholicism attractive to non-Catholic conservatives. Many Catholic conservatives, such as Bozell, Hart, Kendall, Kirk, and Wilson were converts. The non-Catholic James Burnham and the Jewish Frank Meyer—both *National Review* editors and prominent conservative intellectuals—respected the Catholic Church’s stance against both communism and liberalism, and both subsequently were deathbed converts.<sup>39</sup>

While many Catholic intellectuals aligned themselves with the conservative revival, they were not of one mind in either their political and religious views or in their relationship to the conservative movement. In general, Catholics who aligned themselves with the conservative movement were Catholic conservatives, but with a wide range of thought. At one end were Catholics who believed that there was a strong consonance between Catholicism and American conservatism, which was pro-capitalist; these were the Catholic conservatives. While not libertarians; they were defenders of the free-market, even though papal encyclicals such as *On Capital and Labor* (1891) and *On Reconstruction of the Social Order* (1931) criticized free-market philosophy and urged restrictions on the capitalist system. Buckley and Wilson, for example, pointed to capitalism’s

success at creating and distributing wealth to a greater degree than socialism. More importantly, however, the capitalist emphases on private property and decentralized government, they believed, were in accord with both the Church's support of private property (which was, the Church taught, a foundation of individuality and the family), and the Church's disdain for gargantuan secular and totalitarian states (which debased both individual human dignity and the family and threatened the Church). The capitalist system limited the size of the state; thus, Catholic conservatives argued, it protected the individual, the family, and the Church. In addition, it preserved individual initiative (and thus human dignity) and encouraged federalism, which appeared similar to the Catholic concept of subsidiarity developed in the encyclical *On Reconstruction of the Social Order*.<sup>40</sup>

While Bozell would become very critical of capitalism, in the late 1950s and early 1960s, he, too, could find similar positive attributes in capitalism. He noted that production was “*best controlled by the natural operation of the market*” and lauded the free-market's restraints on the power of the state.<sup>41</sup> He criticized nationally-directed welfare, progressive and excessive taxation, and big labor—all of which limited the free-market and increased the state's power.<sup>42</sup>

But Bozell was already traveling to the other end of the spectrum of Catholic conservatism. At this end were a minority of Catholics who can be labeled Catholic traditionalists—such as Molnar and Wilhelmsen—and were critical of capitalism. Molnar, for example, was an admirer of the Catholic and French royalist, Bernanos, who viewed capitalism and socialism as “mere

variations of the same ‘system,’” which was dependent upon a “despiritualized” individual.<sup>43</sup>

Wilhelmsen traced the origins of capitalism to the “Calvinist Revolution,” which he believed, “altered the structure of our civilization far more deeply than either the French Revolution or the Communist Manifesto.”<sup>44</sup> Calvinism, Wilhelmsen argued, shattered the sacramental (Catholic) vision of the world—a “God transcending *within* immanence”—and introduced a Manichaeian world in which God was the “Totally Other,” retreating “to the lonely splendor of His transcendent majesty.”<sup>45</sup> “No longer was God with man in the drama of the present moment of time,” Wilhelmsen wrote, rather “God was before him in the Kingdom which was to come into history.”<sup>46</sup> To the Calvinist, “Reality was no longer something *conserved*, cherished, and seen as the robe of God.”<sup>47</sup> In contrast to the Catholic who looked upon creation as good, sanctified as it was by the incarnate God, the Calvinist looked upon “temporal society as nothing but an instrument to bring about the golden world wherein the Lord would dwell in the midst of His saints,” he noted—“The universe became nothing but the ‘raw material’ of Manchestrism, good only to be exploited and hammered into use.”<sup>48</sup>

The Calvinist worldview, Wilhelmsen argued, not only contributed to the rise of capitalism but also to “immanentist eschatology”—in which man placed his faith in “a worldly salvation to be achieved within history through instruments conceived in his own mind, and executed by his own hand”—both, given their explicit desire for transformation, cultivated modern society’s worship of

technology as the ultimate instrument for production and transformation.<sup>49</sup> Both worldviews disconnected technology from a traditionally sacred view of creation. Technology was thus “charged with the power to transform society completely,” Wilhelmsen wrote, “to make civilization over, to alter the fabric of human personality, and even to absorb the physical cosmos within a new world created by the genius of mathematicized science.”<sup>50</sup> Unlimited “technologized science,” he contended, concealed the real and sacred world. It shrouded creation in scientific formulas and measurements and thus distanced humankind from creation and prevented man and woman from contemplating the real world “in its very existence.”<sup>51</sup> “Paradox though it may be,” Wilhelmsen wrote, “it remains a brutal truth: scientific power over a thing is had in proportion to the failure to know the thing as it is.”<sup>52</sup> The destructive power of technology was traceable to this disconnecting attribute. Humankind no longer looked upon the real and sacred world, which was concealed with blueprints for its transformation, and thus could no longer cherish its beauty—its sacredness.

Standing against the sacrilegious hubris laden in Calvinism and immanentist eschatology was the Catholic faith, which humbled the Catholic before creation (and therefore its Creator) and emphasized “being rather than becoming.”<sup>53</sup> “The first of his virtues is humility: the realist acceptance of finite perfection. . . . The Roman Catholic conserves whatever God has given him, whatever his ancestors have bequeathed him. A profound reverence of creation informs his mind,” Wilhelmsen wrote, “he treads gently upon being, lest he shatter that most absolute of gifts. He does not tinker with existence. He rather

celebrates reality.”<sup>54</sup> *Triumph’s* future founding editors were of the latter disposition; they were Catholic traditionalists.

At the center of their thought was the Incarnation, which, Wilhelmsen noted, redeemed creation.<sup>55</sup> “The Lord gives being to the material world and He legitimizes His gift,” Wilhelmsen wrote, “by entering history in the womb of a woman and by hammering out His living over a carpenter’s bench.”<sup>56</sup> As Christ sanctified the real, man’s and woman’s analogous purpose was to hallow the world—to bring all things to Christ. “Only the Incarnation can make man whole, but as the Incarnation issues into Calvary,” Wilhelmsen wrote, “so too must the whole man sacrifice himself to the service of the God-Man. The ascent of man to God is impossible without the prior descent of God to man, and the two meet at the Cross.”<sup>57</sup>

The temporal order played a vital role in man’s and woman’s purpose to sanctify creation. While the Roman Catholic Church—the extension of the Incarnation—was the supreme sign of God’s grace on earth, it was not of this world. Its role was to impart divine truth to man’s temporal institutions, to inspire a Christ-centered society in which temporal power was rendered unto Christ’s Church. This sacral society provided for true order in a threefold manner; first, and most importantly, it conformed man and woman to their true, God-oriented nature and purpose as it sought to aid their salvation; second, law in the sacral order, made to conform to the moral law, was objective as its origin was divine—it was above humankind; and third, it was truly reverence-inspiring as it was Christ’s law.<sup>58</sup>

In a sacral order, in which all things were rendered unto Christ, man and woman were directed toward Christ and thus aided in their struggle to transcend their fallen condition—to live in consonance with their God-oriented identity and purpose, which was to sacramentalize creation (bring all things to Christ), and earn spiritual salvation. “Just as the individual man can find his natural perfection only by losing himself in Christ,” Wilhelmsen wrote, “so too can the community of all men find its soul only within the bosom of Christian Wisdom.”<sup>59</sup> Catholics were called to construct a sacral society—a calling, Wilhelmsen stated, that was “a fundamental urge, deep within man, grounded in an ontological need for the complete integration of man’s spiritual and temporal destinies.”<sup>60</sup> It was an “ontological need” in man, because, Wilhelmsen exclaimed, “only He Who Is can slake his thirst.”<sup>61</sup>

In addition to their anti-capitalism, the confessional state, promoted by Wilhelmsen and later by Bozell, was another factor that distinguished them from the more mainstream Catholic conservatives like Buckley, who, for example—like Catholic liberals—praised the United States Constitution for restraining power by rooting it in the people and for guaranteeing religious liberty.<sup>62</sup> Wilhelmsen believed that the confessional state, ruled by a traditional (legitimate) monarchy—a form of government analogous to the kingship of Christ—which rendered all power unto the authority of Christ’s Church, was superior to the United States’ secular-democratic government.<sup>63</sup>

*Triumph’s* future founding editors, however, did share the broader conservative movement’s zealous anticommunism. They viewed Soviet-led

global communism as the gravest threat to Christian order. Standing in the way of a communist victory was the West, specifically the United States, which they initially believed was the heir of Christendom and the defender of Christian civilization against the communist barbarian hordes. The role to bear the “sword and cross” of Christendom, Wilhelmsen remarked, had been given to America “by Providence itself.”<sup>64</sup> Molnar, an admirer of the French Right, could agree with their view of the United States as “primarily a bulwark of Christian civilization in the world-struggle against Communism” and a “sword granted to the West by Providence in a period of danger and distress.”<sup>65</sup>

*Triumph's* future founding editors were liberationist anticommunists (like their mainstream conservative counterparts); they rejected the view, promoted by their liberal antagonists, that communism could be contained, and they urged its destruction. Bozell argued that if the United States realized its Christian purpose, it would aggressively confront the Soviet threat. The orders would then go out, Bozell wrote:

To the Joint Chiefs of Staff: *Prepare for an immediate landing in Havana.* To the Commander in Berlin: *Tear down the Wall.* To our chief of mission in the Congo: *Change sides.* To the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission: *Schedule testing of every nuclear weapon that could conceivably be of service to the military purposes of the West.* To the Chief of the CIA: *You are to encourage liberation movements in every nation of the world under Communist domination, including the Soviet Union itself. And you may let it be known that when, in the future, men offer their lives for the ideals of the West, the West will not stand idly by.*<sup>66</sup>

The roots of such zealotry were found first in their Catholic-Christian view of communism. Unlike liberals, the Cold War for Bozell and Wilhelmsen was not a war between differing economic systems, a contest over which could create

more abundance, or even a war primarily between democracy and totalitarianism; rather, it was a proxy war between Heaven and Hell. While they viewed the West as, Bozell wrote, the “hopeful, human analogue of the divine order,” they viewed Soviet-led global communism as the human analogue of Hell.<sup>67</sup>

Soviet-led global communism’s hellish objective was to conquer the world and to disconnect humankind from its origin and end—God.<sup>68</sup> The communist directed man and woman to set their gaze upon a secular utopia that provided for in abundance and equality their worldly appetites—that they could, through their own effort, bring into being—communism, then, transformed man and woman into gods, who could affect society’s materialist salvation. The divinization of humankind and the belief in worldly salvation, Bozell noted, denied Christian truth—“the mysterious ravages of original sin, the relevance of divine redemption, [and] the subordination of matter to spirit.”<sup>69</sup> The effort to divinize man was “not only a violation of the First Commandment,” Wilhelmsen wrote, but was “also the crowning absurdity within the whole history of the human race, for what could be more ridiculous than man worshiping himself?”<sup>70</sup> “Absurd,” he pointed out, “for when man begins to admire himself in a mirror his pride makes him less attractive than before,” and “Meaningless, because the vaunted earthly paradise is not at hand, because suffering is still with us, because the universe still groans under evil, because men are not better than they were, because men are worse than they were.”<sup>71</sup>

Salvation, Catholics instinctively knew, was not of this world.

Furthermore, even if communism fashioned man as his own god, communist man, paradoxically, was no longer valued—he was not God’s creation, but merely the product of the impersonal and mechanical forces of evolution.

Thomas Molnar, a future founding editor of *Triumph*, asked:

Can man survive as man, that is, an individual with a conscience, when he is deprived of God and of extra social spiritual authority? If only matter and its evolutionary forms exist, then man, too, is only matter, however complex and superior to other forms he may be. If he is not a reflection of the divine being, then he is in no sense sacred and final, and new forms of evolution may supersede him. . . . Despiritualized man, living in total society, is regarded as but one unit of the working force, relatively valueless in himself.<sup>72</sup>

Despiritualized man was expendable and no more than an automaton in the mass, collectivized, and machine-driven society envisioned by communists.

Furthermore, the historical determinism posited by communists fostered a historicist and thus relativist conception of ethics, which militated against the trans-historical truth posited by Christianity. Because communists put their faith in the “primacy of the historical process,” they looked with a “sense of condescension and superiority to the past,” Wilhelmsen wrote, “but also a hatred of present existence, a resentment of the given,” because the present must be destroyed to make way for the future.<sup>73</sup> Communist man, then, found historical meaning only in an abstract conception of the future, and all past and present existence became a soulless and vicious means of serving the future.

Wilhelmsen wrote:

Not only is man commanded to live in the future, not only is he cautioned against preserving those traditional values he has inherited as a legacy from the past, but the very morality of his actions is measured, not by

human nature, not by the needs of living men and women, but the supposed future direction of the historical process. Not only can Marxism enslave and murder millions with a perfectly good conscience, but the heirs to liberal humanism, the latter-day secularists, can lecture the rest of us on our duties to an historical dynamism which would sweep away the civilization that has alone made life bearable for man because it has shown him his soul.<sup>74</sup>

The communist effort to disconnect humankind from God and guide it with an inherently relativistic historical determinism toward a secular utopia was a combination for disaster, or, as *Triumph's* future founding editors viewed it, Hell on earth.

With Soviet-led global communism on the march to conquer the world, the Christian West's response, *Triumph's* future founding editors argued, must be to destroy communism. Such militancy, however, was not wholly defensive. The future founding editors believed that the Catholic-Christian mission must be to spread Christendom: to magnify Christian truth—to hallow the world.<sup>75</sup> Soviet communism was not safe, then, behind the Iron Curtain. Yet, their communist antagonists, they knew, were equally as missionary and would never be content until they communized the world—as Lucifer tried to conquer heaven, so his proxy sought world domination. It was a death struggle. Because the communist purpose was “to destroy the living expression of the West's truth, even in the homelands, utterly and forever,” Bozell wrote, the “Western response must be in kind: to remove the threat: to destroy it.”<sup>76</sup>

*Triumph's* future founding editors' anticommunist zealotry was traceable also to the nature of the communist advance. On the one hand, the communist threat was embodied in the power of nation-states, most ominously the Soviet

Union, which advanced the revolution through traditional political and military resources, such as expanding its empire to include other nation-states and setting up communist puppet regimes.

On the other hand, they believed that the Soviet Union was the dictatorial head of a vast network of communist parties that had embedded themselves in non-communist states in an effort to foment revolution through legal means—such as through parliamentary procedures, propaganda, and union organization—and illegal methods, such as espionage, paramilitary efforts, and sabotage. These communist parties, then, served as fifth columns for the Soviet Union; they worked to weaken the non-communist nation-states (specifically the United States—the last great obstacle to communist world domination) in hopes of either fostering a revolution; or, at the very least, weakening the United States in order to increase their chances of defeating it in the formal or open—as opposed to the conspiratorial—phase of World War III.<sup>77</sup> The Soviet Union, then, was also a non-traditional threat—it directed a worldwide conspiracy to foment revolution far beyond its borders. *Triumph's* future founding editors (and conservatives), then, were critical of the liberal policy of containment, which focused on holding the Soviet Union to its existing empire; this was only a half-measure, because the Soviet Union, through its proxies and any conceivable method of political warfare, worked to destabilize non-communist governments and foster revolution throughout the world.

They interpreted the communist advance as a *Soviet-led* initiative and viewed communism as a monolithic movement seeking to engulf the world.

Bozell, for example, saw little value, unlike his liberal anticommunist counterparts, in the development of national communism or “Titoism”—the creation of autonomous communist countries—which held out the possibility of weakening Soviet-led global communism. Such development, he believed, was valueless, even if such deviation was authentic, these states—such as Yugoslavia—were still communist states and still were inherently evil; furthermore, communists used nationalism, he believed, only as a political tactic to consolidate communist rule. United States aid to such states, meant to enhance the supposed cracks in the Soviet monolith, then, served only to help its consolidation. Yet, Bozell doubted the authenticity of national communism; he argued that it was but a communist strategy in the Khrushchev era “adopted by the dominant group within the Soviet Party itself as part of the post-Stalin ‘soft’ line,” which projected only “the illusion of autonomous nations within the international Communist movement,” making “Communism more palatable to non-Communists.”<sup>78</sup> “Ultimately,” Bozell wrote of national communism, “it is the Communists in the Kremlin who retain control of the situation; and they will continue to have control so long as there is no serious danger of western influence in Communist affairs.”<sup>79</sup>

The Soviet advance through unconventional methods also was in large part why conservatives and *Triumph's* future founding editors despised decolonization, which they lamented as a retreat of Western civilization and Christianity. The Soviets, they believed, would fill with their proxy forces the power vacuums created by decolonization. In the 1956 Suez Crisis, Bozell

believed that the United States' lack of support for its allies Great Britain and France was a disaster not mainly because Western Powers lost control of the Canal to a Third World power, but because "the real aggressor at Suez was not Nasser, but the Kremlin," and "the real danger was not that Egypt would control the Canal, but that the U.S.'s mortal enemy, the Soviet Union, would."<sup>80</sup> Thomas Molnar, a Francophile, regretted the French retreat from Algeria and noted that if "the French leave Algeria, the Russians will have made a decisive step toward the encirclement of Europe from the South."<sup>81</sup>

Furthermore, *Triumph's* future founding editors—and the broader conservative movement—much more so than liberal anticommunists, viewed communism as an ideological threat, which compounded the threat of the conspiratorial nature of the communist advance. Communism, after all, was very appealing; it held out the promise of a secular utopia in which man and woman faced the perennial temptation, "man's second oldest faith," which proclaims, Whittaker Chambers wrote in his famous biography *Witness* (1952), "Ye shall be as gods."<sup>82</sup> Communism, in addition, was not a nationally- or patriotically-specific ideology; rather, it was a worldview that transcended such boundaries and could be shared equally by a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union or an idealist working in the State Department.

Conservatives, in general, then, envisioned great potential for communist subversion. Bozell, for example, was a McCarthyite; he co-wrote, with his brother-in-law Buckley, *McCarthy and His Enemies* (1954), in which they defended the Senator and challenged the findings of the Tydings Committee, a

Senate subcommittee that concluded that McCarthy's charges—that the State Department's internal security measures were negligent and that there was substantial communist penetration—were baseless.<sup>83</sup> While they admitted that McCarthy had made mistakes, they maintained that the State Department's internal security program was deficient and that there had been substantial communist penetration.<sup>84</sup> The authors were concerned with refuting the Tydings Committee not only because they believed that its conclusions were incorrect, but also because the committee's findings had created a backlash against McCarthy and his cause: McCarthyism—which provided, they wrote, an “effective resistance to communist infiltration.”<sup>85</sup> Buckley and Bozell argued that McCarthy's efforts to combat communist infiltration had mobilized support for legal and social measures that were necessary to combat communist infiltration. They dismissed as “irresponsible nonsense” the charge by liberals that McCarthy had created a “reign of terror,” and they were unapologetic for the accusation that McCarthyism encouraged conformity.<sup>86</sup> All societies, they argued, even democratic ones, required sanctions that upheld its core values, and McCarthyism was a system of legal and social sanctions that ensured conformity to American values.<sup>87</sup> “The vast majority of Americans,” the authors noted, “are certainly in sympathy with those values that Communism threatens.”<sup>88</sup> McCarthyism, then, which was “a program of action against those in our land who help the enemy,” promoted the survival of American society, and as long as McCarthyites remained sincere and prudent in their commitment to exposing communists and pro-communists, the authors concluded that McCarthyism was

“a movement around which men of good will and stern morality can close ranks.”<sup>89</sup>

*McCarthy and His Enemies* was an important book—it helped define conservative or liberationist anticommunism, differentiating it from liberal anticommunism. Buckley and Bozell, for example, operated from the assumption that Soviet-led global communism sought world domination, “for all of the twists and turns of the Party Line,” they wrote, “the Communists have never swerved and, barring a philosophical or political revolution, never would swerve from their ambition to occupy the world.”<sup>90</sup> They were concerned with the conspiratorial nature of the communist advance. Indeed, Bozell credited the communist conspiracy with “the destruction of McCarthyism.”<sup>91</sup> Buckley’s and Bozell’s anticommunism was laden also with a critique of pluralism. They argued that it was necessary, even in a democratic society, for the government to promote a public orthodoxy and to limit ideas or groups that were hostile to America’s political and cultural traditions.<sup>92</sup> They also criticized liberal anticommunism; liberals, they argued, were incapable of stemming the domestic communist threat because they were committed to a radical conception of an open society in which all ideas went unmolested by legal or social sanction.

The future founding editors’ liberationist anticommunism could likely have caused war with the Soviet Union. They did not fear such a possibility, however, even if it meant a nuclear confrontation. Indeed, they argued for the necessity of nuclear weapons in the struggle against the Soviet Union, which, Bozell reasoned, possessed superior conventional forces and was restrained from

conquering Western Europe, he believed, only by the United States' nuclear superiority. Bozell argued against any type of limitations on the production and testing of nuclear weapons, which were necessary to maintain nuclear superiority. If the Soviet Union gained a lead in the production of nuclear weapons, he argued, they would initiate a first strike or launch the conventional phase of World War III without fear of nuclear reprisal. "The Communists are psychologically disposed to strike the first strategic blow," Bozell wrote, "and thus will have an immense initial advantage in any all-out nuclear war."<sup>93</sup> "This advantage," he concluded, "can be offset only by *superior* American weaponry."<sup>94</sup>

Even parity with the Soviet Union in nuclear armaments was dangerous, Bozell argued, because such a scenario would neutralize the nuclear option and tilt the balance in favor of the Soviets, who had superior conventional forces. Nuclear superiority, then, had contained and was needed to contain the Red Army. Bozell urged an arms race and criticized nuclear testing restrictions and notions of mutual disarmament—the Soviets, guided only by the desire to advance world conquest, could not be trusted; "communists are congenital cheaters," Bozell remarked.<sup>95</sup>

Given the severity of the Soviet-led global communist threat, Bozell believed that the use of nuclear weapons to stem the communist tide was morally defensible. "Is it likely that God has written provisions into the moral law," Bozell wrote, that "require the extinction of Christian civilization?"<sup>96</sup> We must "keep our 'ultimate' weapons," he wrote, and "*be disposed to use them with good*

*conscience* . . . if this becomes the only way to save the Christian West.”<sup>97</sup>

Bozell would not have argued for the use of nuclear weapons in a traditional nation-state conflict, but the Cold War was not such an affair. The objective of Soviet-led global communism was the destruction of Christian civilization; thus, the action to defend it and magnify Christian truth, an action in consonance with God’s will, was a sacred act. As Bozell wrote, the decision to use nuclear weapons against the Soviet Union should be made with “the serenity with which spiritually free men always choose good over evil; with the knowledge that when the right is pursued, it is God who ordains the cost.”<sup>98</sup>

Bozell did not believe that the use of nuclear weapons was the only way to achieve victory; rather, he believed that if the United States’ leadership developed the Christian purpose to use nuclear weapons, they would also possess the “power and will to wage an extended war of attrition against Communism,” Bozell wrote—a policy “that holds forth reasonable hope of ultimate victory and would, therefore, have to be tried.”<sup>99</sup> Bozell argued that new leadership—that “will assert a national purpose that transcends survival”—that directs its purpose to God’s will was required to reverse the trend toward surrender.<sup>100</sup> But such a leadership must, without hesitation, when the policy of attrition ceased to reverse the communist advance, be predisposed to “seek the destruction of our tormentors by a sudden stroke in the middle of the night.”<sup>101</sup>

If concern with the rise of Soviet-led global communism was an issue in the creation of *Triumph*, an even more important factor was the founding editors’ disillusionment with the United States’ role as the guardian of the Christian West.

They believed initially that the United States was a bulwark of Christian civilization, but their faith in the United States as the standard bearer of Christendom withered. The United States, they came to conclude, was incapable—because it lacked a Christian purpose—of resisting the communist onslaught. They believed that the only force capable of resisting its hellish enemies was a Christian purpose—as the Devil was vanquished by the Archangel Saint Michael and the heavenly armies, his earthly proxy could be slain only by a Christian sword.

The roots of such disillusionment could be traced to their view that the United States' political leaders and policy makers ultimately desired a policy of coexistence. However, coexistence, they believed, was impossible and, in a death struggle, an insane proposition. As Wilhelmsen noted, "because the Communist must will the very non-existence of his enemy, should he fail to convert him. No dialectic is possible. The only sane reaction to Communism is an assertion of the West with an even firmer intransigence."<sup>102</sup> As no dialectic was possible between Heaven and Hell, so was any such synthesis between their proxy forces. The United States' failure to confront and defeat Soviet-led global communism was an abandonment of the Christian mission, to defend and magnify Christian truth.

The view that the United States was seeking a policy of coexistence was traceable to a number of sources. They increasingly came to believe that the United States was dominated, especially its ruling elite, by liberalism, which was, Bozell wrote, "at the deepest philosophical depths . . . anchored in the ancient

heresy of gnosticism with its belief that the salvation of man and of society can be accomplished on this earth.”<sup>103</sup> Bozell argued, however, that liberalism was, unlike communism, a “moderate” expression of gnosticism, because liberals believed that they could perfect man and society by changing the environment and not overtly controlling and changing the individual. Yet—and here the communists knew better—the “gnostic dream of an earthly paradise can be realized,” Bozell wrote, “not by changing society, *but by changing man*—by transmutative surgery on the soul,” which referred to the communist effort to transform man’s “preformed nature, one that is ultimately defined transcendently in terms of his origin and destiny,” to a nature defined by its finite, materialistic potentialities.<sup>104</sup> Bozell concluded:

*It follows that if gnosticism is ever to triumph, it will triumph in the Communist form. Yet Liberals instinctively recoil from that prospect: their sense of humanity, their residual attachment to the values and forms of the West, forbid the Communist solution. What a pickle—to be possessed by a world view that demands the victory of your enemy! Men afflicted by such a neurosis go mad, and civilizations do also. And in the meantime they fight—stubbornly—but aimlessly, without hope and without purpose: a ‘twilight struggle.’<sup>105</sup>*

Liberals, then, were incapable of combating the communist onslaught. Yet, Bozell’s and Wilhelmson’s disillusionment with the United States as the defender of the Christian West was rooted in more than the *abstract* conception of the supposed philosophical ties between communism and liberalism, but very *concrete* events that also exposed America’s failing Christian purpose.

In November, 1956, Hungarians rose in rebellion against their Soviet overlords; the Hungarian government was a Soviet puppet regime. The rebellion was encouraged in part by the Eisenhower administration, which stressed

sympathy for Eastern European countries imprisoned by the Soviet Union and broadcast into Eastern Europe, through Radio Free Europe, an anticommunist, liberationist, and nationalist rhetoric to those countries behind the Iron Curtain.<sup>106</sup>

The Hungarians toppled their communist rulers and called for assistance from the West. Unfortunately for them, Radio Free Europe's message was merely rhetoric. No support came; however, the Red Army did violently suppress the rebellion. The Eisenhower administration did nothing more than publicly deplore the Soviet invasion.<sup>107</sup>

Wilhelmsen saw great hope in the Hungarian Revolution. Against insurmountable odds, the Hungarians still challenged their Soviet oppressors. Wilhelmsen believed that such courage was derived from the Christian faith, which taught that life transcended its physical limitations. "There are no graves for those of us who are of the Christian West," Wilhelmsen stated; "or—better yet—graves exist solely that we might climb out of them."<sup>108</sup> The Christian tradition, then, cultivated supernatural bravery; Christendom was, Wilhelmsen wrote, "man with his back to the wall. It is the glory of lost causes and the splendor of certain defeat. It is the dice clacking at the feet of the Savior."<sup>109</sup> Wilhelmsen wrote such words on Good Friday; and as Christ rose from the dead, so would Christian Hungary—the "Hilt of Christendom"—"rise again."<sup>110</sup>

If Wilhelmsen saw great hope in the Revolution, he found great tragedy in the United States' failure to aid the revolutionaries. Wilhelmsen wrote that America "has been judged and found empty by civilization itself" and now "stood dishonored before the West. . . . branded as a nation of cowards from Oslo to

Madrid.”<sup>111</sup> The United States’ abandonment of Hungary indicated that it feared war and death, and such cowardliness militated against the Christian tradition. Wilhelmsen argued that even though war risked the survival of Western civilization, the West “must not despair” in the possibility of death and defeat.<sup>112</sup> “Such a failure would have been written into creation for ends known only to the God of history,” he wrote—“a failure made bearable because the Cross teaches men that even God Himself took upon His back the contradictions of human existence.”<sup>113</sup> The Christian tradition called on its adherents to defend and magnify Christendom no matter the risk. It was better “for the whole cosmos to go up in flames, unto the very last star and the most remote moon, burnt out—the whole of existence scorched and reduced to a cinder blown away into the awful wastes of the void,” Wilhelmsen wrote, “than that dishonor should unfold the banner of Hell within our walls.”<sup>114</sup>

Bozell expressed a similar sentiment over Nikita Khrushchev’s visit to the United States in 1959—the same Khrushchev who ordered the invasion of Hungary. Bozell wrote that the visit “exposed a surrender potential in the United States of a depth and magnitude that leaves no objective grounds for believing the country will survive.”<sup>115</sup> Bozell traced such a condition to the Eisenhower administration, which transformed America from a “nation steeled to the cold war” to a “flaccid, feckless, indifferent nation that believed, if it believed anything at all, that peace is the highest value.”<sup>116</sup> Bozell believed that such a transformation was due to Eisenhower’s policies—rooted in what he termed the “nuclear-war-is-unthinkable thesis”—which had “committed the nation to coexistence with the

Soviet Union” and “endorsed the ‘spirit of Geneva.’”<sup>117</sup> America, Bozell lamented, was a nation “whose soul preferred peace to victory.”<sup>118</sup> This was the “supreme irony of the struggle,” Bozell noted—the West was fearful of death and thus recoiled from the possibility of a nuclear war; yet, the Christian West, unlike its atheistic adversary, subscribed to a transcendental origin, purpose, and destiny.<sup>119</sup> The threat of death should be “different with men who have a purpose outside of history,” he wrote, the “terror—the specter of a lifeless planet—is, by all rights, *our* weapon.”<sup>120</sup>

The signs of the United States’ Christian decadence were also manifest domestically, especially in the secularization of the public school system. The Supreme Court, in its decisions in *McCullum v. Board of Education* (1948), *Engel v. Vitale* (1962), and *Abington School District v. Schempp* (consolidated with *Murray v. Curlett*) (1963), established a “wall of separation” between church and state and declared a policy of “neutrality” for government toward religion. In the fight of its life against atheistic communism, this was an unfortunate time, Bozell reasoned, for American to de-Christianize its public life:

Granted, people and nations are interiorly ‘better’ for being God-oriented. But are not prayers also said—I don’t know why I should be embarrassed to write about this, but I am—in the hope of being *answered*? And may we not properly assume that unsaid prayers go *unanswered*? And thus that God may not be moved to care much about the fate of a nation that does not pray, that *officially* whores after false gods? The Jewish and Christian traditions are full of reminders that God replies to such nations by taking it out of their hides.<sup>121</sup>

Bozell believed that the Warren Court’s decisions were rooted in the developmental concept of sociological jurisprudence rather than precedent and political and social consensus. Ominously, for Bozell, such a trajectory

disconnected the law from metaphysics—that is, eternal truths—and rooted law in the relativistic concept of social development and utility.<sup>122</sup> Bozell dismissed the idea that the Founders had established a “wall of separation” (rather than the disestablishment of religion) between church and state; “every informed person knows that the kind of ‘separation’ demanded by the Supreme Court in the past 15 years,” he wrote, “is a total stranger to America’s historical experience, as well as to the demonstrable purpose of the framers of the First Amendment.”<sup>123</sup> But even if they had, he argued, the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment did not intend for the Amendment to make the Bill of Rights applicable to the states—education was intended to be a state prerogative.<sup>124</sup>

Yet even more problematic was the assumption that a government that claimed neutrality was indeed neutral on matters of religion. In a concurring review of Charles E. Rice’s *The Supreme Court and Public Prayer* (1964)—which argued that the Court’s neutral policy developed in the *Murray* case was anything but neutral—Bozell noted that Rice pointed out correctly that the Court’s neutral policy would “‘bar the churches’ tax privileges,” and,

‘Require the removal of God’s name from coins, the pledge of allegiance and public anthems—unless the Court decides such innovations of the Deity are merely “patriotic or ceremonial.” . . . In a word, an official admission of the country’s dependence on God ‘will be [deemed] constitutional only if it is not meant to be believed—one might say only if it is hypocrisy.’<sup>125</sup>

Rice argued—an argument that Bozell was concurrently developing in *The Warren Revolution*—that the Court’s “neutral” policy was not neutral but actually agnostic and, as Bozell wrote, “a camouflage for an official policy *against* theistic religion.”<sup>126</sup> Bozell wrote that “Christ had the point in mind in observing that

those who were not with Him were perforce against Him.”<sup>127</sup> The point was illustrated by “the public school teacher’s quandary on being asked whether human rights come from a Creator-God, as maintained by the Declaration of Independence.”<sup>128</sup>

Under the Court’s ‘neutrality’ rule, the teacher cannot answer the question by either “Yes” or “No,” for this would amount to the government ‘taking sides.’ The required reply is, ‘I don’t know’—i.e., ‘*I cannot say whether it is true or not, because the government cannot take a position on the existence of God.*’ But that reply, as Professor Charles Rice has remarked, is a far cry from ‘neutrality’: plainly ‘the teacher is aligning the government on the side of *agnosticism* through his affirmation that, as a matter of state policy, God’s existence is unknown or unknowable.’ Thus, ‘the Supreme Court, while invoking the rhetoric of an impossible “neutrality,” has neatly replaced our traditional public affirmation of God and His law with a new, non-theistic public creed, demanding of the state a perpetual suspension of judgment on the question, ‘Is there a God?’<sup>129</sup>

### Disaffection with American Conservatism

While *Triumph*’s future founding editors were dismayed with the prevalence of liberalism, they became disaffected also with American conservatism as an alternative. America had lost its Christian purpose; this was its sickness, and as such, it required a Christian revival. The conservative movement’s—specifically *National Review*’s—adherence to libertarianism, however, was incapable, they believed, of resurrecting a Christian will.

*National Review* was not a radical libertarian magazine. The editors excommunicated, for example, radical libertarian, Ayn Rand, from the mainstream conservative movement. In a review of Rand’s renowned *Atlas Shrugged*—which posited a radical individualism—Whitaker Chambers identified

her vision as “philosophical materialism,” which “begins by rejecting God, religion, original sin, etc., etc.” and thus, places “‘Randian Man,’ like Marxian Man,” at the “center of a godless world.”<sup>130</sup> Materialist man, Chambers wrote, “becomes merely the most consuming of animals, with glut as the condition of his happiness and its replenishment his foremost activity.”<sup>131</sup>

Rand’s hope for man to be completely free of social restraint was utopian. Such a system could never be implemented and would lead, Chamber’s noted, to some “species of Big Brother”—most likely a dictatorship that would attempt to “solve and supervise” the transition to Rand’s utopia—because Rand’s hubristic and dogmatic idealism could scarcely tolerate dissent.<sup>132</sup> “From almost any page of *Atlas Shrugged*,” Chambers wrote, “a voice can be heard, from painful necessity, commanding: ‘To a gas chamber – go!’”<sup>133</sup>

*National Review* was, however, pro-capitalist. The editors labeled, for example, Pope John XXIII’s encyclical, *Mother and Teacher* (1961), which was very critical of capitalism, “a venture in triviality.”<sup>134</sup> The encyclical ignored, the editors noted, the “extraordinary material well-being that such free economic systems” were generating, and gave “scant mention” to the problem of the “continuing and demonic successes of the Communists.”<sup>135</sup> In a later editorial, *National Review* posted the irreverent witticism, “Mater sí, Magistra no” (Mother yes, Teacher no).<sup>136</sup>

Bozell became especially wary of the magazine’s attempt to fuse the principal elements of libertarianism with those of traditionalism, thereby making libertarianism, Bozell believed, the principal ideology of the conservative

movement. Libertarianism, Bozell concluded, was part of the modern march away from Christian truth. How, then, could such ideas and, by extension, the conservative movement resurrect a Christian purpose?

If communism and liberalism denied Christian truth, libertarianism completed the unholy trinity of modern political ideologies by denying the purpose of the Incarnation—to inculcate humankind, Bozell argued, with Christian virtue, for the “fulfillment of the potentialities of [mankind’s] God-oriented nature,” for the purpose of salvation.<sup>137</sup> He was quick, then, to criticize Meyer’s attempt at fusionism. Meyer argued that fusion could be rooted in the concept that incorporated “at one and the same time the transcendent goal of human existence and the primacy of the freedom of the person in the political order.”<sup>138</sup> Such a fusion, Meyer wrote:

Maintains that the only possible ultimate vindication of the freedom of the individual person rests upon a belief in his overriding value as a person, a value based upon transcendental considerations. And it maintains that the duty of men is to seek virtue; but it insists that men cannot in actuality do so unless they are free from the constraint of the physical coercion of an unlimited state. For the simulacrum of virtuous acts brought about by the coercion of superior power, is not virtue, the meaning of which resides in the free choice of good over evil.<sup>139</sup>

The value of the individual, Meyer argued, was rooted in the belief that humankind had divine origins; thus, any order must recognize a transcendent beginning and end, yet such an order must also guarantee individual liberty—which was divinely ordained, Meyer believed—to allow man to act virtuously to accomplish salvation. The obtainment of virtue—making the moral choice—was achieved only in a situation of volition; otherwise, a moral decision, made without

free choice, was devoid of virtue because it was “no more than a conditioned tropism.”<sup>140</sup>

Bozell argued against the possibility of a “libertarian-traditionalist amalgam.”<sup>141</sup> He denied Meyer’s claim that the obtainment of virtue was dependent upon political freedom; rather, he argued that Christian teaching posited an inherent free will and that the moral choice was a “*psychic event*” and ultimately, though not completely, unaffected by external circumstances.<sup>142</sup> In Christian teaching, in matters of morality, the individual could never be deprived of choice. The Christian view of an inalienable moral freedom, however, did not mean that political systems were inconsequential to the formation of virtue; rather, moral freedom gave humans the ability to reject their God-oriented nature—a possibility because of the “ravages of original sin.”<sup>143</sup> Humankind, therefore, given that its objective was beatitude with God, required as much help as possible to conform to its true transcendental nature, to develop its God-oriented potential, and obtain salvation. Bozell wrote:

That is why the role of grace is so vital to the Christian view of things, not only supernatural grace, but the natural grace that springs forth from man’s constructs: his institutions, his customs, his laws—the ones that have been inspired by his better angel and that remain in time to give nourishment to all of the human race. And that, in turn, is why the Christian view, which begins in despair, ends in optimism.<sup>144</sup>

The Christian purpose, then, was “twofold: to give the widest possible access to supernatural grace—that is, to magnify the Christian Church; and to establish temporal conditions conducive to human virtue—that is, to build a Christian *civilization*.”<sup>145</sup>

Bozell agreed with libertarians that the freer the moral choice the greater the merit; yet, he maintained that the moral choice—whether reflexive, instinctive, or coerced—was still virtuous “if man’s virtue consists in conducting himself in conformity with his nature, with the divine patterns of order.”<sup>146</sup> Because man will always have “sufficient moral freedom,” Bozell argued, “the ideal to which man should aspire is to *minimize*” the occasions he has to reject the moral law, and “to develop the kind of character that will generate virtuous acts as a matter of course.”<sup>147</sup> “For as the mystics tell us,” Bozell wrote, “true sanctity is achieved only when man loses his freedom—when he is freed of the temptation to displease God.”<sup>148</sup>

The libertarian emphasis on freedom as the necessary precondition for the obtainment of virtue, Bozell argued, militated against a Christian order; such an emphasis was nihilistic—the opportunity for virtue was held in proportion to the absence of cultural, political, and social restraints. Bozell reasoned that if freedom became the foremost value in society, then “there is no superior principle that can be invoked, at any stage, against the effort to maximize freedom,” and “there is no point at which men are entitled to *stop* hauling down the ‘props’ which every rational society in history has erected to promote a virtuous citizenry.”<sup>149</sup> While Bozell noted that libertarians still wanted to uphold public order—to the extent that the law should protect one man from denying another man his freedom—his point was that the libertarian view provided no supports for “the purpose of encouraging and aiding virtue” and thereby helping man and woman obtain salvation.<sup>150</sup>

Libertarianism, then, if it did not deny Christian truth (like communism and liberalism), encouraged the freedom to reject one's God-oriented nature. Libertarians placed their faith for the success of such a system in human capability, that is, the human capability to earn salvation without any public guides. In this regard, it was akin to liberalism and communism, believing that humankind could, on its own, achieve its salvation.<sup>151</sup> In stark contrast, Bozell argued for the construction of a Christian order that facilitated virtue.<sup>152</sup> The libertarian emphasis on freedom, Bozell wrote, was part of the "story of how the free society has come to take priority over the good society."<sup>153</sup> Bozell developed five cannons in support of the virtuous society; they were a militant rejection of libertarianism and Meyer's concept of a libertarian-traditionalist fusion:

1. *The goal of man is virtue—the fulfillment of the potentialities of his God-oriented nature. Man's purpose therefore is to seek virtue. God rewards or punishes depending on how individual man, each judged in the context of his peculiar circumstances, conducts the quest.*

2. *The chief purpose of politics is to aid the quest for virtue. Man's corruption necessitated many such aids. The peculiar function of politics is to create a commonwealth whose institutions—one of which is the state—will reflect as nearly as possible the ideal values of truth, beauty and goodness, and so help instill them as real values in the consciousness of its citizens.*

3. *Political (and economic) freedom are, in this sense, "institutions" which the prudent commonwealth will adopt in such measures as they are conducive to the virtue of its citizens.*

4. *Free will inheres in human nature as a *condition* of each man's personal quest for virtue. Without it, the quest could not take place—movement toward the goal would be impossible. Without it, no less important, the quest would be unnecessary—the goal would be at hand. Short of the goal, no man will lack opportunity for exercising free will. As the goal approaches, the occasions for exercising it will diminish, as it merges into the will of God.*

5. The urge to freedom for its own sake is, in last analysis, a rebellion against nature; it is the urge to be free from God.<sup>154</sup>

Bozell insisted that *National Review* conservatism and, by extension, mainstream conservatism was rooted in Meyer's view that freedom was the precondition for virtue. The quest for freedom rather than virtue, he believed, motivated *National Review's* perspectives. This was manifest, he contended, in its efforts to justify the use of contraception and reconcile its use with Roman Catholic doctrine.

*National Review's* editors were concerned with population growth in the 1960s and feared the effect it would have on the economic health of the country and other such calamities that population pressure could cause worldwide. It was clear that their answer to the population issue was contraception.<sup>155</sup> Garry Wills argued in the pages of *National Review* that Pius XI's condemnation of contraception in his encyclical, *On Christian Marriage* (1930), should not be considered an infallible teaching and could thus be regarded as advisory.<sup>156</sup> Furthermore, Wills contended that Pope Pius XII's acceptance of the so-called rhythm method of regulating procreation was an indicator of the Church's move away from its rejection of contraception and toward its eventual acceptance of contraception.<sup>157</sup>

Bozell responded that Wills's "representation of *Casti Connubii* [*On Christian Marriage*] as 'not infallible,'" was "at best a beleaguered point of view" and that most of the eminent Catholic theologians either rejected such a viewpoint or believed that the Church's anti-contraceptive position was an infallible doctrine established before *On Christian Marriage*.<sup>158</sup> Furthermore,

Bozell argued that it was “palpably not true” that Pope Pius XII’s approval of the rhythm method was a deviation from Catholic teaching, but rather an affirmation of *On Christian Marriage*.<sup>159</sup> Bozell quoted from *On Christian Marriage*, in which Pius XI stated that “Nor are those considered as acting against nature who in the married state use their right in the proper manner although on account of natural reasons either of time or of certain defects, new life cannot be brought forth.”<sup>160</sup> But Bozell admitted that the Church had not yet stated clearly its view on anovulants, which seemed to complicate the doctrinal issues involved.

*National Review*’s decision to treat the contraceptive issue lightly, and with a more liberal or developmental view of Church teaching, stunned Bozell. He noted that while the Church “hopes for understanding from her children, she will settle for assent.”<sup>161</sup> *National Review* had not shown assent. Bozell, in contrast, understood the contraceptive issue as constituting a much greater significance and was angered by the developmental view of Catholic doctrine and the suggestive nature of encyclicals that his colleagues were willing to posit; he wrote:

If the Church next Monday were to abandon her teaching on contraceptives as set forth in *Casti Connubii*, I doubt whether the Church on Tuesday could plausibly hold herself forth, either to the faithful or to the world, as an infallible authority on morals—or on anything else except ghostly matters like the Assumption that are not subject to human disputation.<sup>162</sup>

Bozell was shocked even more so by Buckley’s early view on abortion, motivated by a fear of the calamities caused by overpopulation, the pluralist nature of American society, and the Church’s support, as of the Second Vatican Council, for religious freedom. Buckley noted that while the Catholic Church

prohibits abortion, this ban—under the Second Vatican Council’s pronouncement on religious liberty—could be applied only to Catholics. And as such, he argued that the Catholic Church did not have a right to impose such views on the civil law. “Some Catholics may understand themselves to be pleading as defenders of the rights of unborn children of whatever faith,” Buckley wrote,

And the stand is honorable; but not viable; and the means by which the case is pleaded must be suasive rather than coercive. Not viable because the positive law, the law in effect, does not recognize an unborn child as a human entity, possessing rights—which is why penalties against illegal abortions are less than those against murder. With the result that the vision some Catholics might cherish, of introducing unborn children into the category of citizens fully endowed with human rights, is a vision so utterly unapproachable as to suggest that the requirements of prudence and of charity intervene; that other, preliminary considerations should figure more prominently in the social program of the Catholic Church.<sup>163</sup>

Bozell responded that Buckley’s reasoning was burdened by relativism—rooted, as it was, he believed, in a pluralist conception of public ethics and an esoteric view of the moral law. Bozell did not believe that the Vatican II-Church had abandoned its mission to conform the secular law to the moral law. “One could predict that Vatican II’s Declaration on Religious Liberty would generate much mischief,” Bozell wrote, “But what it seems to have done to my friend was quite unforeseen—to date, to my knowledge, not even the tipsiest representative of the Catholic New Breed has been driven to this bit of recklessness.”<sup>164</sup>

*National Review’s* libertarianism, liberal Catholicism, and more generally its secular orientation led Bozell to leave the journal and the conservative movement.<sup>165</sup> American conservatism, “saddled with notion that freedom comes first and virtue second,” was, he believed, part of the modern dialectic leading toward the secularization of society.<sup>166</sup>

If Bozell was disappointed with the ideological composite that was American conservatism, he was disillusioned also with its political failures. The latter signified its moral inadequacies and the moral decadence of American society, which seemed anesthetized by liberalism's materialist solutions, and thereby also led to his decision to found *Triumph*.

Bozell (and *National Review*) cautiously favored the Republican Party over the liberal, secular, statist, pro-labor and pro-federally-mandated civil rights Democratic Party. Yet for Bozell, the Republican Party in the fifties and early sixties was not dependably conservative, and its left wing often overshadowed its right wing. Bozell was especially dismayed with President Eisenhower and his "New Republicanism," which, Bozell argued, was in effect and theory indistinguishable from liberalism. When reporting from the 1956 Democratic Presidential Convention, Bozell and Wilmore Kendall remarked that the Democratic Party was in disarray because:

It is an impossible political task to work up national enthusiasm for driving the defilers out of the temple when the main point of the people who want to do the driving is that the temple is, in all important respects, the very place that it was when they left it four years ago.<sup>167</sup>

Eisenhower and the Republicans, Bozell believed, had failed to stem the trend toward statism. "Republican candidates, as a point of elemental decency," Bozell exclaimed in 1957, "should hereafter refrain from lambasting the opposition party for favoring the welfare state—either that, or be prepared to repudiate the record of their own party."<sup>168</sup> The so-called "New Republicanism"—based on Eisenhower's adage that he was conservative when it came to financial matters but liberal when it came to people—was rooted, like liberalism, Bozell

maintained, not in constitutionalism, but in the totalitarian precept that the “state is competent to do all things” and “sheer majoritarianism.”<sup>169</sup>

Bozell declared the Republican Party dead after severe setbacks in the 1958 congressional elections. He blamed the party, which “made Dwight Eisenhower its high priest, in exchange for its soul.”<sup>170</sup> Bozell was unenthusiastic about the Catholic John F. Kennedy. The latter’s campaign probably contributed to Bozell’s waning confidence in the ability of the United States to be the standard bearer of Christianity. Kennedy, after all, had vowed to keep his religion separate from politics. It was yet another sign of the increasing secularization of American society.<sup>171</sup>

Richard Nixon, Kennedy’s opponent in 1960, while not as liberal as Eisenhower, was, Bozell noted, too pragmatic to be a “principled conservative” like Barry Goldwater.<sup>172</sup> Bozell had in 1960 ghost-written for the Senator, *The Conscience of a Conservative*, which was an anti-liberal political manifesto that championed an aggressive anticommunist foreign policy, libertarian economic policies, states’ rights, strict constructionism, and traditional Christian values. It actually was an expression of the fusionist conservatism promoted by Meyer and *National Review*.<sup>173</sup> Nash writes that the book became “one of the most successful political tracts in American history.”<sup>174</sup> “It galvanized,” Nash added, “the rumbling popular conservative movement, catapulted Goldwater to national prominence, and helped the Right to capture the Republican Party in the mid-1960s.”<sup>175</sup> Yet, such political success was trumped ultimately by disappointment. Bozell and Buckley, both of whom had labored to present Goldwater as a viable

conservative candidate, were excluded from the senator's presidential campaign, and Goldwater was subsequently trounced in the 1964 election.<sup>176</sup> While Bozell claimed many years later that he "didn't have the slightest ambition to join" the Senator's campaign, it seems that a position in Goldwater's campaign staff would have been, at the very least, difficult to refuse for a man who studied law in order to become a politician, because he thought he "could change the world."<sup>177</sup>

Bozell himself ran three times for political office. He won a race in 1958 for assemblyman for Montgomery County, Maryland; but he was unsuccessful in his campaigns for a seat in the Maryland House of Delegates in 1958 and for the Senate in 1964.<sup>178</sup>

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> Unsigned, ed., *Frederick Daniel Wilhelmsen (Eminent Professor and Catholic Intellectual): A Tribute from the University of Dallas* (Dallas: University of Dallas, 1998), 8-10.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 9-10.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 9-10.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>11</sup> Editors, "Mr. Johnson Remembers Hungary," *Triumph* 1 no. 3 (November, 1966): 38. Their efforts to aid the Hungarians were thwarted by the State Department.

<sup>12</sup> Michael Lawrence, introduction to *Mustard Seeds A Conservative Catholic Becomes a Catholic: Collected Essays*, by L. Brent Bozell (Manassas, VA: Trinity Communications, 1986), 11. Also, see Michael Lawrence, introduction to *The Best of Triumph*, ed., Unsigned (Front Royal, VA: Christendom Press, 2001), xviii-xix. Bozell's wife Patricia also helped create and sustain the journal. In a farewell address, the *Triumph's* editors noted that "in the truest personal and professional sense *Triumph* [was] Patricia Bozell's magazine." SCC, "Dedication," *Triumph* 11 no. 1 (January, 1976): 2-3.

<sup>13</sup> For biographical information on Bozell, see Patrick Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America, 1950-1985* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), 21-23, 60-64, 141-160; *American Conservatism: An Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Bozell, L. Brent;" L. Brent Bozell, *Mustard Seeds*, 7-19, 340-348; William F. Buckley, Jr., "L. Brent Bozell, RIP," *National Review* 49 (May 19, 1997): 22-23; John B. Judis, *William F. Buckley, Jr.: Patron Saint of the Conservatives* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988), 55-57, 104-109, 221-224, 318-322; Kevin Lynch, "Mission of Mercy," *National Review* (June 5, 1987): 45-46; George H. Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America: Since 1945* (New York: Basic Books, 1976; Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 1998), 98-99, 162-165, 186, 200-203, 241, 252-254, 273, 292-301; and Unsigned, ed., *The Best of Triumph* (Front Royal, VA: Christendom Press, 2001), xviii, xix, xxvi. For biographical information on Bozell, this author has relied also on Patrick Allitt's interviews with L. Brent Bozell and his wife, Patricia Bozell. L. Brent Bozell, interview by Patrick Allitt, 26 February 1991, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA; and Patricia Bozell, interview with Patrick Allitt, 9 March 1991, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA. Patricia Bozell also provided this author with a privately published book of eulogies of her husband and letters of condolences to the Bozell family from family and friends after his death in 1997. Patricia Bozell, ed., *LBB: Memories* (published privately with the help of Michael Lawrence, 1997).

---

<sup>14</sup> Bozell, *Mustard Seeds*, 345.

<sup>15</sup> Bozell, *Mustard Seeds*, 346; and L. Brent Bozell, interview by Allitt.

<sup>16</sup> Jeffrey Hart, John B. Judis, and George H. Nash believe that Bozell's decision to join the Roman Catholic Church was influenced by Buckley at Yale. Bozell maintained that he made his decision to convert before Yale, but that he delayed his actual conversion until his Yale-years because his mother "was very anti-Catholic." L. Brent Bozell, interview by Allitt. For Hart's, Judis's, and Nash's views on this matter, see Jeffrey Hart, *The Making of the American Conservative Mind: National Review and Its Times* (Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 2005), 6; Judis, *William F. Buckley, Jr.*, 56-57; and Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America*, 98.

<sup>17</sup> Judis, *William F. Buckley, Jr.*, 56-57. Bozell noted that when he first voted—in the Nebraska Democratic presidential primary in 1948—he voted for William O. Douglas, "because of his world federalism." Bozell, *Mustard Seeds*, 346.

<sup>18</sup> Judis, *William F. Buckley, Jr.*, 57.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 55-57.

<sup>20</sup> Patricia Bozell, ed., *LBB: Memories*, 40.

<sup>21</sup> William F. Buckley, Jr. and L. Brent Bozell, *McCarthy and His Enemies: The Record and Its Meanings* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1954).

<sup>22</sup> Bozell titled his column "National Trends."

<sup>23</sup> Bozell continued to publish articles for *National Review* until 1965.

<sup>24</sup> Barry Goldwater, *Conscience of a Conservative* (New York: Hillman Books, 1960); and L. Brent Bozell, *The Warren Revolution: Reflections on a Consensus Society* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1966).

<sup>25</sup> Lawrence, introduction to *Mustard Seeds*, 10.

<sup>26</sup> For biographical information on Wilhelmsen, see *Contemporary Authors*, New Revision Series, s.v. "Wilhelmsen, Frederick D.," Patrick Foley, "Frederick D. Wilhelmsen," *The Catholic Social Science Review* 1 (1996): 281; Patrick Foley, "In Memoriam Frederick D. Wilhelmsen: One Year Later," *The Catholic Social Science Review* 2 (1997): 329; Warren H. Carroll, "In Memoriam: Frederick D. Wilhelmsen (1923-1996)," *Faith and Reason* 22 no. 4 (Winter, 1996): 239-246; Maria S. Ceplecha, "Remembrances of a Philosopher-Sailor," *Faith and Reason* 22 no. 4 (Winter, 1996): 263-267; Thomas D. D'Andrea, "Frederick D. Wilhelmsen: An Appreciation and Memoir," *Faith and Reason* 22 no. 4 (Winter, 1996): 253-267; Michael B. Ewbank, "Dr. Fredrick Daniel Wilhelmsen: 1923-1996," *The Wanderer* (June 20, 1996): 12; Michael B. Ewbank, "In Memoriam: Frederick D. Wilhelmsen (1923-1996)," *Review of Metaphysics* (September, 1996): 262; Jeffrey Hart, "Frederick Wilhelmsen, RIP," *National Review* (July 1, 1996): 17; Robert A. Herrera, "Frederick D. Wilhelmsen," *The Catholic Social Science Review* 1 (1996): 283-284; John Janaro, "Editorial," *Faith and Reason* 22 no. 4 (Winter, 1996): 233-235; James J. Lehrberger, "Christendom's Troubadour: Frederick D. Wilhelmsen," *The Intercollegiate Review* (Spring, 1997): 52-55; James J. Lehrberger, "In Memoriam: Frederick D. Wilhelmsen (1923-1996)," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* (Summer, 1996): 458; William Marshner, "Don Federico: Presente!" *Faith and Reason* 22 no. 4 (Winter, 1996): 247-252; Thomas Molnar, "Frederick D. Wilhelmsen—R.I.P.," *Chronicles* (June, 1997): 45; Richard John Neuhaus, "While We're At It," *First Things* (August-September, 1997): 86-87; Thomas Schaefer, "Frederick D. Wilhelmsen:

---

Requiescat in Pace,” *The University Bookman* 36 (Fall 1996): 18-21; and Unsigned, ed., *Frederick Daniel Wilhelmsen*.

<sup>27</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, *Hilaire Belloc: No Alienated Man, A Study in Christian Integration* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1953); Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, *Man’s Knowledge of Reality: An Introduction to Thomistic Epistemology* (Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1955); and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, *The Metaphysics of Love* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1962).

<sup>28</sup> Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement*, 1-117. Like Nash, this author believes that it is best to see anticommunism as a separate strain of conservative thought even though both libertarians and traditionalists were anticommunist. See Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement*, 74-117. Some intellectuals were drawn to the conservative movement principally out of their anticommunist convictions rather than a specific adherence to either libertarian or traditionalist principles. James Burnham, for example, was a pivotal figure in the post-World War II conservative intellectual revival, and he was neither a libertarian nor a traditionalist.

<sup>29</sup> Eric Voegelin, *The New Science of Politics: An Introduction* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952): 126, 121.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 131, 132.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 132.

<sup>32</sup> Friedrich A. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1944; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994). 101. For a historical perspective of libertarian thought in the post-World War II period, see John L. Kelly, *Bringing the Market Back In: The Political Revitalization of Market Liberalism* (New York: New York University Press, 1997).

<sup>33</sup> Wilhelmsen, *Hilaire Belloc*, 51.

<sup>34</sup> Richard M. Weaver, *Ideas Have Consequences* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962), 1. For an examination of traditionalist thought, see Russell Kirk, *The Conservative Mind: From Burke to Santayana* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1953). For a historical perspective of traditionalist thought, see Paul V. Murphy, *The Rebuke of History: The Southern Agrarians and American Conservative Thought* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001).

<sup>35</sup> Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement*, 171. For an examination of “fusionist” concepts, see Frank S. Meyer, ed., *What is Conservatism?* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964).

<sup>36</sup> George H. Nash wrote that *National Review* was “Far more indispensable to the Right than any single liberal journal was to the Left . . . if *National Review* (or something like it) had not been founded, there would probably have been no cohesive intellectual force on the Right in the 1960s and 1970s. To a very substantial degree, the history of reflective conservatism in America after 1955 is the history of the individuals who collaborated in—or were discovered by—the magazine William F. Buckley, Jr. founded.” Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement*, 140. Gregory L. Schneider wrote, “Buckley’s magazine much like the *Freeman*, was a money-losing venture; yet it had a profound impact on the conservative movement.” Gregory L. Schneider, *Cadres for Conservatism: Young Americans for Freedom and the Rise of the Contemporary Right* (New York: New York University Press, 1999), 18. Jerome L. Himmelstein noted that *National Review* was “the most influential and symptomatic” conservative journal. Jerome L. Himmelstein, *To the Right: The Transformation of American Conservatism* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990) 28. Buckley, the magazine’s owner and editor in chief, and James Burnham, a long-time senior editor, were the strongest forces behind the march to mainstream acceptance. Burnham was likely the dominant intellectual influence behind such a direction; he

---

had great influence over the magazine—serving in some respects as a father figure to Buckley. Burnham was an empirical conservative and could sacrifice principle for expediency when the latter course of action provided a greater chance of capturing political power. John B. Judis, Buckley's biographer, wrote that Burnham "was Buckley's first and world become his most important recruit." Judis, *William F. Buckley, Jr.*, 100, 122. Buckley acknowledged Burnham's influence in a eulogy, labeling him "the dominant intellectual influence in the development of this journal." William F. Buckley, Jr., "James Burnham 1905-1987," *National Review* 39 (September 11, 1987): 31. For studies of Burnham, see John P. Diggins, *Up From Communism: Conservative Intellectual Odysseys In American Intellectual History* (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1975); Samuel Francis, *Thinkers of Our Time: James Burnham* (London: The Claridge Press, 1999); Kevin J. Smant, *How Great the Triumph: James Burnham, Anticommunism and the Conservative Movement* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1999); and Daniel Kelly, *James Burnham and the Struggle for the World: A Life* (Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2002).

<sup>37</sup> Some other Catholic contributors were Colin Clark and Arnold Lunn.

<sup>38</sup> Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement*, 71; also, see Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America*, ix. Allitt's study implies that Catholics and Catholic thought was the principal force behind the new conservatism.

<sup>39</sup> Burnham was born a Catholic but had left the faith. Kelly, *James Burnham and the Struggle for the World*, 366; and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Frank Meyer, R.I.P.," *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 45.

<sup>40</sup> For Buckley's and Wilson's views on capitalism, see William F. Buckley, Jr., *God and Man at Yale: The Superstitions of 'Academic Freedom'* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1951); William F. Buckley, Jr., *Up from Liberalism* (New York: Bantam, 1959); Francis G. Wilson, "Catholics and the New Conservatism," *Social Order* (June, 1956): 247-252; and M. Susan Power, "A Forgotten Conservative: Francis Graham Wilson," *Modern Age* (Winter 1999): 55-62. Also, see Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America*, 70-75.

<sup>41</sup> Goldwater, *Conscience of a Conservative*, 42, 39-44, 45-77.

<sup>42</sup> Echoing libertarians, Bozell wrote: "The Conservative has learned that the economic and spiritual aspects of man's nature are inextricably intertwined. He cannot be economically free, or even economically efficient, if he is enslaved politically; conversely, man's political freedom is illusory if he is dependent for his economic needs on the State." Goldwater, *Conscience of a Conservative*, 12. For Bozell's authorship of *Conscience of a Conservative*, see Richard Rovere, "The Conservative Mindlessness," *Commentary* 39 (March 1965): 38; and most general histories of American conservatism. For other Bozell articles that imply a pro-capitalist view, see L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Reuther Schemes for Power," *National Review* 2 (October 20, 1956): 8-9; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Repeal of the Constitution," *National Review* 2 (December 29, 1956): 9-10, 23; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Budgetary Elephantiasis," *National Review* 3 (February 2, 1957): 104-105; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: The New Privileged Class," *National Review* 3 (June 22, 1957): 588; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Big Labor and the Mundt Bills," *National Review* 5 (February 15, 1958): 152-153; and L. Brent Bozell, "The 1958 Elections: Coroner's Report," *National Review* 6 (November 22, 1958): 333-335.

<sup>43</sup> Thomas Molnar, *Bernanos: His Political Thought and Prophecy* (New York: Sheed and Ward), 167-168. Wilhelmsen questioned the conservative credentials of the libertarian-wing of the American conservative movement. "What is *conservative* about a mentality whose creed is ever-expanding production and perpetual change;" he wrote, "whose advance scouts are the slick advertising agents best symbolized by Madison Avenue; whose goal is a nation avid to throw

---

away its substance year after year in order to follow the Pied Pier of modern technology; whose intellectual defense is the historical necessity of bowing meekly to the *fiat* of history—that fiat called by some ‘The Managerial Revolution,’ by others ‘The Servile State’?” Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Who Is a Real Conservative?” *The Catholic World* (December, 1956): 198. For more articles that express Wilhelmsen’s anti-capitalist view, see Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “The Conservative Catholic,” *The Commonweal* 57 (February 20, 1953): 491-493; Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Technics and Totalitarianism,” *Commonweal* 60 (April 23, 1954): 58-61; Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “In the Name of Sanity,” *Social Order* (January, 1955): 21-25; Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Technology: Limited or Unlimited,” *America* (October 20, 1956): 66-68; and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Otto von Hapsburg and the Future of Europe,” *Modern Age* (Summer 1958): 266-272.

<sup>44</sup> Wilhelmsen, “In the Name of Sanity,” 25.

<sup>45</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “The Vision of Christopher Dawson,” *Commonweal* 67 (January 3, 1958): 356; and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “The Conservative Vision,” *Commonweal* 62 (June 24, 1955): 298

<sup>46</sup> Wilhelmsen, “The Conservative Vision,” 298.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>49</sup> Wilhelmsen: “Technics and Totalitarianism,” 58.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 60.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>53</sup> Wilhelmsen, “Who Is a Real Conservative?” 199.

<sup>54</sup> Wilhelmsen, “Why I am a Catholic,” 67-68.

<sup>55</sup> Reflecting on Wilhelmsen, the professor, Warren H. Carroll writes: “In his lectures Fritz [Wilhelmsen] put special emphasis on the humanity of the Risen Christ. . . . I always quote his recalling the appearance of the Risen Lord to the disciples on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, when they thought Him a ghost until He asked if they had anything to eat. They offered Him some fish which he took and ate. After retelling this, Fritz would throw back his head and shoulders, spread his arms (and his cape, if he was wearing it as he sometimes did in class), and intone: ‘ladies and gentlemen, on those fish I base my faith!’” Carroll, “In Memoriam: Frederick D. Wilhelmsen (1923-1996),” 244.

<sup>56</sup> Wilhelmsen, “The Conservative Vision,” 297.

<sup>57</sup> Wilhelmsen, *Hilaire Belloc*, 31.

<sup>58</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “The Sovereignty of Christ or Chaos,” *The Wanderer* (October 26, 1967): 12.

<sup>59</sup> Wilhelmsen, *Hilaire Belloc*, 99.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 94.

---

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>62</sup> See Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America*, 37-41.

<sup>63</sup> For examples of Wilhelmsen's favorable view of a confessional state and monarchy, see Wilhelmsen, "The Sovereignty of Christ—or Chaos," 1-12; Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Royalist Revival in Central Europe," *National Review* 5 (January 18, 1958): 61-63; Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Otto von Hapsburg and the Future of Europe," *Modern Age* (Summer 1958): 266-272; and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "In Defense of Princess Irene of Holland and of Spanish Catholicism," *The Wanderer* (August 5, 1965), 3-8.

<sup>64</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Reflections on the Utility of a Disinterested Education," *University Bookman* 3 (1962): 54.

<sup>65</sup> Thomas Molnar, "The American Experiment," *Commonweal* 63 (March 23, 1956): 638

<sup>66</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "To Magnify the West," *National Review* 12 (April 24, 1962): 287. The italics are Bozell's.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>68</sup> For Bozell's views on communism and the Cold War, see L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends," *National Review* 1 (December 28, 1955): 17; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends," *National Review* 1 (February 29, 1956): 12, 20; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: The Symington Hearings on Airpower: A Report," *National Review* 2 (June 20, 1956): 8-9; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Why Mr. Rovere Likes Ike (II)," *National Review* 2 (July 11, 1956): 7; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: The Great American Slumber," *National Review* 2 (October 6, 1956): 9; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Eisenhower's Premises, Stevenson's Conclusions," *National Review* 2 (October 27, 1956): 8; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Wet Blankets in Foggy Bottom," *National Review* 2 (November 3, 1956): 8, 22; L. Brent Bozell, "A Special Report: The Mideastern Policy," *National Review* 3 (January 19, 1957): 56-57; L. Brent Bozell, "Mr. Burnham's Missing Sanctions," *National Review* 3 (February 9, 1957): 127; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: The Challenge to Government Foreign Aid," *National Review* 3 (April 13, 1957): 348, 353; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: The U.S. Pushes 'National Communism,'" *National Review* 3 (June 1, 1957): 516-517, 530; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Why the Moon is Red," *National Review* 4 (October 26, 1957): 368; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Why the Moon is Red (II)," *National Review* 4 (November 2, 1957): 392; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Their Finest Hour?" *National Review* 5 (January 18, 1958): 56; L. Brent Bozell, "Retreat in Lebanon: Mr. Hammarskjold Pulls a Fast One," *National Review* 6 (July 19, 1958): 80-81; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Congress Speaks," *National Review* 6 (August 16, 1958): 128; L. Brent Bozell, "Nuclear Tests Hedge Against Disaster," *National Review* 6 (March 14, 1959): 579-581; L. Brent Bozell, "A Communist View of Soviet Strategy," *National Review* 7 (June 6, 1959): 106; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: They Gave the Orders," *National Review* 7 (October 10, 1959): 387; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: They Gave the Orders (II)," *National Review* 7 (October 24, 1959): 419; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: World Approval or National Security?" *National Review* 8 (January 16, 1960): 34-35; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: The Dangers of Concessionship," *National Review* 8 (April 9, 1960): 327; L. Brent Bozell, "Nuclear War and the Moral Law," *National Review* 11 (September 23, 1961): 197-198; L. Brent Bozell, "The Strange Drift of Liberal Catholicism," *National Review* 11 (August 12, 1961): 81-85; Bozell, "To Magnify the West," 285-287.

<sup>69</sup> Bozell, "The Strange Drift of Liberal Catholicism," 83.

<sup>70</sup> Wilhelmsen, "Why I am a Catholic," 65.

---

<sup>71</sup> Ibid. For Wilhelmson's views on communism and the Cold War, see Wilhelmson, "The Conservative Catholic," 491-493; Wilhelmson, "Communications: 'The Conservative Catholic,'" 650-652; Wilhelmson, "Technics and Totalitarianism," 58-61; Wilhelmson, "In the Name of Sanity," 21-25; Wilhelmson, "The Conservative Vision," 295-299; Wilhelmson, "Technology: Limited or Unlimited," 66-68; Wilhelmson, "Frederick D. Wilhelmson," *Commonweal* 65 (February 22, 1957): 550-551; Wilhelmson, "Who is a Real Conservative?" 197-201; Frederick D. Wilhelmson, "The Natural Law, Religion, and the Crisis of the Twentieth Century," *Modern Age* (Spring, 1966): 146-148; Frederick D. Wilhelmson, "The Bankruptcy of American Optimism," *National Review* 3 (May 11, 1957): 449-451; Frederick D. Wilhelmson, "History, Toynbee and the Modern Mind: Betrayal of the West," *Modern Age* (Summer 1957): 33-47; Frederick D. Wilhelmson, "The Vision of Christopher Dawson," *Commonweal* 67 (January 3, 1958): 355-358; Frederick D. Wilhelmson, "Royalist Revival in Central Europe," 61-63; Wilhelmson, "Otto von Habsburg and The Future of Europe," 266-272; Frederick D. Wilhelmson, "Toward a Theology of Survival," *National Review* 17 (January 12, 1965): 17-19; Frederick D. Wilhelmson, "Notes Toward a Grammar of the Dialogue," *National Review* 17 (June 1, 1965): 450; and Wilhelmson, "The Sovereignty of Christ—or Chaos," 1-12.

<sup>72</sup> Thomas Molnar, *Utopia: The Perennial Heresy* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967), 223. For Molnar's views on communism and the Cold War, see Thomas Molnar, "The American Experiment," *Commonweal* 63 (March 23, 1956): 635-638; Thomas Molnar, "Lessons From Hungary," *Commonweal* 65 (March 1, 1957): 564-566; Thomas Molnar, "Intellectuals, Experts, and the Classless Society," *Modern Age* (Winter 1957-58): 33-39; Thomas Molnar, "The Cold War without Communism," *National Review* 10 (April 22, 1961): 255-257; Thomas Molnar, "All Too Hasty Wisdom," *National Review* 11 (July 15, 1961): 20-21; Thomas Molnar, "Teilhard's Collectivist Salvation," *National Review* 14 (June 4, 1963): 464-465; Thomas Molnar, "A Critique of Utopian Catholics," *Modern Age* (Spring, 1963): 163-175; Thomas Molnar, "To the Anthill with Love," *National Review* 16 (December 1, 1964): 1073-1074; Thomas Molnar, "Paradox of the Marxist Philosopher," *National Review* 16 (December 15, 1964): 1107-1110; and Thomas Molnar, *The Two Faces of American Foreign Policy* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1962).

<sup>73</sup> Wilhelmson, "History, Toynbee and the Modern Mind: Betrayal of the West," 34, 35.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., 35.

<sup>75</sup> As the purpose of the Incarnation was to "impart the means for dealing with human imperfections—for easing man's way to his ultimate goal, and for realizing, in this life, his maximum human potentialities"—so was man's purpose to "establish human conditions conducive to the reception of that teaching." "Our commission," then, Bozell argued, "was to plant in history the ideals and the standards contained in Christian truth—and to build institutions and foster mores that will help sustain these ideals; in short, to build a Christian *civilization*." L. Brent Bozell, "To Magnify the West," 287. The italics are Bozell's.

<sup>76</sup> Bozell, "To Magnify the West," 287.

<sup>77</sup> Burnham, an ex-socialist turned empirical conservative, was the principal expounder of this thesis. As a primary figure at *National Review*, Burnham would become one of the Right's chief Cold War theorist and, in a series of books—*The Struggle for the World* (1947), *The Coming Defeat of Communism* (1949), and *Containment or Liberation* (1952)—he argued that the primary means of the communist advance was through what he labeled "political warfare," by which he meant all measures of combat, ranging from propaganda to paramilitary efforts, excluding only formal military action, to expand their empire and to demoralize and weaken the United States in preparation for World War III. Burnham, then, promoted a liberationist policy to confront the Soviets. They were attacking; thus, containment was a foolish strategy. He encouraged the United States to engage in "political warfare" campaign to roll back the Iron Curtain. Bozell echoed, to some extent, Burnham's views on the nature of the Soviet-led global communist

---

advance and the methods of confronting it. For example, see L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Nuclear Tests Hedge Against Disaster," *National Review* 6 (March 14, 1959): 580; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends," *National Review* 7 (July 4, 1959): 172; and Bozell, "National Trends: A Communist View of Soviet Strategy," 106.

<sup>78</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: The U.S. Pushes 'National Communism,'" 530.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>80</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Mr. Dulles Finds Himself," *National Review* 2 (September 29, 1956): 8.

<sup>81</sup> Thomas Molnar, "Algeria—Integration or Independence?" *Catholic World* 192 (February, 1961): 295. For Molnar's views on French decolonization, see Thomas Molnar, "Retreat in Algeria," *National Review* 10 (February 11, 1961), 84-85; Thomas Molnar, "The Terrible Meaning of the Algerian Settlement," *National Review* 12 (May 8, 1962): 321-323; Thomas Molnar, "France: Paternalism or Civil War?" *National Review* 13 (September 11, 1962): 180; Thomas Molnar, "Letter from Africa: The Truth About Angola," *National Review* 16 (April 7, 1964): 280; Thomas Molnar, "Neo-Colonialism in Africa," *Modern Age* (Spring 1965): 175-186; and Thomas Molnar, "No New Road," *National Review* 18 (February 8, 1966): 122, 124.

<sup>82</sup> Whittaker Chambers, *Witness* (New York: Random House, 1952), 9. Molnar wrote that Marxism was a "variant of the age-old temptation of the mind to destroy the individual—free, incalculable, spontaneous—and erect the scientific anthill; that is the heresy coeval with Adam." Molnar, "The Cold War Without Communism," 257.

<sup>83</sup> Buckley and Bozell, *McCarthy and His Enemies*, 68. The subcommittee was named after its chairman, Senator Millard Tydings.

<sup>84</sup> Buckley's and Bozell's and, by extension, the conservative side's argument that there had been substantial communist penetration in government and society (and that the Soviet Union was indeed directing a domestic espionage network) is finding some legitimacy in current Cold War historiography. The prevailing view was that the fear of communist penetration and the notion that the Soviet Union was directing domestic communist subversion were overstated. Historians, such as John E. Haynes and Harvey Klehr, have studied the relatively recently declassified Venona Project—secret messages between Soviet agents in the United States and their superiors in the USSR decoded by U.S. intelligence—and have concluded that 349 individuals residing in the U.S. as citizens, immigrants, or permanent residents were involved in espionage activities. They concluded also that communist agents had penetrated the U.S. government, including the White House. Interestingly, Haynes and Klehr—using the declassified Venona Project—verified some of McCarthy's charges. They identified Lauchlin Currie, a senior administrative assistant to Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harold Glasser, an economist in the Treasury Department, Mary Jane Keeney, who worked for the United Nations, and Franz Leopold Neumann, who worked for the Office of Strategic Services, as "Americans and U.S. residents who had covert relationships with Soviet intelligence agencies," and William Remington, who worked for the office of War Production during WWII, as an American "who had [a] covert relationship with Soviet Intelligence agencies but [was] not identified in the Venona cables." McCarthy, incidentally, challenged the loyalty of these individuals. See John Earl Haynes and Harvey Klehr, *Venona: Decoding Soviet Espionage in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 339-382; and Buckley and Bozell, *McCarthy and His Enemies*, 364-382.

<sup>85</sup> Buckley and Bozell, *McCarthy and His Enemies*, 245, 340.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, 316-317.

---

<sup>87</sup> Buckley and Bozell wrote: “The members of a society must share certain values if that society is to cohere; and cohere it must if it is to survive. In order to assert and perpetuate these values, it must do constant battle against competing values. A democratic society, for example, dare not take for granted that the premises of democracy will, unaided (i.e. solely in virtue of their ideological superiority), drive Communism out of the market. If the contest were to be adjudicated by a divine tribunal, society could sit back with folded hands and watch the show. But it is not; and hence a concomitant of man’s selecting freedom as against Communism is his acting rationally in *behalf* of freedom and *against* Communism.” Buckley and Bozell, *McCarthy and His Enemies*, 323-324.

<sup>88</sup> Buckley and Bozell, *McCarthy and His Enemies*, 317. The authors argued that McCarthyism was “nine parts social sanction to [only] one part legal sanction,” which ensured the survival of minority rights.” Even so, the “one part legal sanction”—which included laws such as the Smith Act, the McCarran Act, and the Feinberg Law—was “entirely legitimate,” because the United States was at war. Buckley and Bozell, *McCarthy and His Enemies*, 329.

<sup>89</sup> Buckley and Bozell, *McCarthy and His Enemies*, 335. Despite McCarthy’s eventual censure, Bozell remained loyal to the Senator and wrote him a flattering eulogy. Bozell noted that he “came to know intimately, and to love, the wreckage” that was McCarthy; and wrote that he was a man with a “keen and absorbent and discriminating” intellect, a man with a “vivid moral sense,” and an “iron will,” who, despite public condemnation and physical failings, retained the will in the last years of his life “to concentrate, ruthlessly, on the central problem of our time.” “He never lost his determination,” Bozell wrote, “to set the world right, to bring down the country’s tormentors.” Bozell seated the blame for McCarthy’s death, not on alcoholism, but on the Senate’s decision to censure him; the “Senate turned on him, and that ruined him,” Bozell wrote, “God was merciful to stop his heart.” L. Brent Bozell, “National Trends: This Was a Man,” *National Review* 3 (May 18, 1957): 468. At *National Review*, Bozell wrote often on the intertwining issues of internal security and communist subversion. While he acknowledged that the Cold War, the Smith Act, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation had reduced the size of the Communist Party of the United States, he still believed that the remaining members were a hardened core of paramilitary revolutionaries who were actually more effective as a small disciplined party. He believed, for example, that in 1957, Hawaii was, “to a frightening extent, under the thumb of the Soviet international,” which wielded power through the local Hawaiian chapter of the “Communist-dominated” International Longshoremen and Warehousemen’s Union. L. Brent Bozell, “Nation Trends: The Kremlin’s Hawaiian Fief,” *National Review* 3 (January 5, 1957): 12, 8. Bozell accepted the Eastland Committee’s findings that communists had substantial control of the Hawaiian chapter of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen’s Union, which was able to control the Hawaiian export economy. While the International Longshoremen Warehousemen’s Union was known to be influenced by communists, some contemporaries argued that the Eastland Committee’s findings were motivated by racism. Hawaii was a multiethnic territory and such a conclusion, they believed, was meant to prevent it from becoming a state. Hawaii became the fiftieth state in 1959. Bozell, however, spent more time criticizing liberals—whom he accused of promoting an “anti-security program” for the government—than he did identifying subversion. For example, see L. Brent Bozell, “National Trends,” *National Review* 1 (November 19, 1955): 12; L. Brent Bozell, “National Trends,” *National Review* 2 (May 30, 1956): 8; L. Brent Bozell, “National Trends,” *National Review* 1 (December 14, 1955): 12; and L. Brent Bozell, “National Trends,” *National Review* 1 (March 14, 1956): 10. He was horrified especially by McCarthy’s censure, a watershed event, which, he argued, provided liberals with the confidence to both portray Republicans, for political expediency, as “*too hard* on the security issue,” and to attack for ideological reasons any measures of internal security that they deemed too aggressive. All of these measures, he argued, hindered government security and demonstrated the inability of liberals to understand the threat of communist subversion. “Democratic leaders [of the 1950s] are,” he wrote, “if possible, *more* obdurate, and, if possible, *more* ostentatiously uneducated about and contemptuous of the Communist threat (and/or susceptible to Communist propaganda about the Communist threat) than in the ‘red herring’

---

days." L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends," *National Review* 1 (February 22, 1956): 17. The italics are Bozell's.

<sup>90</sup> Buckley and Bozell, *McCarthy and His Enemies*, 329, 4. The italics are Buckley and Bozell's.

<sup>91</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: The Great American Slumber," *National Review* 2 (October 6, 1956): 9. Even more interesting was James Burnham's view of McCarthyism. Burnham did not praise or condemn McCarthy, but wrote that McCarthyism was actually "an invention of the communist tacticians," who wished to damage the anticommunist cause by propagating it as a danger. James Burnham, "A Letter of Resignation," *Partisan Review* no. 20 (November-December, 1953): 716.

<sup>92</sup> Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement*, 107; and Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America*, 23.

<sup>93</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: World Approval or National Security?" 35.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.* For further examples of Bozell's views on nuclear weapons, testing, and disarmament, see Bozell, "National Trends: Why the Moon is Red, II," 392; Bozell, "Nuclear Tests Hedge Against Disaster," 579-581; and L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: The Symington Hearings on Airpower: A Report," *National Review* 11 (June 20, 1956): 8-9; and Bozell, "National Trends: The Dangerous of Concessionship," 227.

<sup>96</sup> Bozell, "Nuclear War and the Moral Law," 198.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.* The italics are Bozell's.

<sup>98</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: They Gave the Orders, II," *National Review* 7 (October 24, 1959): 419.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>102</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Imitations of Walking Death," *National Review* 9 (July 16, 1960): 27.

<sup>103</sup> Bozell, "To Magnify the West," 286.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.* The italics are Bozell's; and L. Brent Bozell, "Freedom or Virtue?" *National Review* 13 (September, 1962): 184.

<sup>105</sup> Bozell, "To Magnify the West," 286. The italics are Bozell's.

<sup>106</sup> John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 127-198, 156-161.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.* Also, see Kenneth Hill, *Cold War Chronology Soviet-American Relations: 1945-1991* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1993): 88-89; and Bennett Kovrig, *Communism in Hungary: From Kun to Kadar* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1979).

---

<sup>108</sup> Unsigned, ed. *Frederick Daniel Wilhelmsen*, 8-9.

<sup>109</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "The Bankruptcy of American Optimism," *National Review* 3 (May 11, 1957): 451.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.* Molnar, a Hungarian émigré, argued that the main lesson from Hungary was that Soviet imperialism might not falter on "account of the flaws in Marxist economic science," but on an account of nationalism. He noted that modern criticism of the "national spirit" undermined a possible "force of resistance to tyranny." He wrote: "If there is an important lesson to the events in Hungary, it is one which we forget because it is so obvious: the conscience of a nation is concentrated in those who live with its past no less than with its present, who cherish its memories as their own, and are able to stir them up in their compatriots whenever disaster threatens. We may feel a deep sorrow for the fate of Hungary and the Hungarians, but we may also envy them. In this age of un-balance and anxiety they knew why they lived and why they died." Thomas Molnar, "Lessons from Hungary," 566. *Triumph's* future founding editors would not forget Hungary. On the ten year anniversary of the revolution, they published a scathing editorial lamenting the United States' decision to do nothing. They argued that Lyndon Johnson was dishonoring the sacrifices of the Hungarian revolutionaries by increasingly committing the United States to a policy of coexistence with the Soviet Union. See Editors, "Mr. Johnson Remembers Hungary," 38.

<sup>111</sup> Wilhelmsen, "The Bankruptcy of American Optimism," 449.

<sup>112</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Toward a Theology of Survival," *National Review* 17 (January 12, 1965): 18.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

<sup>115</sup> Bozell, "They Gave the Orders," 387.

<sup>116</sup> Bozell, "Eisenhower's Premises, Stevenson's Conclusions," 8.

<sup>117</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Why Mr. Rovere Likes Ike (II)," *National Review* 2 (July 11, 1956): 7; and Bozell, "Eisenhower's Premises, Stevenson's Conclusions," 8.

<sup>118</sup> Bozell, "Retreat in Lebanon: Mr. Hammarskjold Pulls a Fast One," 81.

<sup>119</sup> Bozell, "National Trends: They Gave the Orders, II," 419.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.* The italics are Bozell's.

<sup>121</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "The Court Enjoins God," *National Review* 16 (September 8, 1964): 776. Also, see L. Brent Bozell, "Saving Our Children from Gold," *National Review* 15 (July 16, 1963): 19-22, 34.

<sup>122</sup> See L. Brent Bozell, "Legal Libertine," *National Review* 11 (November 18, 1961): 340-341. For Bozell's views of the Warren Court, see L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: A Bill to Curb the Court," *National Review* 6 (March 1, 1958): 200-201; L. Brent Bozell, "Should We Impeach Earl Warren," 11 (September 9, 1961): 153-155; and Bozell, *The Warren Revolution*.

<sup>123</sup> Bozell, "The Court Enjoins God," 775.

---

<sup>124</sup> Ibid. Also, see Bozell, "Saving Our Children From God," 19-22; and Bozell, *The Warren Revolution*, 75-77.

<sup>125</sup> Bozell, "The Court Enjoins God," 775.

<sup>126</sup> Bozell, *The Warren Revolution*, 79. The italics are Bozell's.

<sup>127</sup> Ibid.

<sup>128</sup> Bozell, "The Court Enjoins God," 776; also, see Bozell, *The Warren Revolution*, 79.

<sup>129</sup> Bozell, *The Warren Revolution*, 79; and Bozell, "The Court Enjoins God," 776.

<sup>130</sup> Whittaker Chambers, "Big Sister is Watching You," *National Review* 4 (December 28, 1957): 595. Also, see Gary Wills, "But is Ayn Rand Conservative," *National Review* 8 (February 27, 1960): 139.

<sup>131</sup> Chambers, "Big Sister is Watching You," 595..

<sup>132</sup> Ibid.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid., 596.

<sup>134</sup> Editor, "The Week," *National Review* 11 (July 29, 1961): 38.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid.

<sup>136</sup> Editors, "For the Record," *National Review* 11 (August 12, 1961): 77. Buckley was criticized for his irreverence by the two major liberal Catholic journals, *America* and *Commonweal*. See Editors, "Affront to Conservatives," *America* 105 (August 19, 1961): 622; and Editors, "A venture in Triviality," *Commonweal* (August 25, 1961): 461.

<sup>137</sup> Bozell, "Freedom or Virtue," 187.

<sup>138</sup> Frank S. Meyer, "The Twisted Tree of Liberty," *National Review* 12 (January 16, 1962): 26.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid.

<sup>140</sup> Frank S. Meyer, ed., *What is Conservatism?* (New York: Holt and Rhinehart and Winston, 1964): 9.

<sup>141</sup> Bozell, "Freedom or Virtue," 181.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid., 182. The italics are Bozell's.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid., 184.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid. The italics are Bozell's.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid.

---

<sup>148</sup> Ibid.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid., 183.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid., 184

<sup>152</sup> Ibid.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid., 206.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid., 187. The italics are Bozell's. Bozell's viewpoints were derived from Pope Leo XIII's encyclicals, *On the Christian Constitution of States* (1885), *On the Nature of Human Liberty* (1888), and *On Christian Democracy* (1901).

<sup>155</sup> See William F. Buckley, "On the Right: The Birth Rate," *National Review* 17 (March 23, 1965): 231. "NATIONAL REVIEW'S discovery of the population explosion," Bozell remarked, "confirms a) that God's arrangements for peopling the planet have indeed gone awry, and if disaster is to be averted we had better grab the wheel quick; b) the means that we employ are to be evaluated by their efficiency." L. Brent Bozell, "The Open Question: *Mater sí, Magistra, sí!*" *National Review* 17 (September 7, 1965): 772.

<sup>156</sup> Wills had already written a book, *Politics and Catholic Freedom* (1962), in which he argued that encyclicals were suggestive rather than dogmatic. His argument asserted a developmental rather than an immutable quality to Catholic social teaching. See Gary Wills, *Politics and Catholic Freedom* (Chicago, Henry Regnery, 1962); and Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America*, 96.

<sup>157</sup> Gary Wills, "Catholics and Population," *National Review* 17 (September 7, 1965): 643-648.

<sup>158</sup> Bozell, "The Open Question: *Mater sí, Magistra, sí!*" 772, 786. The title of Bozell's article, "*Mater sí, Magistra, sí!*" was an explicit criticism of the magazine's earlier irreverent response, "*Mater, sí; Magistra, no,*" to the encyclical *Mater et Magistra*.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid.

<sup>160</sup> Bozell, "The Open Question: *Mater sí, Magistra, sí!*" 772.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid., 772, 786.

<sup>163</sup> William F. Buckley, Jr., "On the Right: The Catholic Church and Abortion," *National Review* 18 (April 5, 1966): 308.

<sup>164</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "Letters," *National Review* 18 (May 3, 1966): 390.

<sup>165</sup> Bozell remarked in an interview that *National Review* "did not stand for orthodoxy" and "was not only a non-Catholic magazine but even an anti-Catholic magazine, as the dispute over *Mater et Magistra* showed. They didn't regard Catholic teaching as authoritative and authentic. The same was true a bit later on birth control and abortion." Bozell, interview by Patrick Allitt.

<sup>166</sup> Bozell, "Freedom of Virtue," 187.

---

<sup>167</sup> L. Brent Bozell and Wilmore Kendall, "From the Democratic Convention," *National Review* 2 (August 25, 1956): 9.

<sup>168</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "Budgetary Elephantiasis," *National Review* 3 (February 2, 1957): 105 (104-105).

<sup>169</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Repeal of the Constitution," *National Review* 2 (December 29, 1956): 9 (9-10, 23). Also, see L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends," *National Review* 1 (March 7, 1956): 16; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends," *National Review* 11 (July 4, 1956): 7; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends," *National Review* 2 (July 11, 1956): 7; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: The Stevenson Tailspin," *National Review* 2 (November 10, 1956): 8; L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: The Road Ahead," *National Review* 2 (November 24, 1956): 10, 17.

<sup>170</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "The 1958 Elections: Coroner's Report," *National Review* 6 (November 22, 1958): 335.

<sup>171</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "The Catholic Issue" *National Review* 9 (September 24, 1960): 171.

<sup>172</sup> Bozell, "The 1958 Elections: Coroner's Report," 333-335; and L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Goldwater on First Ballot," *National Review* 8 (June 18, 1960): 388. Also, see L. Brent Bozell, "National Trends: Mr. Nixon's Moment of Truth," *National Review* 9 (October 8, 1960): 200.

<sup>173</sup> Wilhelmsen was also a Goldwater supporter—he wrote position papers for his presidential campaign. R.A., Herrera and others, eds., *Saints, Sovereigns, and Scholars: Studies in Honor of Frederick D. Wilhelmsen* (New York: Peter Lang, 1993), xv.

<sup>174</sup> Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement*, 192.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.* Bozell wrote *Conscience of Conservative* even before he had met Goldwater. L. Brent Bozell, interview with Patrick Allitt. Even though Goldwater lost the 1964 presidential election, his campaign helped the conservative movement. His nomination, William A. Rusher notes, led to three important developments; first, it meant that conservatives, rather than liberals, would control the Republican Party; second, Goldwater's campaign fostered a network of likeminded conservative activists, and third, the campaign introduced the conservative movement and America to Ronald Reagan. William A. Rusher, *The Rise of the Right* (New York: William Morrow & Company, 1984), 161-162.

<sup>176</sup> For information on Bozell's and Buckley's exclusion from the Senator's presidential campaign, see Judis, *William F. Buckley, Jr.*, 222.

<sup>177</sup> Bozell, interview by Patrick Allitt.

<sup>178</sup> Bozell, interview by Allitt; Editor, "Notes and Asides," *National Review* 5 (May 10, 1958): 440; and Buckley, "L. Brent Bozell, RIP," 22. In Bozell's candidacy for the senate seat, Willmoore Kendall was his domestic policy adviser and Wilhelmsen was his foreign policy adviser. Judis, *William F. Buckley, Jr.*, 318-319. Bozell's campaign was probably hindered by his attempt to communicate to his potential constituency that the greatest problem facing America was the "Gnostic heresy." Judis, *William F. Buckley, Jr.*, 318-319.

## CHAPTER III

### ORIGINS OF *TRIUMPH*, PART II

*Triumph* was born out of the post-World War II conservative intellectual revival and the future founding editors' disaffection with American conservatism. Yet, also significant to the journal's origins were the dominance liberal Catholics exerted over the Catholic press and the Second Vatican Council, which triggered substantial reform and made the liberal domination of the Catholic press even more problematic. This seemingly gave them significant influence over the direction of reform. But also significant to *Triumph's* founding was the influence that Spain and Carlism had on its principal guiding intellectuals, L. Brent Bozell and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen.

#### Liberal Catholics and the Second Vatican Council

*National Review* was not an ideal outlet for *Triumph's* future founding editors. Neither could they find expression in the liberal-dominated Catholic press; by the mid-1960s, the editors of the two major American Catholic journals—the Jesuit-directed *America* and the lay-directed *Commonweal*—refused to enter into any dialogue with their traditionalist brethren.

While the Roman Catholic Church in America was officially united before the Second Vatican Council, there was already a liberal-conservative divide among Catholic intellectuals. In the fifties, for example, Thomas Molnar and Wilhelmsen (and other Catholic conservatives, such as Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, William F. Buckley, Jr., and Russell Kirk) published articles in both *America* and *Commonweal*.<sup>1</sup> The liberal-conservative division—like the divide between libertarians and traditionalists—was bridged by a shared muscular anticommunism. As Patrick Allitt writes, “Catholic intellectuals [in the 1950s] were all but unanimous in regarding communism as philosophically indefensible and the Communist movement as a ruthless international conspiracy bent on world conquest.”<sup>2</sup> Yet, Bozell and liberal Catholics differed on the issue of domestic anticommunism, especially over the value of Joseph McCarthy. Bozell was a staunch supporter of the senator, while the editors at *Commonweal* labeled McCarthy a “reckless, irresponsible boogey-man.”<sup>3</sup> The Catholic liberal-conservative division was bridged also—again, like the divide between libertarians and traditionalists—by the minority status of its adherents. As conservatives were defined by their minority opposition to the prevailing liberal intellectual establishment, Catholics were united in their minority divergence from mainstream Protestant culture. There were profound differences, however, between liberal and conservative Catholics.

In the pages of *Commonweal*, Wilhelmsen explained his view of the principal difference between them. Liberals argued that the Catholic faith was principally developmental and was manifest—it’s changing forms—in social and

cultural evolution. Liberal theology, then, was “eschatological”—liberals accepted historical transformation, Wilhelmsen argued, with little rebuke, including the newly emerging “technological-collectivist society,” because they believed that “God’s plan for the universe unfolds in time, and will not reach its consummation until the dead are called forth on the Last Day.”<sup>4</sup> “To attempt to halt the march of history” for the liberal Catholic, he wrote, was “to attempt to frustrate the Divine *fiat*.”<sup>5</sup> In contrast, traditionalist theology, Wilhelmsen argued, was “incarnational.”<sup>6</sup> The Incarnation, traditionalists believed, called on man to “*incarnate* the Faith, make it flesh, down to the very gestures of a man.”<sup>7</sup> Traditionalists, then, opposed a developmental view of Catholicism and sought to incarnate a trans-historical faith in each age. “Therefore, Christian men must not be adjusted to an alien world,” Wilhelmsen wrote, “but the world itself must be structured so that it might bring forth men worthy of their supernatural destiny”—beatitude with God.<sup>8</sup>

Catholic liberals, he believed, sought adaptation to (in hopes of sanctifying) the industrial, secular-liberal order, but Wilhelmsen rejected such an order as an “historical monstrosity” that militated against the Catholic tradition—the mission to subject all things to the Kinship of Jesus Christ. *Commonweal* editors believed that Wilhelmsen was too idealistic. In “the present ‘absence of angels’ and utopias from this world,” *Commonweal*’s editors remarked, “both the Church and the individual Catholic must be content to work with men and in the necessarily imperfect civilizations of men.”<sup>9</sup> Wilhelmsen noted in response that the current age was “not a pagan world waiting for the fullness of the

Incarnation;” rather, it was a “world that has come *after* the Incarnation, that has largely rejected the Incarnation . . . that has built itself on the ruins of Christendom.”<sup>10</sup> “The modern mind is, at its very core, anti-humanistic, and therefore incapable of incarnating the Gospel,” Wilhelmsen wrote:

This is not to surrender man to the darkness; for unless we are aware that man is blinded, we cannot hope to give him vision. In order to incarnate the faith in this our own time we cannot sanctify the darkness, we can only destroy the darkness with Light.<sup>11</sup>

Catholics, then, should penetrate the modern, secular world—but not to sanctify secular conventions in an effort to make an anti-Christian world temporarily more hospitable, but to sanctify creation by destroying the secular-liberal order (that is, to convert it to Roman Catholicism and subject it to the authority of the Roman Catholic Church).<sup>12</sup>

If Wilhelmsen and liberal Catholics disagreed over the relationship of Catholics with the modern world, they were also opposed in their views on the relationship between the Roman Catholic Church and Western Civilization. If Wilhelmsen was skeptical of the modern, secular-liberal order, he, along with Bozell, still believed—in the fifties and early sixties—that the “West’s truth is still visible.”<sup>13</sup> Bozell and Wilhelmsen believed that the Catholic faith had been incarnated in Western Civilization, which Wilhelmsen called the “standing grace of this world.”<sup>14</sup> The West, Bozell wrote:

*Has been vouchsafed the truth about the nature of man and his relationship to the universe, and has been commissioned to construct and preserve an earthly city based on this truth. . . . the standards of perfection are the standards of the West. The ideals toward which any earthly construct should aspire are the West’s ideals. The virtue of a social structure cannot be known by any other measure. And so the West asserts a God-given right, and thinks of it as a God-imposed duty, to*

conserve and spread *its* truth, to judge political and economic and social systems according to *its* lights, to change and improve them under *its* authority.<sup>15</sup>

This was in part the reasoning that led *Triumph's* future founding editors to the conclusion that the Cold War was a sacred conflict. If the West was the human analogue of the divine order, then God, Bozell concluded, was “involved in the Cold War,” because “*God's* civilization” was involved.<sup>16</sup>

Bozell's words incurred the fury of liberal Catholics, who did not envision a sacramental mission for the West. *Commonweal* editors wrote that to “speak of the West as *God's* civilization is almost blasphemous,” that Bozell had “mistaken the West for the Church.”<sup>17</sup> It was the Church, the *Commonweal* editors retorted, which had been “vouchsafed the truth about the nature and destiny of man,” and it “will ride the raging tides of history and survive whether the West does or not. The Church is not the West and the West is not the Church.”<sup>18</sup> To sacralize the West and its Cold War, according to *Commonweal's* editors, was dangerous; it was to immanentize *God's* supposed will in the struggle against communism. “The Kingdom which Christ promised is not of this world,” the editors lectured, “and, as He told the Roman authorities, He does not rely on secular means to bring about its fulfillment.”<sup>19</sup> Enlisting *God* “as the Supreme Commander of our material forces,” *Commonweal's* editors warned Bozell, was to hopelessly blur the line between the sacral and secular realms.<sup>20</sup>

Gary Wills and Frank Meyer defended Bozell. “Surely Saint Joan of Arc would have been surprised,” Wills wrote, “to learn that *God* does not use secular means to protect a Christian civilization.”<sup>21</sup> If Catholic liberals charged Bozell

with immanentizing God's will and blasphemously sacrilizing the Cold War, Wills and Meyer accused liberal Catholics of adopting a Manichean conception of the world and thus ignoring the purpose of the Incarnation—to hallow the physical world. “The scandal of Redemption’s physical vehicle is the enduring scandal of the Cross, of the Incarnation, of the sacramental view of life,” Wills wrote, and the “challenge to the Christian is to work within the demands of this *embodiment* of the World in time; it is a challenge that can never be met by denying any relation between Christ’s work and ‘secular means.’”<sup>22</sup> “It is sad to have to remind Catholics, even Liberal Catholics,” Meyer wrote, “that this is a sacramental, not a Manichean world, that our secular actions as ordinary men partake of the sacred when we act with good faith and motive and grace towards truth and good.”<sup>23</sup>

Interestingly, during his *Triumph* years, Bozell would come to agree with liberal Catholics that the West was indeed not God's civilization. Bozell concluded that his view—that the West had incarnated Christian truth—may have been true at one time, but that Christian truth was no longer visible in Western civilization.<sup>24</sup> But in the meantime, his view of a sacred West led to further conflicts with liberal Catholics over decolonization in Africa.

Catholic liberals celebrated decolonization; they believed that colonialism was driven by racism and brutalized native peoples—for liberals, then, colonization was a sin.<sup>25</sup> Catholic conservatives, in contrast, believed that colonization—given that Western civilization was God's civilization—was the fertilization of both Christian truth and superior cultural development in barbarian lands. Molnar wrote of French colonization in Algeria that “in 1830 the French

did not find a country called Algeria, but a miserable land of perhaps a million herdsmen, a pirates' nest; they left it in 1962 with fertile fields and farms, vineyards, orchards, oil wells, big and active cities, roads, airports—and nine million people.”<sup>26</sup> “Should the West be ashamed for having gone to Africa,” Bozell asked, for “lighting a spark of truth in the midst of untruth? For building an outpost of civilization where barbarism was unrelieved?”<sup>27</sup> There was no doubt in the minds of *Triumph's* future founding editors that the western presence in Africa was the source of that continent's civilization, and if it were prematurely removed—before Africa was civilized—the continent would descend into chaos and barbarism. “The wolves began to howl,” Bozell wrote of decolonization in Africa, as “the West gathers her skirts about her and scurries off, leaving a continent to be devoured.”<sup>28</sup> This fear was compounded by the Cold War; communists, they believed, would take advantage of the chaos fomented by the retreat of Western power and would take over. If liberal Catholics celebrated decolonization as the furthering of the new pluralistic and democratic global order, the future founding editors viewed it as a sign of the West's decay—traceable, they believed, to its waning Christian purpose. If the West no longer believed in its superior and divinely ordained mission to bring Christ to all peoples, then it could no longer justify its presence in Africa.

The Cold War also became a point of contention between liberal and conservative Catholics. While *Commonweal's* editors were initially staunchly anticommunist—they wrote in 1959, for example, that “collaboration with Communists by Catholics is impossible”—they began in the early 1960s to

temper their anticommunism.<sup>29</sup> This change was precipitated by their admiration for the pacifist Catholic Worker Movement and Pope John XXIII's encyclical *On Establishing Universal Peace in Truth, Justice, Charity, and Liberty* (1963), which criticized the nuclear arms race and called for nuclear disarmament.<sup>30</sup>

*Commonweal's* editors began to wonder if a polarized foreign policy was the best way to proceed against Soviet-led global communism—a threat that was diminished in their view by increasing evidence that Soviet-led global communism was not a monolithic movement and that nuclear war was a morally indefensible outcome of the Cold War.<sup>31</sup> This transition was explicit in the journal's changing position on the Vietnam War.

In 1961, the editors supported involvement in Vietnam because it constituted, they argued, “one auspicious place for the free world to make a stand.”<sup>32</sup> The editors, however, began to change their position by 1965, concluding that first it was impractical and then immoral.<sup>33</sup> “Despite the enormous military power of the U.S.,” the editors wrote,

The Vietcong can probably hold on to the interior indefinitely. While it is probably true to say that we cannot lose the war, neither can we win it against an organized, dedicated guerrilla force working among a sympathetic or indifferent rural population—this has never been done before.<sup>34</sup>

They called on the United States government to “explore every avenue to peace to end this brutal, degrading war.”<sup>35</sup> One year later the editors were even more adamant, arguing that the United States should withdraw “even at the cost of a Communist victory.”<sup>36</sup> The editors wrote: “The war in Vietnam is an unjust one. We mean that in its most profound sense: what is being done there, despite the

almost certain good intentions of those doing it, is a crime and a sin.”<sup>37</sup> They urged a withdrawal even while conceding that “a Communist victory in South Vietnam would most likely mean a rigorous dictatorship, bloody liquidation of dissenters, and a certain amount of social and economic reform,” and possibly “lead China to tragically miscalculate American determination in some ‘eyeball to eyeball’ nuclear confrontation of the future.”<sup>38</sup>

Liberal and conservative Catholics disagreed also over the most important domestic issue of the fifties and sixties—the Civil Rights Movement. Liberal Catholics supported the Movement. They believed that segregation was a sin. They despised the brutality that enforced the racial caste system in the South. After the Birmingham police violently halted a Martin Luther King-led demonstration through Birmingham in 1963, *Commonweal's* editors wrote that it was “the police who should have been arrested, both for obstructing justice and for vicious assault.”<sup>39</sup> They were especially delighted with the Christian character of the early movement. *Commonweal's* editors wrote that “Without their strong Christian faith to sustain them, many of the southern Negroes and the ministers who lead them would not be making this fight. These are rebels who go to jail singing hymns and carrying Bibles.”<sup>40</sup>

Catholic conservatives generally opposed the movement. Buckley argued that white southerners—because they were the “advanced race”—could reasonably deny African Americans suffrage. Buckley was not a majority-rule democrat and believed that society was better off denying its undereducated peoples, white or black, suffrage. “The question, as far as the White community

is concerned,” Buckley asked, “is whether the claims of civilization supersede those of universal suffrage.”<sup>41</sup> He believed that they did. Bozell dissented. He wrote that “the evidence is far from conclusive that Southern civilization hangs on the thread of Negro disenfranchisement.”<sup>42</sup> He believed that *National Review’s* position undermined law and order and was thus anti-conservative. Buckley’s conclusions, he reasoned, supported the violation of the Fifteenth Amendment. “I had always thought our position to be that of observance of and respect for [the law and the Constitution],” Bozell remarked, which were “indispensable for the well-ordered society, and a minimal requirement for the preservation of conservative values.”<sup>43</sup>

Bozell did not, however, support the Civil Rights Movement.<sup>44</sup> He disagreed, for example, with the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, because he believed that the Supreme Court had wittingly both violated the Tenth Amendment and misinterpreted the Fourteenth Amendment. Education, Bozell argued, was—because of the Tenth Amendment—a constitutionally-protected state prerogative, and the Fourteenth Amendment, which the Supreme Court invoked to outlaw segregated schools, was never intended to apply to education. Much more was at stake in the *Brown* decision than segregated schooling; Bozell wrote:

What is wrong, or at least unprecedented, in the *Brown* approach is the Chief Justice’s insistence that the authors of the fourteenth Amendment had given the Supreme Court a continuing mandate to read whatever meaning into the phrase ‘equal protection of the laws’ the Court might deem appropriate. . . . The second objection is that the theory, if it applies in such a case as *Brown*, reduces to a shambles the whole concept of constitutional government. If the Supreme Court is at liberty to substitute contemporary judgments about the good society for those of the

Fourteenth Amendment's framers—and to give those contemporary judgments the force of constitution law—what is the Court, under the pretense of construing the Constitution, not at liberty to do?<sup>45</sup>

The Court's attack on constitutionalism in the *Brown* decision—and also in its redefinition in the 1960s of the relationship between church and state—undermined political and social stability. Bozell argued that law and order in the United States was derived from both a “fixed” and a “fluid” constitution.<sup>46</sup> The former represented codified law, while the latter referred to the unofficial but elemental social consensuses on public policy. The “fluid” constitution was a society's “ethical substructure,” which formulated the “*standard*” to which official acts of government were “expected to conform.”<sup>47</sup> The “fluid,” unlike the “fixed” constitution, was “fashioned gradually, subtly, often imperceptibly,” Bozell wrote, “by the society's organic process.”<sup>48</sup>

Social stability was dependent upon the “fixed” constitution reflecting organically developed consensuses in the “fluid” constitution. The Warren Court neglected this process. It had instituted, Bozell argued, “a *third* kind of constitution-making,” which “*sought to transfer the solution of some of the most momentous problems of contemporary public policy from the fluid constitution to the fixed constitution—by judicial decree.*”<sup>49</sup> The Warren Court, in the *Brown* decision, rejected precedent and political and social consensus and rooted its ruling in sociological jurisprudence and subsequently undermined social stability.

Bozell, then, like many Catholic conservative intellectuals, criticized the Civil Rights Movement, because he viewed its judicial aspect not only as an attack on federalism, but on constitutionalism—which undermined the organic

development of society. Neither did Bozell sympathize with civil rights activism.<sup>50</sup> He even criticized liberal Catholics for their support of such activism, which was, he believed, to adopt secular-liberal egalitarian abstractions at the cost of disorder—Catholics should be more concerned with saving souls than fostering social upheaval.

The liberal-conservative divide was exacerbated by the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). Called by Pope John XXIII in January of 1959, the Council became a nerve-wracking experience for *Triumph's* future founding editors. Pope John XXIII called for reform, and the possibility for radical transformations became a reality when the Cardinals from the conservative Roman Curia—the Pope's governing institution—were outmaneuvered and subsequently underrepresented in the commissions that drafted the documents for the proposed reforms. The so-called "Curial party" had lost control of the Council and liberal and traditionalist factions emerged. A more liberal direction to the Council was ensured by the election of John Baptist Montini, or Pope Paul VI, as Pope John XXIII's successor after the latter died in late 1962. Pope Paul VI was "a progressive," Thomas Bokenkotter writes, "obviously committed to the Johannine revolution."<sup>51</sup>

The Council introduced substantial reform—notably the transformation of the liturgy, a more collegial understanding of the Church's authority, a more ecumenical stance toward non-Catholic religions, and a recognition of the right of religious liberty. Viewing the Church as an evolving concept, liberal Catholics relished the reform introduced by the Council. They believed that prior to the

Council, the Church's relationship to the modern world was one of "aloofness and haughty isolation."<sup>52</sup> The reform, they hoped, would make the Church more relevant to the modern world and thus more efficacious in its salvific mission. *Triumph's* future founding editors, in contrast, had looked favorably upon the pre-Vatican II Church's awkward and isolated relationship to the modern world, which was, as they viewed it, under siege by gnostic hordes. The Roman Catholic Church was, Wilhelmsen wrote, a "torch lighting up the darkness of a world given over to increasing doubt about religion and marked by . . . materialist and totalitarian savagery."<sup>53</sup> The Church was fulfilling its trans-historical role—it was *in*, but not *of*, this world, standing athwart historical change and imparting eternal and saving truths to a confused world. *Triumph's* future founding editors cared little if such a stance fostered an awkward relationship between the Church and the modern, secular world. Indeed, its awkward relationship to the modern world was a sign of the Church's vitality as it was intended to be a contradiction to the secular world.

The Council, however, seemed to suggest that the Church was eager to forfeit its unique and transcendental role and adapt itself to the modern world. Wilhelmsen wrote that the Second Vatican Council "revealed and released a secret Catholic desire to 'join the world.'"<sup>54</sup> While *Triumph's* future founding editors questioned the changes, they did not dispute the Council's legitimacy. Actually, they viewed the Council as a directive to convert the world. In this way, the origins of *Triumph* traced to the Council were, in part, proactive. What was disturbing to them was the wave of radicalism triggered by the Council.<sup>55</sup> The

Council, Patrick Allitt notes, “set off a revolution of rising expectations.”<sup>56</sup> Liberal Catholics, and especially radicals or New Breed Catholics—who Wilhelmsen believed suffered from “a spiritual loss of nerve, a religious exhaustion”—were anxious to push for further change, broadly interpreting the Council’s mission of renewal as one of updating the Church to secular conventions; they had lost faith in the efficacy of the Church.<sup>57</sup> In a prospectus and appeal for financial support for *Triumph*, the future founding editors noted that they welcomed “needed modernizations in the Church—the happy prospects of *aggiornamento* envisioned by John XXIII,” but argued that

‘John’s vision’ had been Cruelly abused by Catholic extremists, who speak these days in stridently left-wing accents, and often in a revolutionary tone; whose counsels unavoidably encourage religious indifferentism, a dilution of doctrine and morals, and in general, an accommodation with the Church’s enemies in the secular world.<sup>58</sup>

“The fresh air John XXIII is said to have let into the church,” Bozell wrote, has “intoxicated the Catholic Left.”<sup>59</sup> He pointed out that the reform encouraged by the Catholic Left had its “ancestry in the preoccupations of a world that has always viewed itself as laying siege at the walls of Rome.”<sup>60</sup> “The world has become a rather alluring mistress,” Wilhelmsen scathingly remarked, “wooed by infatuated Catholics of ‘The New Breed,’ who address secular culture with the same prayer that St. Augustine wrote to God: *Late have I loved Thee, O Beauty!*”<sup>61</sup> In this way, the origins of *Triumph* traced to the Council also were reactive.<sup>62</sup>

The problem of wide challenges to Catholic orthodoxy was compounded by the liberal domination of the major American Catholic presses. Catholic

liberals, *Triumph's* future founding editors believed, “dominated the American Catholic press . . . to an even greater extent than secular liberals have dominated the secular press.”<sup>63</sup> “The Left now speaks to and for the Church, in varying degrees of extravagance and stridency,” they noted, “through *Commonweal*, *America*, *Ave Maria*, *The Sign*, *Jubilee*, *Ramparts*, *The Catholic World*, and *U.S. Catholic*.”<sup>64</sup> The liberal monopoly of the Catholic press fostered the impression, they argued, that

Their personal views—their tolerance of theological and moral innovation; their impatience with majesty and mystery in the liturgy; and in social policy, for instance, their approval of extremist civil rights legislation, and of a pacifistic-coexistence approach to Communism—have the imprimatur of the Church itself.<sup>65</sup>

Wilhelmsen, in a letter to *The Wanderer*—one of the few Catholic Right newspapers—explained the dilemma Catholic traditionalists faced in America. They were generally excluded, if they did not “trim their Catholicism,” from conservative journals because of the confessional character of their writing, and they were excluded from Catholic journals if they did not “trim their Conservatism.”<sup>66</sup> The situation had produced, Wilhelmsen lamented, a “vacuum of Catholic Conservative opinion in the United States.”<sup>67</sup> Bozell and Wilhelmsen argued that liberal Catholics were hypocrites; liberals wanted a dialogue with the secular-liberal, modern world, including other religions and even communists, but excluded their traditionalist brethren from the pages of their journals. Bozell wondered what had happened to their “professed belief in the dignity and utility of the discussion process,” and asked rhetorically if their exclusionist policies were “compatible with their commitment to catholicity?”<sup>68</sup>

*Triumph's* future founding editors were bewildered by the transformation of the Church and the push for further change. In 1965, Bozell traveled to Saint Michael's College in Vermont to attend a conference on communism that the college was hosting.<sup>69</sup> John XXIII's encyclical *Pacem in Terris* (1963) and the Second Vatican Council fostered an effort on behalf of the Catholic Left to open a dialogue with communists—previously the mortal enemies of the Church. During the conference, one of the presenters, a professor at the college, stated that there was a “remarkable parallel between some of the central beliefs of Marxism and Christianity” and noted an “essential similarity” between the “faith movements.”<sup>70</sup> Such a thesis, Bozell noted, passed “without challenge from the half-dozen faculty members who participated in the conference. Without exception,” he wrote, “every one of them had called attention to its thematic role in the conference, and had explicitly or implicitly endorsed it.”<sup>71</sup>

“What in the Name of God is Going on in the Catholic Church”—which was the cover title for a 1965 *National Review* issue analyzing the Second Vatican Council—probably expressed Bozell's thoughts on Saint Michael's conference on communism.<sup>72</sup> Only twenty years ago, he pointed out, “the teaching of Catholic educators . . . was in tune with the prayers that used to be said to St. Michael after the Catholic Mass, invoking his aid in the battle for souls behind the Iron Curtain.”<sup>73</sup> It was a stunning turnabout. Lamenting this transformation, Bozell reflected upon the school's patron saint: “I wonder what St. Michael, whose symbol is the sword, might be thinking about all of this.”<sup>74</sup> Certainly a change had taken place; the congeniality and passivity with which

Saint Michael's debated communism in the 1960s was a stark contrast from militant anticommunism exhibited at Santa Clara University in the 1950s—there, students were willing to follow their philosophy professor to Hungary in order to fight communists.

The future founding editors were disoriented by the transformation of the Catholic Church. They were frustrated by the lack of an adequate forum in which to defend the Church against those who hoped to undermine the absurdity that it was to the modern, secular world. If the Church seemed absurd to the world, so be it, they reasoned; the Church was a contradiction to the times, and they were ready to draw swords to protect the contrast—they still believed in Saint Michael's sword. Much of Bozell's and Wilhelmsen's Catholic militancy, and, by extension, *Triumph's*, was derived from their experiences in Spain.

### Spain and Carlism

*Triumph* would be a crusading journal. Its editors militantly sought the conversion of America and the construction of a confessional state. Much of the inspiration for such an apostolate was derived from Bozell's and Wilhelmsen's experiences in Spain. Both lived in Spain for a period of time and came to admire both the country's Catholic culture and Europe's oldest and most significant traditional Catholic political movement, Carlism. Bozell lived in Spain from 1961 until 1963, while Wilhelmsen lived in Spain for almost a decade. The Spain of the 1950s and 1960s, however, seemed like an odd country to admire.

Why would Bozell and Wilhelmsen move there; why would they revere Spain; and more importantly, how did their experiences in Spain lead to *Triumph's* founding?

Spain, after all, was a very poor country and was ruled by the dictator, Francisco Franco.<sup>75</sup> Franco in 1939 had overthrown Spain's republican government after his Nationalist forces emerged victorious in the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939).<sup>76</sup> Franco was generally reviled by the liberal intellectual establishment in the United States, even though he had kept Spain neutral during the Second World War and had aligned Spain with the United States during the Cold War.<sup>77</sup> Few liberal intellectuals admired right-wing authoritarian regimes, and even fewer could forget that during the Spanish Civil War, Franco had accepted military support from Adolph Hitler and Benito Mussolini.<sup>78</sup> Contrary to popular opinion, however, Franco was not a fascist; his authoritarian regime was more traditionalist and Catholic than it was radically statist and totalitarian. It was, however, still repressive; he was most brutal in the wake of victory, when he sought to purge his Republican enemies and consolidate his rule.<sup>79</sup> The Franco regime, however, became less rigid in the fifties and sixties.<sup>80</sup>

Despite Franco's undemocratic methods, it was not unusual for American Catholics that grew up in the 1930s to admire the Catholic Franco. During the Spanish Civil War, the majority of them, including the Church's hierarchy, rooted for the Nationalist forces, while the majority of Protestant Americans rooted for the Republicans.<sup>81</sup> Patricia Bozell, a member of the well-known conservative

and Catholic Buckley family, remembered such a distinction growing up in Sharon, Connecticut:

My earliest memory of any sort of dissension with the outside world was at a dance we attended when I was about eleven. People were talking about the Spanish Civil War, all of course taking the Republican side, and I said something to the effect of “up with Franco.” That, in Sharon, was practically as bad as eating your children, incomprehensible.<sup>82</sup>

Many American Catholics viewed the Spanish Civil War as much more than a battle between Franco’s nationalist forces and the Republicans; rather, it was a sacred battle for the survival of Roman Catholic Spain. The Spanish Republic had attacked the Catholic Church; the Republic’s anticlerical constitution and subsequent anticlerical legislation separated Church and state, removed the Church from education, and curbed the Church’s economic power. As historian Sebastian Balfour explained, “the church was transformed from one of the official expressions of Spain’s identity into a mere voluntary association.”<sup>83</sup> Even more appalling to Catholics was the outburst of Republican violence directed at the Catholic Church at the outbreak of the Civil War—thousands of priests and nuns were murdered and hundreds of churches were looted and burned—actions that Wilhelmsen labeled an “excrudescence of Hell.”<sup>84</sup> The Republican side was further tainted, in the eyes of Catholics, by its inclusion of communists in its coalition. During the war, the Republicans conceded to the communists more power and influence in order to gain access to Soviet arms supplies. The Soviet Union, after all, was the Republic’s only major foreign supporter. While historian Hugh Thomas has concluded that there was no communist plot to take over Spain, Bozell and Wilhelmsen believed that this

would have been the only reason for communist involvement. Franco, then, was leading a crusade against the enemies of Christ—it was, Wilhelmsen often remarked, about “the Cross.”<sup>85</sup> Franco, when he was victorious, reversed the anticlerical reforms of the Republic and established an explicitly Catholic regime. Historian Raymond Carr writes, “In spite of Falangist rhetoric which infected the public pronouncements of the government, the fundamental values of the new state were military order and Catholic orthodoxy.”<sup>86</sup>

Spain, then, was not such a peculiar destination for American Catholics like Bozell and Wilhelmsen, especially given the Catholic and cosmopolitan character of the conservative intellectual revival in the 1950s and 1960s. European émigrés bolstered the ranks of the conservative revival, and many American conservative intellectuals naturally admired and sought to link the Christian political and cultural tradition of European civilization with America's. They established contacts with European right wingers, and many of them frequently traveled to Europe and even lived there for a period of time.<sup>87</sup> Bozell and Wilhelmsen, in addition to Reid Buckley, Willmoore Kendall, and Francis Wilson—the latter three were all future *Triumph* contributors—chose Spain as one of their European destinations. Born and raised in a Protestant country, and with some of them being converts, they were eager to visit a Catholic country, and few countries, if any, had a greater claim to be called a Catholic country than Spain.<sup>88</sup>

Spain's Catholic fervor made its history. “Spain was forged as a nation,” Wilhelmsen argued, “through eight hundred years of Reconquest against the

Arabs. That long battle was fought under the aegis of the Cross.”<sup>89</sup> It was Spain’s Catholic faith that allowed it not only to defeat Islam but also communism. “The Crescent and the Hammer and Sickle: ultimately they have but one common enemy,” Wilhelmsen noted: “the Cross of Christ and that civilization that took root and flourished from the wood of Golgotha. There is only one nation in history that has bested at arms both Islam and Marxism and that nation is Spain.”<sup>90</sup>

In Spain they found a fundamentally Catholic culture. Wilhelmsen wrote of Spain: “The fact is that the entire culture is Catholic, the very air Spaniards breathe is thoroughly Catholic—and that Catholic air *is* Spain.”<sup>91</sup> Patricia Bozell reflecting on her and her husband’s experience in Spain, remarked:

In Spain they lived the Catholic faith. Its history is peppered with battles for the faith. . . . During Franco’s governance, the many Masses were well attended, the streets were named after saints, the bells rang, nuns strolled the streets, crosses proliferated. You breathed the Catholic thing; it was rich and full. It gave you a sense of belonging and of history and of continuance. Things were not chopped off, partitioned. Religion was not relegated to an hour on Sunday, to getting dressed up, nodding at the sermon, and coming home to read the funny papers. It was alive, or so it seemed to us.<sup>92</sup>

In Spain, Bozell and Wilhelmsen also found Carlism—a traditional Catholic political movement that dated back to the early nineteenth century and the most explicit expression of Spain’s Catholic fervor.<sup>93</sup> Bozell and Wilhelmsen admired Franco; ultimately, however, they were not Francoists.<sup>94</sup> Rather, Bozell, and especially Wilhelmsen—who had taught for five years in Navarre, the heartland of Carlism—revered the Carlists.

The origins of Carlism are traced back to the French Revolution. Although Spain resisted French Revolutionary influence through war—first against the French Convention in the 1790s and then against Napoleon in the early nineteenth century—the revolution nonetheless augmented the development of a liberal bloc that stood in opposition to Spain’s Catholic and traditional political and social order. This development gave birth to “two Spains”—Catholic traditionalist Spain and liberal anti-clerical Spain.<sup>95</sup> Both posited different cures for Spain’s nineteenth-century decadence. The former sought a resurgence of traditional institutions, especially the Church and the Bourbon monarchy; however, a contingent of these traditionalists—the ideological predecessors of the Carlists—did not seek to conserve eighteenth-century Bourbon rule, which they identified as a period of royal and ministerial despotism. They rejected Bourbon absolutism and regalism and believed that Spain should return to its pre-bourbon past, one in which the monarchy was limited by the Church, the Cortes, and regional political and administrative rights and institutions.<sup>96</sup> Liberals, in contrast, sought further modernization through anticlerical, anti-privilege, and centralizing reforms. The division fostered five civil wars in the nineteenth century alone.<sup>97</sup>

Carlism emerged from the Catholic traditionalist side in the 1820s during the reign of Ferdinand VII. Ferdinand’s incompetence annoyed both traditionalists and liberals. Traditionalists were further angered by Ferdinand because he favored the policies of moderate liberals and did not restore the Inquisition. A contingent of traditionalists—called the *Apostólicos*—began to

unite around the leadership of Carlos María Isidro, Ferdinand's conservative brother and heir to the throne. They were content in the likelihood that Carlos would soon succeed the ill and childless Ferdinand. Yet matters were complicated when Ferdinand's fourth wife, María Cristina, gave birth to a female heir, Isabel. Ferdinand changed the law of succession, claiming that Philip V's Salic Law of 1713, which prevented women from inheriting the throne, was revoked by the Cortes's Pragmatic Sanction of 1789, and he named Isabel as his heir. "Queen María Cristina," historian Alexandra Wilhelmsen notes, "promised the liberals a freed hand in transforming the government if they would support Isabel's shaky claims to the crown."<sup>98</sup> The *Apostólicos* supported Carlos's succession and subsequently became known as the Carlists. "For the following one hundred years," Alexandra Wilhelmsen writes, "the throne in Spain would be identified with liberalism and contested by banished members of the royal family who refused to make their peace with the Revolution."<sup>99</sup>

Ferdinand's death in 1833 and Isabel's succession triggered the First Carlist War (1833-1840). Carlos V was defeated and failed to reclaim the throne. His son, Carlos Luis, or Carlos VI (1845-1861), failed in the same task in the Second Carlist War in the 1840s, and Carlos V's nephew, Carlos María de los Dolores, or Carlos VII (1868-1909), was unsuccessful also in his effort to reclaim the throne in the Third Carlist War in the 1870s.<sup>100</sup> War was not, however, the only method of Carlist expression; Carlists also promoted their cause politically, which included the use of campaigns, debates, speeches, treatises, and Carlist presses.<sup>101</sup>

Carlism was much more than a dynastic conflict; it was a Catholic traditionalist political movement that included the claim of legitimism. The Carlist political agenda—solidified during Carlos VII’s leadership in the late nineteenth century—was encapsulated in the Carlist motto: “*Dios, Patria, Fueros, Rey*” (“God, Fatherland, Regional Rights, King”).<sup>102</sup> Carlists believed that Spain had been devastated by liberals—and their anticlerical, centralizing, democratic, economic, and secular reforms—and was in need of reconstruction. Carlists wanted to return to a sacral society in which Christ, through His Church, exerted a dominant influence on society. The Carlists first and foremost were defenders of the Church. It was, they believed, the only foundation on which to construct and organize society. The fourth Bourbon pretender, Jamie III, stated in a 1919 manifesto that “above all other aspirations, I desire the reign of Jesus Christ over rulers and nations, in the individual and in society, because I am convinced that there is no salvation outside Him for either society or the individual.”<sup>103</sup>

The creation of a sacral society—that is, a society in which all authority was rendered unto Christ’s Church—included the establishment of both a confessional state (its corollary, the enforced preeminence of Catholicism for the salvation of its members) and the political independence of the Church. Although there would be collaboration between Church and state, the former had to be independent, Carlists believed, in order to avoid state meddling and for the Church to function correctly—the Church was not of this world and was not to be manipulated by politicians; it was above the political fray.

The Carlist call for the “Fatherland” embodied the Spanish tradition of territorial political independence and their respect for Spain’s organic laws and its principal political institutions, the monarchy and the Cortes. Carlists were not nationalists. They cherished Spain’s traditional laws and especially its historic institutions in contrast to the foreign character of liberal ideas and implementations. While Carlists appreciated the concept of a united Spain, they viewed Spanish political unity as based on a type of federalist system in which each region’s distinctive administrative, cultural, economic, and political institutions were autonomous and respected by the central government. This idea was expressed in their call for “Regional Rights.” Carlists wanted a Bourbon king to reside over Spain’s patchwork of regional political entities. They wanted a sovereign king who “both ruled and governed,” Alexandra Wilhelmsen writes, and who had the “authority and power needed to solve national affairs effectively.”<sup>104</sup> The king’s power, though, would be checked and balanced by the Church (as the king was subject to the authority of Christ’s vicar), the Cortes, and regional political and administrative institutions. In matters of governing and administrating, then, Carlists subscribed to what would be called in Catholic social teaching, subsidiarity.

Carlists believed that Carlos V and his heirs were the legitimate successors to the Spanish throne. In this respect they were legitimists, but Carlist ideology as it evolved also included the concept of the “legitimacy of exercise,” which superseded the “legitimacy of origin.”<sup>105</sup> The Carlist ideology—because Carlism was not merely a legitimist claim but a Catholic traditionalist

political movement that sought the reinstatement of a sacral order—required that Carlos V's heirs be much more than representatives of his bloodline, but also adherents of Carlism, exclaimers of the motto "*Dios, Patria, Fueros, Rey*," defenders of the Church, and archenemies of liberalism. When Carlos VI died, for example, Carlists discarded the natural line of succession, which would have given the crown to his liberal brother, Don Juan. The crown passed instead to Don Juan's counterrevolutionary son, Carlos María de los Dolores (Carlos VII).<sup>106</sup> When the latter was offered the Spanish crown in the 1860s by liberal politicians, he refused it, noting that law and *tradition* had made him king—he proclaimed that "The Revolution knows I cannot be its king."<sup>107</sup>

The Carlists did not formulate a specific economic ideology, but they followed the Church's social encyclicals. They were anti-socialist and were critical of capitalism, and revered private property.

Carlists were not "conservatives" in the literal understanding of the word. They were not interested in conserving eighteenth- or nineteenth-century Spain. They certainly were not fond of the liberal nineteenth century, but they also were wary of eighteenth-century Bourbon absolutism and regalism, even though they were fighting for the succession of a particular Bourbon line.<sup>108</sup> Although Carlists first congregated around the defense of the *Ancien Régime*—a sovereign and legitimate, absolutist Bourbon king—against the rise of liberalism, their ideology evolved into a movement that sought to reinstate the Kingship of Christ over Spain. It is important to note that if Carlists could not be considered conservative, even in nineteenth-century Catholic Spain—because they had no

intention of conserving a liberal monarchy—then *Triumph's* editors, who were influenced by the Carlists and sought to institute the Kingship of Christ (but in late-twentieth century America, which had no precedent for such an order), certainly were not conservative, but were radical.

The last great outburst of Carlist militancy was during the Spanish Civil War, which was the fourth Carlist War. Around 70,000 Carlists—40,000 from Navarre—joined the Nationalist side.<sup>109</sup> The *requetés*—the Carlist militiamen—were fierce fighters. Carr writes that the Navarese *Requetés* “were to prove Franco’s best troops.”<sup>110</sup> Though the Carlists were finally on the winning side, they would be politically marginalized by the Franco regime.

The effort of the Carlist *requetés* in the Spanish Civil War fostered a crusading mentality in both Bozell and Wilhelmsen. The Carlists were some of the last living examples of men dedicated to fighting for the Christian faith. Wilhelmsen wrote that “typically, each Carlist company in the Spanish Civil War had one man whose duty was to carry a tall cross into battle.”<sup>111</sup> Thomaz Da Groomes and Wilhelmsen noted that during the civil war, Carlist militiamen had “Christ the King on their lips, rosaries around their necks,

Sacred Hearts on their tunics, rifles in their hands. Enormous crosses were interspersed in their ranks that made their advances over the shell pocked fields of the Ebro and before Bilbao a moving forest of faith, a cathedral in arms.<sup>112</sup>

The Carlists were present-day crusaders. Carlism was, Wilhelmsen wrote, “marked by an allegiance to God and Church unmatched anywhere in the world.”<sup>113</sup> In addition to admiring its militancy in defense of the faith, Bozell and Wilhelmsen admired Carlism’s call for a sacral society. Like the Carlists, Bozell

and Wilhelmsen would seek the reign of Jesus Christ, as Jamie III put it, over the individual and society.

Wilhelmsen eventually would write a political treatise for the Carlist movement—*Así pensamos* (So We Think) (1977)—and was knighted even by the Carlist Bourbon line, becoming a Knight of the Grand Cross of the Order of the Outlawed Legitimacy. Both Bozell and Wilhelmsen would bring Carlist symbolism back with them to America. The first chapter of the Sons of Thunder—a Carlist-inspired organization—was not started coincidentally at the University of Dallas where Wilhelmsen taught.<sup>114</sup> Bozell named his estate in Virginia, Montejurra after the mountain top in Navarre where Carlists gathered yearly to commemorate a famous battle.<sup>115</sup> Both men donned the red beret at what may have been the first pro-life demonstration in the United States in June, 1970 at the George Washington University Clinic. In a speech to his fellow demonstrators—among them a contingent of Sons of Thunder clad in Carlist uniform—Wilhelmsen shouted out the old Carlist rallying cry: “*Viva Cristo Rey!*” (Long live Christ the King).<sup>116</sup>

Bozell’s and Wilhelmsen’s experiences in Spain fostered, in part, the creation of *Triumph*. In Spain they found “Hispanidad.” Years later, Wilhelmsen explained “Hispanidad” and alluded implicitly to its impact on their lives. Forged in the Reconquest, Spain, Wilhelmsen noted, had a special mission:

Spain was a project before it was a reality, something ‘yet to be made,’ a hope, a promise. And at the heart of that dream there was an adherence to the Catholic Faith. Spain thus enters history as an adventure, a Holy Crusade, a Grail to be won. Small wonder it is that in the heart of every Spaniard, no matter how ignoble or infamous his life, there has always lingered a Don Quixote, a knight

in the service of the cross. Centuries passed and the unity of Spain was slowly knit into political existence—and always it was *Catholic* Spain. Here the nation was not only subordinate to its apostolic mission, but was annealed out of the clash and dust of history by that very mission. There is no Spain without Christ.<sup>117</sup>

“Spain was formed as a *mission and as nothing else*,” Wilhelmsen exclaimed.<sup>118</sup>

In its very being, Spain was missionary—this was “Hispanidad,” a call to

“transcendence, a surrender of self and world to their God.”<sup>119</sup> “Christus vincit:

Christus regnat: Christus imperat—Christ conquers: Christ reigns: Christ rules,”

Wilhelmsen wrote; this “is the heart of Hispanidad.”<sup>120</sup>

In Spain, Bozell and Wilhelmsen had heard the call to subordinate all things to Christ. Bozell’s wife, Patricia, stated that “After Brent and I went to Spain in 1960, Brent’s whole view of the world shifted from the political field to the religious. Religion became the basis of all his thinking, of all his conceptualizing.”<sup>121</sup> While in Spain, Bozell resigned from his position as editor at *National Review*, and exclaimed in an article, in what could be viewed as a farewell declaration, Christ’s words to “Go . . . and teach all nations.”<sup>122</sup> “These are the marching orders of Christianity,” Bozell wrote, “and, from a theological viewpoint, its central operational command.”<sup>123</sup> He and Patricia were content in Spain and even considered living there for the rest of their lives, but they felt an obligation to “carry Catholicism back to America.”<sup>124</sup> Bozell had gone to Spain and had come back bursting with “Hispanidad.” He had returned a crusader. Wilhelmsen noted that history “forged Spain into a living and marching sword in defense of the Church.”<sup>125</sup> Bozell, upon his return to America, was ready to

forge his own sword to defend the Church and institute the Kingship of Christ—that sword was *Triumph*.<sup>126</sup>

## Founding

The prevalence of both communism (internationally) and liberalism (domestically), which were leading society toward its complete secularization; the trauma of the Second Vatican Council, which unleashed a wave of liberalization throughout the Church, in addition to the Council's directive to Christianize society; the liberal domination of the American Catholic presses, the libertarian nature of mainstream conservatism and its flagship, *National Review*; and the political failures of conservatism, in addition to the examples of Spain and Carlism constituted *Triumph's* origins. The principal founding editors—Bozell and Wilhelmsen—wanted to promote a Christ-centered society; their radical solution to America's ills.<sup>127</sup>

The journal's formation was generated out of a network of Catholic conservative intellectuals who shared, if not the founding editors' solutions, their concerns for America's future. It was an impressive group and included such conservative luminaries as William J. Baroody, Lee Edwards, Edwin J. Feulner, Jr., Willmoore Kendall, Russell Kirk, Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, E. Victor Millone, Stanley Parry, Peter Stanlis, Stephen Tonsor, Gary Wills, and Francis Wilson, among others.<sup>128</sup> This network, linked by correspondence, was formed out of the relationships that these intellectuals developed through their participation in

conservative publications, notably *National Review* and *Modern Age*, and in organizations, such as the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists (ISI) and the Philadelphia Society.<sup>129</sup> Indeed, these like-minded intellectuals used the occasion of the first national meeting of the Philadelphia Society in February, 1965 at the Sheraton Hotel in Chicago to stage their first informal meeting.<sup>130</sup> In Chicago, they planned to develop a statement outlining their purpose for organizing and strategies for confronting the lack of a Catholic conservative voice, including the creation of a larger correspondence list of Catholic conservatives, the formation of an official conference to discuss the problem and solution in greater detail, and the consideration of publishing a newsletter or journal.<sup>131</sup> They wanted to create a Catholic journal that was critical of both political and religious liberalism.

A core—consisting of Bozell, Kirk, Thomas Molnar, Wilhelmsen, Wilson, and John Wisner—emerged from the Chicago meeting eager to develop a Catholic organization and journal.<sup>132</sup> This core group sent out a memorandum in September, 1965—addressed to “Conservative Catholics with a serious interest in ideas”—with the intent of forming an organization.<sup>133</sup> In the memorandum, they stated that there was a “need to develop better lines of communication and an intellectual dialogue among Catholic scholars and others with a serious interest in the application of traditional Catholic teachings to the problems and issues of our age.”<sup>134</sup> They outlined their intentions to form a committee—“perhaps leading to a society”—that would improve the lines of communication between Catholic conservative intellectuals; its possible tasks included the

expansion of the mailing list of such Catholics (including college students) for the distribution of articles, lectures, and reviews, the sponsoring of seminars and conferences, and the publication of a newsletter and journal.<sup>135</sup> They used the memorandum also to arrange another meeting and again used the occasion of the Philadelphia Society's meeting in October, 1965—this time at the Sheraton Hotel in Washington, D.C.—to gather like-minded Catholics in the hopes of forming a Catholic organization.<sup>136</sup>

Thirty-five Catholic conservative lay intellectuals attended the October meeting—which they dubbed the American Catholic Conference—and decided to form an educational society to facilitate cooperation and the exchange of ideas among Catholic conservatives and to promote their views.<sup>137</sup> They formed an interim committee to “further the organization of the society” and to plan another meeting, to be held at the Chicago-Sheraton in March, 1966.<sup>138</sup>

Twenty-five members attended the Chicago meeting on March 5, 1966; they formed the Society for the Christian Commonwealth—soon to be *Triumph's* parent organization—which was a non-profit Catholic educational society dedicated to the following beliefs:

That the proper object of every social order and every culture is to bring the human condition into harmony with the will of God. . . . that Christians are summoned to mount an integrated effort to explore, evaluate, and communicate means of constructing an authentically Christian social order, of shaping the modern world in a cultural framework that reflects Christian truth.<sup>139</sup>

The same core of Catholic intellectuals responsible for the formation of the Society for the Christian Commonwealth also formed the Committee for a Conservative Catholic Magazine—consisting of Bozell, Kirk, Molnar, Wilhelmsen,

Wilson, and Wisner—behind which Bozell, the chairman, was the principal force.<sup>140</sup> The committee formed an editorial board—comprised of Bozell, Molnar, Wilhelmsen, and Wisner—and enlisted writers from the U.S. and abroad, including, among others, Christopher Dawson, a prominent historian who was famous for arguing that religion (rather than materialism) was the driving force of cultural development, and Otto von Habsburg, “heir to the Austrian emperors and, more remotely, the Holy Roman emperors.”<sup>141</sup> They originally envisioned a fortnightly journal, but limited fund-raising and the likelihood of a relatively small readership forced the founding editors to publish monthly. They intended for the journal to have two basic purposes: to critique the modern secular-liberal order and to promote a Christ-centered order. They would pursue these objectives at “both the concrete and theoretical levels,” envisioning a target audience of “college-level comprehension and interest.”<sup>142</sup> While their journal would be “explicitly Catholic,” it would “never represent its views as official Catholic ‘teaching;’” rather, the journal would “insist only that its views and positions reflect a legitimate interpretation of doctrinal principles, and that they constitute a preferable mode of applying doctrine to the problems in question.”<sup>143</sup> The committee’s statement on the intended tone of the journal read:

1. Consistent with the gravity of the subject under discussion, the Journal would place a high premium on urbanity and humor. Pedantry and pomposity would be rigorously excluded.
2. While it would never be shrill or grim, the Journal would have a capacity for anger. An event like the abandonment of Hungary, or the betrayal of Diem, would be an occasion for more than a wringing of hands.
3. The Journal would deliberately foster a mood of controversy. Just as it would represent the Church, and society, as “engaged”, just so the Journal would be conscious of its own engagement in a lively struggle

(generous and amiable with those foes who share its moral premises, stern with those who do not) for truth.<sup>144</sup>

In appearance and length, the committee envisioned a journal similar to *Commonweal* and *National Review*. For content, the committee intended to include any articles—rooted in a Catholic perspective—of a cultural, political, social, or theological analysis related to their basic purposes. Though the journal would focus primarily on American society, it would not be limited to such coverage and would include reports on the state of the Church in Europe—including reports on the “fate and activity of the Suffering Church behind the Iron Curtain”—Latin America, Africa, and Asia.<sup>145</sup> The journal would also include a regular and aggressive editorial section, an open forum with the journal’s opponents, a book review segment, and sections on liturgical, theological, and other Church issues.<sup>146</sup>

The founding editors initially chose *Future* as the journal’s title—“agreed on in a nearby bar”—because, as they noted in their inaugural issue: “The editors of this magazine take seriously the theological proposition of Hope, and therefore assume that the full realization of the Christian vision lies ahead.”<sup>147</sup> The editors were worried that their orthodoxy, their traditionalism, would be dismissed in the American intellectual landscape as defensive and reactionary. The editors, then, wanted the title to convey their intention to transform American society—to embody their radical mission to institute the Kingship of Christ in the political order. Yet a group already had claim to the title and threatened a lawsuit; thus, the editors chose *Triumph* instead. It conveyed, Bozell remarked in a letter to Wilson, “the same forward vision and confident mood regarding Christianity’s

ultimate destiny.”<sup>148</sup> Recalling the decision to rename the journal *Triumph*, Lawrence wrote, “I do remember somebody warning, ‘People will accuse us of triumphalism’; the I-think-unanimous reaction was: So what?”<sup>149</sup>

Yet, the journal was merely an idea until the committee could gain support for it and raise money.<sup>150</sup> Of some concern was the support of the American bishops; Stephen Tonsor advised in a letter to Francis Wilson, “If we are to accomplish anything we must have some help from the clergy. Catholicism is not a layman’s Church. We need, above all, the bishops.”<sup>151</sup> Bozell tried to cultivate such support; he hoped that a bridgehead with the American bishops would provide “some seed money” and “some protection against the day on which the Left has the bright idea of challenging our orthodoxy.”<sup>152</sup>

The committee, however, also needed the financial support of like-minded, wealthy laymen and conservatives in general. Bozell sent out fundraising letters to both groups. In the letter sent to Catholics, Bozell, in a Catholic accent, stressed that the Church was under siege from the secular world and was in danger of buckling under the pressure; he noted the liberal domination of America’s Catholic presses and pleaded for a defense, through the formation of the journal, of the Church’s “venerable traditions” and the opportunity to “champion unapologetically the Truth she uniquely opposes to the secularist onslaught of the age.”<sup>153</sup> More important was the letter Bozell sent to conservatives. He did not have a substantial list of like-minded Catholics and had to appeal to the wider conservative community for financial support. Bozell’s letter, then, focused on politics—as opposed to concerns about liberal attacks on

Catholic orthodoxy—he phrased his arguments in a conservative, rather than a specifically Catholic, context. He linked Catholic concerns to those of the broader conservative movement. Bozell noted the vital role that religion, and especially the Catholic Church, played in the fight against communists, writing that the Church had served as an “implacable opposition to [these] enemies of ordered liberty”—so much so “that friend and foe alike clearly recognized her as one of the chief foundations and inspirations for the conservative cause.”<sup>154</sup> He warned, however, that liberals now dominated the Catholic presses so thoroughly that “the Church seems to speak with almost exclusively left-wing accents, and often in a revolutionary tone,” and that such liberal monopolization had fostered the impression that secular liberal views had the imprimatur of the Catholic Church.<sup>155</sup> Bozell warned that without a conservative Catholic journal, liberals would succeed in using the Church, which he noted speaks for “hundreds of millions,” as a “powerful propaganda vehicle for the Left.”<sup>156</sup> “No conservative,” Bozell cautioned, “can be indifferent to the struggle now going on in the Catholic Church.”<sup>157</sup> Bozell urged the formation of a united front against liberals, stressing that the defense of the Catholic Church should concern all right-wingers—that a “collapse at any strategic point” against the liberal onslaught threatened the entire conservative movement.<sup>158</sup>

Michael Lawrence has noted that *Triumph*'s initial financial supporters primarily were “politically conservative American Catholics”—meaning those Catholics eager for *Triumph* to argue for the consonance between American conservatism and Catholicism.<sup>159</sup> “They were confident,” Lawrence writes, “that

there was a seamless fit between these two articles of faith, and they wanted *Triumph* to buttress their confidence.”<sup>160</sup> In other words, they wanted *Triumph* to do exactly the same thing that the founding editors had accused liberal Catholics of doing—that is, to mold Catholic teaching to fit their specific ideological agenda. In a letter to Wilson, William Oliver Martin, a professor of philosophy at the University of Rhode Island and a future *Triumph* contributor, warned against such an objective in their endeavor to start a Catholic journal; he argued that they must not enter into the conservative-liberal dialectic:

Let us never, never put it in terms of ‘liberal’ vs. ‘conservative.’ That is a trap constructed by the Enemy. We are licked before we start. I am forced to go along with such ideological terms on a political basis. But, I refuse to do it when we are dealing with the guidance of the One, True Church, by the Holy Ghost, Right?!?!<sup>161</sup>

Martin, however, should not have worried. There was little chance that Bozell (who had been radicalized in Spain and who had previously written that the “chief purpose of politics is to aid the quest for virtue”) or Wilhelmsen (a future Knight of the Grand Cross of the Order of the Outlawed Legitimacy) would conform their Catholic views to American conservatism.

In addition to limited fundraising and the lawsuit that challenged their claim to the title, *Future*, the editors faced one more calamity. Their inaugural publication, scheduled for August, was delayed by lightning, which struck the printing plant’s transformer and shut down the presses.<sup>162</sup> The editors at *National Review*—who originally welcomed “jubilantly the founding of a journal of conservative Catholic opinion”—wrote the following of the event:

A manifestation of heavenly displeasure, the editors of *America* might be tempted to observe, provided they could bring themselves to believe that

there is anything on earth the Lord is nowadays displeased with, except maybe segregated schools. But, if anyone wants to play *that* game, in three days the issue rose again and is now available.<sup>163</sup>

The editors chose Saint Athanasius as the patron saint of the magazine. It was a fitting choice; they sought, after all, “the triumph of Christianity over Secularism.”<sup>164</sup> Saint Athanasius combated the great heresy of Arianism. Arius, a fourth-century Egyptian priest, had argued against Christ’s divinity. If Christ was not God and man, then the world was not redeemed and sacred—Arius’s heresy implied the de-sacralization of the physical world. This was akin to, the editors believed, the secular liberal and communist effort to secularize society. Like Arius, they sought society’s de-sacralization. Athanasius’s crusade against Arianism—his effort to reassert Christ’s divinity—was a sacralizing mission. Like Athanasius, *Triumph’s* editors were on a sacralizing mission—to render all things to Christ.<sup>165</sup>

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> By 1955, however, the editors at *America* excluded any Catholic authors who were listed on the *National Review* masthead. They returned articles that had been accepted for publication to Kirk and von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, because they were affiliated with *National Review*. The editors at *America* believed that *National Review* had unfairly “ridiculed” one of their former editors, Farther Robert Hartnett. *National Review* editors had indeed criticized Hartnett for his liberal viewpoints; as they explained, “the editorial direction of *America* under his stewardship was, quite consistently and quite emphatically, Liberal as regards politics.” Editor, “On Editorial Policy,” *National Review* 1 (December 28, 1955): 6-7.

<sup>2</sup> Patrick Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America, 1950-1985* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), 26. Michael Harrington wrote in the liberal Catholic *Commonweal* that “In political terms, cooperation with Communists remains as impossible as ever.” (363) And that “Their Parties are so tightly bound to Moscow that they quite literally *cannot* be transformed. It is their very nature to be dedicated to subordinating all else to the demands of Stalinist imperialism.” (364) Michael Harrington, “New Communist Line,” *Commonweal* 64 (July 13, 1956): 363-365. Also, see Editorial, “Pope John on Communism,” *Commonweal* 70 (May 1, 1959): 116-117.

<sup>3</sup> Editorial, “Week by Week” *Commonweal* 56 (June 2, 1952): 188. *America*’s editors called McCarthy charges “pretty irresponsible.” Editorial, “Senator McCarthy’s Charges,” *America* (April 1, 1950): 737. On McCarthy’s censure, the editor at *Commonweal* wrote: “One can feel no sympathy, however, for what ‘Joe’ represents and for the disservice to the nation his recklessness has accomplished. This disservice made his censure by the Senate inevitable and long, long overdue. When, and if, it is voted in November, the Senators will merely be catching up with history. In censuring Mr. McCarthy, the Senators will be paying a debt which has to be paid and so will do much to restore the Senate and the nation’s honor. We can then, perhaps, get on with the truly important things, no longer diverted by that hysteria which has sapped out strength which will bear the Junior Senator from Wisconsin’s name into history.” Editorial, “The Watkins Report,” *Commonweal* 61 (October 8, 1954): 4. Also, see Editorial, “The Campaign,” *Commonweal* 55 (November 30, 1951): 189; Editorial, “The Trouble with Crusades,” *Commonweal* 56 (August 29, 1952): 499-500; and Editorial, “The Decline of McCarthy,” *Commonweal* 61 (December 24, 1954): 324-325.

<sup>4</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “The Conservative Catholic” *Commonweal* 57 (February 20, 1953): 493, 492.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 492.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 493.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Editorial, “‘Liberal’ vs. ‘Conservative,’” *Commonweal* 57 (February 20, 1953): 488.

<sup>10</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Communications: ‘The Conservative Catholic,’” *Commonweal* 57 (April 3, 1953): 651.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* Also, see Editorial, “Liberal vs. Conservative,” 488.

---

<sup>13</sup> Bozell, "To Magnify the West," *National Review* 12 (April 24, 1962): 287.

<sup>14</sup> Wilhelmsen, "History, Toynbee and the Modern Mind: Betrayal of the West," *Modern Age* (Summer 1957): 40.

<sup>15</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "The Strange Drift of Liberal Catholicism," *National Review* 11 (August 12, 1961): 85. Wilhelmsen wrote (quoting Douglas Jerrold extensively): "Christian civilization is not just one among many; it is, and the world today provides overwhelming evidence of the fact, the only civilization built on the rights of the human personality, rights which derive from the belief in the immortality of the soul of man . . . . The doctrine of man's fall and redemption, of the equality of all men before God, of the ability and obligation to win salvation, and consequently of the sanctity, dignity and responsibility of the individual personality, these doctrines changed the face of the world. They gave a wholly new direction to human activity . . . . The "rights" which are deducible from these doctrines are today universally recognized by all who are heirs to the traditions of the Western European civilization, even by those who deny in whole or part of the doctrine from which they have derived.' To the above I can only add the following supplementary comments: man free under a law, rooted, not in the vagaries of the majority principle, but in the very fabric of human personality; the free family, the free Church, the free society headed by the legitimate state: these are the marks of the Christian heritage. . . . The classical-Christian tradition raised up an edifice that gave man dignity under God, and freedom within the law." Wilhelmsen, "History, Toynbee and the Modern Mind: Betrayal of the West," 39-40.

<sup>16</sup> Bozell, "The Strange Drift of Liberal Catholicism," 85. Bozell was responding to an article published in *America*. See George H. Dunne and C.J. McNaspy, "How We Look to Others," *America* (May 13, 1961): 272-275.

<sup>17</sup> Editorial, "God and the Cold War," *Commonweal* 74 (September 8, 1961): 483-484.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 483-484.

<sup>20</sup> The Jesuits at *America* also criticized Bozell for his claim that the West was God's civilization. See James O'Leary, "God Save Father Dunne: A Public Confession to L. Brent Bozell," *America* 105 no. 24 (September 9, 1961): 703. Norris Clarke noted, in the pages of *America*, that a principal problem with Bozell's view was that the West was no longer a unified Christian civilization. Clarke wrote that "*there no longer exists any articulate public consensus in the West on the ultimate values which once formed the living soul of its culture, nor any institutional organs by which, even if present, it could be expressed.* . . . And if there is no common consensus, on what grounds can an individual nation or its government claim to speak in the name of Western Christian civilization? . . . In simple words, the once professedly Christian West has for at least a century lost its voice. And with its voice has gone, too, any divinely commissioned 'authority' it *might* once have had to instruct, judge and improve the rest of the world. I fear that Mr. Bozell has not yet really accepted the fact that, like it or not, we no longer live in the world of the Holy Roman Empire, or Philip II's Spain, or even in the select club of Christian European kings and princes who agreed with each other at least on the ultimate, if not on the immediate, destiny of man." Clarke reasoned, however, that even if the West was still the Christian West, it was still "highly improbably in the light of history that the West has any definite God-given mission to hold the rest of the world in permanent master-disciple tutelage—spiritually, intellectually, economically, or culturally." Norris Clarke, "Is the West 'God's Civilization'?" *America* 106 no. 25 (March 31, 1962): 853-856.

<sup>21</sup> Gary Wills, "An Exchange of Views: 'God and the Cold War,'" *Commonweal* 75 (October 20, 1961): 95-97.

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 96. For the *Commonweal's* reply to Wills, see Editorial, "Reply," *The Commonweal* 75 (October 20, 1961): 97-98.

<sup>23</sup> Frank S. Meyer, "Principles and Heresies: Commonweal Puts the West in Its Place," *National Review* 11 (October 7, 1961): 234. For *Commonweal's* response to Meyer, see Editorial, "God and Man at *National Review*," *Commonweal* 75 (October 27, 1961): 107-108. In a seemingly circular debate, the editors argued that it was Meyer who was falling into the Manichean trap by conceptualizing the Cold War as an absolutist struggle between good and evil and reaffirmed their view that the West was not God's civilization. They wrote: "With equal vehemence we deny that the West has any 'transcendent value' in the eyes of God—the God who made a middle eastern tribe His chosen people, the God whose only-begotten Son was a Middle Eastern Jew. We find it impossible to see how anyone can look upon the West 'as close to an absolute white'—that West which, conservatives forget, was the spawning ground of modern materialism, secularism, and Communism." Editorial, "God and Man at *National Review*," 107-108.

<sup>24</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "Politics of the Poor (Letter to Yourselves, Part II)," *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 14.

<sup>25</sup> For example, see Daniel M. Friedenber, "Harvest in the Congo," *Commonweal* 72 (September 23, 1960): 511-513; and Editorial, "Algerian Hopes," *Commonweal* 73 (March 17, 1961): 624.

<sup>26</sup> Thomas Molnar, "Neo-Colonialism in Africa," *Modern Age* (Spring 1965): 176.

<sup>27</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "To Magnify the West," *National Review* 12 (April 24, 1962): 287.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> Editorial, "Pope John on Communism," 117. Also, see Michael Harrington, "New Communist Line," 363-365. Harrington wrote, "In political terms, cooperation with Communists remains as impossible as ever" (363). Also, see Michael Harrington, "Communism after Hungary: In the United States," *Commonweal* 65 (February 1, 1957): 455-457; Editorial, "Mr. Khrushchev at the U.N.," *Commonweal* 73 (October 14, 1960): 59-60; and Editors, "Debate in Moscow," *Commonweal* 75 (November 3, 1961): 139-140.

<sup>30</sup> Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America*, 137.

<sup>31</sup> Editor, "Communism and the Pope," *Commonweal* 78 (May 24, 1963): 235-236. Also, see Editorial, "Polarized Policy, Plural World," *Commonweal* 74 (May 19, 1961): 195-196.

<sup>32</sup> Editorial, "Defense of Vietnam," *Commonweal* 75 (October 20, 1961): 85; Editorial, "Uncertain Prospect for Vietnam," *Commonweal* 79 (November 15, 1963): 212; and Editorial, "North Vietnam's Bloody Nose," *Commonweal* 80 (August 21, 1964): 559.

<sup>33</sup> Editorial, "Vietnam Protests," *Commonweal* 83 (October 29, 1965): 113-114; and Editorial, "Ending the War," *Commonweal* 83 (December 10, 1965): 295-296.

<sup>34</sup> Editorial, "Ending the War," 296.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> Editorial, "Getting Out," *Commonweal* 85 (December 23, 1966): 335.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 336.

<sup>39</sup> Editorial, "Washington Report: The Crisis in Birmingham," *Commonweal* 78 (May 24, 1963): 239; Also, see Editorial, "Negro Protests," *Commonweal* 72 (April 1, 1960): 4-5; Editorial, "Birmingham, a City," *Commonweal* 78 (May 17, 1963): 212-213.

<sup>40</sup> Editorial, "Washington Report: The Crisis in Birmingham," 239.

<sup>41</sup> Editor, "Why the South Must Prevail" *National Review* 4 (August 24, 1957): 148-149.

<sup>42</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "The Open Question," *National Review* 4 (September 7, 1957): 209.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> For Bozell's views on the Civil Rights Movement, see Bozell, "The Open Question," 209; L. Brent Bozell, "Should We Impeach Earl Warren," *National Review* 11 (September 9, 1961): 153-155; L. Brent Bozell, "Legal Libertine," *National Review* 11 (November 18, 1961): 340-341; Bozell, "The Strange Drift of Liberal Catholicism," 84; L. Brent Bozell, "To Mend the Tragic Flaw," *National Review* 14 (March 12, 1963): 199-200; L. Brent Bozell, "The Lessons of Cambridge and Salisbury: Was Violence Necessary?" *National Review* 15 (August 27, 1963): 145-147; L. Brent Bozell, *The Warren Revolution: Reflections on a Consensus Society* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1966), 15-37, 41-57.

<sup>45</sup> Bozell, *The Warren Revolution*, 56-57.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 15-37.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 19, 16-17.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., 20.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 25. The italics are Bozell's.

<sup>50</sup> Bozell, "The Lessons of Cambridge and Salisbury: Was Violence Necessary?" 145-147.

<sup>51</sup> Thomas Bokenkotter, *A Concise History of the Catholic Church*. rev. ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1990), 360.

<sup>52</sup> Editor, "The Pope's Trip," *Commonweal* 79 (December 20, 1963): 360-361.

<sup>53</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Catholicism is right, so why change it?" *The Saturday Evening Post* (July 16, 1967): 10.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> *Triumph's* future founding editors were concerned also with traditionalist Catholics who rejected the Council's legitimacy. They were critical, for example, of the Catholic Traditionalist Movement and its founder, Reverend Gommar A. Depauw. To deny the validity of the Second Vatican Council was to deny the Church's legitimacy that it was guided by the Holy Spirit.

<sup>56</sup> Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America*, 24.

<sup>57</sup> Wilhelmsen, "Catholicism is right, so why change it?," 10.

---

<sup>58</sup> L. Brent Bozell to Fellow Catholic (fundraising letter), Francis G. Wilson Papers, Record Series 15/18/24, Box 1, Folder: "Catholic Conservatives (organization; magazine), 1965-1966," University of Illinois Archives, Urbana.

<sup>59</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "Who is Accommodating to What?" *National Review* 17 (May 4, 1965): 374 (374, 377).

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

<sup>61</sup> Wilhelmsen, "Catholicism is right, so why change it?" 10. Thomas Molnar labeled "'updating' or *aggiornamento*" in "its bulk and basic inspiration, the ecclesiastical counterpart of the political 'opening to the left.'" Thomas Molnar, "The Ideology of *Aggiornamento*," *National Review* 17 (May 4, 1965): 365.

<sup>62</sup> The increase in experimentation and the effort to institute much wider ranging change challenged papal supremacy—Pope Paul VI was powerless to stem the plethora of challenges to Catholic tradition that the Council had instigated. Such a challenge threatened to tear apart the fabric of Catholic orthodoxy and unity—"We see in Rome not only the Voice of God on earth but the very center of creation," Wilhelmsen wrote, "Beyond this voice and outside this center there is for us . . . nothing other than darkness. . . . For us Rome and the Keys of the Kingdom are one." Wilhelmsen, "Catholicism is right, so why change it?," 10.

<sup>63</sup> L. Brent Bozell to Fellow Catholics (fundraising letter), Francis Wilson Papers.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.

<sup>66</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "A Note Concerning Intellectual Dialogue and Catholic Journals," *The Wanderer* (August 5, 1965): 5.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

<sup>68</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "Notes and Asides," *National Review* 13 (August 14, 1962): 93.

<sup>69</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "Dialogue in Vermont," *National Review* 17 (December 14, 1965): 1153-1156.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., 1154, 1156.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., 1156.

<sup>72</sup> See the cover of the May 4, 1965 issue of *National Review*.

<sup>73</sup> Bozell, "Dialogue in Vermont," 1156.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

<sup>75</sup> While Spain's industrial underdevelopment may have been a sign of its economic backwardness to the liberal establishment in America, this was not a problem for Wilhelmsen or Bozell. For the former, the industrial world was an abomination, a byproduct of the Calvinist and Gnostic heresies. In this way, Spain's economic underdevelopment was envisioned as a sign of its strength.

---

<sup>76</sup> For the Spanish Civil War, see Hugh Thomas, *The Spanish Civil War*, 3rd ed. (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1986).

<sup>77</sup> While Franco ultimately kept Spain neutral during the Second World War, the Blue Division, a contingent of volunteer soldiers, fought with Germany on the Eastern Front. Sebastian Balfour, "Spain from 1931 to the Present," in *Spain: A History*, ed. Raymond Carr (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 267; and Stanley G. Payne, *Fascism in Spain, 1923-1977* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1999), 340, 342. After World War II, Franco's Spain was isolated by the Allied powers, but as the Cold War developed—and due to Franco's decision to gradually liberalize Spain's economy—Spain was brought into an alliance in the 1950s with the United States.

<sup>78</sup> One of Hugh Thomas's conclusions, in *The Spanish Civil War*, is that foreign support, including the Soviet Union's support for the republican side, had a fundamental impact on the course of the war. Thomas, *The Spanish Civil War*, 465-674, 968-969, 974-985.

<sup>79</sup> For an examination of fascism in Spain, see Payne, *Fascism in Spain*.

<sup>80</sup> For a brief examination of the Spanish Civil War and the Franco regime, see Raymond Carr, *Modern Spain 1875-1980* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 135-172; and Balfour, "Spain from 1931 to the Present," 243-282.

<sup>81</sup> In 1938, fifty-eight percent of American Catholics supported the Nationalist forces, whereas eighty-three percent of Protestants supported the Republicans. Charles R. Morris, *American Catholic: The Saints and Sinners Who Built America's Most Powerful Church* (New York: Random House, 1997), 234.

<sup>82</sup> Patricia Bozell, interview by Patrick Allitt, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta GA. For information on the Buckley family, as children, see John B. Judis, *William F. Buckley, Jr.: Patron Saint of the Conservatives* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988), 17-51.

<sup>83</sup> Balfour, "Spain from 1931 to the Present," 245.

<sup>84</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "The Future of Catholic Spain," *Triumph* 10 no. 6 (June 1975): 12.

<sup>85</sup> For Wilhelmsen's view that the Civil War was fought for "the Cross," see Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Letter from Spain: Forces at Work in Today's Spain," *America* (September 21, 1963): 306; Wilhelmsen, "The Future of Catholic Spain," 11-14, 30; and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Adiós: Francisco Franco—Caudillo de España," *The Wanderer* (December 11, 1975): 85-94.

<sup>86</sup> Carr, *Modern Spain 1875-1980*, 148.

<sup>87</sup> George H. Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America: Since 1945* (New York: Basic Books, 1976; Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 1998), 181-182; and Rafael Calvo-Serer, "They Spoke For Christian Europe," *National Review* (July 27, 1957): 109, 112.

<sup>88</sup> Bozell, Kendall, and Wilson were converts. Francis Wilson, a distinguished political scientist and longtime professor at the University of Illinois, Urbana, was probably the intellectual responsible for Bozell's and Wilhelmsen's interest in Spain. Wilson, a Hispanophile, was Willmoore Kendall's dissertation adviser and probably sparked his interest in Spain. It was Kendall, in turn, who fostered Wilhelmsen's interest in Spain, and the latter encouraged the Bozells to travel there. Wilson, Patrick Allitt notes, "made a forceful case for the consonance of

---

Catholicism and American conservatism . . . Both groups [Wilson argued] ‘operate on the principle of an objective moral order and reject secularism based on pragmatic and neo-utilitarian philosophy.’” Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America*, 59-60. Also, see Francis G. Wilson, “Catholics and the New Conservatism,” *Social Order* (June, 1956): 247. Wilson produced a study on the Spanish political tradition, *Political Thought in National Spain* (1967). For information on Wilson, see Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America*, 58-60; H. Lee Cheek, Jr., Susan Powers, and Cheek, Kathy B. Cheek, eds., *Political Philosophy and Cultural Renewal: Collected Essays* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transactions Publishers, 2001); and M. Susan Power, “A Forgotten Conservative: Francis Graham Wilson,” *Modern Age* (Winter 1999): 55-62.

<sup>89</sup> Editors, “Spain’s Fairest Gem,” *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 9.

<sup>90</sup> Wilhelmsen, “The Future of Catholic Spain,” 11.

<sup>91</sup> Editors, “Spain’s Fairest Gem,” 9.

<sup>92</sup> Patricia Bozell, interview with Patrick Allitt.

<sup>93</sup> This author’s knowledge of Carlism is derived from the following sources: Martin Blinkhorn, *Carlism and Crisis in Spain, 1931-1939* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 1-40; Warren H. Carroll, “Carlism in the Spanish Rising of 1936,” in *Saints, Sovereigns, and Scholars*, ed. R.A. Herrera, James Lehrberger, and M.E. Bradford (New York: Peter Lang, 1993), 377-388; Edgar Holt, *The Carlist Wars in Spain* (London: Putnam, 1967); Jeremy MacClancy, *The Decline of Carlism* (Reno: University of Nevada Press, 2000), 1-33, 127-156; Stanley G. Payne, “Spanish Conservatism, 1834-1923,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 13 no. 4 (October, 1978): 765-789; Alexandra Wilhelmsen, “Carlos VII or an Introduction to Carlism,” *Iberian Studies* 8 no. 1 (Spring 1979): 29-41; Alexandra Wilhelmsen, “The Carlist Motto, *Dios, Patria, Fueros, Rey*, in the Late Nineteenth Century,” *Society for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies Bulletin* 6 (September, 1979): 250-253; Alexandra Wilhelmsen, “The Conspiracy of La Rápita and the Theory of the Two Legitimacies,” *Society for Spanish and Portuguese Studies Bulletin* 11 (October, 1986): 16-18; Alexandra Wilhelmsen, “Carlism’s Defense of the Church in Spain, 1933-1936,” *Faith and Reason* 14 (Winter, 1990): 355-370; Alexandra Wilhelmsen, “The Theory of Spanish Political Traditionalism (1810-1875): Realism and Carlism,” in *Identidad y nacionalismo en la España contemporánea: El Carlismo (1833-1975) Jornadas organizadas por la Universidad de Wisconsin-Madison y la Fundación Hernando de Larramendi*, ed. S. G. Payne (Madrid: Actas, 1996), 44-54; Alexandra Wilhelmsen, “Antonio Aparisi y Guijarro: A Nineteenth-Century Carlist Apologist for a Sacral Society in Spain,” in *Saints, Sovereigns, and Scholars*, ed. R.A. Herrera, James Lehrberger, and M.E. Bradford (New York: Peter Lang, 1993), 365-376; Alexandra Wilhelmsen, “Carlism: From Reaction to Counterrevolution, 1833-1876,” in *Spanish Carlism and Polish Nationalism: The Borderlands of Europe in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries*, ed. Marek Jan Chodakiewicz and John Radilowski (Charlottesville, VA: Leopolis Press, 2003): 9-23. Also, see Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Forces at Work in Today’s Spain,” 311-313; and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “The Future of Catholic Spain,” 14, 30.

<sup>94</sup> They were critical of the Franco regime for marginalizing the political influence of the Carlism despite their significant contribution in the Spanish Civil War, and for acquiescing to pressure for religious freedom, and for designating Prince Juan Carlos—from the liberal line of the Bourbon family—as king and chief of state. Wilhelmsen, “Letter from Spain: Forces at Work in Today’s Spain,” 306-313; Wilhelmsen, “The Future of Catholic Spain,” 11-14, 30; and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Adiós: Francisco Franco—Caudillo de España,” in *Citizen of Rome: Reflections from the Life of a Roman Catholic*, by Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, (La Salle, IL: Sherwood Sugden and Company, 1980), 222-233.

---

<sup>95</sup> Richard Herr, *The Eighteenth-Century Revolution in Spain* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1958; Reprint, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1969), vii; and Alexandra Wilhelmsen, "Carlism: From Reaction to Counterrevolution, 1833-1876," 9-10.

<sup>96</sup> Blinkhorn, *Carlism and Crisis in Spain*, 6-7.

<sup>97</sup> The five wars were the Constitutional War (1821-1823), the War of the Malcontents (1827), the First Carlist War (1833-1840), the Second Carlist War (1847-1849), and the Third Carlist (1872-1876).

<sup>98</sup> Alexandra Wilhelmsen, "Carlism: Reaction to Counterrevolution," 11. Alexandra Wilhelmsen is the daughter of Frederick D. Wilhelmsen.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid.

<sup>100</sup> The dates of the Second Carlist War, also referred to as the Matiners War, was from 1847-1849 and the Third Carlist War broke out in 1872 and lasted until 1876. The last two Bourbon pretenders in Carlos V's direct line were Jamie III (1909-1931) and Alfonso Carlos I (1931-1936).

<sup>101</sup> Alexandra Wilhelmsen, "Carlism's Defense of the Church in Spain, 1833-1936," 357-358; and Alexandra Wilhelmsen, "Carlism: From Reaction to Counterrevolution, 1833-1876," 13-14.

<sup>102</sup> Alexandra Wilhelmsen, "The Carlist Motto, Dios, Patria, Fueros, Rey in the Late Nineteenth Century," 250-253.

<sup>103</sup> Jamie III; quoted in Alexandra Wilhelmsen "Carlisms Defense of the Church in Spain, 1833-1936," 361-362. María Teresa, the wife of Carlos VII, wrote in 1864 that "the truths, certain and infallible, of the Catholic faith form the very solid foundation of our political, civil, and domestic life." María Teresa; quoted in Alexandra Wilhelmsen "Carlism's Defense of the Church in Spain," 361. The nineteenth-century Carlist political writer Antonio Aparasi y Guijarro wrote in the 1870s that "There will be dissolution in every society in which God is denied or ignored and the origin of sovereignty is vested in man." Antonio Aparasi; quoted in Alexandra Wilhelmsen "Antonio Aparasi Guijarro: A Nineteenth-Century Carlist Apologist for a Sacral Society in Spain," 371.

<sup>104</sup> Alexandra Wilhelmsen, "The Carlist Motto, *Dios, Patria, Fueros, Rey* in the Late Nineteenth Century," 252.

<sup>105</sup> Alexandra Wilhelmsen, "The Carlist Conspiracy of La Rápita and the Theory of Two Legitimacies," 16-18.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid.

<sup>107</sup> Carlos VII; quoted in Alexandra Wilhelmsen, "Carlos VII or an Introduction to Carlism," 32.

<sup>108</sup> Blinkhorn notes this inconsistency. Carlism—"a Bourbon cause"—he writes, was "paradoxically wedded to Spain's pre-Bourbon past." Martin Blinkhorn, *Carlism and Crisis in Spain*, 4.

<sup>109</sup> Blinkhorn, *Carlism and Crisis in Spain*, 256.

---

<sup>110</sup> Carr, *Modern Spain*, 132.

<sup>111</sup> Frederick Wilhelmsen, "The Future of Catholic Spain," 14.

<sup>112</sup> Thomaz Da Groomes and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, *Triumph* 2 no. 10 (November, 1967): 9.

<sup>113</sup> Frederick Wilhelmsen, "Forces at Work in Today's Spain," 172.

<sup>114</sup> Wilhelmsen was member also of the Muthiko Alaiak, which was basque for "Happy Lads." "The *Muthiko*, the editors explained, was "a local society dedicated to Navarre, to Spain, and to Carlism." Da Groomes and Wilhelmsen, *Triumph* 2 no. 10 (October, 1967): 9.

<sup>115</sup> The Battle of Lácar (1875) pitted the revered Bourbon pretender and Carlist, Carlos VII, against the Bourbon king, Alfonso XII. The former was victorious.

<sup>116</sup> Lawrence, "Present Imperfect," *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 9. Eventually five men were arrested, including Bozell, at the *Triumph*-led pro-life demonstration at the GWU Clinic.

<sup>117</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Hispanidad," *The Wanderer* (February 8, 1990): 10.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, 10-11.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>121</sup> Patricia Bozell, Patrick Allitt interview.

<sup>122</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "Freedom or Virtue?" *National Review* 13 (September, 1962): 184.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.* For Bozell's resignation, see Editor, "In This Issue," *National Review* 14 (June 18, 1963): 479.

<sup>124</sup> Patricia Bozell, Patrick Allitt interview.

<sup>125</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Hispanidad," 10.

<sup>126</sup> It should be noted, however, that the entire editorial staff would not be united by any concept of Hispanophilia or adoration of Carlism. Molnar, who was with the magazine until 1970, and Gary Potter, an editor and longtime contributor, were not interested in Spain or Carlism. Molnar favored the French right, and he admired the French Catholic royalist, Bernanos, who was critical of the nationalist side in the Spanish Civil War. Thomas Molnar, *Bernanos: His Political Thought and Prophecy* (New York: Sheed and Ward), 100-108; and Thomas Molnar, "Frederick D. Wilhelmsen—R.I.P.," *Chronicles* (June, 1997): 45. Potter was never comfortable with *Triumph's* attachment to Carlism. "The Spanish idiom—I had problems with that," he wrote. "I understand Carlism and if I were Spanish I might be a Carlist too. But I remember saying at a heated editorial meeting one day that we weren't going to shake down the Anglo-Saxon state by chanting "Viva Christo Rey!" Potter, like Molnar, was much more a Francophile than a Hispanophile. Gary Potter, interview by Patrick Allitt, 4 March 1991, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA. Even Michael Lawrence, a longtime editor, believed that there was "a bit too much" admiration of Spain and Carlism in the journal. Michael Lawrence, interview by Patrick Allitt, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta GA.

---

<sup>127</sup> For information on the founding of *Triumph*, this author has relied on Michael Lawrence's introductions to *Mustard Seeds* and *The Best of Triumph*, see Michael Lawrence, introduction to *Mustard Seeds A Conservative Catholic Becomes a Catholic: Collected Essays*, by L. Brent Bozell (Manassas, VA: Trinity Communications, 1986), 10-12; and Michael Lawrence, introduction to *The Best of Triumph*, ed., Unsigned (Front Royal, VA: Christendom Press, 2001), xviii-xix; and especially the Francis G. Wilson Papers at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. The collection contains a folder on the activities of Catholic conservatives from 1965 to 1966. It includes letters, memorandums, minutes from meetings, a pilot issue of *Triumph*, and other miscellaneous items. See Francis G. Wilson Papers, Record Series 15/18/24, Box 1, Folder: "Catholic Conservatives (organization; magazine), 1965-1966," University of Illinois Archives, Urbana. This author has relied also on correspondence between Bozell and Russell Kirk in the Russell Kirk Papers, see Russell Kirk Papers, Folder "Correspondence Between L. Brent Bozell and Kirk," Clarke Historical Library, Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant; and Patrick Allitt's interviews with Brent and Patricia Bozell, and Michael Lawrence. L. Brent Bozell, interview by Patrick Allitt, 26 February 1991, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA; and Patricia Bozell, interview by Patrick Allitt; and Michael Lawrence, interview by Patrick Allitt. Russell Kirk (1918-1994) was a Catholic convert and a traditionalist conservative. Kirk was the founder of *Modern Age* and *The University Bookman*, both conservative journals, and his, *The Conservative Mind* (1953) is considered a pillar of the post-World War II conservative intellectual revival. In it, Kirk argued that there was a American conservative tradition—which he traced through such thinkers as John Adams, John Q. Adams, and John C. Calhoun—an explicit challenge to the liberal contention that America was inherently liberal and that conservatism was a mere, reactionary impulse. In *The Conservative Mind*, he also helped define conservatism. See Russell Kirk, *The Conservative Mind: From Burke to Santayana* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1953); and *American Conservatism: An Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Russell Kirk."

<sup>128</sup> This list was derived from various documents in the Francis G. Wilson Papers. See Name and address list, December 8, 1964, Francis G. Wilson Papers. Baroody (1916-1980) was the creator of the American Enterprise Institute, a preeminent public policy think tank; Edwards (1932-) was a principal organizational figure in the post-World War II conservative revival and now a historian of conservatism; Feulner (1941-) was a bright economic and public policy consultant, who would eventually help found the Heritage Foundation and transform it into a premier conservative think tank on public policy; Kendall (1909-1967) was a brilliant political scientist and a founding editor of *National Review*; Kuehnelt-Leddihn (1909-1999) was a distinguished Catholic political thinker and novelist; Milione was the president of the Intercollegiate Studies Institute; Parry (1918-1972) was a priest of the Congregation of Holy Cross and a prominent political scientist; Stanlis (1920-) is a renowned scholar of Edmund Burke and Robert Frost; Tonsor (1923-) was a longtime Professor of History at the University of Michigan, a prominent traditionalist conservative and cultural critic; Wills (1934-), at the time, was a prominent conservative intellectual, a writer for *National Review*, and a Professor of Classics at John Hopkins University. Kendall, Kirk, Kuehnelt-Leddihn, and Wilson would become *Triumph* contributors. For biographical information of these conservative intellectuals, excluding Wills, consult *American Conservatism: An Encyclopedia*.

<sup>129</sup> The Intercollegiate Society of Individualists—later renamed the Intercollegiate Studies Institute—was created in 1953 by Frank Chodorov. It was founded to counter socialist propaganda on college campuses and develop a network between conservative-minded faculty and students. See *American Conservatism: An Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Intercollegiate Studies Institute;" and Lee Edwards, *Educating for Liberty: The First Half-Century of Intercollegiate Studies Institute* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2003). The Philadelphia Society, an organization for conservative intellectuals, was founded by Donald J. Lipsett in 1964 and served as a forum for both libertarian and traditionalist intellectuals. The society was named after Philadelphia in honor of the city's connection to the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution, which symbolized, one writer remarked, "our ancient heritage of personal liberty under moral law."

---

For further information on the Philadelphia Society, see, Erick von Keuhnelt-Leddihn, "The Philadelphia Society," *National Review* 17 (November 2, 1965): 986; and Guy Davenport, "The Need to Maintain a Civilization," *National Review* 17 (April 6, 1965).

<sup>130</sup> Memorandum by Donald Lipsett, February 19, 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers; and Donald Lipsett to Francis G. Wilson, December 8, 1964, Francis G. Wilson Papers. Also, see Thomas Molnar to Francis G. Wilson, January 11, 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers; and Thomas Molnar to Francis G. Wilson, February 5, 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers.

<sup>131</sup> Memorandum by Don Lipsett, February 19, 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers. It appears that the Catholic conservative network used the Intercollegiate Studies Institute's mailing list to coordinate the initial meeting. The memorandum for the gathering was sent out by Donald Lipsett, the "National Field Director" of the Intercollegiate Studies Institute.

<sup>132</sup> Molnar would become a founding editor. He was an important addition. Molnar was a European émigré. He was born in Budapest, Hungary in 1921. During the Second World War Molnar was imprisoned by the Nazis at Dachau for his participation in a Catholic resistance group in France (where he was engaged in his collegiate studies). Molnar wrote the following of his last chaotic days at Dachau: "Pierre and I spent the day reconnoitering. The barracks were in horrible condition: dirt, mainly from human beings in the last phase of disintegration. As one walked among them, one could not avoid stepping on an outstretched hand or foot, but instead of a curse, however, brutal yet reassuring, all one heard was a faint, whinnying sound, like that of an old and sick animal in which the spark of life is close to extinction. We witnessed bitter battles for a dish of warm water in which the morsels of yesterday's bread had been carefully dipped. And there were the emasculated, screaming voices shrieking oaths, flows of dreadful insults, and the thud of fists falling on the bony surface of what used to be a flesh-covered body. Dante and Virgil had seen nothing worse in their voyage through the circles of hell." Thomas Molnar, "Last Days at Dachau," *Commonweal* 65 (March 1, 1957): 172. Molnar was liberated from Dachau by American forces. He was disappointed upon his return to Hungary to find that the Nazis had merely been supplanted by communists. He left an increasingly communist Hungary and went to Belgium, where in 1948 he obtained his master's degrees in both French literature and philosophy from the University of Brussels. Molnar then migrated to the United States and earned his doctorate in 1952 in French literature from Columbia University. He taught at a few different Catholic colleges on the West Coast, before finding a permanent position as Professor of French and world literature during the sixties and seventies at Brooklyn College, City University of New York. Molnar was already a prolific writer by the mid-1960s. By 1968, he had published seven books in English, ranging from studies on the French Catholic royalist, Bernanos, to the decline of education, to the inadequacies of American foreign policy. See Molnar, *Bernanos*; Thomas Molnar, *The Future of Education* (New York: Fleet Academic Editions, Inc, 1961); and Thomas Molnar, *The Two Faces of American Foreign Policy* (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1962). His other published books by 1968, included the following: *The Decline of the Intellectual* (1961), *Africa: A Political Travelogue* (1965) *Utopia: The Perennial Heresy* (1967), and *Ecumenism or New Reformation?* (1968). Molnar also contributed articles to *Commonweal*, *Modern Age*, *National Review*, and the *Catholic World*. For biographical information on Molnar, see Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America*, 204-242; Thomas Molnar, "Last Days at Dachau," 169-172; Thomas Molnar, "Growing Up in Eastern Europe," *The Human Life Review* 16 (Spring 1990): 63-71; Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America*, 70-71; Russell Kirk, foreword to *The Future of Education* by Thomas Molnar (New York: Fleet Academic Editions, Inc., 1961), 10-13; *American Conservatism: An Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Molnar, Thomas;" and *Who's Who in America*, 37th ed. (1972-1973), s.v. "Molnar, Thomas.

<sup>133</sup> Memorandum by L. Brent Bozell, Russell Kirk, Thomas Molnar, Frederick Wilhelmsen, and Francis G. Wilson, September 9, 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*

---

<sup>135</sup> Ibid.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid.

<sup>137</sup> American Catholic Conference: A Report, October, 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers.

<sup>138</sup> Ibid.

<sup>139</sup> Excerpts from By-laws of Society for the Christian Commonwealth, Article II, Declaration of Beliefs and Purposes, October, 1966, Francis G. Wilson Papers. Titles such as “The Catholic Philosophical Society” and the “Charles Carroll Society” were rejected because they were being used. See Donald Lipsett to Francis G. Wilson, May 27, 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers; and L. Brent Bozell to Francis G. Wilson, January 25, 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers. For the formation on the Society for the Christian Commonwealth, see L. Brent Bozell to Francis G. Wilson, January 25, 1966, Francis G. Wilson Papers; and William J. Fitzpatrick to Francis G. Wilson, April 24, 1966, Francis G. Wilson Papers.

<sup>140</sup> Lawrence, a long-time *Triumph* editor, wrote: “In truth the Committee was Brent and Trish [Patricia]. As was the magazine it eventually brought forth. *Triumph* would never have come to be, and would not have been sustained for a decade, had it not been for the audacity of Brent’s ‘founding idea,’ Brent’s energy and, most importantly, Brent’s thought; and without Trish . . . well, Brent wouldn’t have been Brent . . . Brent and Trish Bozell, more than anyone else, did it. . . . Brent and Trish did the serious work of organizing the fund-raising and putting together the editorial plan for the new magazine.” Lawrence, introduction to *The Best of Triumph*, xviii-xix.

<sup>141</sup> Russell Kirk, *Confessions of a Bohemian Tory: Episodes and Reflections of a Vagrant Career* (New York: Fleet Publishing Corporation, 1963), 145. For the tentative list of editors and contributors, see Prospectus for *Future*, December 8, 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers.

<sup>142</sup> A Preliminary Report from the Committee for a Conservative Catholic Magazine: Prospectus, 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers; and Blueprint for *Future*, Francis G. Wilson Papers.

<sup>143</sup> Blueprint for *Future*, Francis G. Wilson Papers.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid.

<sup>147</sup> Editors, “Future’s Triumph,” *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 6; and Thomas Molnar, “Frederick D. Wilhelmsen—R.I.P.,” 45.

<sup>148</sup> L. Brent Bozell to Francis G. Wilson, August 26, 1966, Francis G. Wilson Papers.

<sup>149</sup> Lawrence, introduction to *The Best of Triumph*, xix.

<sup>150</sup> Bozell anticipated “annual operating expenses of \$340,000” but believed that the journal could start publication “if \$100,000” [was] raised immediately.” L. Brent Bozell to Fellow Conservative (fundraising letter), September 8, 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers.

<sup>151</sup> Stephen Tonsor to Francis Wilson, May 19, 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers.

<sup>152</sup> L. Brent Bozell to Francis G. Wilson, January 25, 1966, Francis G. Wilson Papers. Bozell reported to Wilson that he was successful currying support and money from a number of

---

bishops. He wrote: "Bishop Wright made an initial pledge of \$5,000 last week; the week before Archbishop O'Boyle of Washington offered \$2,500; and we have Archbishop Hannan's \$5,000 pledge from Rome."

<sup>153</sup> L. Brent Bozell to Fellow Catholic (fundraising letter), 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers.

<sup>154</sup> L. Brent Bozell letter to Fellow Conservative (fundraising letter), September 8, 1965, Russell Kirk Papers.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid.

<sup>156</sup> Ibid.

<sup>157</sup> Ibid.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid.

<sup>159</sup> Lawrence, introduction to *The Best of Triumph*, xx.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid.

<sup>161</sup> William Oliver Martin to Francis Wilson, January 30, 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers.

<sup>162</sup> L. Brent Bozell to Francis G. Wilson, August 26, 1966, Francis G. Wilson Papers; and L. Brent Bozell to Russell Kirk, August 26, 1966, Russell Kirk Papers.

<sup>163</sup> Editorial, "At Last, A Conservative Catholic Magazine," *National Review* 18 (September 6, 1966): 870; In a letter to Wilson, Bozell discussed the lightning strike that shutdown production at the printing plant. "Naturally," he wrote, "we paused, wondering whether we had just been notified of the pleasure of the Holy Ghost. But a friend soon reminded us that lightning bolts are part of Lucifer's traditional equipment." L. Brent Bozell to Francis G. Wilson, August 26, 1966, Francis G. Wilson Papers; and L. Brent Bozell to Russell Kirk, August 26, 1966, Russell Kirk Papers.

<sup>164</sup> Editors, "Future's Triumph," *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 6.

<sup>165</sup> Pilot issue of *Future*, December 8, 1965, Francis G. Wilson Papers.

## CHAPTER IV

### CHURCH AFFAIRS

Holy Mass is the unbloody sacrifice of the New Testament in which the Body and Blood of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, are offered to God under the appearance of bread and wine.

—Saint Joseph Daily Missal<sup>1</sup>

If we sometimes speak in patronising tones of the Tridentine era, then our descendants will be equally justified in shaking their heads over the euphoric triumphalism of the present time, our happy self-congratulation, our certainty that we in this generation have broken through at last to true wisdom. . . . We shall have seemed to have gone absurdly far in a Pelagian direction. . . . We shall be remembered as a generation that saw only one side of things. We loved ‘becoming’ and hated ‘being’: we cherished the idea of an emergent and evolutionary Christianity, and looked in some apathy upon the faith once delivered to the saints. We stressed the priesthood of all believers and played down the particularity of order; we indulged a passion of ecumenism, and hushed up a painful fact that schism and heresy are still sins. We wanted the Church’s outward seeming to reflect the poverty of Christ, never his majesty.

—Christopher Derrick<sup>2</sup>

‘A liturgist is an affliction sent by God, so that at a time when there is no overt persecution, a Catholic need not be denied the privilege of suffering for his faith.’

—Christopher Derrick<sup>3</sup>

*Triumph’s* editors believed that the United States was collapsing. Its fall was traceable to its consensus ideology, secular liberalism. The root problem of the secular-liberal order was that it was anthropocentric rather than Christ-centric. Such an order placed *all* of its trust in humankind’s rationalist

capabilities—that is, it placed its faith in the development of human society in a mind unaided and unbounded by God (secular), and free (liberal) to develop its own solutions to the tasks of organizing, fulfilling and perfecting humankind. Inherent in such a view was the notion that man and woman were wholly self-sufficient in their purpose of perfecting themselves and society.

The editors envisioned a dialectic in which humankind—by placing its faith in itself rather than God—was marching away from a Christ-centered order to that of a wholly secular order. The secular-liberal thesis, the editors believed, was headed toward synthesis with the secular-totalitarian antithesis. Whereas the former posited a free or liberal mind as the expedient path toward human betterment, the latter held an esoteric faith in a wholly materialist vision of existence in which man and woman were deemed incapable of realizing the benefits of a secular order and therefore must be dragooned toward such human betterment.

The editors believed, however, not in the inevitability of such a development but in the inevitability of its failure. Indeed, they believed that secularists of either stripe were incapable of organizing, fulfilling, and perfecting humankind, because man and woman were God-oriented creatures and withered internally when cut off from their Source and Sustainer. Such internal decadence precipitated external decay, which was manifest, they believed, in the impending collapse in the 1960s and 1970s of not only the United States, but more generally Western Civilization.

This was in fact the reason why initially the editors were concerned with the Second Vatican Council, which fostered a spirit of adaptation—rather than its intended renewal—to modern, secular civilization; the same secular civilization that the editors believed was in its death throes.<sup>4</sup> “It goes without saying that it is never the task of the Church to ‘catch up with the times,’” Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn wrote; rather, he added, the “task of the Church, with her faithful,

Is to *fashion and form the times*, to heed the age-old scriptural injunction: *instaurare omnia in Christo*. She has the basic truth and the promises of Christ and while admittedly there are truths to be found outside her realm, she is the Mother—and should be the Teacher—of the world.<sup>5</sup>

Prior to the Council, neither liberal nor conservative Catholic would deny the Church’s alienation from modern, secular civilization. But whereas liberal Catholics believed that this was a sign of its failure in its mission to *be in this world*, to sacramentalize it, *Triumph’s* editors believed that such alienation was a sign of its resounding success in its mission to be in *but not of this world*—to sacramentalize the world on its (eternal) terms. This was why Wilhelmssen could write the following of the pre-Vatican II Church:

Until a few years ago the Church looked immense, impressive, aloof, and often menacing to those outside her discipline. But from *within* the Church itself, it seemed to many of us that she was slowly winning her battle. . . . We gloried in the conviction (and perhaps we deceived ourselves in so glorying) that the Catholic Church was on the march, a phalanx. . . . And then the whole business collapsed.<sup>6</sup>

In further reflection, however, the editors believed that the Council was in itself healthy. They viewed it as a sort of purifying process that exposed its members who had lost faith in the efficacy of the Church to convert the world.<sup>7</sup> Managing editor, Patricia Bozell, noted that the pre-Vatican II Church had rotted

elements within it and compared the Council to the opening of a window and letting the “putrid matter . . . out.”<sup>8</sup> It was also a detachment from a dying, secularized Western Civilization. “In 1965 Holy Mother Church . . . sloughed off the civilization it had started a millennium and a half before, and prepared once more, as in the sixth century,” John Wisner wrote, “to plunge into the depths of barbarism. It is among the barbarians, the Council seemed to be saying, that the Church could hope to find new customers; civilized men were too feeble to bear contact with God.”<sup>9</sup>

The editors equated secularization with barbarization. No longer rendering themselves unto God, man and woman were, internally, a law unto themselves. And the temporal law, no longer in consonance with the moral law (and thus no longer integrated with man’s and woman’s God-oriented interior self), was an obstacle to virtue. No longer conformed to God, man and woman could no longer transcend the persistence of concupiscence and fell upon each other—without order, civilization collapsed. The Council, then, also was a call to re-Christianize the world, to give birth to a new civilization informed by the Christian faith. It was, contributor Hamish Fraser noted, a calling “for the restoration of the temporal power of the Catholic laity.”<sup>10</sup>

This threefold view of the Council’s purpose—for the Church to let out its putrid elements, detach itself from Western Civilization, and Christianize the world—was obscured and traduced, however, by external enemies but especially by those Catholics, the editors believed, who had lost faith in the efficacy of the Church to convert the world and thus viewed the Council as an authorization to

adapt the Church to the modern, secular world. Two “conflicting currents” thus emerged within the Church: one emanating from those who believed that the Council embodied a “spirit” of adaptive reform and thus interpreted the “Council’s work as inviting the secularization of the Church,” while the “other current flows from Rome,” they noted—emanating from Pope Paul VI, who, they argued, was “fostering a counterspirit,” indeed “mobilizing a new counter-reformation” to protect the integrity of the faith and the Council’s true purpose, that of renewal.<sup>11</sup>

The editors believed that Pope Paul VI’s desire for the reassertion of orthodoxy in the wake of the unorthodox practices triggered by the Council was evident in his encyclicals: *On the Holy Eucharist* (which reasserted the Church’s orthodox teaching on the Eucharist), *On the Development of Peoples* (which reasserted the Church’s traditional socio-economic teachings), *On the Celibacy of the Priest* (which reasserted the Church’s teaching on the necessity of priestly celibacy), and *On the Regulation of Birth* (which reasserted the Church’s ban on contraception); and in his apostolic letter, *Credo of the People of God* (which reasserted the orthodox creed of faith).<sup>12</sup> Of the latter, the editors wrote that it was a “stunning existential demonstration, in a day when other Christian bodies are busy adjusting their confessional commitments to the failing world, that this Church has the simple grace to invite the world to adjust to her.”<sup>13</sup> If the Credo was absurd to the modern, secular world—even to growing numbers of Catholics, so be it, they proudly reasoned; Pope Paul VI had declared that the Church stood athwart the secularizing and liberalizing tendencies of the world,

and though the Church might dwindle in size, it would, as Christ promised and as Paul gave proof, remain visible, even if such visibility was “in a catacomb or in a monastery or in the skiff of an earlier Paul plying the Great Sea.”<sup>14</sup>

The editors remained steadfastly loyal to the “to-be-sainted Paul VI”—qualified Bozell—who, they believed, was the resplendently orthodox pope the Church needed in times of such great challenges to its existence.<sup>15</sup> Although Pope Paul VI was not the disciplinarian that the editors had hoped for—they were privately dismayed with his lack of action against dissenters, liturgical and catechetical innovators, and heretics—they still defended him, noting that such positive action was practically futile in an increasingly collapsing institutional Church, which shunned his authority.<sup>16</sup> While his authority was assured by Christ Himself, Pope Paul VI lacked the power to enforce his authority and such action might call “further attention to the papacy’s weakness,” they reasoned, and “encourage further doubt about its authority.”<sup>17</sup> “But let the taunting world learn caution,” they wrote:

And let this Peter take heart from the counsel of St. Bernard of Clairvaux who reminds him that he is ‘the light of the world, the Vicar of Christ, the Christ of the Lord, and, last of all, the God of Pharaoh. *Understand what I say. When power and wickedness go hand in hand we must claim for you something more than human. Let your countenance be on them that do evil. Let him who fears not man nor dreads the sword, fear the breath of your anger. Let him think that he who incurs your wrath, incurs the wrath not of man but of God.*<sup>18</sup>

The powerful secularizing spirit plaguing the Church was due, the editors wrote, to “*a crisis of faith in the Church of God.*”<sup>19</sup> It was not directly a crisis in private faith, but a loss of faith in the efficacy of the Church to affect the world.<sup>20</sup> This crisis was manifest, they believed, in those Catholics who believed that the

Church, to speak to the modern world, must communicate and express itself with secular idioms and forms. No longer faithful in the power of the Church to transform the world, they turned to secular solutions. In part, this viewpoint was derived from the so-called modernist theological view that the Catholic faith was principally developmental, and, as such, its truths were manifest in cultural and social evolution.<sup>21</sup> The Church, Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn wrote, was “suffering from chronolatry.”<sup>22</sup> Given that modern society was fundamentally secular, as the editors maintained, then adaption to it entailed the secularization of the faith and the discarding of the Church’s transcendental nature—the same characteristic, expressed in the tenet that the Church is not of this world, that provided the faith with its immutable and thus truthful, majestic, and commanding quality (as an anchor held a ship in place against the current of the sea, so the transcendental anchor, the Church, incarnated the *same* faith, if with further elucidation, in every age against the current of time). Such secularization, the editors worried, precipitated the complete immanentization of the Catholic faith—it would no longer be both transcendent and immanent, but evident “in the world, in the streets, in the Secular City,” Marvin R. O’Connell wrote critically—“If you want to find God you must look into the process of social evolution.”<sup>23</sup> Contributor D.J. Dooley asserted that “ours is not an ‘evolving God’ or a ‘God of process’ . . . He does not proclaim ‘I Become’ but ‘I Am.’”<sup>24</sup> This crisis of faith in the Church—manifested in the fashionable imitation of the secular order—would become especially evident to the editors in the transformation of the Roman

liturgy and also in what they perceived as the American bishops' acquiescence to political pluralism.

### The Catholic Church in America

The editors believed that the Church was the judge of all peoples and nations. It alone had not only the right (as it was Christ's Church) but the obligation (because of Christ's commandment to love), to communicate the moral law (Christ's law) to all men and women and judge all earthly institutions according to how well they complied with His saving truth. This was the Church's commission given to it by Christ. It could never abrogate such a mission without failing to be Christ's Church. Yet, they believed that the generality of the American bishops or the corporate voice of the Church in the United States—as expressed through the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) and the United States Catholic Conference—were abandoning the Church's mission to teach all nations.

This was evident, the editors believed, in the bishops' April, 1968 *Statement on the National Race Crisis*, issued at the NCCB's semi-annual meeting. The bishops not only cited racial and materialist causes for the racial turmoil, which was the same conclusion of the secular-liberal establishment, but also emphasized materialist rather than spiritual solutions. "The bishops' statement on the race crisis, for all its relevance to Christianity," the editors lamented, "might have been made by the Chamber of Commerce, or the

Masons.”<sup>25</sup> The editors believed that the crisis was ultimately spiritual, fostered by the African American fear of assimilation into an essentially materialist culture that demanded material rather than spiritual fulfillment.

Furthermore, the bishops “ventured no instruction at all on the great religious and moral issues that should have been the primary business of their meeting,” the editors noted—including the pressing doctrinal and theological controversies involving liturgical and catechetical reform, “the ‘liberalized’ abortion laws that have been introduced in about half the nation’s state legislatures,” and “the new policy of the United States government that institutionalizes birth control in the foreign aid and domestic welfare budgets.”<sup>26</sup> “*In short, in the epochal moment for Church and country, in April, 1968,*” they wrote, “*the bishops of the United States could think of nothing distinctively Christian to do and nothing distinctively Christian to say to their fellow Catholics or to their fellow countrymen.*”<sup>27</sup> “None of the ills that afflict the Church or society can be cured,” the editors noted, “if we refuse to ‘bow our heads’ to the Lord Jesus Christ,” and because the bishops offered no such advice, the editors concluded that they had “lost faith in the *efficacy* of Christianity”—if Christianity was the solution, they wondered, why not preach it as such?<sup>28</sup> The bishops’ effort “to extend the Church’s mission to the secular order has suffered from a pitiful defensive uncertainty,” they wrote, “which casts doubts on their ability to understand the true nature of the mission.”<sup>29</sup> “What this means is that the bishops of the United States have lost faith in the *mission* of the Church: the task of sacramentalizing the world, of raising it to the dignity that the Incarnation

promised to Creation,” the editors wrote; this “loss of the incarnational faith helps explain why, in the spring of 1968, the Church in the United States seemed to have reached an Autumn.”<sup>30</sup>

The bishops’ loss of faith in the efficacy of the Church, predicated on the general collapse of faith in the Christian solution, led to an interest in secular liberalism, which seemed to be affecting history (thus the attraction) and its accompanying pluralist tenet. “For it is the peculiar evil of liberalism, among all the errors man is capable of, that it can hold out a credible promise of welcoming its enemies,” the editors wrote, “even while it is eating them. It can do this because its seductive willingness to put up with everyone’s beliefs conceals the implicit bargain that no one will follow his beliefs—will take them seriously.”<sup>31</sup>

The bishops’ silence on Christian solutions to the race crisis, the doctrinal and theological disputes, and the evils of abortion laws and the institutionalization of birth control policies, was, the editors concluded, an “explicit assent” to the pluralist bargain. In such an arrangement, the bishops “can take a stand on a public issue only when their stand does not purport to bind other, dissident, units in the pluralism. Which means,” they noted: “the American bishops now feel able to take a stand on a public issue only when they concur with the consensus of the national secular establishment. Which means,” they added: “the American Church has married the American state, is committed to its secular values and goals, is an arm of a political order which . . . is down on one knee before history—but not genuflecting; falling.”<sup>32</sup>

The Church's alignment with the secular-liberal American state became manifest in some of its agenda, such as the bishops' "Crusade against Poverty," which the editors believed was a deliberate mimicking of Lyndon Johnson's "War on Poverty."<sup>33</sup> The bishops' "war on poverty" was not only a "ludicrous . . . venture that is utterly doomed to failure," but it was a significant diversion of lay mobilization and resources from what should have been, according to the editors, the principal concern of the Church—the pro-life cause—which was, coincidentally, a cause at odds with the American state.<sup>34</sup> The editors wrote that due to the ridiculousness and inevitable failure of such a war, it was "a patent duty of Catholics to protect their bishops by abstaining from the collection on November 22, [1970]" for the Campaign for Human Development—the bishops' organizational center of the war on poverty.<sup>35</sup> "Yet," they noted, "charity remains an obligation of Christians, and the poor remain the people to whom Christians are obliged to be charitable;" therefore, "Catholics should give their money," they wrote, "to the Society for the Christian Commonwealth, *Triumph's* parent organization, whose 'Ransoming the Poor' campaign is (a) designed to help the poorest of the poor—the unborn; and (b) designed to give them the most fundamental of gifts—life itself."<sup>36</sup>

The editors, though, believed that there was hope for the Church in America. The bishops who were sheep to the secular-liberal shepherd would be scattered by the latter's impending death, the editors believed, "and they will wander off aimlessly, impotently, in all directions. Their influence will be at an

end.”<sup>37</sup> And while the “Church’s unholy wedlock with liberalism” will usher in a “winter of disbelief,” they noted, “after winter there is Spring.”<sup>38</sup>

In contrast to what they viewed as a meek American Church, which was unwilling to violate the pluralist bargain by thundering against violations of the moral law and offering Christ as the solution to America’s ills, the editors envisioned a militant Church. A Church isolated by the exclaiming of its truth, by its dogmatism—its glory all the more conspicuous the more it contradicted secular society, and thereby magnified in its seclusion. Yet, such a militant Church would not be content with isolation; it would call on its members to bring secular society into conformity with the moral law, to subject the public order to the authority of Christ’s Church. Roman Catholicism, they held, was not an esoteric but an exoteric faith—to be imparted to all. To be so righteous in their stance in a pluralist society was in effect to draw swords against it, but this is what Catholicism was about, Wilhelmsen explained:

It is the call to sanctity and sacrifice that . . . does often demand its crucifixion in the name of Christ. It is the American Jesuit Father [Miguel] Pro blessing his Marxist and Masonic firing squad in Mexico with the stumps of his arms after the barbarians had finished cutting them off. It is Spanish soldiers charging Communist trenches with fixed bayonets and rosaries. It is an enormous Cross spread over a third of the world where Christ is murdered daily. It is saints and heroes and sinners. In short, Catholicism is about God and about Men of God. It is about an army marching through history chanting Te Deum. Catholicism is about swords.<sup>39</sup>

Indeed, the editors confronted the increasing legalization of abortion with the following words of instruction for the American Church: “if she is to abide by her divine mandate to teach all peoples, the Catholic Church in America must . . . renounce the pluralist system, she must forthrightly acknowledge that a state of

war exists between herself and the American political order.”<sup>40</sup> Naturally, such sentiments caused wariness with the ecumenist turn fostered by the Second Vatican Council.

### Protestants and Jews

In the Second Vatican Council’s *Decree on Ecumenism* (1964), the Church acknowledged that Protestant churches possessed some Christian truths—if reflected imperfectly—and encouraged a dialogue to work toward ending the division among the Christian churches.<sup>41</sup> While the Council placed severe limits on this ecumenical endeavor, it nonetheless took a more reconciliatory rather than hostile stance toward the Protestant communion, even accepting some of the blame for the division. Like the other reforms encouraged by the Council, the editors believed that its original meaning and intention were misrepresented by the so-called “*New Breed*” Catholics.<sup>42</sup> These Catholics (those intent on secularizing the Church) in the editors’ view, ignored the Church’s instructions for moderation—that such a dialogue was to be based not in a dialectical context searching for synthesis, but rather in an understanding that the Catholic Church possessed the full truth of divine revelation.<sup>43</sup> The editors accused the *New Breed* of entering into the former—an imprudent dialogue, they believed, that would ultimately lead to indifferentism.

In contrast, the editors viewed the Decree not as a means to synthesize the Catholic and Protestant faiths, but to speak to Protestants as Catholics—to

impart to them their faith—to convert them. The Council had rightly shed its old standoffish attitude toward Protestants, they reasoned, which was uncharitable, as it failed to communicate to Protestants the full means of salvation. The editors, themselves, admitted such an attitude; although they believed in the superiority of their faith and had wished for the conversion of Protestants (and Jews), they had not dedicated themselves to the task of conversion. In *“that respect we failed to act charitably toward non-Catholics,”* they confessed; *“a failure that indeed called into question the value we professed to attach to their persons. So we have decided to amend our lives,”* they declared:

*We are going to enlist in an ecumenical movement that will make sense, because it will make love. It will be a movement that vigorously seeks to give Protestants and Jews and non-believers all that we think we have. It will not assume that non-Catholics are complimented by being offered a diluted version of the religion, by being told that, unlike the noble Catholics, they are not courageous or deserving enough to merit the full gift.<sup>44</sup>*

The editors, working from their thesis that the Council was a call to Christianize an increasingly barbarous world, understood the Decree as a triumphalist rather than conciliatory directive. “Is triumphalism,” contributor Christopher Derrick asked, “such a very terrible thing? If so, let us seek its converse. But the opposite of ‘triumphalism’ is (presumably) ‘defeatism.’ Is this what we want? Do we really favor the idea of a defeatist Church?”<sup>45</sup> “If the church is to operate faithfully as His Body, it needs also, and with equal urgency, to enact His [Christ’s] arrogance, His flaming dogmatism, and all the unsearchable majesty and richness and grandeur of God;” he wrote, “and in practice, it seems very doubtful psychology to suppose that an apostolate thus

enriched would really elicit a weaker response on the world's part."<sup>46</sup> "Any species of ecumenism that is not essentially triumphalist," Hamish Fraser concluded, was "simply not Christian."<sup>47</sup>

Protestantism, the editors believed, was in part the source of the modern dialectic leading toward a secular society. The Protestant emphasis on the primacy of the individual conscience—given their belief that grace had no mediator but came directly as a gift from God—over the authority of the Church was religiously anarchic and politically secularizing.<sup>48</sup> Believing that the Bible, not the Church, was the sole, infallible source of faith—a faith deduced *privately* or *individually*—led to the subjectivization of belief.<sup>49</sup> Such a development was not culled by any Protestant church authority. "If salvation were the critical and sufficient act of God alone and *if* simple faith could secure this salvation, then the Church was obviously supererogatory," Martin F. Larrey wrote.<sup>50</sup> Given the Protestant belief in "the nonmediatory activity of grace reared on private interpretation of Holy Writ," which denied the church any salvational role and granted ultimate authority to the individual, the Protestant churches' power, Larrey argued, devolved to its membership, which held authority.<sup>51</sup> Whereas in the Catholic faith, the Church was the indispensable "conduit of grace," he wrote, and therefore "ontologically prior to salvation"—meaning that its authority was in its "*power*, not in the *membership*."<sup>52</sup> To maintain any semblance of authority or unity, Protestant churches had to continually either further generalize their faith or encourage revivals to maintain any kind of community of faith.<sup>53</sup> The trajectory, though marked by bouts of revivalism, was toward indifferentism and

dissolution. Indeed, commenting on America's modern moral decadence, reader Kenneth A. Cory posited a "straight line from the Reformation notion of 'Each man his own priest,' to the present 'Do your own thing.'"<sup>54</sup>

Envisioning no role for a grace dispensing and faith binding Church, it was but a logical transition away from a confessional state that, like the Catholic Church, might bind the individual conscience in matters of faith. The non-confessional trajectory of the Protestant dispensation was rooted in more than practicality, but in its understanding of the nature of grace. If grace was non-mediated—it was not dispensed, for example, through baptismal holy water, or the Eucharist, or confirmation chrism—then the physical world was not an avenue for salvation, the world was not good, it was not sacred—the divine was not in it; rather, it was an obstacle to salvation, an extension of man's and woman's depravity to be suffered.<sup>55</sup> This dialectical understanding of man's relation to the divine was contrasted by the sacramental view of creation posited by Catholics, who envisioned a sacred world, as it was redeemed by Christ.<sup>56</sup> Catholics had a mission to sacralize, as Christ did, the real—to bring all things to Christ so as to direct man and woman in all things toward God.<sup>57</sup> While Catholics, then, could construct a confessional state as an extension of this sacralizing mission, which was to increase avenues of God's grace to mediate salvation, Protestants—viewing a non-sacred world, not penetrated by the divine and thus insufficient to affect salvation—could hardly posit a Christianizing role for the state.<sup>58</sup>

The Protestant emphasis on the individual conscience over the authority of the Church and its non-sacramental vision facilitated the emergence of the secular state. The latter separated religion from politics by allowing a “totally vertical and individualist” relationship with God and denied any “horizontal” role for religion for “fashioning the social and political order,” which meshed nicely with Protestantism.<sup>59</sup> These secularist premises were manifest in the origins of a Protestant United States, which was contrived on a pluralist understanding of the political order. “Let creeds multiply merrily, the American ‘solution’ proclaimed,” Wilhelmsen wrote: “latitudinarianism will eventually dilute conviction; religion will retreat to the ‘private sphere’—to the attic of the individual conscience, and to sacristies whose doors are closed to the public forum.”<sup>60</sup> “The American founders wrote wisely from their point of view,” he wrote—“They brought forth the only great power in history that has not been guilty of anything so indecent as a religious war.”<sup>61</sup>

The dialogue with Protestants, then, must be directed toward conversion. Yet the difficulty of such a dialogue was further compounded by the increasing liberalization of some of the major Protestant denominations, including the Episcopalian and United Presbyterian churches. In reviewing the Presbyterian Confession of 1967, contributor Leonard P. Wessel, Jr., wrote that it was “an example of the ever-present temptation on the part of Christianity, not to change the spirit of the times, but to give into it.”<sup>62</sup> He concluded that the United Presbyterian Church was “an apostate Christian communion.”<sup>63</sup> Furthermore, the editors hoped that the Catholic Church in America would not join the National

Council of Churches (NCC) because of the “massive involvement of certain Protestant church bodies, all connected with the NCC, in anti-Christian and anti-human policies.”<sup>64</sup> “In every major city there is the Clergy Abortion Referral Service; babies are killed . . . in Protestant hospitals;” the editors wrote, “Protestants are strong on the ACLU [American Civil Liberties Union], which keeps filth in our streets and shop-windows; Protestant bodies lobby regularly to keep our children captives of the state’s school system;” and, they added, “the campaign of bitterness and hatred against Catholic social and moral ideals still flows from Protestant pulpits, right on time, whenever we succeed in the exercise of our ‘political rights.’ If this is friendship,” they asked, “what is enmity?”<sup>65</sup>

William Marshner noted that because “every major Protestant denomination connected with the NCC has taken a formal stand of some sort in favor of at least ‘therapeutic’ abortion,” neither “an authentic ecumenical policy on the part of the Catholic Church, nor the movement to defend the sanctity of unborn life, could be anything but severely damaged by a Catholic decision to join the National Council of Churches.”<sup>66</sup> Protestants, then—at least their liberal brethren—were increasingly on the side of the secular-liberal enemy, which made any dialoguing with them imprudent.

Yet, the editors were willing to align politically with the more conservative or evangelical Protestants—not to unify, but to be “effective co-belligerents,” evangelical Protestant Harold O.J. Brown hoped, against the secularizing and liberalizing tendencies of the zeitgeist.<sup>67</sup> This type of cooperation was undertaken especially in the pro-life movement. Given that the editors originally

believed that the passage of an amendment to outlaw abortion was a priority, they reasoned that the “political needs of the hour,” as Marshner noted, required collaboration.<sup>68</sup> The Society for the Christian Commonwealth, *Triumph’s* parent organization, even formed an interfaith pro-life organization—Americans United for Life.<sup>69</sup> Yet it would always be a precarious alliance for the editors, based as it was on expediency rather than substance. As Bozell noted, he did not mind an alliance with evangelical Protestants to curb the secular onslaught, so long as Catholics did not misunderstand that they were “at war with them.”<sup>70</sup>

The Second Vatican Council also called for a more amiable relationship with non-Christian religions, including especially Judaism. In the *Declaration on the Relation to Non-Christian Religions* (1965), the Church addressed the Christian origin of anti-Semitism—the charge of deicide. “True, the Jewish authorities and those who followed their lead pressed for the death of Christ; still, what happened in His passion cannot be charged against all Jews, without distinction, then alive, nor against the Jews of today,” the Council fathers declared; “Besides, as the Church has always held and holds now, Christ underwent His passion and death freely, because of the sins of men and out of infinite love, in order that all may reach salvation.”<sup>71</sup>

As with Protestants, the editors believed that the only dialogue with Jews that made sense was one that sought conversion, because it was an act of love. “Christ constrains us to love Jews too much to treat them as anything other than men in need of Christ,” the editors wrote.<sup>72</sup> The editors were disappointed with the guidelines promoted by the American bishops and a Vatican-sponsored

paper (written by Lawrence Cardinal Sheehan of Baltimore), both on Catholic-Jewish relations, which cautioned against proselytizing in such interfaith dialogues. “We are perplexed. Surely a deliberate decision, in whatever context, *not* to try to convert Jews is an unforgivable expression of anti-Semitism. How,” they asked, “can we—ever—selfishly refuse to try to give to the Jews our most precious of gifts, faith in Christ and in his Church?”<sup>73</sup> The editors called Cardinal Sheehan an “anti-Semite” and labeled his paper “anti-Semitic.”<sup>74</sup> “By abandoning their attempts to share with Jews their most valued possession—the Christian faith, a gift to which all men are called, and most certainly the Jews, through whom the Savior came into the world—Christians,” they wrote, “would deny to Jews the fulfillment of the promises made to Israel and awaited anxiously by the Jews throughout the centuries.”<sup>75</sup>

Part of the difficulty, the editors believed, with dialoguing with Jews was that they, as with Protestants, were part of the problem; that is, they were in part responsible for the secularization of society. Jews, they lamented, were “in the vanguard of the secular liberal revolution in the U.S.”<sup>76</sup> “Secular salvation on earth—America’s Gnosticism—blended easily with a tradition that had never affirmed unequivocally the immortality of the soul,” the editors wrote: “salvation through democracy and a high standard of living have been the Kingdom for both the American establishment and its Jewish component.”<sup>77</sup>

## The Pauline Mass

The editors wanted a triumphant Church and, to them, nothing reflected the Church's grandeur more than the pre-Vatican II mass of the Roman rite (referred to in the post-Vatican II era as the Mass of Pius V, the Latin Mass, or the Tridentine Mass). It was, they reasoned, the incarnation par excellence of the Church's transcendent nature, and, as such, it was supremely effective in directing man and woman toward God. This was because it was—with its archaism and exuberant ornateness—an awesome contradiction to the increasingly secular and mundane, and excessively nontraditional, world surrounding them.<sup>78</sup> Wilhelmsen wrote of his childhood that the “door to our parish church was our one opening into transcendence.”<sup>79</sup>

Yet the Second Vatican Council's directive for liturgical reform—including especially its instructions to use the vernacular, simplify the rites of the mass, increase the participation of the laity, and adapt the mass, to a degree, to local cultures and traditions—fostered a surge of reform that led to a considerable revision of the Roman rite.<sup>80</sup> In 1969, Pope Paul VI promulgated the *Novus Ordo Missae* or the *New Order of the Mass* of the Roman rite, which significantly revised the rites of the pre-Vatican II mass.<sup>81</sup>

The editors were upset with the changes. Such change, after all, was not insignificant; the liturgy of the mass was “in fact the very heart of Catholic life,” contributor Donald G. McClane wrote—“It is that for which the Church exists.”<sup>82</sup> As in most Vatican II reforms, the editors believed that the Council's directives

and the actual outcomes were at odds. New Breed reformers, they reasoned, had disregarded the Council's call for prudence and instituted unauthorized reform, such as the wholesale replacement of the archaic and sacrilized Latin with the profane vernacular. They were concerned especially with the simplified translations, which incorporated mundane language and, in some cases, they charged, corrupted the authentic meaning. They were alarmed also by the adoption of popular music in place of Gregorian chant, the subtraction of much kneeling and genuflecting, the rearrangement of the altar and priest (who now faced the congregation in worship), the effort to strip churches of much their ornamentation, and the overall increase in lay participation, which suggested, to them, a raucous social gathering rather than solemn worship.

The liturgical reformers, the editors believed, in their efforts to simplify the liturgical rites, were secularizing the mass, stripping it of its solemnity, and thereby obscuring its transcendent character and frustrating the adoration of God. This was not done unwittingly; rather, the liturgists, the editors posited, were intent upon de-sacralizing the mass as they had come to believe that the transcendent was outmoded—an inaccessible, indifferent, and ineffectual concept for the modern, secular mentality. What was pertinent to liturgical reformers was a modern form of worship that focused on the immanent (or man and woman and their physical world) rather than the transcendent (or God and the spiritual world). As Christopher Derrick noted, the new mass seemed to be “centered upon man rather than upon God.”<sup>83</sup> In referring to the rearrangement

in which the priest now faced the laity instead of the altar, Derrick noted the following of the reforming generation:

We liked to turn inwards and gaze upon each other, and we designed our churches accordingly, not liking a situation in which priest and people faced in the same direction, united in their confrontation with God. . . . We preferred to confront Man; and it will seem very symbolic that when we first put the old Roman Canon into English, the translated text began with 'We' (referring to our noble selves) where the Latin had begun with 'Te' (referring to God.)<sup>84</sup>

"If any one characteristic marks the Catholic ultraliberals"—those who contributor Ronald D. Lambert charged with attempting to corrupt the mass—it was "their disregard for the supernatural, their scorn of the sacred, their aggressive and defiant secularism."<sup>85</sup> "The basic evil afflicting the Church today," Lambert noted, referring to this crisis in liturgical reform, was "the lost awareness that man's purpose on earth is directed mainly to supernatural ends; and coupled with this, the lost sense of reverence for the majesty of God."<sup>86</sup>

Contributor Dietrich von Hildebrand indeed believed that this "lost sense of reverence" was manifest in the new mass and frustrated authentic worship of the divine. Reverence was an indispensable precondition for the adoration of God. It "is only the reverent man," Hildebrand wrote, "who can consciously transcend himself and thus conform to his fundamental human condition and to his metaphysical situation," and thereby "experience the sacred."<sup>87</sup> The "lifting up of our hearts," not increased vocal participation, he noted, was "the first requirement for real participation in the mass;" the Latin Mass cultivated, because of its solemnity, reverence and awe and thus the capability to think beyond and above oneself, to transcend self.<sup>88</sup> In contrast, the "vernacular mass with popular

songs,” which was thought to make the mass more relevant by making it relatable, he wrote, “leaves us in a profane, merely natural atmosphere,” and thereby obstructed “the confrontation of man with God.”<sup>89</sup> The “question is whether we better meet Christ in the mass by soaring up to Him,” he rhetorically posited, “or by dragging Him down into our own pedestrian, workaday world.”<sup>90</sup> “The innovators,” he charged, “would replace holy intimacy with Christ by an unbecoming familiarity.”<sup>91</sup> The faithful, rather, must be “drawn out of their ordinary lives into the world of Christ”—they must be given opportunity for the “contemplative adoration of Christ.”<sup>92</sup>

If Hildebrand criticized the new vernacular mass from a Catholic philosophical view, Lawrence Brown objected to it on more pragmatic grounds. Brown, arguing from the standpoint that the “vernacular beginnings” of Protestantism were the principal cause of its doctrinal divisions, believed that the vernacular mass—because languages “unavoidably reflect the intellectual, political, and moral structure” of a particular society—would also threaten doctrinal unity within the Catholic Church.<sup>93</sup> Furthermore, Brown doubted that an accurate and viable translation from Latin to English was possible. “After 200 years of democracy and secularization—is it really possible,” he asked, especially with English, “to make a beautiful and worthy translation of the Latin service?”<sup>94</sup> The advantage of Latin was its archaism, rooted as it was in a pre-modern, centuries-old tradition that spoke of the divine, but English, he contended, was divested of the “indispensable sense of awe and reverence”

required in sacred language as it was beset by “400 years of progressive secularism.”<sup>95</sup>

“Not only Catholicism, but every great religion has its sacred language, Kuehnelt-Leddhin wrote; “all of these faiths used dead languages not only because they impart a sense of the sacred and the sublime, but because they imply permanence.”<sup>96</sup> “Latin was a unifying influence in the Church,” he wrote, “a common bond for Catholics on six continents”—indeed he pointed out that in traveling in the past he used his “Missal as a linguistic passport for the entire world.”<sup>97</sup> But, he lamented, “the liturgical reformers are intent on rebuilding the “Tower of Babel with all of its linguistic confusions.”<sup>98</sup>

Thomas Day was concerned that the reforming tendency to adopt secular styles would also profane Church music. He acknowledged that the Church had traditionally borrowed its music from the secular world, but, he wrote, “in every case and in every century, the Church has always taken the *best*.”<sup>99</sup> Modern music could be adopted so long as it did not have a vulgar identification, he argued; but the traditional styles of “Gregorian chant and Renaissance polyphony,” because they were integrally sacred, “should probably continue to be held in a place of honor.”<sup>100</sup> Day believed that because of the imprudent borrowing of colloquial forms of music, future musicologists would conclude that this era of Church music was “a time of senseless barbarism, destruction, and impoverishment.”<sup>101</sup>

Richard J. Shuler noted that the Council—in its Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy—had encouraged an adoption of new music styles but with the stated

qualification that its purpose must be the “glory of God and the sanctification of the faithful.”<sup>102</sup> This contrasted the Music Advisory Board’s statement on the reform of music—“which has been ‘adopted as its own’ by a committee of the American hierarchy”—that “announced,” he noted, “that the ‘primary goal of all celebration is to make a *humanly* attractive experience.”<sup>103</sup> The two were incompatible. And the latter displayed the secularist orientation of reform.

The solemnity of the mass, the editors believed, was undermined also by the endeavor to divest churches of their baroque quality—to rid them of any sacred images, statues, and other ornamental decorations deemed, by reformers, as excessive and inconsistent with the Church’s austere beginnings, and thus true form. The pomp of the pre-Vatican II Church’s decor, the reformers reasoned, leaned toward idolatry and served as an unnecessary barrier between God and man. But such Christian art, the editors believed, was indispensable to Christian worship, because it fostered reverence and awe and veneration of the transcendent and thereby helped direct man and woman toward God. In this regard, “the slaughter of the Holy Images currently under way in Catholic churches is not simply a quarrel between different artistic schools; it is a religious war, lacking only the clangor of arms and bloodshed of the previous iconoclastic wars,” ecclesiastical artist and contributor John de Rosen wrote—“the Catholic Church is being sacked of those symbolic *things* which help to draw the sinner’s mind to his Savior.”<sup>104</sup> The “new iconoclasm” Wilhelmsen wrote, “has swept our churches of beauty . . . protestantizing and rendering flat and ugly the Bride of

Christ.”<sup>105</sup> Deprived of such awe-inspiring beauty, Wilhelmsen wondered how Catholic parishioners could now “worship in Puritan barns.”<sup>106</sup>

The reformers’ campaign against the baroque decor displayed not only their lack of respect for sacred images, statues, and other ornamentation, but their lack of regard for tradition. Their effort to strip the altar of ornamentation, for example, ignored the fact that the altar’s ornate quality was the expression of the organic nature of worship; the byproduct of a history of Christians further illuminating, in their art, the majesty of God.<sup>107</sup> This is what de Rosen was referring to when he wrote that “The traditional altar,

Climaxing in the awesome and inspiring achievements of the Baroque, has been a monument to centuries of salvific activity on the part of the Church: her bishops and martyrs, her artists and craftsmen, her thousands of humble and joyous people seeking life and salvation at the altar of God.<sup>108</sup>

The contemporary altar, he lamented, with “its aggressive plainness, its vulgar simplicity, memorialize nothing but the spiritual stagnation of its inventors and the age they represent.”<sup>109</sup>

Indeed, *Triumph’s* editors and contributors believed that a significant sentiment of the liturgists, which coincided with their disdain for the transcendent, was a strident contempt for tradition—the religious tradition that incorporated and preserved the transcendent quality of the mass in succeeding generations, and which especially was pertinent in the secularized modern world. “Frivolous or arbitrary changes” to the mass, in contrast to its organic development, were “apt to erode a special type of reverence,” Hildebrand wrote: “*pietas*. . . . [which] may be understood as comprising respect for tradition; honoring what has been

handed down to us by former generations; fidelity to our ancestors and their works.”<sup>110</sup> “Those who idolize our epoch, who thrill at what is modern simply because it is modern, who believe that in our day man has finally ‘come of age,’ lack *pietas*. . . . A Catholic should regard his liturgy,” he stated, “with *pietas*. He should revere, and therefore fear to abandon the prayers and postures and music that have been approved by so many saints throughout the Christian era and delivered to us as a precious heritage.”<sup>111</sup>

“It is the spirit of the age,” and of the liturgical reformers, Lambert argued, “to break with tradition, to assume that what was true, good and significant for men in past centuries cannot be so now—a view of man obviously at odds with that of the Church.”<sup>112</sup> “To insist on the rejection of ideas and modes of expression that belong to the past *because* they belong to the past,” as the reformers had done, “implies that human nature is discontinuous, that we do not have the same sort of minds and emotions as our ancestors;” he wrote, “whereas the Church holds that mankind is one, not only horizontally, in all men of a given time, but vertically, in all men of all times, back to Adam.”<sup>113</sup>

The new mass, Derrick wrote, “will be a theoretically manufactured thing rather than an organic growth,” and thus “will embody one fashion of the mind, the outlook of one generation.”<sup>114</sup> At an old style Latin Mass,” he noted, “all the Christian centuries seemed present, as though in eternity: in the outward forms of this new liturgy, we shall emphatically be doing a thing of the late twentieth century.”<sup>115</sup> “At these current tendencies,” he believed, “our grandchildren will marvel; they will be astonished at our willingness to submit the liturgy to

pressures that were sociological and political in nature, our relative indifference to the sacred.”<sup>116</sup> This desire for “contemporary relevance,” to “adapt to the present age,” was ominous, because, he added, “nothing dates like contemporaneity”—was the mass to be subjected to the fancy of each generation, “thus inflicting turmoil and distraction upon us forever and wasting a quite disproportionate amount of the Church’s time and energy. Perhaps saner counsels will prevail, and a refusal to run endlessly and tiringly after the rainbow’s end of ‘adaptation,’” he wrote: “perhaps the Church will bear in mind the story told by Jean Cocteau, of a man who put his pet chameleon on a piece of Scottish plaid. (It died of exhaustion.)”<sup>117</sup>

“The first mysterious Sacrifice, given us by God’s love, consisted only in the essence of the Canon of the Mass, and as it evolved naturally from a living tradition it was enriched through the centuries by man’s returned love,” Patricia Bozell wrote; but the new mass has been “machined to fit the needs of what a handful of liturgical exegetes consider useful for twentieth-century man.”<sup>118</sup> “And because this Mass has been given down to the people instead of springing up from them,” she added, “it is no longer organic and cannot be the means through which man is attuned to God, nor, by extension, to his fellow man. Because it is a synthetic pastiche, it is limited—in time, in concept and reality.”<sup>119</sup>

Patricia Bozell’s views highlighted a general conviction among the editors and contributors that the liturgical changes were the work of a cadre of “liturgical bureaucrats,” or, as Wilhelmsen labeled them, “ecclesiastical gangsters,” who hijacked the liturgy in an effort to implement their heretical theological views.<sup>120</sup>

While the Church's leaders promulgated liturgical change, they handed over the task of completing the intricacies of it to a bureaucracy.<sup>121</sup> In this regard, the editors would also come to hold responsible the bishops, the guardians of the faith—who, “apparently,” in the editors' view, were “unmoved” by the doctrinally-suspect changes to the mass.<sup>122</sup> Indeed it was the bishops' lack of response to these drastic liturgical changes that, in part, motivated the editors' charge that the Church in America was entering an autumn.<sup>123</sup>

At the center of the liturgical bureaucracy was a “tiny knot of purposive men,” who Gary Potter labeled the “Liturgy Club,” which operated, he contended, on its own authority and was set upon transforming, not renewing, the liturgy.<sup>124</sup> He posited two alarming conclusions—first, that the “Liturgy Club” would maintain control of Catholic worship “until the hierarchy steps in and reassumes actual as well as merely formal control of the Church,” and second, that “if left to its own devices,” it would further exceed its directives.<sup>125</sup>

This was especially ominous for the state of Catholic worship, because many members of the so-called Liturgy Club were influenced, Lambert argued, by a “new theology” that “leads to denial of Transubstantiation, denial of the Real Presence, denial of the doctrine that the Mass is the true, literal Sacrifice of the true, literal Body and Blood of Christ.”<sup>126</sup> These “existentialist theologians,” he noted, denied that the bread and wine became the Body and Blood of Christ; instead, they posited that the bread and wine meant or signified Christ's Body and Blood.<sup>127</sup> Liturgical revision, under the guidance of such theologians, then, threatened to destroy the integrity of the mass and with it the Catholic faith.<sup>128</sup>

This indeed was the editors' concern from the beginning—that such unfaithful liturgists would use their power to undermine belief in the Real Presence. Though they did so wittingly, it was not done blatantly, the editors believed, but subtly and gradually in their translations and adjustments to the old rites. All of these changes, which encouraged irreverence and doctrinal ambiguity, “seemed to point in the same, dangerous direction,” they noted—“to desacrilizing Catholicism’s central act of worship, and obscuring what the Mass chiefly is: a propitiatory Sacrifice which re-enacts and renews God’s redemptive act at Calvary.”<sup>129</sup> “We have said repeatedly that there is proceeding, along with the bad taste, a guarded but relentless attack against *doctrines* that are central to the Catholic Faith. And the principal target of the attack, they wrote, “is nothing less than the Holy Sacrifice itself—the Catholic conviction that in the Consecration the very Act of Calvary is mysteriously renewed.”<sup>130</sup> The liturgical changes attacked “the life of the living Eucharistic Lord,” Wilhelmsen wrote, by denying or minimizing the truth “thundered” by the Council of Trent—that,

The Lord God Himself, the Infinite Wisdom of the Father, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, the God of God and the Light of Light, He in Whom all things were created even to the last world and the most distant star, that He—Christ: God: King: Lord: Made Man, broken and murdered on the cross—is really there upon the Altar as victim in all the awful majesty of His Divinity and the fullness of His Glorious Humanity.<sup>131</sup>

The editors believed initially that the faulty English translations and changes in worship, especially in the Roman Canon—the Eucharistic Prayer in which the bread and wine were consecrated—which they considered not only “stripped clean of beauty” but “doctrinally suspect,” might lead to the development of “a High and Low Church, as in Anglicanism.”<sup>132</sup> While the Low

Church “would be content with a vulgarized and democratized faith,” the High Church “would fight desperately for a Mass, whether in Latin or the vernacular, that retained the full integrity of the liturgy and therefore of the Faith.”<sup>133</sup>

Regardless, the outcome, they noted, would be the destruction of the Latin Rite; “the tunic of the Body of Christ would now, really, have been torn to shreds,” they wrote—“lots would have been drawn, and the drama of the Cross would have been acted out in agony once again in our time.”<sup>134</sup>

Compounding the severity of a doctrinally suspect English translation and changes to the Canon was the introduction of multiple anaphoras (or Eucharistic prayers) that further presented the opportunity for tampering and corrupting the integrity of the mass—that it was “Calvary re-presented.”<sup>135</sup> Lambert accused the liturgists of seeking the “proliferation of anaphoras, even ad lib anaphoras,” in which they could incorporate their “new radical approaches to the mystery of the Mass.”<sup>136</sup> The editors believed that the only bulwark against the eventual corruption of the mass was for the Church to preserve the Roman Canon “in both the vernacular and in Latin, substantially unaltered,” to limit “severely” the number of anaphoras, and for the selection process of an anaphora, if not directly authorized by the Holy See, to be strictly governed “by how faithfully it perpetuates the act—not the memory, but the *act*—of God’s Sacrifice. What is primarily at stake,” they wrote, “is the integrity of the Sacrifice. Permit that to be lost, and the Mass is lost; and the Faith is lost.”<sup>137</sup>

If the editors were never content with the liturgical changes, which, they noted, introduced a “form of Catholic worship that would have been all but

unrecognizable, as Catholic, five years ago,” they eventually came to accept the new mass.<sup>138</sup> “The old Catholic Mass was an expression of Catholic culture,” but “that culture is everywhere in ruins,” they noted, “so we must not be surprised that the Mass is also in ruins.”<sup>139</sup> But its “heart”—the act of “Christ’s Sacrifice on Calvary”—they argued, was left intact, which was “not a cultural product but a connection with God.” The mass’s integrity was preserved.<sup>140</sup>

What surrounded the heart was the byproduct of culture, which was ultimately inessential “to the vitality of the heart.”<sup>141</sup> And if the surroundings of the old mass, nourished in a Catholic culture, were “cast in a beauty and depth congenial to the heart,” it was quite expected that the surroundings of the new mass, developed in the dullness of a secular culture, would be, they wrote, “dry bones.”<sup>142</sup> “So it must be until the Church informs a new culture,” they wrote: “The Church of Rome, however poor her furnishings, however tawdry her dress, is home. It is Christ’s home, who wishes us with Him during the night, as He signals us down these strange corridors into a new day.”<sup>143</sup>

Ultimately, tradition could not be the editors’ guide in liturgical changes. What was the traditional form was not eternally sanctified merely because it was the form of the preceding ages. The Christian West was dying and so with it the mass it had helped develop, but this did not mean that the faith was dying. “The truth does not depend on the culture. The culture depends on the truth,” Wisner wrote, “or, to put it another way, man does not make God, God makes man.”<sup>144</sup> The truth, the act of Calvary, was preserved and so with it the faith, which would live on in the coming barbarism. Their guide, rather, was Christ’s Vicar—Pope

Paul VI—who had instituted the new mass. Pope Paul VI—the Church—had spoken. “We are Papists,” Wilhelmsen explained—that is, their final loyalties were not to tradition but to Christ’s Church, which transcended the ages.<sup>145</sup>

Yet if the editors were asking Catholics “to have the courage to stay at Peter’s side for as long as it takes to cross today’s cultural desert,” they added also that such loyalty did not entail an obligation “to be content with ugliness or irreverence or bad taste.”<sup>146</sup> “And there certainly is no obligation,” they wrote, “to ignore threats to the integrity of Catholic worship; in fact, to every Catholic there is given the most emphatic duty to oppose such threats with all means appropriate to his station.”<sup>147</sup> Wilhelmsen even proposed direct action when irreverence turned into sacrilege, which, “being an act,” he wrote, “can only be countered by another act.”<sup>148</sup>

The editors wanted Catholics to be vigilant because they believed that the new mass, like the old mass before it, would come under attack from reformers, who sought further change, further heterodoxy in worship.<sup>149</sup> “Let laymen demand of their priests, priests of their bishops, and bishops of the Holy See,” they wrote, “that any future ‘experimentation’ move in the direction of creating a liturgy truly conducive to the expression of the sacral in the postmodern age.”<sup>150</sup> “If there is to be experimentation,” they instructed, “let us be bold enough to plunge intelligently into the future—and to reserve it for Christ. And this, we may find, is the true case for the Latin Mass. The argument for the use of Latin tomorrow,” they argued, “will not be built around its venerability, but around its peculiar aptness for inspiring in man a sense of the sacred.”<sup>151</sup>

The editors also would build the case for the old mass around its impeccable orthodoxy, which became an especially pertinent need, they believed, given the English translation of the new mass. “The battle for liturgical beauty in the Mass has been lost,” McClane wrote—“the war for doctrinal orthodoxy has not.”<sup>152</sup> Just as the liturgists had provided a revision instead of translation of the old Roman Canon, so they were producing, the editors argued, their “own highly original version of the new *Ordo Missae*.”<sup>153</sup> But even the Latin version of the new mass, for which “no responsible critic . . . claims to find heresy in it” and was “free of error,” was not, they believed, “free of ambiguity.”<sup>154</sup> “The new *Ordo*,” they argued, “is manifestly, incontestably, subject to the criticism that it mutes, de-emphasizes, leaves unstated or incompletely stated, certain essential Catholic doctrines concerning the nature of the Mass and the Eucharist.”<sup>155</sup> The editors, then, sought to base their argument for the preservation of the old mass, neither in its impeccable tradition, nor in some claim that the new mass was heretical, but in the view that it would provide an example of sacred worship, not to be copied but emulated, and in its “unquestionable doctrinal security” in a time of great flux in Catholic worship.<sup>156</sup> The old mass, they wrote, “has been through all the centuries, in its every word and cadence, for believers and non-believers alike, a thundering affirmation of the Sacrifice.”<sup>157</sup> To further bolster their case, the editors argued that the new fashionable temperament for heterodoxy in worship—which they otherwise despised—justified their claim for the preservation of the old mass.<sup>158</sup>

The *Triumph* staff, then, never favored the new mass and continually pressed for the preservation of the old mass. “I abominate the new vernacular liturgy; I abominate it when it is done badly,” Wilhelmsen stated, “and I abominate it even when it is done reasonably well. I do not rejoice in the *Novus Ordo* in Latin.”<sup>159</sup> “I am among those Catholics who once fought for the restoration of the Old Mass. I am *not* among those Catholics who today believe that this battle is antiquated,” Wilhelmsen wrote, “and that, therefore, we ought to resign ourselves to the present liturgical situation and set about the task of doing other things.”<sup>160</sup> William H. Marshner argued that the Council’s *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, which ushered in the liturgical transformations were built on “structuralist, positivist, and behaviorist paradigms” that suggested that “liturgy is a function of social structure and ought, therefore, to vary as the structure changes.”<sup>161</sup> But, he noted, University of Chicago anthropologist, Victor Turner, has imploded such a notion by demonstrating that “liturgy is naturally an expression of anti-structure, that is, an opportunity for people to step outside of secular roles and their mindset of sociopolitical ‘relevance.’”<sup>162</sup> Which explained why, he wrote, “people are bored and frustrated at the ‘new liturgies’ precisely because this opportunity is denied them.”<sup>163</sup> “Thus Turner refutes the whole theoretical framework of the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*. Nothing could make one more relieved,” he noted, “that Vatican II was not a dogmatic council than this scholar’s demolition of its most highly touted document!”<sup>164</sup>

Bryan Houghton believed that the audible, vernacular liturgy instituted an anthropocentric rather than a theocentric form of prayer. In the old mass, the

individual was left in a silent, outwardly inactive, anonymity—to privately adore God; whereas in the new mass, the individual was drawn into participation, a regimented vocal participation (what Jane Bret called “liturgical fascism”) that prevented anonymity and the opportunity for the private adoration of God.<sup>165</sup> In the traditional view, prayer, Houghton noted, was “aiding and abetting a supernatural act performed by the Holy Ghost”—prayer, then, “was a divine act humanized.”<sup>166</sup> The less an individual in prayer “impinges on the Holy Ghost the better,” he wrote—the objective was “to become as theocentric as grace permits. He should become recollected and empty himself so as to leave room for the divine operation of the Holy Ghost.”<sup>167</sup> Such transcendence was fostered by the silent, inactive, anonymity in the old mass, but in the new mass, it was implied that prayer—because it was participatory, making the individual the principal actor—was “a natural act, aided and abetted by actual grace . . . a human act sanctified.”<sup>168</sup> “Instead of activity of the will bent on self-emptying, recollection and adherence in order to adore God, there is the maximum intellectual and imaginative activity directed toward self-perfection.”<sup>169</sup> In such an understanding of prayer, he wrote, a “lyrical professor of theology would infallibly pray best and it would remain a profound mystery how anybody as stupid as the Little Flower or Bernadette Soubirous ever prayed at all.”<sup>170</sup> What was at question in the new form of worship was whether prayer would be for “the self-perfection of man or the pure adoration of God.”<sup>171</sup>

Such dissension drew criticism, even the charge of hypocrisy. The editors were staunch supporters of Pope Paul VI’s encyclical *On the Regulation of Birth*,

and argued that if the encyclical was not an infallible teaching, it was still to be accepted with faith in the teaching authority of the Magisterium; it was to be received with obedience and deference. They attacked those who criticized the encyclical as apostates. Yet, were the editors themselves, in their criticism of the new mass and in their efforts to preserve the old mass, especially after it was promulgated by Pope Paul VI as the new order, dissenting from papal authority?

The editors argued that they were loyal to Pope Paul VI; they accepted his promulgation of the new mass as the exclusive rite of the Latin Church, which, they wrote, must be met with a “response of fealty and ultimately obedience.”<sup>172</sup> Had they not—because it was declared by the pope as the new order—proclaimed its legitimacy? For them, it was not a question of the new mass’s integrity; this was assured, to reiterate, as it was promulgated by the pope. Rather, their dissent was rooted in the hope for the preservation of the old mass; that the new mass would not be made the exclusive rite of the Latin Church.<sup>173</sup> This, they argued, was a permissible dissent, because such an issue involved the Church’s “*practical*” rather than its “*Theoretical*” authority.<sup>174</sup> The latter referred to the Church’s infallibility in matters of faith and morals, which was to be met with absolute faith and thus absolute assent; whereas the former “appeals not to belief” but referred to the Church’s authority in practical decisions, which were not tied to infallible teachings and did not demand full assent.<sup>175</sup> Such a differentiation did not imply that it was acceptable to disobey the Church’s practical authority, which was still the “practical authority of a higher order.”<sup>176</sup> Rather, Catholics still were bound to obey the Church’s practical decisions and to

“submit to them in reverence and deep respect,” Hildebrand wrote, but “we need not consider them felicitous or prudent.”<sup>177</sup> “If we are convinced that any practical change or decision is objectively unfortunate, noxious, compromising, imprudent, or unjust, we are permitted to pray that it may be revoked,” he noted, “to write in a respectful manner about the topic, to direct petitions for a change of it to the Holy Father—to attempt, in a variety of ways, to influence a reversal of the decision.”<sup>178</sup>

While *On the Regulation of Birth* was not defined in *ex cathedra*, or infallible, it was still a teaching on morality and was to be adhered to “wholeheartedly.”<sup>179</sup> Its teaching was binding, Hildebrand argued, “because its content has always been part of the teaching of the Church; in it we are confronted with the theoretical authority of the Church embodied in the tradition of the ordinary Magisterium.”<sup>180</sup> “It is not a mere practical commandment of the Church. . . . It is a statement about a moral fact; that is, it states a *truth*, he wrote:

That birth control is sinful. It is forbidden not because of the Pope’s policy, but because the theoretical authority of the Church declares its sinfulness. Here, as in all cases of a teaching of the theoretical authority, the old maxim applies: *Roma locuta est: causa finita est* [Rome has spoken, the case is finished].<sup>181</sup>

In contrast, the decision to make the new mass the exclusive right of the Latin Church was a policy decision and fell wholly within the parameter of the Church’s practical authority. Thus, Hildebrand and the editors, believing in the superiority of the old mass, justified and encouraged efforts to preserve the old mass—to have it celebrated alongside the new mass.<sup>182</sup> They were free to do so, they reasoned, until Pope Paul VI commanded otherwise.<sup>183</sup>

In addition to their efforts to preserve the old mass, the editors proved their belief in the new mass's doctrinal integrity in the controversy over the English translation of the consecration. In the consecration of the wine, the Latin words "*pro multis*" meaning "for many"—indicated that Christ's blood shall be shed (for you and) "for many"—was translated into "for all." Many traditionalist Catholics believed that this invalidated the sacrifice, because, as the Church taught, not "all" were saved. It was heresy to suggest so. Christ's sacrifice opened the possibility of salvation by redeeming all men, but one had to adhere to His truth as communicated through His Church; it certainly did not suggest that everyone would be saved. Such a translation was, in large part, the reason for schismatic movements on the Right that pledged allegiance to the old mass and the pre-Vatican II Church.<sup>184</sup>

The editors believed that it was a "faulty translation" that "should be corrected."<sup>185</sup> As Lawrence noted, one of the principal translators had told him, personally, a few years previous, "that *pro multis* had to be translated 'for all men,' lest people get the idea that Catholics believe Protestants are not saved!"<sup>186</sup> But Lawrence did not believe that the faulty translation invalidated the consecration. And their faith in its validity would not be contingent upon the outcome of the debate between sacramental theologians over which words of the consecration were essential to its authentication.<sup>187</sup> Rather, they would submit in prayer and docility to the Church and wait for her to speak on the translation, and they would have faith in the integrity of the mass because of its apparent efficacy. "The Pope and bishops and priests all over the world," Lawrence wrote, "are

using vernaculars that include the equivalent of ‘for all men.’ This doesn’t make it a good translation; but it does say something about whether the faulty translation renders the consecration invalid. It says this,” he noted:

If these consecrations are invalid, is not the promise of Christ in jeopardy—or even altogether abrogated? If the Church all over the world is failing, if the Vicar of Christ is failing, to celebrate the Mass, have not the gates of Hell prevailed . . . or come very close to it? *Securus judicat orbis terrarum*: the whole world is a safe guide: St. Augustine’s famous test of catholicity . . . should be good enough for us.<sup>188</sup>

*Triumph* would “be guided by the Augustinian prescription. . . . We are confident in the catholicity of the Catholic Church; and confident in the Vicar of Christ who is the representative and proof of her catholicity. Moved by Hope,” Lawrence wrote, “we will continue to believe that the Holy Spirit is guiding the Church through the present liturgical storm and will bring her safe to port.”<sup>189</sup>

## Priests and Nuns

If liturgical reform, especially as implemented by the New Breed Catholics, led to the de-sacralization of the Church’s central act of worship—the representation of Christ—it was expected by the editors that the radical reformers would attempt also to secularize Christ represented in the Church’s liturgical services—that is, the priest. The clergy was, next to the Eucharistic celebration, the most visible sign of the Church’s transcendent and immanent character. The priest was sacred. By the special grace bestowed upon him in the sacrament of Holy Orders, he is, Pope Pius XII taught, “made like to the High Priest and possesses the power of performing actions in virtue of Christ’s very person.”<sup>190</sup>

The most important spiritual power given him in consecration, contributor Josef Pieper wrote, was that to “confect the Sacrament of the Altar *in persona Christi*.”<sup>191</sup> Acting in the person of Christ in the Eucharistic celebration went beyond mere representation, Pieper noted, but indicated a sacramental likeness to Christ, affected not by the priest, but Christ Himself.<sup>192</sup>

Yet priests suffered a decline in prestige in the post-Vatican II Church. This was attributable to the breakdown of the Catholic ghetto—of which the priest was a central figure—but also to the collegial implications of the Council and the liturgical reforms it triggered, which cast the priest more as a leading participant than as a sacred leader.<sup>193</sup> Both developments fostered a less authoritative and sacred conceptualization of the clergy.<sup>194</sup> The decline in prestige was due also to the abandonment of any further liberalization of the faith after the Council—most infamously manifest in Pope Paul VI’s reassertion in 1968 of the Church’s ban on contraception, in his encyclical *On the Regulation of Birth*. The latter was widely ignored by Catholics, which fostered further irreverence for the Church’s authority.<sup>195</sup> Yet it was the expectations of the New Breed Catholics and their hopes of further adapting the Church to the secular world—fostered but not authorized by the Council—that led to the concerted effort, the editors believed, to directly de-sacralize the priestly vocation; which was principally manifest in their efforts to get rid of the priestly vow of celibacy.

Those in favor of change viewed the vow of celibacy as psychologically unhealthy, sociologically ostracizing, and as antiquated moralizing—rooted, as it was, they believed, in a sinful view of sex. Celibacy was, for the editors, part of

the vocation that comprised its sacredness and commanded awe, and was therefore indispensable in leading men and women to Christ.<sup>196</sup> “Self-denial was not recommended by Christ as a mode of resignation, of escaping from life and reality. It is a means, the only successful means, of dominating reality,” the editors wrote—“No man can command events, or lead other men, until he has first learned to command himself.”<sup>197</sup> “The truth is that the continence of her clergy is the clearest sign that the Church, though in this world, is not of it,” they wrote, “the spectacle celibate clergy fills with awe believers and unbelievers alike because it unmistakably (and accurately) implies an intimacy with the transcendent.”<sup>198</sup> The celibate priest, John Wisner wrote, was “evidence that spirit transcends, controls and forms the flesh.”<sup>199</sup> “According to Christian psychology,” Wisner noted, celibacy “leads to a concentration of spiritual energy which raises men entirely above their fellows.”<sup>200</sup> “Indeed,” he declared, “the Christian clergy has been, without any doubt, the most restless, active, turbulent, bruising, intolerant, intolerable, energetic, creative, original, courageous, virtuous and fruitful body of men in the rolls of history.”<sup>201</sup>

The New Breed sought also to de-sacralize the religious life, the editors charged, by promoting more socially engaged vocations at the neglect of their spiritual work, which implied an emphasis on man’s and woman’s material needs rather than their more important spiritual needs.<sup>202</sup> The editors argued for a visible, spiritually-oriented priesthood, rather than an activist one. A priesthood dominated by “a socio-political ministry” left “no room for the priest” the editors wrote, “as man of sacrifice, man of prayer, man of the One True Church, man of

Rome, who would preach and practice a true devotion to the Eucharist, to the Mother of God, and to the saints.”<sup>203</sup> These were the devotions that drew man and woman to Christ. They did not reject all types of clerical activism, but, as Bozell remarked, the socially active religious in the United States seemed to be those who believed “that Christianity ought to make a kind of accommodation with secularism.”<sup>204</sup> “I often wonder why it is that priests who are moved to leave their schools, and so on—to go out to parade—never seem to do so on behalf of causes like school prayer,” he asked, “or on behalf of causes like the deprivations of freedom in Communist countries.”<sup>205</sup>

The editors praised the new *Instruction on the Contemplative Life and on the Enclosure of Nuns*, issued by the Vatican Congregation for Religious, which reaffirmed the importance of the contemplative life. “This is particularly true in an age of secularism,” they wrote, “for the contemplative life affirms the supreme efficacy of the life of the spirit.”<sup>206</sup> “Like celibacy, the contemplative life is especially relevant to a world in which it appears ridiculous,” they noted, “because it permits a clear vision of the sacred. The loss of this vision is responsible for the impoverishment of our culture, and lies behind the banalities that proceed under the name of ‘relevance.’ Indeed,” they added,

It is the contemplative who are supremely active, not only because ‘in the heart of the world’ they share ‘to a more universal degree the fatigue, the misery, and the hopes of all mankind,’ sustaining it with their prayers, but because their activity is the summit of all human activity: the glorification of God.<sup>207</sup>

If the editors viewed the religious life as sacred and above any earthly endeavor, they did not believe priests or nuns were above criticism, especially if

they seemed to transgress their sacred vocations. They were critical of the Sisters of the Immaculate Heart in Los Angeles, California, for example, for opting to wear normal clothes rather than the traditional habit, which they viewed as an act of abandoning their unique identity and the visibility of their sacred life—nuns, they asserted, were not normal ladies.<sup>208</sup> They were angry also with the National Coalition of American Nuns (NCAN), which “called upon sisters not to be scabs,”—that is, they quoted from the NCAN statement, to refrain “for the sake of ‘sisterly solidarity,’” from ““assuming responsibility for a school or hospital from which other nuns have been evicted by arbitrary mandate of parish or diocesan decision-makers.”<sup>209</sup> This was a very “maddening thing,” they noted, that “the successors of Teresa of Avila and Bernadette Soubirous and Catherine of Siena and Mother Seton should be urged to abandon the young and the sick and form a labor union! One can only turn, in disgust,” they decried, “to the conclusion that nuns of the NCAN mentality ought to stay away from children, from the sick and dying, from the untaught.”<sup>210</sup>

The editors attributed the increasing numbers of priests who left their ministry and increasing disobedience in the priesthood, not to psychological or sociological problems, but to their rejection of Church teachings, especially in the “areas of sexual morality, human life and Church government.”<sup>211</sup> In part, they traced such a problem to the seminaries, which emphasized, they contended, training in social skills, rather than holiness—that “humble and total surrender of man to God which makes man like Christ, who is both the Son of God and the Savior of mankind.” To “inculcate genuine spiritual depth,” they recommended “a

diocesan residence which seminarians would share with men of great and proved faith—mature priests—learning from them principally by living with them the life of the Spirit. The greater part of these seminarians' academic training," they wrote, "could be provided by nearby secular universities, whose academic credentials are almost certain to be superior to any existing seminary's, and whose milieu, because candidly hostile, would provide a true testing ground of a faith and holiness nurtured elsewhere."<sup>212</sup>

The other cause of such priestly unfaithfulness, which ranged from mere incredulity to heresy, was an increasing acceptance of Modernism; that is, to reiterate, the theological view that Church teaching should be developmental. The editors became very critical of the Jesuits in this regard; specifically the Jesuit-directed *America*. "It is made a point of honor," in the Jesuit company, "and a fundamental condition of intellectual responsibility, for the young Jesuit to adhere more or less to the *nominal*ly Christian theological attitudes of Modernism, which finds 'true' Christianity in anything and nothing," contributor Farley Clinton wrote.<sup>213</sup> "For the Jesuit 'theologian' of the 1960s," Clinton added, "the Faith is certainly not truth, revealed and confirmed by God, to be held intellectually, but something more like the old Roman ruins out of which the imaginative 'theologian' hews the marble for a house of his own construction."<sup>214</sup> "Frequent confession, orthodoxy, devotions, the spirit of thinking with the Church, were once the meat and drink of the Jesuits;" but, he stated:

Another spirit reigns in the Society today—although, of course, there are individual, heroic, exceptions. It is the sort of unclean spirit which cries out for the exorcist (of course it cries out against the exorcist) rather than the debater. It is not casual error, it is persistent, repeated, multiform error,

dislike of faith and obedience, that we find in, for instance, Fr. Donald Campion's *America*. (He seems to edit his extremely vulgar journal by means of the ouija board.) The journalist feels, the preacher or theologian feels, he is God, he is the pope, he decrees what all shall believe. . . . It is fortunate for everyone, really, when they [Jesuits] leave and abandon the pretence that they are sincere Catholic priests rather than thieves, liars and schismatics, committed to the shameful heresy which all Catholic priests solemnly forswear in their anti-Modernist oath, while they live on the alms of the Catholic faithful and maintain the name and dress of true priests.<sup>215</sup>

The editors admitted that it was difficult for them to publish Clinton's wrathful article on the Jesuits, given the company's historic Christian devotion, and because, as they noted, "most of *Triumph's* staff, including Mr. Clinton, has been educated by them."<sup>216</sup> Yet they concurred with his conclusion that the Society of Jesus was indeed "deeply infected" with Modernism.<sup>217</sup> If not, they reasoned, why had the company failed to censor *America*? "Isn't it time, however, to expect them to *do* something in a public way (besides writing us letters) to rescue the Company and its reputation? If the Society of Jesus," they wrote, "either in its American component or in Father [Pedro] Arrupe's international apparatus, cannot gather the strength or cunning to suppress *America*, there really *is* no excuse for not suppressing the Society."<sup>218</sup>

Of the Catholic presses, the editors were more critical of the Jesuit *America*, whose *implied* imprimatur, given their historic orthodoxy, seemed more of a threat to undermine the faith, but it certainly was not, they believed, the only Catholic press that whined "with heresy" instead of "roaring with orthodoxy."<sup>219</sup> It was that they could expect, if they would never tolerate, apostasy from the major liberal Catholic presses, *Commonweal* and the *National Catholic Reporter*. They attributed what they believed was the heretical direction of the Catholic presses,

not only to a Modernist theological view, but also to its corollary, to the accommodation that *America* and the other liberal Catholic presses had made with America's pluralist and democratic political culture—that Catholics must privatize their faith. "But Catholics *have* had higher ambitions," they wrote: "they have believed themselves possessed of a body of Truth which is valuable to *all* men; and they have believed that their civic business was to try to make the climate of moral opinion conform to that Truth."<sup>220</sup> But "With very few exceptions, the opinion journals that represent the Church to the world have been shrieking for at least the last five years an uninterrupted howl against the authoritative teaching of the Church;" they wrote, "God and man are really god and Man; birth control is acceptable today because everyone says so; [and] abortion will be acceptable tomorrow because everyone is about to say so."<sup>221</sup> They were, the editors concluded, "a reliable barometer of the winds of moral decay."<sup>222</sup>

They were especially infuriated with what they perceived as an accommodation to abortion in *America*, *Commonweal*, and the *National Catholic Reporter*. The latter two gave voice to "the hard-core remnant of the 'Catholic liberals'"—"Charles Curran, John Dedek, John Deedy, Robert Drinan, Mary Daly, Donald Thorman, and others"—who, they wrote "will stop at nothing to maintain solidarity with the American dream: two cars in every garage and an emptiness in every womb."<sup>223</sup>

If the Catholic press was to survive—its failure in part was due to the collapse of the Catholic subculture—it could not mimic the secular-liberal press and contribute to the further morphing of Catholics into Americans. It would have

to be Catholic, which meant it would have to be “an apostolate.”<sup>224</sup> If it communicated “love of the Church and passionate belief in her teachings,” and “the conviction that America, that the world, has no other hope whatsoever than Christ—then the fire will spread; the enthusiasm will be catching. Then the ‘subculture’ will rise again, not this time as a ghetto,” they wrote, “but as the growing, uncontrollable army of Christ the King.”<sup>225</sup>

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> Rev. Hugo H. Hoefer, S.O. Cist., ed., *Saint Joseph Daily Missal: The Official Prayers of the Catholic Church for the Celebration of Daily Mass*, rev. ed., with an introduction by Rev. Richard Kugelman, C.P., S.T.L., S.S.L. (Rochester, MN: Carl B. Noelke Co., 1961), 3.

<sup>2</sup> Christopher Derrick, "Trimming the Ark," *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 8-9.

<sup>3</sup> Christopher Derrick, "Pavane for a Dead Liturgy," *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 17.

<sup>4</sup> The "true purpose" of the Council, Erick von Kuehnelt-Leddihn wrote, was to go "back to the sources, rather than innovation or 'catching up with the times'"—"though perhaps," he noted, "this was not clearly recognized by all of those present and participating." Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, "Radical Christianity," *Triumph* 2 no. 2 (February, 1967): 19.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Catholicism is Right, So Why Change It?" *The Saturday Evening Post* (July 15, 1967): 10.

<sup>7</sup> As Bozell noted, the Church had "waged a largely successful defensive battle against the world for four centuries," but then "found herself besieged from within: her beliefs were disbelieved, her moral teachings scorned, her authority flouted, her cultural treasures of every sort debased or abandoned, her saints neglected, her Mother insulted. Her vocations dried up, her priests and nuns betrayed her in droves, her bishops stopped bishing, and she seemed quite relieved to turn over her mission of leavening the world and winning new souls for Christ to Billy Graham and the Salvation Army." L. Brent Bozell, "Liturgy: Present and Future," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 39.

<sup>8</sup> Patricia Bozell, interview with Patrick Allitt, 9 March 1991, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

<sup>9</sup> John Wisner, "What Happened to the Church," *Triumph* 3 no. 2 (February, 1968): 23. Michael Lawrence stated: "The Church's centuries long cultural attachment to a Western (European) set of cultural norms was needing some change, simply because that culture's own integrity probably was over. There was a spiritual intuition at the heart of the calling of the council. It probably had to do with recognition that the western culture which in many ways had been identified with Roman Catholicism for centuries wasn't viable any more. Something else was going to emerge in its place. The Church needed to detach itself." Michael Lawrence, interview with Patrick Allitt, 27 February 1991, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

<sup>10</sup> Hamish Fraser, "The Triumphalism of Vatican II," *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 20.

<sup>11</sup> Editors, "Troubled Seas," *Triumph* 1 no. 4 (December, 1966): 7. Contributor William J. Fitzpatrick wrote that if the "Second Vatican Council is read as demanding the 'adaptation' of the Church—and of the Faith she professes—to the 'modern world,'" then "Pope Paul VI has been teaching otherwise—in the sixteenth months since the close of Vatican II, Paul VI has tirelessly counseled the faithful about the state of the post-conciliar Church. In some five hundred addresses, letters and instructions, in meetings with Cardinals and bishops, and priests and laymen, with Jesuits and aristocrats, with theologians, scientists, scholars, artists, with tourists from many lands, the Pope has been teaching his flock." William J. Fitzpatrick, "The Pope Speaks," *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 18.

---

<sup>12</sup> Editors, "Habemus Papam," *Triumph* 3 no. 8 (August, 1968): 38; Ronald D. Lambert, "The Threat to the Mass," *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 20-24; and Editors, "Ten More Years," *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 45.

<sup>13</sup> Editors, "Habemus Papam," 38.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.* Also, see Editors, "The Two Synods," *Triumph* 8 no. 10 (December, 1974): 45.

<sup>15</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "Liturgy: Present and Future," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 39.

<sup>16</sup> Bozell, for example, was dismayed with Pope Paul VI's lack of action against bishops and priests who dissented from his encyclical, *On the Regulation of Birth* (1968). L. Brent Bozell, interview with Patrick Allitt, 26 February 1991, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

<sup>17</sup> Editors, "Chaos in the Church: A Reassurance," *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 42.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Bishops v. Pope?" *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 7.

<sup>20</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Autumn of the Church," *Triumph* 3 no. 6 (June, 1968): 10.

<sup>21</sup> Marvin R. O'Connell, "Crisis in Confidence," *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 17-19.

<sup>22</sup> Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, "The Church and Our Age: Sovereignty or Servitude?" *Triumph* 3 no. 12 (December, 1968): 25.

<sup>23</sup> O'Connell, "Crisis in Confidence," 18. Such secularization, the editors believed, was manifest in the Church's decision to remove a number of saints from the liturgical calendar, because of a lack of historical knowledge of their lives. They argued that this was an imprudent concession to "rationalist epistemology"—that truth was "equitable to the conclusions of scientific disciplines, like archeology." "Any pious Christian knows that the fact of an active and long standing cult around St. Januarius, for example, is far more pertinent proof of the existence of Januarius than any scrapping of fossils can provide." But devotees were to be reassured, the editors wrote, the blood of Saint Januarius liquefied in its vial "on schedule, on the first Sunday of May, as it does every year" at the cathedral in Naples where it was housed; and when the priest brought the vial out to a "worried crowd, the blood of St. Januarius liquefied again." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Christopher et al.—Saecula Saeculorum," *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 8. Secularization was manifest also in the discussion to move some holy days to Sundays so that such practices did not interfere with work. "Well, well," the editors lamented. "No one can accuse the NC News Service's copywriter of missing the flavor of this most recent inspiration by Church bureaucrats on how to 'renew all things in Christ.' Spare Catholics the inconvenience . . . keep office and factory schedules intact . . . get rid of civil holidays that honor the Lord . . . confine any Mass obligation at all to the everywhere convenient (because it is everywhere secularly baptized) Sunday. . . . If factory hours get in the way of celebration, what must give is the office and factory hours—not the celebration!" Editors, "Present Imperfect: Come Clean," *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 8-9.

<sup>24</sup> D.J. Dooley, "The Enquiring Mind: Gilson on Evolution," *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 19. Also, see Thomas Molnar, "Gnosticism: The Perennial Heresy," *Triumph* 3 no. 7 (July, 1968): (23-26); and von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, "The Church and Our Age: Sovereignty or Servitude?" 25-27.

---

<sup>25</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Autumn of the Church," 10. For the bishops' Statement on the National Race Crisis, see Hugh J. Nolan, ed., *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops: Volume III 1962-1974* (Washington, D.C., United States Catholic Conference, 1983): 156-160.

<sup>26</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Autumn of the Church," 10.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> Editors, "Ten More Years," *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 45; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Autumn of the Church," 37.

<sup>29</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Teeter-Totter Bishop," *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 9.

<sup>30</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Autumn of the Church," 37. The editors, because they were angry with the bishops for their lack of militancy, printed forms for readers to cut out and sign and put in the collection basket on Sunday that noted parishioner disapproval and the intention to withhold financial contributions. The form read in part: "This is to inform you of my intention to withhold any and all financial contributions to the Church except those directly intended for the financial support of my pastor, until such time as I am convinced that the fallible humans currently at the throttles of power in the Church in America have recovered the capacity to spend the Church's resources in fulfillment of Christ's mandate: Go, therefore, and teach all nations. I shall be happy to discuss this matter with you at any time." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Oiling the Throttles," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 9.

<sup>31</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Autumn of the Church," 37.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 38. In November, 1968, the American bishops issued their *Statement on Human Life in Our Day*, which condemned contraception and abortion. See Hugh J. Nolan, ed., *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops: Volume III 1962-1974* (Washington, D.C., United States Catholic Conference, 1983): (164-194). By 1973, the editors became less critical of the bishops. "It can be said now, in 1973, that much of what was said then by way of attempting to understand the Church's agony was correct. Or so it seems to me," Bozell wrote. "But is also seems to me," he added, "that our indictment of the American bishops was probably unfair, and certainly contrary to the best interests of the Church. For it could not help to contribute to the very internal strife and spirit of contestation that was making her heart bleed. Or so it now seems to me; and I should like to deliver a message of contrition." L. Brent Bozell, "The Church and the Republic," *Triumph* 8 no. 9 (November, 1973): 10.

<sup>33</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Flock, Protect Your Shepherds," *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 9. For the bishops' declarations of war on poverty—*Resolution on Crusade Against Poverty* and *Resolution on the Campaign for Human Development*—see Nolan, ed., *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops: Volume III*, 214-215, 273-274.

<sup>34</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Flock, Protect Your Shepherds," *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 9-10.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 10.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid. The editors consistently criticized the bishops for focusing too much, in the editors' view, on secular-liberal causes rather than on what they deemed the most important issues in America, the contraceptive and abortion issues. The bishops routinely condemned abortion, but the editors envisioned more from their shepherds; they hoped that they would mobilize the Catholic population in defense of the unborn. By focusing on secular-liberal issues, material issues, the bishops were attending to "matters of more immediacy to the Catholic

---

people,” but, the editors wrote, “the bishops are—however unwittingly—creating an image of themselves as tigers on issues pleasing to secular-liberals and lambs on matters where Catholics must stand alone. We know that the reality is far different from the image, but if the bishops do not soon end that dichotomy, they may find themselves unable to roar, fit only for fleecing.” Editors, “Present Imperfect: Render to Cesar,” *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 9. In 1975, an article, signed “Pertinax,” read: “Perhaps it can be said that the difference today between a liberal bishop and a ‘conservative’ one is that the liberal would have the conference pass its resolutions before the ADA [Americans for Democratic Action], whereas the conservative prefers to wait for [Walter] Cronkite, the *Times* and even *Time* to approve the latest non-departure in democratic retrogression.” Pertinax, “The Catholic Interest,” *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 17.

<sup>37</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: The Autumn of the Church,” 38.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.* For other articles on the bishops, see Editors, “The Bishops Take Over,” *Triumph* 3 no. 2 (February, 1968): 38; Editors, “The Synod: Suenens or Danielou,” *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 42; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Ibi Ecclesia. Ubi Kelly?” *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 7; Editors, “Present Imperfect: The Bishops in Charge,” *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 8; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Bishop in the Dock,” *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 9; William H. Marshner, “Send this Man to School,” *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 31; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Buy Now, Pay Never,” *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 10; William H. Marshner, “The Bishops’ Strange Love,” *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 11-14, 43; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Oy, Oy, McHugh,” *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 9; Editors, “Present Imperfect: The Higher Brass,” *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 9-10; Michael Brock, “Lessons from ‘Dagger John,’” *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 18-20; and Editors, “Present Imperfect: NOW Meet a Bishop,” *Triumph* 10 no. 6 (June, 1975): 8-9.

<sup>39</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Catechism V. The Child: A New Religion,” *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 21.

<sup>40</sup> Editors, “The Silent Church,” *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 42.

<sup>41</sup> Vatican Council II, “Decree on Ecumenism,” The Holy See, [http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat\\_ii\\_decree\\_19641121\\_unitatis-redintegratio\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat_ii_decree_19641121_unitatis-redintegratio_en.html) (accessed July, 29, 2008).

<sup>42</sup> Editors, “Ecumenism,” *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 8.

<sup>43</sup> Dietrich von Hildebrand wrote: “It belongs to the essential mission of the Church to strive to convert every human being. In contradistinction to the Jews, who do not ordinarily seek conversions because they consider the revelation of God in the Old Testament as directed exclusively to a Chosen People, the Catholic Church follows the command of Christ: ‘Teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.’ This is why she is called the *catholic* Church, from the Greek word meaning ‘universal.’ But that ecumenism which has become fashionable since Vatican Council II is something quite different; in some interpretations it even contradicts true Catholic universality. . . . The emphasis of Vatican II is not really on ecumenism, as that is properly understood; he noted, “what the Council urges is actually a new attitude toward non-Catholic religions. The Council invites Catholics, while clearly recognizing the dogmatic errors of the sects, to recognize also what is true in them.” Dietrich von Hildebrand, “The Charitable Anathema” *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 24.

<sup>44</sup> Editors, “Ecumenism,” 8-9.

<sup>45</sup> Christopher Derrick, “In Defense of Triumphalism,” *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 18.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

---

<sup>47</sup> Hamish Fraser, "The Triumphalism of Vatican II," *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 22.

<sup>48</sup> "The Protestant principle of the primacy of the individual conscience over the authority of the Church," Wilhelmsen wrote, "has become a public orthodoxy in the secularized West. This new orthodoxy has outlawed any corporate incarnation of Christian principles in the social and political order." Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Hallowed Be Thy World," *Triumph* 3 no. 6 (June, 1968): 13.

<sup>49</sup> The problem of varied biblical interpretation was further complicated by modern biblical scholarship, which introduced multiple methods of textual analysis. Yet, as the editors pointed out, the Catholic was protected by the Church from such a multiplicity of interpretation. "The biblical scholar, who is merely the practitioner of a science, has absolutely no competence to define religious truths. He is limited by his science to scientific truths, and these are of a very different order. The Church, on the other hand, is not limited to 'scientific truths'; in fact, she is not limited to biblical truth either, for she is, in an important sense," they wrote, "the author of the Bible. Inspired by the Holy Spirit to write Scripture as one means of teaching the Word, she alone is inspired by the Spirit to interpret it. That is why, commenting on the methods of interpretation used in modern biblical research, the Second Vatican Council declared: 'All of what has been said about the way of interpreting Scripture is subject finally to the judgment of the Church, which carries out the divine commission and ministry of guarding and interpreting the Word of God' (*Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation*)." Editors, "Present Imperfect: 'Guidelines for Scientists'" *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 10. William Marshner wrote: "The Catholic Church teaches that canonical Scripture is a *unified* revelation, whose ultimate author is God disclosing His nature and will to His Church, and that therefore the entire content of Scripture must conform to the work of the Holy Spirit within the Church. Moreover, Scripture is in part identical with the 'deposit of faith' given to the apostles to their successors, a deposit that has been identified and protected by an infallible magisterium, which is itself the fulfillment of biblical promise." W.H. Marshner, "The Scripture Game II," *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 24. Also see W.H. Marshner, "The Scripture Game," *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 19-21; and William Marshner, "Contra Gentiles: Hermeneutic's Wonderful World," *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 31.

<sup>50</sup> Martin F. Larrey, "The Mediator Church—Can Protestants Accept It?" *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 24.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 23, 24.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 24, 26.

<sup>54</sup> Kenneth A. Cory, "Reactions: Dear Triumph," *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 3. In explaining his conversion to the Catholic Faith, *Triumph* contributor, Jeffery Hart wrote: "And what of the Catholic Church? There it seemed clear that the foundation of doctrinal stability, and thus the preservation of actual content, was, lo, precisely the thing Protestantism had rejected: authority, papal authority, the authority of Peter. Here was poetic justice with a vengeance. The Protestants *deserved* their empty churches. From this standpoint, it could even be argued *a posteriori* that if, as the evidence indicated, Christ had founded a Church, he would not a) have founded one certain to fail, and b) would therefore have established a source of doctrinal authority, and that c) Scripture alone cannot have been such a source because it has not, in the event, worked, and so, therefore d) Catholicism." Jeffrey Hart, "Our Prematurely Patriotic Church," *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 25.

<sup>55</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Christmas in Christendom," *Triumph* 2 no. 12 (December, 1967): 12; and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Hallowed Be Thy World," *Triumph* 3 no. 6 (June, 1968): 12-13.

---

<sup>56</sup> Wilhelmsen, "Hallowed Be Thy World," 11-12.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 12-13. Michael Lawrence wrote: "Catholics differ from Protestants in a number of ways, but one of them surely is that after the Reformation—as a result of important strains in it, perhaps—the Christian political tradition became fairly exclusively a Catholic inheritance. The habit, going back at least to Augustine, of attempting to deduce from Christian doctrine principles around which to center the political and social orders is not, by and large, a Protestant habit; who has ever heard of Presbyterian politics?" Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: Catholics and Their History," *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 27.

<sup>59</sup> Wilhelmsen, "Hallowed Be Thy World," 13.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid. William H. Marshner believed that the secular United States could only memorialize its fallen soldiers for dying and wearing a uniform, not because they fought and died for the "things that matter in Eternity." He wondered "if God's adoring angels had ever heard of the First Amendment." William H. Marshner, "A Mass at the Valley of the Fallen," *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 12.

<sup>62</sup> Leonard P. Wessel, Jr., "Are the United Presbyterians Christian?" *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 23. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: Credo In Deum Neutrum," *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 9-10.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: Presbyterian Agony," *Triumph* 2 no. 7 (July, 1967): 9.

<sup>64</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Out Stake in Geneva," *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 10.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.

<sup>66</sup> William H. Marshner, "Ecumenism in Crisis: Some Catholic-Political Considerations," *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 18-19, 21.

<sup>67</sup> Harold O.J. Brown, "A Protestant Case for Co-Belligerency," *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 25. The Society for the Christian Commonwealth—*Triumph's* parent organization—for example, developed a speaker's bureau that including Protestant speakers. See Unsigned, "Society for the Christian Commonwealth," *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 5. The editors also included Protestant contributors, such as Brown and Robert W. Fox.

<sup>68</sup> William H. Marshner, "Ecumenism in Crisis: Some Catholic-Political Considerations," 18-21.

<sup>69</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Life in America," *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 5; and L. Brent Bozell, "Americans United For Life," *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 3, 11.

<sup>70</sup> L. Brent Bozell, interview by Patrick Allitt, 26 February 1991, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA. For other articles on ecumenism, see David Fitch, "Two Views of Avery Dulles, S.J.: Dogma, Dulles and Ecumenism," *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 24-27; Joseph S. Brusher, "Clio and the Theologians," *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 26-27; Robert W. Fox, "Is Ecumenism Possible?" *Triumph* 1 no. 11 (November, 1966): 22-24; Robert W. Fox, "The Protestant Burden," *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 36-38; John Wisner, "Wisner's World: Leisure and Slums," *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 24; Arnold Lunn, "With

No Apologies," *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 18-21; Michael J. Rooney, "Reactions: Eucharistic Euphemy," *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 5, 42; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: Cost Analysis Saves?" *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 10. An issue related to the ecumenical direction of the post-Vatican II Church, was the Pentecostal movement, which was, in part, "quickly accepted by the official Church" because of the Council's "embracing of the necessity of ecumenism." *The Encyclopedia of American Catholic History*, s.v. "Charismatic Renewal." The editors were not enthusiastic about the Pentecostal movement in the Church—what became known as the Catholic Charismatic movement—which emphasized an intense awareness of the Holy Spirit's presence and His subsequent conferral of charisms, namely the holy powers of healing, glossolalia (or speaking in tongues), and prophecy. *The Encyclopedia of American Catholic History*, s.v. "Charismatic Renewal." Contributor Thomas Barbarie wrote: "In truth, Pentecostalism is a chaotic negation of rationality, and as such, is peculiarly suitable for this, our age, in which most can read and few can think." (20) "Reflect for a moment," he added, "how strange indeed it is that those who so recently opposed Latin in the liturgy because of its obscurity have now endorsed total unintelligibility (glossolalia) as a means of communing with God." (22) Barbarie even argued that the Pentecostal movement was more dangerous than agnosticism. "The Catholic who at twenty becomes an agnostic," he wrote, "is much closer to eventual reabsorption than his counterpart who finds satisfaction in Pentecostalism. Agnosticism is nothing. Pentecostalism is nothing masquerading as something very real: existence itself." (22) Thomas J. Barbarie, "Tongues, Si! Latin, No!" *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 20-22. Reader Mrs. Edward Muha wrote that "the Church long ago termed this movement a form of Spiritism, a religion long since condemned by the Church as heresy, regarding it as synonymous with witchcraft and revolution." Mrs. Edward Muha, "Reactions: Apertura a Spirito," *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 6.

<sup>71</sup> Second Vatican Council, "Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions," *The Holy See*, [http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decl\\_19651028\\_nostra-aetate\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651028_nostra-aetate_en.html) (accessed July 30, 2008).

<sup>72</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Tannenbaum's Complaint," *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 5.

<sup>73</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Bishops Set Lines," *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 7.

<sup>74</sup> Editors, "Anti-Semitism in the Vatican?" *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 42.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>76</sup> For other articles on Catholic-Jewish relations, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: ADL's Anti-Semitism," *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 9-10; Editors, "Present Imperfect: America and Israel," *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 8-9.

<sup>77</sup> Editors, "Jew and Black," *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 41. The ecumenical turn also seemed to foster, in the editors' views, a more benign view of theological experimentation and a hesitation to condemn heresy for the sake of unity. But this was to hide from the truth. "The disunity which is based on the incompatibility of truth and falsehood, Dietrich von Hildebrand wrote, "cannot and should not be avoided. . . . Christ said: 'Do not suppose that I have come to bring peace to the earth; it is not peace I have come to bring, but a sword. For I have come to set man against his father, a daughter against her mother . . .' The truth of Christ, that is, must be preferred even to familial peace." (23) But true unity and salvation was found only in the truth of the Catholic Church, he noted, and thus it is the obligation, an obligation of charity, to use the anathema to condemn heretics to protect the faithful. But the Church's obligation of charity did not stop there it continues to pray for heretics, even if she is not in communion with them. Dietrich von Hildebrand, "The Charitable Anathema" *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 23-24. For articles on heresy, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: In Defense of Heresy," *Triumph* 6 no. 3

---

(March, 1971): 9-10; Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Leslie Dewart: Heretic or Hellene?" *Triumph* 2 no. 1 (January, 1967): 30-34; William H. Marshner, "Hans Küng: Infallible?: An Inquiry," *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 8-11. In the latter article, Marshner wrote: "it looks as though Küng, like Luther, is working from a personally formed and highly selective theological 'synthesis,' a construct based on favorite data in the New Testament, and boldly marketed as 'gospel.' . . . His is a sad world in which God remains in His heaven, alone infallible; the Church on earth can claim nothing from Him except some vague indefectibility which preserves her from no error and offers mankind, lost in a swamp of existential 'meanings,' no firm ground, no light. It is, in the last analysis, the *visibility* of the Church that Küng has lost. All that is left to him is the old 'high-Church' dream: a toothless 'petrine ministry' agreed to for sweet unity's sake by all the 'people of God' who see no cause to wrangle if nobody is certainly right." (8, 11). Also, see Unsigned, ed., "The Teilhard Papers," *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 11-14, 43; William H. Marshner, trans., "Replacing Christianity: The Teilhard Papers II," *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 28-31, 40-42; Unsigned, ed., "The Phenomenon of (Colored) Man: The Teilhard Papers III," *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 28-30, 43.

<sup>78</sup> William H. Marshner believed that much of the ugliness of the new mass derived from its adaptation to American culture, which, he reasoned, was thoroughly secular. He noted this after attending the new mass in Spain, which had a Catholic culture, and conceded that the new mass in Spain was not the abomination that it was in the United States. William H. Marshner, "A Mass at the Valley of the Fallen," *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 11-13.

<sup>79</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Toward an Incarnational Politics II: The Hour Is Short; The Hour Is Now," *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 29.

<sup>80</sup> For *The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, see Austin Flannery, ed., *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, 1981 ed. (Northport, NY: Costello Publishing Company, 1981), 1-282.

<sup>81</sup> The Latin Mass was not discarded; rather, it has become the traditional form of the Roman rite, while the Pauline Mass is the ordinary form.

<sup>82</sup> Donald G. McClane, "Liturgy: Present and Future: Why Renewal?" *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 39.

<sup>83</sup> Derrick, "Pavane for a Dead Liturgy," 18. Also, see Rose Kirby "Reactions: Pavane for a Dead Liturgy," *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 4.

<sup>84</sup> Derrick, "Pavane for a Dead Liturgy," 18. The "Canon" referred to the Eucharistic Prayer or the consecration in which the bread and wine became Christ's Body and Blood.

<sup>85</sup> Ronald D. Lambert, "The New Missal: Experiment in Heresy," *Triumph* 3 no. 3 (March, 1968): 21.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>87</sup> Dietrich von Hildebrand, "The Case for the Latin Mass," *Triumph* 1 no. 2 (October, 1966): 11.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*

---

<sup>91</sup> Ibid.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid, 12, 13. Hildebrand wrote: "It must be said with all emphasis that the question how much the faithful speak and sing during Mass is in no way the decisive criterion for the degree of real participation in holy Mass. Beautiful and desirable as exterior bodily participation and dialogue may be, inner participation is incomparably more important and essential." (16-17) "The Latin Mass (I mean the Mass instituted by St. Pius V) and the Gregorian chant favor an attitude of reverence and recollection;" he wrote, "the sublime spirit which they emanate offers the greatest chance for drawing the faithful into the holy action, helping them emerge from all profane things into the supernatural world of Christ." (17) Dietrich von Hildebrand, "Liturgy: Present and Future: Reverence and Recollection," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 16-17.

<sup>93</sup> Lawrence R. Brown, "The Language of the West," *Triumph* 1 no. 4 (December, 1966): 16.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., 17. Brown believed that the vernacular mass would threaten the Church's missionary role—that it would no longer present the "Christian West" as a distinct religious and intellectual tradition "over against the other peoples and societies of the world, civilized and savage, Christian and non-Christian. Such unity, be it noted, does not imply hostility to the rest of the world," he added, "but simply a distinctive religious, moral and intellectual tradition—what men have always meant, in other words, by 'a civilization.'" (17-18)

<sup>96</sup> Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, "The Reactionary Vernacular," *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 18.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., 18, 19.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., 20.

<sup>99</sup> Thomas Day, "Arts and the Age: Must Church Music Be Bad Music," *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 32.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., 33.

<sup>102</sup> Richard J. Schuler, "Who Killed Sacred Music," *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 23.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid. Emphasis added.

<sup>104</sup> John D. Rosen, "The New Iconoclasm," *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 26, 27.

<sup>105</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Respondeo: Dicendum: Introibo as Altare Dei," *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 30.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid.

<sup>107</sup> The editors disdained efforts to adapt the mass to modern conventions, because modern society, they believed, was thoroughly secular and any borrowing would impinge the sacredness of the mass. The old mass, in contrast, was *developed* in a Christian civilization.

<sup>108</sup> John De Rosen, "The Altar," *Triumph* 3 no. 11 (November, 1968): 29.

- 
- <sup>109</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>110</sup> von Hildebrand, "The Case for the Latin Mass," 13.
- <sup>111</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>112</sup> Lambert, "The New Missal: Experiment in Heresy," 18.
- <sup>113</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>114</sup> Derrick, "Pavane for a Dead Liturgy," 17.
- <sup>115</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>116</sup> Ibid., 18.
- <sup>117</sup> Ibid., 17.
- <sup>118</sup> Patricia B. Bozell, "Liturgy: Present and Future: Mystery Rationalized," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 12.
- <sup>119</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>120</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Crucifying the Mass," *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 10; and Wilhelmssen, "Respondeo: Dicendum: Introibo as Altare Dei," 30.
- <sup>121</sup> Editors, "Exit Holland," *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 42.
- <sup>122</sup> Editors, "The English Cannon," *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 38.
- <sup>123</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Autumn of the Church," 37. The editors believed that imprudent reformers had also introduced apostasy into the new catechetics. As with the doctrinally-suspect changes in the liturgy, the editors blamed the problem on the bishops' practice of conceding to much authority to a bureaucracy to implement change. In referring to the crisis in catechetics, the editors wrote that "Until the bishops relearn that theirs is the responsibility for the flock, the flock had best rely on itself to teach its children what religion is all about." Editors, Present Imperfect: St. Louis Blues," *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 10; Also, see Editors, "Make It Bind and Bind Fast," *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 46. The editors wrote that *A New Catechism: Catholic Faith for Adults* was "actually . . . an American edition of the notorious 'Dutch Catechism'—notorious because, among other reasons, theologians of the Vatican's Doctrinal Congregation have found 13 'major' and 48 'minor' doctrinal errors in the text." It implicitly denied, for example, they noted, the virgin birth, the doctrine of original sin, and monogenesis. Editors, "Doctrine in Dutch," *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 38. The editors held a forum on *The Roots of Faith* series, a catechism for high school students, that, they wrote, "probably has the best academic credentials of all the new catechisms; the group of scholars who prepared this series represent a microcosm of the Catholic educational establishment." Thomas Molnar wrote the following of the catechism: "*The Roots of Faith* does not expressly ridicule the Faith; but the child will inevitably be left with the impression that the Faith in which he is brought up is at best imperfect, the work of fallible men and outmoded institutions, not to be abandoned, perhaps, but in dire need of completion and maturation." (18) "The authors of *The Roots of Faith*, he wryly asserted, "may be pleased with the knowledge that they will never have to bear the burden of having saved anyone's soul." (19) Thomas Molnar, "Catechism V. The Child: A Political Faith," *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 17-19. Robert W. Fox wrote that *The Roots of Faith* series was a failure because "the main point of Christian instruction—that there is a God, revealed in Jesus Christ, who loves him and wills his salvation—will pass him [the student] by." Robert W. Fox,

---

“Catechism V. The Child: What Catechisms Are For,” *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 23. Michael Lawrence urged parents, whose children attended a Catholic school that used *The Roots of Faith*, to remove them from the school, enroll them in a public school, and take over the role of educating them in the faith. Michael Lawrence, “Catechism V. The Child: What Parents Are For,” *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 23-24.

<sup>124</sup> Gary Potter, “The Liturgy Club,” *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 37. Jane Bret wrote that “Liturgical robber-barons have simply stolen from under an unsuspecting and now suffering laity two thousand years of tradition, beauty, form, mystery and blessed silence.” Jane Bret, “The Two Liturgies: Liturgy in the Age of McLuhan,” *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 16.

<sup>125</sup> Potter, “The Liturgy Club,” 37.

<sup>126</sup> Ronald D. Lambert, “The Threat to the Mass,” *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 20.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, 21, 21-24. (20-24). Also, see Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “The Death of the Age of Analysis,” *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 24-25. Christopher Derrick noted, in response to the attack on transubstantiation, that Catholics must call transubstantiation true “or we have to admit that for a great many centuries the Catholic Church has consistently urged material idolatry upon the Faithful.” (22) “For Christians, as for the Jews and the Moslems and all monotheists, the First Commandment comes first. Nothing but God is to be worshipped;” he wrote, “and it *matters* whether the Thing in the tabernacle, is god or not-God.” (22) “We *must* kneel in worship before God, and we must *not* kneel in worship before ‘a little piece of bread’ if it’s only that: we need to care passionately—overwhelmingly—about the difference, however difficult it may be for us to grasp, however deep the mystery.” (22) Christopher Derrick, “Does Transubstantiation Matter?” *Triumph* 3 no. 7 (July, 1968): 19-22. For transubstantiation, also see Vincent P. Miceli, “Transubstantiation: Anchor of Orthodoxy,” *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 27.

<sup>128</sup> Ronald D. Lambert, “The Threat to the Mass,” 21, 20. Lambert was critical of those who responded to the call for liturgical reform. “Predictably,” he wrote, “the men who responded to it [the call for reform] most enthusiastically were not those whose orthodox regard for the Mass would deter them from too radical changes. Rather, the movement was quickly dominated by men careless of doctrine and contemptuous of tradition—men whose only notable reverence is for the spirit of the age. If modern man finds the Mass uncongenial, these reformers judge the trouble must be with the Mass, not with the man.” Ronald D. Lambert, “Liturgy: Present and Future: Disastrous Invitation,” *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 13.

<sup>129</sup> Editors, “The Battle for the Mass,” *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 37.

<sup>130</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Crucifying the Mass,” *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 10.

<sup>131</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Empty Womb, Empty Altar,” *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 21.

<sup>132</sup> Editors, “The English Canon,” *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 37, 38. They called the new canon “a ‘Peoples’ Mass,’” “attuned to the least elevated sensibilities in the body of the faithful,” “flat,” and “altogether uninspiring,” and “vastly inferior to the rhythms of the Anglican liturgy, and several cuts below such older Catholic versions in English translation as the St. Andrew’s and the Maryknoll.” (37) The editors wrote that “No one violation of the Latin text in the English translation is sufficient smoke to prove fire; but all of them together add up to a frightening conclusion: the new English Canon not only sins against all the conventions of faithful translation and good taste; it also sins in the suppression of doctrines integral to the full profession of the Roman Catholic Faith. It accomplishes, in a way its authors could not have misunderstood, a revolution in the prayer life of the Faithful.” (38)

---

<sup>133</sup> Ibid., 38.

<sup>134</sup> Ibid.

<sup>135</sup> Lambert, "The Threat to the Mass," 21.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid., 24. Lambert wrote that the translation of the new missal "abounds with terms that are coarse, vulgar, and offensive, with words and expressions that say too much, much more than the original text." "In some of its aspects," he wrote, "this aversion to reverence becomes downright absurd. Take, for instance, the expunging of all Thee's and Thou's from the liturgy, replacing them by You's. The result of this change is not only to reduce people's consciousness of God's transcendence; it is also to scuttle the majesty of great language. Imagine the outcry if some modernizer were to publish an edition of Shakespeare with all thou's made you's—to render it thereby more intelligible to modern man. He would rightly be denounced as a barbarian, a vandal, and an ass." He noted that there was "systematic degradation of supernatural values" in the new missal. Ronald D. Lambert, "The New Missal: Experiment in Heresy," *Triumph* 3 no. 3 (March, 1968): 19.

<sup>137</sup> Editors, "The Battle for the Mass," *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 38.

<sup>138</sup> Editors, "The New Missal," *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 42.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid.

<sup>141</sup> Ibid.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid. Bozell wrote: "If the Church's whole destiny is assured, why fear for the Mass? If this moment will pass in other difficulties, why of course it will pass for the Church's central public act." "The actual form of the post-modern Mass is not so easy to discern, but two things are certain: it will be much better than what we have to struggle through today;" he wrote, "and it will bear the essential configurations of what is incorrectly called (as though Trent invented it) the Tridentine Mass. The reason for this is that there is an analogy between Newman's teaching on the development of doctrine, and the development of the Church's worship. Both reflect the Church's movement through history, both promise growth in richness and in depth of understanding, and so both spurn the idea of backing up a millennium and a half and starting over." L. Brent Bozell, "Liturgy: Present and Future," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 39.

<sup>144</sup> John Wisner, "What Happened to the Church," *Triumph* 3 no. 2 (February, 1968): 24.

<sup>145</sup> Wilhelmsen, "Respondeo: Dicendum: Introibo as Altare Dei," 31.

<sup>146</sup> Editors, "The New Missal II," *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 42.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid. The editors reprinted a letter sent by Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani, prefect emeritus of the Sacred Congregation for the Faith, to Pope Paul VI, which was accompanied by a critical study of the new mass. The letter and study pleaded for the continuation of the old mass and questioned the juridical validity of the new mass and criticized it for doctrinal ambiguity. See "Special Supplement: The Ottaviani Intervention: A Critical Study of the Novus Ordo Missae," *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 22A-22L.

---

<sup>148</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Sacrilige: A Time to Act," *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 22.

<sup>149</sup> Editors, "The New Missal II," 42.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: Save the Old Mass," *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 7.

<sup>152</sup> McClane, "Liturgy: Present and Future: Why Renewal?" 39.

<sup>153</sup> Editors, "Mobilizing for the Mass," *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 42. The editors wrote that the translation "systematically suppresses expression of awe, reverence and adoration; eliminates suggestions of the desirability of asceticism; transforms Satan into 'hatred'; and introduces a vague, quasi-political communitarianism by writing down words that do not appear at all in the Latin. Of humility, there is to be none: the Latin 'servants' are 'people'; *mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa* is 'I blame myself.' By why go on? The ICEL [International Committee on English] did not intend to translate the Mass, but to make a Mass vaguely similar to the one authorized by Rome; the result is an aesthetic and doctrinal abortion."

<sup>154</sup> Editors, "For the Mass: Open Season," *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 42.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid. The editors were particularly concerned with the catechetics surrounding the new mass. "What troubles is the barrage of propaganda that has accompanied the changes—the catechesis is inspired by the 'liturgical experts,' underwritten by the bishop, and dutifully transmitted in the parishes by the lesser clergy; this catechesis has created a growing and increasingly irresistible suspicion that those who have conjured up the new forms do not believe in the old substance." They wanted an orthodox catechesis to compliment the new mass, "stressing the orthodox understanding of the Sacrifice." Editors, "The Sacrifice," *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 10. Lambert argued that the liturgical reformers, with "faulty translations, their instructions and commentaries," have "planted seeds of confusion and doubt concerning Christ's divinity, the Real Presence in the Eucharist, the sacrificial character of the Mass." Ronald D. Lambert, "Liturgy: Present and Future: Disastrous Invitation," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 15.

<sup>156</sup> Editors, "For the Mass: Open Season," 42.

<sup>157</sup> Editors, "The Sacrifice," *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 10. "Whatever lesson the Holy Ghost is teaching the Church today," Bozell wrote, "it is not to be imaged that part of the instruction is that in the matter of worship He was on vacation between the reign of St. Gregory the Great in the sixth century and that of the to-be-sainted Paul VI in the twentieth." L. Brent Bozell, "Liturgy: Present and Future," 39.

<sup>158</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Two, Three, Many Liturgies," *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 8-9. Wilhelmsen wrote: "If the entire Church embraces a variety of rites—following, thus, the genius of its catholicity—why can there not be a variety within the Latin Rite, one variant of which would be Latin! This ought to appeal to the irony of the Latin temper." Wilhelmsen, "Respondeo: Dicendum: Introibo as Altare Dei," 31.

<sup>159</sup> Wilhelmsen, "Respondeo: Dicendum: Introibo as Altare Dei," 30. Gary Potter reviled the English translation: "I feel fortunate that the *New Ordo* is available to me, living where I do, in Latin," because, he noted, the English translation "really does offend me so much, as writing and generally as theater, that I'm not quite sure what I'd do if I lived in a city where the Latin wasn't available. Go Byzantine rite?" Gary K. Potter, "Liturgy: Present and Future: Question Closed," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 12.

---

<sup>160</sup> Wilhelmssen, "Respondeo: Dicendum: Introibo ad Altare Dei," 30.

<sup>161</sup> William H. Marshner, "Contra Gentiles: Revisiting the Liturgy Question," *Triumph* 7 no. 10 (December, 1972): 31.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid.

<sup>163</sup> Ibid.

<sup>164</sup> Ibid. Also, see William H. Marshner, "Contra Gentiles: Archaism: Diaphany of the Sacred," *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 29.

<sup>165</sup> Bret, "The Two Liturgies: Liturgy in the Age of McLuhan," 19; Bryan Houghton, "The Two Liturgies: Why They Are at War," *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 11-14.

<sup>166</sup> Ibid., 14.

<sup>167</sup> Ibid.

<sup>168</sup> Ibid.

<sup>169</sup> Ibid., 36.

<sup>170</sup> Ibid. The "Little Flower," who was Saint Thérèse of Lisieux, and Saint Bernadette Soubirous of Lourdes were saintly at very young ages. *The Modern Catholic Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Thérèse of Lisieux," and *The Modern Catholic Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Lourdes."

<sup>171</sup> Houghton, "The Two Liturgies: Why They Are at War," 37.

<sup>172</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Pope and the Mass," *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 9.

<sup>173</sup> Ibid.

<sup>174</sup> Dietrich von Hildebrand, "Belief and Obedience: The Critical Difference," *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 11. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Pope and the Mass," 9.

<sup>175</sup> Dietrich von Hildebrand, "Belief and Obedience: The Critical Difference," 11-12. "There is but one absolute theoretical authority" Hildebrand wrote: "the Church in matters of faith and morals. It is the basis of our Catholic faith that Christ has entrusted His divine Revelation to the Holy Church and that the Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit is infallible in matters of faith and morals—that she is an absolute theoretical authority in these matters. It is because of this absoluteness that we are obliged—even morally obliged—to accept the Church's word as true, to believe in it." (11)

<sup>176</sup> Hildebrand, "Belief and Obedience: The Critical Difference," 11.

<sup>177</sup> Ibid., 13.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid.

<sup>180</sup> Ibid.

<sup>181</sup> Ibid.

---

<sup>182</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Pope and the Mass," 9; and Hildebrand, "Belief and Obedience: The Critical Difference," 11-14. Hildebrand wrote: "Thus I hope and pray that the Tridentine Mass will not be abolished, but will continue to be celebrated side by side with the new *Ordo*. Furthermore, I hope and pray that in the course of time, its superiority, from the pastoral as well as the doctrinal standpoint, will be recognized by the Holy See, and that in the future the Tridentine Mass will be reinstated as the official liturgy of the Holy Mass in the Western Church." (14)

<sup>183</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Pope and the Mass," 9. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: Appalling Responsibility," *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 7.

<sup>184</sup> For an examination of these Catholic separatist movements, see Michael W. Cuneo, *The Smoke of Satan: Conservative and Traditionalist Dissent in Contemporary American Catholicism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997; Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1999), 81-120. The editors were very critical of these schismatic movements. To them, they were Protestant-like, in that they—their leaders—posited themselves, above the Church, as the interpreters of Christian truth. See Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: Sillier Yet," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 25. William Marshner classified both liberal Catholics, who sought to constantly update the Church, and traditionalist Catholics, who broke with the Church, as (leftwing and rightwing) "integrist." Integrist, he wrote, "holds that everything in the Church and in the social order forms part of one, huge, 'organic' system and that nothing in the Church or the social order should ever be changed from the form that prevailed just before the outbreak of some revolution, ordinarily the French." Integrist, in this classical sense, subscribed to a form of "evolutionism," it held that the pinnacle of a Christian society—politically and religiously—*developed* in the nineteenth century and that the only objective should be to restore such forms in their entirety. This "error" was manifest in the current turmoil in the Church. The rightwing integrist looked upon the pre-Vatican II Church as the highpoint or perfection of Catholicism; and when things began to change, even non-essential things, they believed that the faith was no longer the faith. They believed that nothing, as it all constituted a whole, could ever change without destroying the faith (which had reached its perfection). Thus, they broke from the Church believing that it was no longer the Church and hoped to preserve and eventually restore all that existed before the Vatican-II revolution. If rightwing integrist employed evolutionism in service of the counterrevolution, their leftwing counterparts employed it in service of the revolution. The leftwing integrist used evolutionism to justify a developmental view of the faith, that the Church must constantly update itself to the changing world to be relevant and efficacious, and if it did not, the faith would die. William H. Marshner, "Contra Gentiles: Integrist in America I," *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 16. "The left-wing Integrist is easy to spot because he quickly falls into heresy (Modernism) by denying that the deposit of Faith is immutable. The crude right-wing Integrist is also easy to spot because he claims that something which the Church has already changed was really immutable, and so he falls into despair or schism." William H. Marshner, "Contra Gentiles: Integrist in America II," *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 14. Both misunderstood true nature of the Church. The Church was in part immutable and in some ways developmental as it had both a transcendent and immanent nature. Also, see William H. Marshner, "New Mass for Independence Day: The Americanization of J. Christ," *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 26-27; and William H. Marshner, "Contra Gentiles: Integrist-as-Slur," *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 26. Also, see Fr. Gommard A. De Pauw, "Reactions: Fr. De Pauw Objects," *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 6. For other articles on liberal Catholicism, see Gary Potter, "Potter's Field: Getting Together," *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 28; Gary Potter, "Potter's Field: Is the American Dream about to Burst?" *Triumph* 2 no. 8 (August, 1967): 31; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Dialogue at N(C)R," *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 7; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Bloody Lies," *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 9-10; Editors, "Life and the Facts of Life," *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 46.

<sup>185</sup> Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: Old Mass, New Mass: Mass," *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 14.

---

<sup>186</sup> Ibid.

<sup>187</sup> Ibid., 15.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid.

<sup>189</sup> Ibid. For other articles on liturgical changes, see John Sheffield, "Reactions," *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 4; in his letter, Sheffield wrote the following in response to the New Ordo: "I wish to declare myself aged, elderly and fossilized both mentally and emotionally." Kirby, "Reactions: Pavane for a Dead Liturgy," 4. Kirby wrote: "I just cannot accept the changes in the Mass. . . . I will worship God at home on Sundays. It will no longer be a sin to miss Mass. I will not consider it a sin if I don't support my parish church. . . . The Catholic religion now *centers around man rather than God.*" Editors, "Present Imperfect: Why Not Ask the People," *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 9-10; Editors, "Present Imperfect: I Am a Man," *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 7; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Storm Before the Calm," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 7; John A. McManemin, "Liturgy: Present and Future: Unsatisfying Compromise," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 15; Rev. Joseph M. Connolly, "Liturgy: Present and Future: Electric to Soggy," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 15-16; Michael Lawrence, "Liturgy: Present and Future: Obscure Spirit," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 16. Also, see Rev. Joseph M. Champlin, "Liturgy: Present and Future: Remarkable, Uneven, Incomplete," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 11; Dale Francis, "Liturgy: Present and Future: Like, No; Love, Yes," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 12-13; Lorenzo M. Albacete, "Liturgy: Present and Future: A Matter of Culture," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 13; Rev. Ralph S. March, "Liturgy: Present and Future: Needed: A Choice," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 17; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: On the Mass," *Triumph* 10 no. 4 (April, 1975): 8.

<sup>190</sup> Pius XII, "On the Sacred Liturgy," The Holy See, [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/pius\\_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xii\\_enc\\_20111947\\_mediator-dei\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_20111947_mediator-dei_en.html) (accessed July 31, 2008)

<sup>191</sup> Joseph Pieper, "What Makes Priests Different?" *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1972): 27.

<sup>192</sup> Joseph Pieper, "What Makes Priests Different? II," *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1972): 28-29. Pieper wrote: "when the priest, celebrating the Eucharistic mystery, pronounces these same words in the canon of the Mass that he speaks and acts, in the narrow and strict sense, *in persona Christi*. In this case something qualitatively, ontologically new happens—something that no longer has anything to do with the category of 'quotation.' Here something is said and done on the basis of a real identification which radically transcends and leaves behind the model closest to your own comprehension, the relation of an actor to the figure he portrays." (28-29)

<sup>193</sup> The editors noted that the democratic turn supposedly fostered by the Council promoted the "principle that priests are responsible 'to the people,' rather than to Christ and His Apostles," and this notion was spreading "all over the world." Editors, "Present Imperfect: One God, One Vote," *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 10.

<sup>194</sup> Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present* (Garden City, NY: Image Books, 1987), 224-225, 437; Charles Morris, *American Catholic: The Saints and Sinners Who Built America's Most Powerful Church* (New York: Random House, 1997): 178-179, 276, 320, 376; Thomas Bokenkotter, *A Concise History of the Catholic Church*. Rev. ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1990), 365-375; *The Encyclopedia of American Catholic History*, s.v. "Vatican Council II and American Catholics."

<sup>195</sup> Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 436-437; and Chester Gillis, *Roman Catholicism in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 96-102, 245-258.

---

<sup>196</sup> The editors celebrated Pope Paul VI's encyclical, *On the Celibacy of the Priest*, which reaffirmed the Church's teaching on priestly celibacy. See Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Golden Law," *Triumph* 2 no. 8 (August, 1967): 7.

<sup>197</sup> Editors, "The Celibate Priest: A Fuller Man," *Triumph* 1 no. 2 (October, 1966): 38. "In a community oriented to God, the highest authority—let us have no nonsense about equality of vocations—is the priestly authority," the editors wrote.

<sup>198</sup> Editors, "The Celibate Priest: A Fuller Man," 38.

<sup>199</sup> John Wisner, "Wisner's World: Priestly Celibacy," *Triumph* 2 no. 8 (August, 1967): 20.

<sup>200</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>201</sup> *Ibid.* The editors wrote the sacrifice of celibacy generated "a great 'spiritual intensity.' This sacrifice is nothing less than the mystery of the Cross, and because it is the Cross, the Christian is at home with it. That is why 'it can become *easy, glad, beautiful, Catholic.*'" A non-celibate clergy was an incapable clergy, they concluded. Editors, "The Capables and the Incapables," *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 42.

<sup>202</sup> Editors, "Nuns Are Not Ladies," *Triumph* 3 no. 3 (March, 1968): 37.

<sup>203</sup> Editors, "Aggiornamento . . . Finally," *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 45.

<sup>204</sup> Unsigned, "Triumph on TV," *Triumph* 1 no. 2 (October, 1966): 35.

<sup>205</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>206</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: In the Heart of the World," *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 10.

<sup>207</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>208</sup> Editors, "Nuns Are Not Ladies," *Triumph* 3 no. 3 (March, 1968): 37.

<sup>209</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Non Sense and Nun Sense," *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1972): 9.

<sup>210</sup> *Ibid.*, 9-10.

<sup>211</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: What Price Theology?" *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 6.

<sup>212</sup> Editors, "The Seminaries," *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 42.

<sup>213</sup> Farley Clinton, "Diabolus est Jesuita . . . ita! Ita!" *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 21.

<sup>214</sup> *Ibid.*, 22.

<sup>215</sup> *Ibid.*, 23-24.

<sup>216</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Memo to Good Jesuits," *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 7. Also, see Editors, "The Celibate Priest: A Fuller Man," *Triumph* 1 no. 2 (October, 1966): 38.

<sup>217</sup> Editors, "Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam," *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 40.

---

<sup>218</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Memo to Good Jesuits," *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 7; and Editors, "Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam," *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 39-41. Father Pedro Arrupe was the Superior General of the Society of Jesus. The editors received many replies from angry Jesuits to Clinton's article, but they noted that none of them attempted to refute the charge of Modernism. "Neither he [Clinton], nor we, wished to 'hurt' you," they wrote, "and we unqualifiedly regret your pain. But we can hope it will be turned to the rescue of your famous Company. Is there a better way for *Jesuits* to work for the greater glory of God?" Editors, "Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam," 41. Also, see Editors, "The Celibate Priest: A Fuller Man," 38; Editors, "Present Imperfect: *America* v. Pope," *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 7-8; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Unholy Orders," *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 7. For other articles on priests, see Christopher Derrick, "Prophets and Pastors," *Triumph* 4 no 5 (May, 1969): 24-26; Editors, "Present Imperfect: One God, One Vote," *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 10; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: Roma Locuta, Causa Dealbata," *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 5-6.

<sup>219</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: What Floats on Top," *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 9-10.

<sup>220</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Democratic Murder," *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 9.

<sup>221</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Grounds for Divorce," *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 8; Also, see William H. Marshner, "Contra Gentiles: Credo in un Dio Crudel," *Triumph* 8 no. 9 (November, 1972): 27.

<sup>222</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Grounds for Divorce," 8; see also William H. Marshner, "Contra Gentiles: Credo in un Dio Crudel," 27.

<sup>223</sup> They argued that the reasoning of such liberal Catholics on abortion could be condensed into the following: "(1) The voided abortion laws are no great loss, here and now, because they were unenforceable and even unjust in the absence of comprehensive maternal-welfare and child-development programs. . . . (2) the real cure for abortion is universal contraception . . . therefore . . . (3) the American bishops are morally bankrupt in their present roof-raising over abortion, having brought this mess upon themselves by their adamance over *Humanae Vitae*, not to mention their moral insensitivity to the 'sacredness of life' in Vietnam . . . (4) the bishops are compounding their dogmatic mistakes by taking an impossibly rigid line on the abortion question itself; sure the fetus is human, but when the mothers' life or health is seriously at stake, or when the fetus is deformed, or the result of rape or incest, then there is a legitimate 'conflict of rights,' a conflict which it would be unreasonable always to settle in the fetus's favor." Editors, "Present Imperfect: 'The Collaborators,'" *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 7. The editors also argued that *America* "has made its peace with the abortion culture in our country. Though still maintaining an anti-abortion pose, the magazine's special issue on abortion, published August 10 [1970] managed to compromise every issue of significance in the pro-life fight. In three separate articles, *America* authors: 1) accused the Church of hypocrisy in the anti-abortion fight because it is not also anti-capital punishment and anti-war; 2) criticized the fight for a Human Life Amendment as 'impossible,' urging instead a few token state laws which would appear to limit abortions but in fact would do nothing of the kind; and 3) condemned 'rigoristic' Catholics for holding to the position that life is sacred from fertilization, calling instead for legislation to protect only 'the biologically hominized being.'" Unsigned, "Life in America," *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 23.

<sup>224</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: What Floats on Top," 10.

<sup>225</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: What Floats on Top," 10. For other articles on issues in the post-Vatican II Church, see, see Robert J. Dwyer, "Ad-Joor-Na-Mint-Ah!" *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 16, 37; Farley Clinton, "The Seeds of Vatican II," *Triumph* 1 no. 3 (November, 1966): 25-28; Peter Wells, "Parish Clergy to the Rescue," *Triumph* 2 no. 8 (August, 1967): 11-14;

---

Editors, "The Church This Christmas," *Triumph* 3 no. 12 (December, 1968): 42; Jeffrey Hart, "Our Prematurely Patriotic Church," *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 24-27; Francis Canavan, S.J. "Rumors of Disbelief," *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 16-18; Editors, "Saints for Our Season," *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 45; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Bible Truth," *Triumph* 8 no. 9 (November, 1973): 7-8; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Reconciling Sinners," *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 7; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Pater Si, Mater No," *Triumph* 10 no. 6 (June, 1975): 9-10.

## CHAPTER V

### “THE SOVERIEGNTY OF CHRIST—OR CHAOS”<sup>1</sup>

‘Yes, I am a King. I was born for this; I came into the world for this; to bear witness to the truth; and all who are on the side of truth listen to my voice.’

—John 18:37

For by His incarnation the Father’s Word assumed, and sanctified through His cross and resurrection, the whole of man, body and soul, and through that totality the whole of nature created by God for man’s use.

—*Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*<sup>2</sup>

Secular liberals were completing the de-sacralization of Western Civilization—triggered by the Renaissance, the Reformation, the Enlightenment, and the French Revolution—and were thus further directing man and woman away from their true purpose; to know, love, and serve God, to glorify Him in all things. They were disconnecting humankind from God, without which humankind was further stunted and destined to wallow in sin and despair. The cure, the editors exclaimed, was to convert America to the Roman Catholic faith and sacralize its public life.

## Secular Liberalism (and Conservatism)

The United States' impending collapse was manifest in the immoral and tumultuous condition of the country—in the moral bankruptcy of its politics (including especially the violations of the moral law, namely financing contraception and legalizing abortion), in the failure both to win and fight justly in Vietnam, in the secularization of education, in the student rebellions, in the increase in crime, in the practice of immoral economics, and in the racial strife plaguing the cities; all of which was the expression of sin and despair. So decadent was the secular-liberal order, the editors believed, that they confidently predicted in June, 1968 its collapse: “Anyone who is not aware that the liberal Republic is coming down, and that it could be a matter of months, at most a few years, before the wreckage is visibly upon us, is too insensate,” they charged, “to hope to draw into profitable conversation.”<sup>3</sup>

The collapse was rooted in the secular-liberal worldview, which secularized man and woman and their world. The editors wrote:

The central tenet of liberalism . . . is that man is on his own. His personal life is neither dependent on nor answerable to any external Authority, nor, in its own sphere, is the public order he constructs. It follows, as the necessary antidote to disillusionment and despair, that human life and human society are perfectable by the agency of man. But since man, by himself, cannot function in the realm of matter. That search, in turn, requires experimentation under the standard of utility; thus the famous American pragmatism which may, in some circumstances, counsel rugged individualism and self-reliance, but in others, recourse to the collectivity, or to the support of technology. Still, liberalism recognized that matter may not be everything and thus urges man to *reach* for the spirit—for truth: on the understanding, however, that one man's reach is as good as another's (. . . relativism): and on the consequent understanding that any affirmation of Truth must be denied (. . . nihilism).<sup>4</sup>

In sum, secular-liberalism, “the American creed,” was “a revolt against God.”<sup>5</sup>

The turmoil of the late-1960s erupted, the editors believed, from a turning away from God. If man and woman no longer knew God, they despaired, because they no longer lived in consonance with their true, God-oriented being and purpose to know, love, serve, and glorify God; and, if man and woman no longer believed in God, they no longer subjected themselves to Him. If they were no longer connected to and thus restrained by God—which was ultimately and most profoundly an internal restraint—they required, because of a persistent concupiscence, much greater external restraint. Yet the secular-liberal governors, because they appeared unwilling to reassert order, had lost faith in their worldview, as the turmoil was both the result and rejection of their secular-liberal faith, and, the editors concluded, they “no longer *wish* to govern.”<sup>6</sup>

Secular-liberal governors had ruled by appeasing man and woman—by denying their sinful nature (by locating the source of political and social error outside of them) and by focusing on satisfying their material appetites.<sup>7</sup> Man, now barbarized—the “orthodox view of secular-liberals is,” John Wisner noted laconically, “that they are sons of monkeys”—and starving for God (“the Word of God is as necessary to him as his daily bread,” he added), was back in the wild.<sup>8</sup> The trajectory for a God-less collapsing liberal America, then, was disorder and then likely enslavement through some sort of police state. “We seem to have only two options: a police state, with pointed bayonets our only safeguard against the switchblade; or mob rule, by enraged and outraged citizens,” the editors wrote, “who take the law they once respected into their own hands and fling

aside order to combat the terror and the tyranny of anarchy.”<sup>9</sup> “Everywhere as the religion has decayed police forces have increased,” Wisner wrote; “If men will not maintain order by adjusting themselves to the will of God then they will be broken to the will of God by the servile or police state.”<sup>10</sup> “All authority on earth comes from God,” the editors wrote.<sup>11</sup> “Disbelieve that (or ignore it) and you may put a policeman on every corner, you may lock up every felon for his natural life, you may get rid of every permissive judge in the land—but,” alas, they argued, “you will not have law and order. You will have a police state.”<sup>12</sup> Liberal America, “entering a winter,” was truly a “doomed land.”<sup>13</sup>

Yet such suffering was instructive; it was, the editors believed, punishment for turning away from God. To gain God’s mercy, America must “bend the knee.”<sup>14</sup> It was also, then, a calling to “cleanse and purify”—to “try again to renew the world in Christ.”<sup>15</sup> In addition to a possible police state or mob rule, there was “a third choice,” the editors reminded their readers, “St. Paul told the Romans of it two thousand years ago: ‘Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believes.’”<sup>16</sup> If the source of the turmoil was sin and despair, God was the source of order and fulfillment and the Roman Catholic Church—the “Church Jesus Christ founded to continue His redemption”—was “the light of nations, the only refuge,” the hope for renewal, that is, it was the true avenue to God’s grace and salvation; the “Church,” the editors wrote, “will be called upon to shape the new world.”<sup>17</sup>

Given that the editors believed that their calling as Roman Catholics was to reinstitute the kingship of Christ in the public order—an objective that was

“*outside*” the American ideological dialectic—they did not align themselves with the Right.<sup>18</sup> Conservatism, which they understood as principally classical liberalism, was not only incapable of renewing America, it was, like secular liberalism, the cause of its decadence, because, L. Brent Bozell reasoned, there was no “essential dichotomy” between them; both were merely different branches of the classical liberal tree.<sup>19</sup> (The editors favored the traditionalist-wing of the predominantly classical liberal conservative movement. Bozell admitted that “a deep gulf” existed between them and that he preferred the former “for its essential piety toward history, especially that part of it which God has been in since the Incarnation,” yet warned that traditionalists “run the danger of slipping into positivism, into an inordinate friendship with the *is* or *was*, and thus of forgetting that Christ came to transfigure history.”<sup>20</sup>)

Bozell conceded that classical-liberal conservatives had preserved more of the “ideal of nineteenth-century” liberalism that had placed an emphasis on a “*self-fulfillment*,” that “acknowledged the spiritual dimension,” which had prevented it from becoming, like secular liberalism, “an exclusively materialist ideal, preoccupied with wealth, sex, and attendant pleasures.”<sup>21</sup> Yet classical liberalism still tended toward materialism, “given the parent ideal of self-fulfillment,” which “emerged as a modern, essentially un-Christian notion, from the Renaissance—which was concerned,” Bozell wrote, “with the fulfillment of the *natural* self, at the expense of the supernatural self, tends to concentration on the *physical* self: on the appetites of matter. This is because man’s fallen nature, unsupported by grace, tends to animalhood.”<sup>22</sup> Its most fatal flaw was not the

resultant materialism but the root emphasis on self-fulfillment; even the acknowledgment of the spiritual dimension was predicated on the assumption that it “could be sustained and moral discipline imposed by the naked strength of the individual.”<sup>23</sup> Self-fulfillment—actually a “pre-Christian idea” traceable to “Adam”—was, Bozell noted, the sin “to assert, and reassert, man’s ability to fulfill himself by himself; to assert, and reassert, his *self-sufficiency*. Which is denied by Christ who says: without Me you can do nothing.”<sup>24</sup>

Because of this sin—which was common to both conservatism and secular-liberalism—the “public life, as it now exists, is an enormous obstacle to virtue, if not to salvation. It is a fierce agent of Satan. Yet it is meant to provide,” Bozell instructed, “inducements to virtue and occasions of grace. It is meant to be a place where God is signified in His things.”<sup>25</sup> The central problem of modern society (or the modern dialectic) was the development of a human-centered and God-less universe, where humankind’s self-sufficiency was absolute and reigned over and above God—the result of which was a desecralized political and social order. The synthesizing trajectory to this secular utopia was the secular-democratic method (the thesis) and the secular-totalitarian method (the antithesis); both, albeit through different means, sought to enshrine man and woman as gods. Secular liberalism and conservatism were within the thesis—comprising their own secondary trajectory toward synthesis as thesis and antithesis. Neither ideology could transcend this dialectic because both rejected the “Christian teaching that the proper goal of the order of the public life is to help open men to Christ.”<sup>26</sup>

Bozell argued that conservatives dismissed attempts to sacralize the public life out of a fear of presumptuously “trying to cast the City of Man into a reflection, however, distorted, of the City of God,” but to do so was to abandon “the City of Man, as the Incarnate God did not.”<sup>27</sup> To “fall back on the great Augustinian dichotomy as justification for severing the sacral and secular orders” was to ignore that it was also an “eschatological theory;” and, as such, conservatives must “understand—with Augustine—that the entire and only commandment of Christian politics is to take Christ to the poor.”<sup>28</sup>

The conservatives’ misunderstanding of the Incarnate God’s call to Christianize the public life, and their subsequent failure to do so, betrayed not only their classical-liberal roots—that man and woman did not need God in the public life—but also, the editors reasoned, a positivist defense of the American system, which conservatives hailed for its ingenuous system of checks and balances and its separation of the temporal and spiritual orders. Yet, the latter was, the editors lamented, part of the modern *zeitgeist* that encouraged the desacralization of the political and social orders. Conservatives, in their defense of the American order, then, were in danger of becoming historicists—following history into a determinist and relativist conception of order. In other words, they were guilty of upholding the American order as the right order of things because it was; and thus, what they deemed right was predestined by history or deterministic (but Christ, not history, was the proper judge of the political and social order). And because in actuality history was developmental, what was

deemed to be right because it *would* change, and thus what was right was historically conditioned or relativistic.<sup>29</sup>

*Triumph's* editors deemed the system, a byproduct of secular-liberal reasoning—as the root problem. The reasoning that constituted the United States Constitution was flawed in two regards—it was predicated both on the principle that power was derived from the governed and that such power would be checked by “*self-interest*.” “Just as Adam Smith’s economics was grounded on the Calvinist rationalization that sufficient self-seeking would promote the common good;” Bozell wrote, “just so our constitutional morality asserted that the self-aggrandizing tendencies of men occupying rival power centers would provide reciprocal obstacles to misgovernment and tyranny.”<sup>30</sup> Both were fatal flaws. The former contrasted the Catholic teaching that all “*power must proceed from God*,” and the latter did not anticipate the possibility that the interests of rival power centers may coincide.<sup>31</sup> This indeed had happened, Bozell argued; secular liberalism, the root cause of America’s modern maladies, had become a pervading and thus consensus ideology. The governors “would not be able to harness secular liberalism—because they would have no *authority* to do so; no authority, that is, that transcends the power structure of which they are a part. For Christianity insists,” Bozell argued, “not only that God is a necessary limitation on political authority, but also (and here is the heart of the matter) that *there is no other limitation*.”<sup>32</sup> His thesis, in sum: the Constitution was anti-Christian. Bozell had gone too far for his brother-in-law, owner and chief editor of *National Review*, William F. Buckley, Jr., who wrote in reply, referencing the

Jesuit John Courtney Murray, that “the idea of the Constitution, and in particular its Bill of Rights, was an essentially Christian idea.”<sup>33</sup>

Placing power in the hands of the people rather than God ultimately qualified authority and power as relativistic, because, despite checks and balances, the people were subject to their changing circumstances, unlike the trans-historical authority of God (as communicated through the Roman Catholic Church), and thus ruled subjectively over the course of time and easily overruled written limitations. The American political system—despite popular perception—was not, Michael Lawrence argued, a government of laws, but of men, but this was not its defect; rather, he wrote:

It is always *men* who rule [that is, exercise power]; and it is not so much mechanical checks on their power (man’s ingenuity is infinitely capable of circumventing such obstacles) as the interior goodness of the men themselves that ultimately determines the goodness of their rule. The closest a political system is likely to come to a government of laws is a government of men who are ruled by a law they take to be higher than, and therefore binding on, their own authority.<sup>34</sup>

The primary defect, then, was the separation the Constitution cast between church and state—placing power in the hands of a people unsupported by an established Church and thereby disconnecting them from the principal source of virtue. “The American tradition has inverted the terms of the Christian tradition. Within Christendom the problem of keeping the people virtuous,” Lawrence explained, “is the primary problem. . . . In the American tradition the problem arises as a secondary matter: the people must be kept virtuous because, if they are not, who will keep the government virtuous?”<sup>35</sup> “*The defect in the constitutional system,*” Lawrence argued, “*was that it did not view*

*government—with all social and political institutions—as intended to buttress and support the people’s Christianity.”*<sup>36</sup> The American system established a self-perpetuating system of moral decay. The government did not inculcate its people with virtue; thus, the people—its rulers—not reinforced in their virtue through the public confession of faith, became immoral and consequently so became their rule.<sup>37</sup>

Furthermore, this “inversion” implied a reversal of “the natural hierarchy of the Christian political order: it located the value of religion in the service it could offer to the government.”<sup>38</sup> The people, the founders believed, would embody the will of God in an otherwise neutral system; but, this arrangement, especially when the people’s virtue became corrupted—because the state did not officially recognize God’s authority—suggested that the state superseded the church and, by extension, God’s authority.<sup>39</sup> The state’s or people’s authority, then, was absolute, which meant, ominously, the editors noted, “the wrong of the state is a contradiction in terms.”<sup>40</sup> Yet in the Catholic conception, all power was to be rendered unto the authority of Christ’s Church—subjected, that is, to an external, objective authority, and thus limiting the reach of the state. “As Lord Acton put it: ‘When Christ said, “Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s.” He . . . not only delivered the precept, but created the force to execute it. To limit the power of the State became the perpetual charge of the Universal Church.’”<sup>41</sup> The American system, then, Lawrence concluded, was a “*departure*” or “*derailment*” from “the Christian political tradition.”<sup>42</sup> The American political system was born out of “the liberal

revolt against an explicitly Christian politics. . . . This is why nothing could be more absurd,” the editors chided conservatives, “than to try to build a ‘conservative’ ideology around the Reaction; to try to give ideational expression and permanency to its present content. That is a prescription for either futility or fascism.”<sup>43</sup>

The problems of the American system were compounded by pluralism, the ideology that animated the American system. Each viewpoint, as long it was promoted through legal channels, was guaranteed a voice and a right to compete for legitimacy (or codification). This was problematic for the editors in two regards—first, it was a relativist conception of political ideas, because the determining factor for legitimization was not adherence to truth but success at competition or plebiscite, and, further, no idea was beyond refute. Second, it was not, contrary to popular view, because of the latter, a neutral system; rather, it was rooted in the view that there were no definitive political truths—it was, then, against truth. As Michael Lawrence noted, the American system’s public orthodoxy was “that there shall be no public orthodoxy. . . . America’s conscience admits—literally for the sake of argument—every side of every question.”<sup>44</sup> This was especially problematic for Catholics who proclaimed an eternal moral law—binding on all peoples and all governments, that was absolute; and not relative and subsequently not debatable or refutable, but rather, insurmountable.<sup>45</sup>

## Confessional Tribe

Secular-liberal America was dying, and the throes of collapse were menacing. Secular-liberal America had “cultivated highly sophisticated and deeply engrained civilizational habits antithetical to Christianity,” including anesthetizing American Catholics with pluralism, and the fruits of its labors—including especially the state financing of contraceptive devices and counseling and the increasing legal sanction of abortion—were not mere neutral death pangs but acts of war.<sup>46</sup> Secular-liberal America was “systematically making war—not specifically on Christians,” Bozell wrote, “which would be tolerable—but on the Christian King.”<sup>47</sup> The solution, he reasoned, was to form a “confessional tribe”—loyal to Christ’s vicar—that would be *in*, but not *of* America.<sup>48</sup> Bonded by neither culture nor geography, the “King’s tribe” existed—and was united in cause—wherever men pledged their allegiance to the King and His Church; in other words, “where men salute the Cross, before any flag.”<sup>49</sup> “We Catholics are a people, distinct and one; and not just any people,” Bozell wrote, “but a royal people set apart historically, by divine grace and command, to serve our King.”<sup>50</sup> The tribe’s mission was to defend and preserve Catholic Christianity by being outside the secular-liberal system—to seek “detachment from that order.”<sup>51</sup> But it was not a retreat—a millennialist withdrawal as society collapsed into barbarism—rather, it was designed “to be the Christian system” in America; to form Christians and Christian institutions from which to launch a militant campaign to reconvert America to the Roman Catholic faith; to prepare the way

for a new Christian order; “to make America Christian;” to “instaure the sovereignty of Christ in the social order.”<sup>52</sup>

This Christianizing objective obviously was at odds with that of the secular-liberal state. “It is not possible in America today to think seriously about being a Christian, much less about carrying out a public Christian apostolate,” Bozell—who had been arrested at a pro-life demonstration—concluded, “without also thinking about the possibility of jail or other discouragements, whether of lesser or greater sternness, which the state may throw up to serious Christianity.”<sup>53</sup> To make sure that the “King’s reign was honored” in America—choosing to follow the moral law when it clashed with the secular law, including especially the effort to protect the unborn—would provoke the state, inviting its vengeance upon the confessional tribe; “then let the State do its worst!” Wilhelmsen exclaimed.<sup>54</sup> Catholic tribesmen, the editors urged, must “turn to their preeminent vocation, to the most militant form of Catholic Christianity: the imitation of Christ and the reconversion of the world to the Cross.”<sup>55</sup> “The Kenosis of the Son of God who emptied Himself even to the death of the Cross will have to be imitated. Christians must again become,” Gerard G. Steckler wrote, “disturbers of the peace. . . . It is of the definition of the Christian to be baptized unto death with Jesus Christ, to crawl into the tomb with him, to be reviled, persecuted, killed, and so dissolved in Christ.”<sup>56</sup> If the secular-liberal state would not yield, Jeffrey A. Mirus wrote, then, “in the shinning robe of truth,” the Christian “must brand the powerful as reprobate, and in the scarlet robe of martyr, he must prepare to live—by preparing to die.”<sup>57</sup>

The editors took seriously the formation and preparation for their militant apostolate of conversion. The Society for the Christian Commonwealth (SCC)—*Triumph's* parent organization—was founded on the belief that:

‘Christians are summoned to mount an integrated effort to explore, evaluate, and communicate among themselves, and to the world, means of constructing an authentically Christian social order, of shaping the modern world in a cultural framework that reflects Christian truth.’<sup>58</sup>

The SCC’s projects included the following: the establishment of a “Christian Commentary Lecture Bureau;” the publication, in addition to *Triumph*, of *Catholic Currents*, a newsletter on ecclesiastic events and *Life in America*, “a tabloid newspaper devoted entirely to the fight for human life;” the opening of the Christian Commonwealth Institute in the Real Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial Spain (“monastery, royal palace, pantheon, symbol of the res publica Christiania”) designed to cultivate an intellect “that will point the way to a Christian tomorrow;” the creation of the SCC Guild Program, “the cornerstone of our efforts to form Catholic apostles to the public life”—which focused on interior Christian development and had as its “social aim . . . nothing less than to spur ‘the renewal in Christ of all things,’ to aid the perennial social mission of the Catholic Church of proclaiming the Kingship of Christ.”<sup>59</sup>

An offshoot of *Triumph's* militant apostolate was the red-bereted and rosary-and sacred-heart adorned Sons of Thunder—modeled after the Carlists; the organization was formed as a counter-group to Young Americans for Freedom, the premier conservative organization for college students.<sup>60</sup> Joseph M. Baker, a founding member of the University of Dallas chapter, recalled that a

founding impulse for the Sons of Thunder was catalyzed at the 1969 YAF convention:

A lot of the people at that convention would become famous, or at least well known, as important players in the Reagan and Bush administrations. But we were not impressed by the bright young Republicans. We were anti-Communist like them. . . . But our main concern at the YAF convention was that we were Catholic. We were turned off by the emphasis on economics, on capitalism. We were appalled when we saw banners waving over the crowd with large dollar signs on them. . . . 'It was awful! They worshipped the dollar like a false god.'<sup>61</sup>

The Dallas chapter demonstrated at the Planned Parenthood Center in the city. They carried signs that read: "'The Pill Kills,' 'Stop Fascist Genocide,' 'Viva il Papa!'" and also prayed on their knees "fifteen decades of the beads"—"refusing to be budged even by the police."<sup>62</sup> "It was perhaps the first time in the history of America," the editors noted approvingly, "that orthodox Christianity had gone to the streets."<sup>63</sup> The Sons of Thunder, "bringing small contingents from Dallas, Philadelphia, [and] Detroit," were outside on their knees praying the rosary at both the *Triumph*-led pro-life demonstration at the George Washington University Clinic and Maloney Hall auditorium at the Catholic University of America while the feminist activist Grace Ti Atkinson blasphemed the Virgin Mary inside.<sup>64</sup>

The editors were not specific on the exact type of action to take, but they noted that such action must be rooted in an understanding that Catholic people in the United States were "the rebel side in a civil war."<sup>65</sup> In addressing graduates of the Christian Commonwealth Institute, Wilhelmsen remarked:

You came to learn how to become rebels against a society that has insulted His Holy Church, that has ignored His Mother. You have succeeded to the degree to which you consider yourselves to be pirates, God's buccaneers, in a society that has outlawed Him and in so doing has outlawed that band of men who raise aloft the Banner of His Sacred

Kingship. You truly are Knights of Banished Legitimacy. The skull-and-crossbones, flag of Catholic Spain in the so-called 'War of Religion' early in the last century, is today our flag.<sup>66</sup>

Blasphemy, certainly, was to be stopped; they noted that when the civil law did not prevent it, "violence against blasphemy is not merely permitted to Christians, it may conceivably be demanded of them in some circumstances."<sup>67</sup> Bozell delineated a distinction between "conscientious resistance" to the secular law—a case in which one could not reconcile his or her conscience with such law in any way and therefore must act "the consequences be damned"—and 'witness,' "understood as protest-action or demonstration," which was to be guided by a prudent consideration of its efficacy.<sup>68</sup> In some cases such a consideration may warn against action that might lead to imprisonment, because "the lone jailbird is not long remembered" and it immobilizes or "takes you out of the battle, it prevents you from fighting another day;" but such prudent consideration also "says," Bozell wrote, "that unless you have some better plan for a future day, you ought to risk, and seek on the solid ground of Christian hope, jail."<sup>69</sup> Generally, though, *Triumph's* militant apostolate focused on the interior conversion and formation of Christians and worked for conversion on a personal level. Other public actions—which were not to be avoided when conscience or prudent consideration called for action—distracted from the construction of Christians and Christian institutions; any venture for Christians into the barbarous world around them required "an institutional life that befits their high calling—one that will serve as a solace and protection for them and as a light to the nations."<sup>70</sup> The editors focused, then, more on monstrating or living

the faith, than demonstrating or articulating the faith—they called on Catholics to *be* the Christian tribe.

*Triumph's* militant apostolate was derived from their view that secular-liberal America was fiercely anti-Christian, but their missionary zeal was precipitated also by the Second Vatican Council, which called on Catholics “to penetrate and perfect the temporal order with the spirit of the Gospel,” which the editors viewed as nothing less than a “summons to restore Christendom.”<sup>71</sup> “Vatican II was first of all . . . a call for the true sons and daughters of the Church of the West,” contributor Warren H. Carroll wrote, “to convert their own people, to go out into the ‘secular city’ and win it back to Christ as their long-ago forefathers in the Faith had won over pagan Rome, by penetrating and transforming the life and character of its civilization.”<sup>72</sup>

Yet the Council's call for a lay apostolate was, for the editors, a reemphasis of what was intrinsic to Catholicism—the mission, initiated by the Incarnation, to sacramentalize the world. “A new world was thus made possible. In this world the life of men—their private intimate life as well as the social and political life of the city—is redeemed, recreated, elevated, sanctified,” the editors wrote, “because the Redeemer is not merely the most perfectly created being but a Person who remains in His divine infinity even as He becomes man.”<sup>73</sup> When Christ “mixed Divinity with the clay of the earth,” Wilhelmsen wrote, He “hallowed reality unto the most distant solar system.”<sup>74</sup>

Creation was good because it was created by God, but its fallen state, chosen by humankind, was redeemed and even elevated by the Incarnation, not

only by the infusion of grace into the world, which utterly transformed human nature (reconciling humankind to God), but also by the opportunity to share in the world's salvation—in an imitation of Christ—which is “why the Church,” Wilhelmsen wrote, “can sing on Holy Saturday—*felix culpa*—‘blessed fault that merited for us so glorious a Redemption.’”<sup>75</sup> Catholics, then, proclaim “a vocation to fashion creation anew and to hallow all things so that they might participate in the Redemption of Our Lord Jesus Christ. This is spelled out explicitly in Pauline theology,” Wilhelmsen wrote,

Which insists that the Fullness of Time Who is Christ calls upon men to ‘fill up what is lacking in the sufferings of the Cross.’ By redeeming the world we remove, to the degree of our intentions, the sufferings of the Cross. We thus assume a burden that otherwise would be Christ’s. In this awful mystery we see God’s infinite graciousness to man in permitting him to lift from God Himself a portion of the burden of Redemption. . . . Nature, crippled by sin, cannot come even into the fullness of its own promise unless it be quickened from within by the grace of Christ that pours through the veins of the mystical Christ, the Church. . . . *Christian* religion is thus marked by an internal experience which consists of two moments: an initial acceptance of our utter dependence upon the Lord of Being, and our response to His call to sanctify the whole of creation and to lead it back to the Father through the Son and in the Spirit. This means, in technical theological terms, that whereas there are only seven sacraments there are as many potential sacramentals—everyone of which conveys actual grace—as there are beings themselves. This sacramentalizing of the real, be it the high act of anointing kings in medieval Christendom or the picturesque blessing of the Portuguese fishing fleet today, is the essence of what I would like to call the *civilizing* aspect of the Incarnation. We are called upon not only to save our souls but, in so doing, to save the world.<sup>76</sup>

The ensuing objective of the call “to sanctify the real, to sacralize it, to redeem it,” was, Wilhelmsen wrote, “to rear up a truly Christian Order of Things,” or a sacral society in which God was glorified in all things.<sup>77</sup> Herein lay the origins of the editors’ radicalism and, by extension, their militancy. Christ’s

injunction to sacramentalize the world (as they envisioned it) was not to sanctify the modern world's separation of the sacral and secular spheres, but to construct a Christian order—an order in which everything was rendered unto Christ—and thus smash through any dichotomies that humankind had erected between itself and God. The time had come, Wilhelmsen wrote, “to plant and water a new tree of civilization amidst the barbarism surrounding us.”<sup>78</sup> We must shape the world “*in the image of the Faith*,” Wilhelmsen wrote, remembering that “the Church of God does not stoop to conquer, but elevates to save.”<sup>79</sup> “We go . . . to the temporal order,” the editors wrote, “to bring down what is against our King and to put up in its place what harmonizes with the infallible principles of the our King’s vicar.”<sup>80</sup> Intrinsicly, this sanctifying mission militated against any type of retreat to a Christian enclave—against the mere incubation of the faith; this would have violated the “*exoteric*” nature of Catholicism.<sup>81</sup> The sacramentalizing mission was one of saving the world—to bring Christ to the whole of humankind; for the editors it began with their own land, and it meant nothing less, Wilhelmsen wrote, than the “Christianization of our own society,” “the planting down deep into the soil of our land the Cross of Christ the King.”<sup>82</sup>

Although the task was daunting, the editors were faithful.<sup>83</sup> Wilhelmsen urged graduates of the Christian Commonwealth Institute to “go home and attack—attack on all fronts,

God is with you—more accurately, more modestly, you are with God. How can you fail? What can the ministers of this corrupt public order do to you? We have a saying in Spanish: *Dentro de cien años todos calvos*—within a hundred years we are all bald anyhow!<sup>84</sup>

Though the odds were not in their favor, the “palm of victory, as Saint Augustine teaches us, belongs to God. To us there belongs only the battle,” he reminded them, “And no other battle today is worth fighting. And a man without a battle is less than a man. He is somebody with a mortgage and a Ford.”<sup>85</sup>

The editors’ tribal stance, then, was not, as some readers claimed, an abandonment of America or—given that the editors understood patriotism principally as loyalty to one’s land and people—anti-American.<sup>86</sup> We try to do what we do for the sake of this people, and the land they have been given to live on and sacramentalize,” Bozell wrote, to abandon this mission “is to desert America.”<sup>87</sup> The United States government, “working as it is designed to work . . . is open to violation of what is, for the Christian,” the editors wrote, “the cardinal rule of politics: that the things of God not be rendered unto Caesar,” and it had thus forfeited its legitimacy.<sup>88</sup> What loyalty Catholics owed to the country’s government was no longer obligatory. The “highest order of patriotism,” the editors wrote, “is to raise up in our land a new standard of legitimacy.”<sup>89</sup>

### Confessional State

The only authority that the editors would have recognized as legitimate and sought to construct, was an order that publicly confessed the Roman Catholic faith—an order, that is, that rendered all power unto Christ’s authority, expressed through His Church. The sacralized social order was to be crowned—and was sustained only (because its faith was reinforced in the public life)—by a

confessional state; crowned, that is, by Christ and His Church. The confessional state was built on faith; therefore, it was not possible to enact the confessional state through political fiat. Rather, it had to spring from the hearts of Christianized Americans, who recognized Christ and His Church as their sovereign; hence, the editors' mission to Christianize America.

The confessional state was not theocratic. The pope was not God and the Church was not the state; rather, the pope was Christ's vicar and it was paramount that the Church be kept free of the state to avoid any meddling that might lead to the subjectivization of the Church's authority. While *in* this world, the Church was not *of* this world; its authority coming from Christ was above all earthly power.

The theological origins of the confessional state were rooted in the kingship of Christ. Christ was given by His Father authority over all creation—all power, then, was to be rendered unto Christ. Wilhelmsen wrote:

Christ—Logos, Verbum, Glory of the Father, Light of Light—is King. . . . And He is King because he inherits—all kings inherit from their fathers—and He inherits from His Father who begets Him in all Eternity. And he is King because he conquers; and title to kingship comes to all kings either through heredity or through conquest. And he conquered on the Cross through His Redemption of the human race. And He governs and His Authority is Sovereign and there is no other sovereignty in Heaven or on earth.<sup>90</sup>

The Incarnation redeemed humankind, which was restored to the likeness of its Creator, reconciled to Him and justified for salvation, which was now possible if man and woman subjected their will to Christ's Kingship, His authority. "In becoming man," Michael Lawrence wrote, "Christ elevated the nature of man to an intimacy with the divine nature which utterly transforms the human. By

allegiance to Christ in the spirit, man can triumph over evil in the flesh, can be virtuous.”<sup>91</sup> “The purpose of politics, then, is to assist man in his efforts to be virtuous. This is to be accomplished, concretely, in large part by the infusion of Christianity into the world’s political and social institutions,” he wrote, “so that those institutions become intrinsically and organically Christian,

Become, in fact, vehicles by which God’s grace is communicated to man. The more the world’s institutions are infused with Christianity, the more pervasive will be the grace of God and the more readily will man approach the virtuous life.”<sup>92</sup>

The more man and woman approached the virtuous life—which they were inclined to reject given the persistence of concupiscence—the closer they came to their purpose, salvation, eternal beatitude with God. The confessional state, then, was an expression of Christ’s love—an expression of His call to hallow the world so that all might come to know Him and thus gain eternal redemption; “the confessional state is thus not principally a juridical theory,” the editors wrote—“It is an act of love.”<sup>93</sup> The confessional state, as an act of love, integrated man’s interior and public life—which was consubstantial with his unified being—to fortify his faith and virtue, prompt him to act virtuously, and thus assist him in his objective of salvation. This was contrasted radically by the American tradition, which relegated religion to the private sphere—which not only failed to support man and woman in their pursuit of salvation but served as an obstacle to virtue—and therefore repudiated the purpose of the Incarnation; it undermined Christ’s redemptive mission.<sup>94</sup>

The specific format of government, so long as all power was subject to Christ’s authority via the Church, was of secondary importance. “Man was

created by God to know, love and serve Him in this world in order to be forever happy with Him in the next. And since to govern means to bring the entity governed to its true end,” Jeffrey Mirus wrote, “a political order—whatever its specific constitution—is judged by one criterion only: how well it disposes temporal affairs to the spiritual end of man.”<sup>95</sup> The editors were certainly not democrats, but like the Church, they did not specify a perfect form of government—the principal guideline: authority must be rendered unto Christ. They might have even been amenable to a democracy that vested ultimate authority in Christ’s vicar. Two things were sure in regard to political arrangements; first, they believed that a healthy—meaning Christian—democracy, if possible, was so only with Catholics. “Popular liberty can only be sustained,” contributor Michael Schwartz noted (drawing upon the work of Orestes Brownson), “if the passions of the people are restrained internally by virtue and intelligence,” and this was only possible when the people—inherently fallible and thus inherently inclined to corruption—recognized an external and objective authority that bound their individual consciences and commanded virtue or adherence to standardized truths and values and thus restrained their passions.<sup>96</sup> Catholics were such a people; they recognized the authority of the Roman Catholic Church over their own individual consciences. Protestants, in contrast—because they emphasized the supremacy of the individual conscience, which led ultimately to an individualized morality in which all truth and authority were subjectivized—undermined the necessary external and objective authority that restrained their passions and were thus less likely to sustain popular liberty.

Second, although the editors believed that the development of a monarchy was highly unlikely in America, which had no monarchical tradition, it is certain that Wilhelmsen—who exerted a significant influence over the staff—was a monarchist. Wilhelmsen’s vision for the Cold-War world was “Habsburg restoration, Christendom reborn from the Andes to the Urals.”<sup>97</sup> Monarchy was, he reasoned, a familial form of politics and thus was “consubstantial with the structure of being,” because family “structures are anterior to all choice, deeper than all law, more profound than any philosophy;” such an order, then, was written into being.<sup>98</sup> Monarchy, furthermore, was analogous to the kingship of Christ and thus a political arrangement analogous to the divine order.

Regardless of the political arrangements, the editors believed that a confessional state fostered greater liberty than the secular-democratic state. Such a view was derived from their Catholic understanding of liberty, which was radically opposed to its modern, liberal definition. The liberal assumed that liberty was “the ability to choose between good and evil,” William H. Marshner wrote, and that this was the source of man’s dignity.<sup>99</sup> The “socio-political application” that followed assumed, then, that “human dignity depends upon the absence of constraint,” and that “man is the more virtuous,” he wrote, “the more his choice is totally free.”<sup>100</sup> The “liberal definition of liberty,” therefore, “discloses that all exterior authority and all exterior law is an impingement on men’s sovereign dignity as individuals. Hence, liberal man rejects all . . . law that comes from outside, and insists,” he continued, “that all law arise in himself. He will insist that to be truly free he must choose every value, create every value,

indeed, be himself the very source of good and the very criterion of good and evil.”<sup>101</sup> Marshner concluded, then, that “there can be no place for authority,” and subsequently there can be no place for truth, the source of authority, but only its seeking—“possessed truth is banished as ‘authoritarian’ and in its place stands the pursuit of truth . . . and thus it is said, the mind becomes finally free.”<sup>102</sup>

The view that man’s liberty was derived from his ability to choose between good and evil was incompatible with the Catholic view that liberty “consists simply in the ability to choose,” which was inherent in God’s gifts of an intellect and will.<sup>103</sup> “Liberty, then, is nothing in itself but the possession of rationality and will,” Marshner wrote; “Freedom, that is, to *be free*, consists in our very power to understand and to will,” but while God “is perfectly free because He understands perfectly and wills perfectly, man wills and understands *imperfectly*, hence his freedom is imperfect”—meaning, that he may choose evil rather than good, but the Christian purpose was one of “withdrawing from evil and entering more and more into the sway of good.”<sup>104</sup> “Thus the very perfection of liberty,” Marshner noted, “according to the liberal scheme, the ability to choose between good and evil, is, in the Catholic scheme, the *imperfection*.”<sup>105</sup>

In its socio-political application, “if to be free means to know the truth and to love the good,” then, it follows, Marshner wrote, that “man’s ability to be free depends upon his formation.”<sup>106</sup> “It depends upon . . . a superior insight into what is true and superior example of what is good. The liberal conception of

freedom,” he concluded, “is immediately ruled out and seen, in fact, to be the very disease of society,

While the Catholic conception of freedom forms the basis upon which to build an order that is permeated with incentives to truth and disincentives to error, a society structured into a tissue of actual graces whereby every man may live better because he knows the truth and wills the good.<sup>107</sup>

The political and social promptings that formed the intellect and will to know the truth and will the good, were, paradoxically, liberating restraints; not only in an eschatological sense—in which living according to God’s will was to gain eternal salvation or *freedom* from death—but also in a political sense. The man oriented to God (an orientation fortified by a confessional order) was—more so than the man separated from God—internally restrained from choosing evil and was prompted to choose good because he was fortified in his faith of God, in his love of God, and in his fear of God—due to a greater access to grace. Such a man, then, was freer because he was further away from his natural inclination to choose evil and thus avoided becoming a slave to his material desires—a possibility because of the persistence of concupiscence. It followed—because man had sufficient access to grace, which helped him transcend his fallen nature, and because he could not escape God, Who sees all—that man actually required less physical force to restrain him. The confessional state, then, was not a police state.

Furthermore, because authority in the confessional state was vested in Christ, the political order commanded greater reverence and respect and fostered a greater degree of law and order—the rule of law was an actual possibility in the confessional state. This was because, as Wilhelmson pointed

out, to break a law in consonance with the natural and moral law, which had Christ as its Author, “was not simply to break a law: it was to break a Heart, Christ’s.”<sup>108</sup> In this very important way, the law was above subjectivization; it was not the instrument of a social class that bred resentment, but an objective standard, above all, to which all were subject.

The confessional state, because it vested all authority in Christ, was not, like the secular state, an absolute state—a law unto itself; rather, its authority was finite. “No man can lay claim to sovereignty, or to total power,” Paul Cole Beach wrote, “because the only ‘sovereign’ is God Himself. Every man stands subject to God and His law—king no less than liegeman.”<sup>109</sup> This is what Michael Schwartz called the “fundamental truth of all Catholic teaching on politics and society”—that “Sovereignty,

No matter where it is vested in any given political order, can never be absolute, for any temporal sovereignty is nothing more than an earthly regency of the only true, eternal and absolute sovereignty of Christ the King. Without this recognition of the radical dependence of human authority upon God, there can be no liberty and no justice, but only the tyranny of Promethean man who, in pretending to be his own absolute master, becomes a puny slave in the hands of Satan.<sup>110</sup>

The Christian society, while “full of incentives toward the good, full of norms, full of laws,” was “not totalitarian,” Marshner wrote, “because (a) it respects the providence of God, to Whom vengeance belongs, (b) it respects the dignity of the individual, and (c) it respects the destiny to which he is called under the sovereign mystery of God’s grace.”<sup>111</sup> In addition, the state would be limited practically by adhering to the Church’s social teachings, which promoted the concept of subsidiarity and distributism.

“The problem with America is not that she is free but that she is not free,” Marshner wrote; “For those who are not the servants of God are in bondage to sin. The bondage of sin is the choosing of evil, and the choosing of evil is the radical imperfection of human liberty, not its perfection.”<sup>112</sup> To reorient Americans to an understanding of true liberty, Marshner suggested, as “a symbolic beginning,” that “somebody ought to take down the Statue of Liberty, stone by stone, and reassemble it at a more suitable address. Like out in front of St. Patrick’s Cathedral.”<sup>113</sup>

The editors’ promotion of a confessional state was criticized as utopian. Such views of the political order “clash with the deepest Christian teachings on the secular order. ‘My kingdom is not of this world’: and therefore if any Christian presumes to construct even a halfbaked Heaven on earth,” Neil McCaffrey wrote, “he is scorning his Master. How can there be a *programmatic* ‘Christian social doctrine’ when the Christian King explicitly disavowed a temporal regime.”<sup>114</sup> Marshner charged McCaffrey with misunderstanding Christ’s words “as a teaching on the secular order. How can a teaching about the nature (pardon me, supernature) of the Church,” he asked, “be a reflection on the temporal order?”<sup>115</sup>

The confessional state was not a utopian concoction. The editors did not envision constructing the City of God, but a City of Man directed toward Rome. Indeed, they, like the Church, viewed themselves as realists. Man was God’s creation—God’s being—and because his *real* purpose was to know, love, and

serve Him, the ideal political order was that which assisted his purpose for being. Such a political order was the only order consubstantial with his *real* being.<sup>116</sup>

Furthermore, contrary to the common view, the Second Vatican Council did not, the editors pointed out, discard the confessional state or sacralize the secular-pluralist order. The political order that confessed the truths of the Roman Catholic Church was still the ideal (the “Church’s political *thesis*”); rather, “the Church recognized the hypothetical case where the ideal arrangement is practically or temporarily unfeasible” (the Church’s “*hypothesis*”), Lawrence wrote, “in which case she is content merely to seek the ideal,” to work towards the “implementation of the thesis.”<sup>117</sup> In this way, the Church viewed the secular-pluralist state—as long as it did not interfere with the Church’s “freedom to teach . . . to convert the political order”—as a satisfactory, but *temporary*, arrangement.<sup>118</sup> The Catholic mission, then, was to convert the political and social orders and to construct a confessional state.<sup>119</sup> American Catholics could never, the editors warned, be reconciled to an order that enshrined the competition for truth rather than the profession of truth. “Catholics don’t believe that truth is relative. If they are sure about anything,” Lawrence wrote, “it is that Christ did not come into the world to announce to men that they could believe whatever they like.”<sup>120</sup>

Catholics, then, could not be content with what the editors termed the “Americanist” position—the position developed by the Jesuit John Courtney Murray, who “turned the thesis-hypothesis doctrine upside down,” Lawrence wrote.<sup>121</sup> “Henceforth the thesis—the ideal arrangement—would be pluralism;

and the hypothesis—the tolerable, but ultimately unsatisfactory arrangement—would be the confessional state.”<sup>122</sup> “The result of this mistake we have now seen: ‘Go, therefore, teach ye all nations,’ Christ commanded; ‘except this nation,’ the Americanists eventually amended. That command to Christians, St. Matthew tells us,” Lawrence wrote, “was virtually the last thing Christ told his infant Church, before ascending to Heaven. Do this, we were told,

On the promise that He would be with us to the end of time. It is a matter of simple logic to conclude that when we cease doing this—when we stop telling the world the Catholic Church has the truth that God intended for *all* men—then we have abandoned Christ. We are no longer His Church.”<sup>123</sup>

## Politics

The editors envisioned little benefit in political participation. The secular-liberal system was inherently flawed—it was collapsing, and its guardians, the people, were little interested in fundamental change. The editors noted that they did not care to vote in the 1968 presidential election because all three candidates—Hubert Humphrey, Richard Nixon, and George Wallace—were “all protagonists of the secular-liberal system,” and thus their prescriptions “betray not the slightest understanding of what ails the country, nor the slightest promise of touching the root of the disease.”<sup>124</sup> The 1972 presidential election elicited no revision in the editors’ view. To them, it did not matter whether Nixon was defeated or reelected; like a “Swiss-watch,” “the system,” they complained, “will go on as before, tick-tock, tick-tock, working like a dream but affirming no Good, swearing no True, monstrating no Beautiful.”<sup>125</sup>

Yet despite the editors' disdain for American politics, they believed that there was some room for a practical participation—one that sought to halt the worst excesses of secular liberalism, but not mitigate their ultimate purpose to be the Christian tribe and transcend the secular-liberal political fray. Catholics, the editors concluded, could not fulfill their royal and priestly role by “being good Democrats or Republicans or liberals or conservatives,” which limited Catholics to conventional objectives; rather, they had to “break the secular confinement of their politics on every front where they are presently barred from acting politically . . . as Catholics.”<sup>126</sup> In other words, if Catholics were to participate in politics, they needed to participate as Catholics—subject to the pope's authority—and not as Democrats or Republicans and bend the public order toward Rome. This was the “short-term objective of the Catholic people,” but ultimately, the editors reasoned, Catholics could not lose sight of their ultimate objective, which was “to wash the American public order in grace, cleanse it, make of it an offering to the Father, a place wherein His will might be done as it is in Heaven.”<sup>127</sup>

The short-term objective of the Catholic people—the more practical approach to politics—was given more credence and urgency by the editors after *Roe v. Wade* (1973) and Watergate. But already in late 1972, the editors believed the moral state of the country was so decrepit that they wrote: “Every authentic and creative Catholic political movement must now be welcomed—and without ideological inhibitions. Let a thousand flowers bloom.”<sup>128</sup>

Believing that the system was on the brink of moral and political chaos, they felt remorseful for their earlier decision of non-involvement; they now

believed that such a judgment “entailed too great a tilt toward nihilism.”<sup>129</sup> The *Roe v. Wade* decision had a paradoxical effect on the editors. It fostered in them an even more cynical view of American society and the depths of its moral decadence; yet, it simultaneously forced them into a greater involvement in politics—including especially the organization of political pressure groups—to negate the ill effects of the *Roe v. Wade* decision.

Watergate also precipitated greater political involvement. The editors perceived the event as a chance to stem the power of the judiciary, advance the pro-life cause, and “achieve a temporary stability for Mr. Nixon’s government and for his presidency, thus helping to hold off the apparent designs of certain ravenous wolves, among which the jackals [Nelson] Rockefeller may be counted.”<sup>130</sup> They detested Rockefeller for his pro-contraceptive and pro-abortion politics.

The editors believed, as noted, that democracy was flawed because it placed authority in the hands of the people rather than God. The people’s sovereignty then was unrestrained and consequently tyrannical. Yet the people had lost power; the executive and judiciary branches had established themselves as sovereign and claimed—because they had divorced their rule not only from God’s authority but also Constitutional limitations—authority unto themselves. This development was most explicit in the Supreme Court, which, they believed, had become maker rather than arbiter of the law, placing itself above the Constitution, and basing its decisions, not in precedent or the natural law, but—because of its positivist mentality—in sociological jurisprudence.<sup>131</sup> “The whole

political system, including every citizen who considers himself subject to it,” the editors concluded, “is at the mercy of judicial fiat.”<sup>132</sup>

They involved themselves, then, in the so-called “Tapes Case”—the confrontation between the executive and judiciary branch during the Watergate investigation over whether or not Nixon could claim “executive privilege” as justification for refusing to release tapes of Oval Office conversations to the Senate investigative committee. They encouraged Nixon to refuse to surrender the tapes, because they believed there was a “definite Catholic interest . . . in deflating the pretensions of the Supreme Court and the regnant myth that it is the final arbiter of what the law is.”<sup>133</sup> Indeed, Bozell and associates of the Society for the Christian Commonwealth became directly involved in the affair. According to Bozell, the Nixon Administration sought his expertise on judicial review.<sup>134</sup> Bozell proffered advice to the Nixon administration in return for a “presidential initiative on behalf of an effective pro-life constitutional amendment.”<sup>135</sup> Nothing ever came of it.<sup>136</sup>

The editors were conflicted over their participation. They believed that such involvement was important but believed also that the political system was irremediably corrupt—it was a conglomeration of varying interests competing for power for the sake of power, unrestrained as they were by legitimate or objective authority. They believed that such a struggle ended only when someone or some faction seized absolute power; and, in a way, their participation, they were aware, aided the power seeking of Nixon, but at the justifiable objective of limiting judicial power.<sup>137</sup> Nixon’s proven involvement in the scandal, then, did not

surprise the editors, who noted that it should not surprise anyone to find out that “he is a Machiavelli,

Or, if you will, a used car salesman; that he is unprincipled, cynical, vain, plastic, cold, calculating, plotting, vindictive; that he and his intimates are not concerned with government in its legitimate function of promoting civilization, but with *rule*: with naked power and the uses of power.<sup>138</sup>

While Bozell had believed initially that aiding Nixon was a prudent action that might tilt “the social order toward a Christian commonwealth,” he concluded that such involvement was not only practically futile, but distracted from their “central Vocation—namely,” Bozell wrote, “to help form men: Christian men and women and children,

To help form them on a personal and family basis, in a way that will equip them to live their lives in a Christian way, while enduring some suffering, and while preparing for fighting battles for the Church, the most important of which (we have believed) will probably be fought at some future point in time.<sup>139</sup>

The rest of the editors concurred, writing that the “Catholic interest in the political order of the United States in 1973 cannot be served by settled and symmetrical alliance with *any* political faction.”<sup>140</sup>

The editors faced the same paradox that they encountered in their involvement with the Nixon administration when they encouraged the formation of an anti-defamation organization—a “Catholic ADL” or a “Catholic Civil Liberties Union”—that would “pursue the aims of the nation’s Catholic people in the political order.”<sup>141</sup> Catholics, they reasoned, must understand that their system was not a disinterested republic, but a “pressure-group democracy” and, like other groups that organize to advance their agendas, they must use “the law, media, the ballot, whatever, to advance the natural law and the revealed

Truth.”<sup>142</sup> Yet the editors worried that such a practice might make Catholics comfortable with “the pressure-group model” and satisfied with merely a few victories—political involvement for the editors could only be a holding maneuver against the secular liberal offensive—but in fact the Catholic people must realize that they “are not like any other group, because it is governed by the Magisterium. And what is due the Magisterium is obedience to its authority. So, there can never be full justice for the Catholic people,” the editors pointed out, “nor (oddly enough) for anybody else, especially unborn children—until the premier place of Catholic Truth as a measure of right and wrong in public policy is acknowledged.”<sup>143</sup>

They were worried, then, that Catholics would conceptualize their interests—not deliberately at least—as relative, and that they would accept the rules of pluralism (each interest group has a right to compete to promote its interests) for conveying their faith, which was ipso facto to acknowledge a certain relativity of interests and deny the catholicity of the Roman Catholic faith. Catholic pressure groups, the editors reasoned, must give token adherence to the rules of pluralism in order to avoid being discredited or suppressed, but Catholics must remain in fidelity to their true apostolate, to Christianize America; anything less was disloyalty to their faith. “We Catholics,” the editors exclaimed, “are not in the business of making peace with the American political order; we are in the business of converting the people of this land, and of sacramentalizing its institutions.”<sup>144</sup>

In finality, *Triumph's* editors remained convinced both of the impending collapse of secular-liberal America and ultimately the futility in direct political participation. Yet the editors did not withdraw from politics—it was always their purpose to “make America take notice that some of her residents have a King besides Caesar.”<sup>145</sup> When the editors discussed a “Catholic politics,” they did not mean merely participation in the electoral process or even this type of participation (which they typically avoided and despised); rather, they meant generally the confessional tribe’s work to convert America—which was public work—and therefore political. As Wilhelmsen wrote, a rejection of this type of politics would have been “a kind of Jansenistic retreat which negates the Pauline command that we carry the Cross to the World.”<sup>146</sup>

### Economics

In economic matters, the editors followed the Roman Catholic Church’s social encyclicals, namely *On Capital and Labor* (1891), *On the Reconstruction of the Social Order* (1931), *On Christianity and Social Progress* (1961), and *On the Development of Peoples* (1967).<sup>147</sup> *Triumph's* staff, then, was anti-socialist and very critical of capitalism.<sup>148</sup> The editors called Adam Smith and John Maynard Keynes “moral asse[s]” and Ayn Rand a “witch” and a “moral anarchist and apostle of selfishness.”<sup>149</sup> “Socialism with its slave-labor camps,” contributor Thomas J. Barbarie noted, was “hardly a worse system than one that allows the

free exchange of money for goods and services which include *Deep Throat* and vacuum curettage machines.”<sup>150</sup>

Bozell—explicating the anti-capitalist theory of Hilaire Belloc (developed in *The Servile State*)—noted that Belloc believed capitalism was the “worst social evil ever invented by man,” because it led to the “Servile State,” or a slave state in which the majority of labor was coerced.<sup>151</sup> Capitalism, Belloc believed, deprived the majority of the population of land—and thus the means and freedom to produce wealth—and led to a very unstable political situation. The loss of property “led to a moral strain in the minds of men, who as heirs of Christendom, have inherited a tradition of freedom and ownership,” and “produced an intolerable insecurity for the non-possessors of property because *livelihood is at the will of the possessors*.”<sup>152</sup> In search of security, men sought the protection of the state, which appropriated property in its own right to provide security from competition. The state secured the wealth of the upper class and the means of producing wealth for the lower classes; however, for the latter, such labor was now ultimately coerced because men henceforth had no choice to withhold their labor because they no longer had their own means, and thus freedom, to produce wealth. Without property—the means to produce wealth—men ultimately were slaves.

The editors believed that United States was undergoing a similar trajectory. They viewed Nixon’s economic policies—to combat economic recession—such as wage-price controls, protectionist tariffs, and tax subsidies as means to secure “an alliance between the state and the very few who control the

making of wealth, at the expense of the vast majority of the capitalist society's members who lack any control over the making of wealth and are therefore," the editors concluded, "by definition, slaves."<sup>153</sup> This was not a betrayal of capitalism, as the conservatives claimed, but rather it was, the editors argued, the "perfection of capitalism."<sup>154</sup>

Optimally, the cure for the Servile State was the "Distributive State" or "Proprietary State"—a state that sought a just distribution of property among the population.<sup>155</sup> The means of this distribution were admitted to be complex and never deduced by the editors, but such a state, Bozell reasoned, would inherently have to be a "Christian State," because only the Church taught the true meaning of private property—that it was ordained by God (and not merely a practical method for material accumulation)—and placed the rightful limitations on it, that land was held in stewardship from God, that wealth must serve the common good (property was not an absolute right), and that man had an obligation of charity.<sup>156</sup> Yet, also to be admitted, the Christian state was not yet a reality. How, then, could one hold off the Servile State? The Christian had to break their dependence on the economy and become less materialistic. "Sacrifice some of the goods that don't contribute to the salvation of the soul," the editors instructed, in order "to save enough money . . . for property . . . the most effective safeguard against servility."<sup>157</sup>

The most effective purchase of property was land in the country, where families could develop more self-sufficiency by growing or raising their food.<sup>158</sup> The editors envisioned an agrarian lifestyle—providing sustenance for your

family by farming—as one of great potential. They believed that it fostered, in addition to economic freedom, hard work and sacrifice, healthy living, separation from “most of the dehumanizing insulations of technologized urban living,” familial living, veneration for tradition, and veneration for nature or creation and creation’s origin, God.<sup>159</sup> Mario de Solenni wrote that it cultivated “an appreciation—a sort of reverence for—the little things in life like worms and seeds and sprouts, and bigger things like the mystery of life itself and the Maker of it all.”<sup>160</sup> The editors did not encourage a mass exodus to the countryside, but they respected the agrarian lifestyle as having significant potential to break families free from the servile economy and envisioned it as a way to set the Christian tribe apart from society—to be *in* but not *of* American society.<sup>161</sup> They also encouraged institutional independence; “Christians in contemporary American society need to begin thinking imaginatively and creatively about ad hoc arrangements—credit unions, cooperatives, mutual support endeavors of all kinds—” they instructed, “that could enable them, on as many fronts as possible, to opt out of an economic and social system increasingly determined to break their will and their Faith.”<sup>162</sup>

For the poor, the answer was not the welfare state. Even though the Church’s social encyclicals had encouraged state intervention to mitigate the effects of the market economy and foster a greater degree of social justice, *Triumph’s* editors viewed the modern welfare state as inherently flawed and thus not an adequate means of fostering social justice. The editors did not accept the Right’s critique of the welfare state, which “extol[ed] the work ethic and individual

initiative” in place of welfare.<sup>163</sup> The modern welfare state, they held, was a byproduct of secular liberalism and thus was anti-Christian. Government welfare solves problems “without regard to morality,” they noted; “the state has no morals and, having no ties with Christ, has no way of getting morals. So faced with increasing numbers of illegitimate births and too many poor people, it promotes life-prevention,” which contradicted the moral law.<sup>164</sup> They noted also that secular liberals used the welfare state as “an instrument for leveling incomes and other projects of social engineering” that contradicted the moral principle of subsidiarity and the Church’s moral proscription on utopian schemes.<sup>165</sup>

Furthermore, secular-liberal welfare sought to replace the Church’s charitable role, which, they believed, was the authentic and only model of charity. “Yet the chief reality remains,” the editors wrote, “while Christ made clear there will always be poor men, He also made clear that they were His most cherished brothers—were the closest likeness of Him. Therefore He became the Church of the Poor.”<sup>166</sup> The Church’s charity was derived from love for the person—because Christ was a person—and did not deal with the poor or poverty in the abstract as did the modern welfare state. “The best government in the world cannot adequately minister to the poor, who, often more than anything else,” the editors wrote, “need the loving attention of a brother.”<sup>167</sup> Furthermore, its works of mercy were predicated on the whole being—taking into account both the spiritual and material nature of man. “Christians are plainly obliged to deal charitably and with basic justice toward all men just because they are men, created in the image of God, redeemed by Him, with a Christian destiny in this

world and the next: which confers a sacred dignity upon every person.”<sup>168</sup> The editors called on the Church in America to assert its divinely ordained role:

The Church must, for one thing, instruct her members in their personal responsibilities in charity. . . . The Church should also, of course, get on with her corporate ministry of feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, sheltering the homeless. . . . Finally, and perhaps most crucial, the Church must instruct the state in its responsibilities in justice toward the poor. A place to begin might be the organization, on an episcopal initiative, of a Catholic caucus in Congress, whose members would be asked to study the social encyclicals in order to translate papal teaching into legislative action. By such means the Church can remind the most secularist of governments of their obligation to develop the instruments of social justice. It is in preaching this obligation that the Church shows herself Mother to the poor and Teacher of nations.<sup>169</sup>

As for the economic crisis that the nation confronted in the seventies, the editors worried that it would cause great social turmoil (to be followed by an omnipotent state), because it imploded the national myth of limitless material progress. The editors noted, however, that such material deprivation was natural—that “God has so arranged the finite world as frequently to require suffering from men as the only price adequate to redress their neglect of Him and the laws of His natural order.”<sup>170</sup> As a solution—in contrast to the capitalist remedy of increased spending—then, the editors offered sacrifice. Noting that the internal ordering of the self toward God, fostered by sacrifice, had important political ramifications, “a people incapable of interior order, of self-restraint, must have order imposed on it from without.”<sup>171</sup> Here they saw great potential for Catholic witness and leadership. Most Catholics, they reasoned, had not been the recipients of the affluence of the 1950s and 1960s or were only a generation or two removed from poverty and thus possessed “a salutary awareness of the human realities of limitation and sacrifice,” but, more importantly, their faith

predisposed them for sacrifice, because it taught them that it was a way to worship God and thus was an occasion for grace.<sup>172</sup> “The understanding that material limitation is as much an occasion of grace as an iron law of the universe,” the editors wrote, “is a precious Catholic heritage.”<sup>173</sup> Catholics, then, the editors concluded, “will have much to say to a reduced America in search of a politics of reality.”<sup>174</sup>

### Racial Strife

The editors took interest in the emergence in the late 1960s of the violent, anti-integrationist, and tribal black power resistance movement. The editors were not, conversely, interested in the pacifist and integrationist Civil Rights Movement. They believed—although they were troubled by what they viewed as an “artificially imposed segregation” in the South—in the organic development of society and were troubled more by forced integration.<sup>175</sup> The editors believed that the movement’s focus on political and economic equality were parochial when considering that America’s problems were much deeper, actually spiritual.

They believed that the religious undertones of the Civil Rights Movement, as expressed by Martin Luther King, Jr., were part of the secular march. Reflecting on King after his death, they noted that he, along with liberal Protestants and New Breed Catholics, preached a secular Gospel, of a “social, utopian Christ” that supposedly encouraged “militant social action (non-violent of course), eradication of poverty, freedom from oppression and so on,” including, importantly, the “prospect of success”—“to seek, and . . . find, heaven on

earth.”<sup>176</sup> King, then, like his liberal religious counterparts, “had little use for the text of the Gospels.”<sup>177</sup> “His characteristic rhetoric,” they noted:

Rolled out of the Old Testament: he had been to the mountain, he had seen the glory of the Lord, he would now lead his people out of the desert into the Promised Land. . . . But as with the prophets of the Jews, the truth that frees was hidden from the Rev. King, and he helped to take it from his people. *The Christ revealed that the Promised Land is not here. Men will get there in virtue of what they do here, most assuredly including what they do to and for other men. But if they expect to find it here, they will find themselves clawing, like animals in a cage, at bars that reach literally to heaven. The Old Testament illusion still holds our secular prophets, now joined by the hapless post-Christians, in remorseless bondage. Martin Luther King, rest his soul, is free at last.*<sup>178</sup>

The black power resistance movement was something else. Black power and black riots presaged a spiritual and Christian revolution. The editors believed that secular liberalism caused the black plight in America. Blacks had been given Christianity, and thus moral discipline—albeit imperfectly (because Protestantism was an imperfect Christianity and the origin of racial problems in the South)—and thus were civilized by white southerners.<sup>179</sup> Yet secular liberals uprooted blacks from this Christian order, because they believed that humankind was best suited, completely satisfied, when man and woman had economic, political, and social freedom. Yet, behind these liberal objectives were the errors that man and woman were wholly material creatures, wholly self-sufficient, and capable of limitless progression. By placing their faith in such notions—that economic, political, and social freedom were the ends of man and woman—liberals had divorced man and woman from God, and without faith in God (and thus without sufficient access to grace, and love of and fear of God), man and woman lacked internal moral discipline. Without which they needed excessive

external control; they were barbarians, quelled only by an outside force. Liberals, then, the editors charged, were “barbarizing” African Americans.<sup>180</sup>

Ultimately, the rioting was not derived mainly from a lack of moral restraint, and it certainly was not, as secular liberals assumed, disillusionment over marginal material success (“a revolution of rising expectations”); rather, it was a revolution against the materialist conclusions of secular liberalism.<sup>181</sup> It was born out of, the editors deduced, “the largely inarticulate terror that always haunts men confronted by meaninglessness (if a man can look forward to nothing but a new Buick or a house in an integrated neighborhood, then surely his life *is* meaningless).”<sup>182</sup> Rebellious African Americans were motivated by “a yearning to make contact with the divine.”<sup>183</sup> It was a rebellion against the “soulless tyranny of secular liberalism.”<sup>184</sup>

African Americans displayed, then, an impressive immunity to secular liberalism. “The Negroes do not appear interested in what the Secular City offers them; almost alone among our brethren,” the editors pointed out, “they seem willing to burst violently through the flesh into the realm of the Spirit.”<sup>185</sup> So appealing was the vigorous black stance against the secular-liberal system, that it was “quite rational now if men speak in terms of a Black Christ, not of course because God really was, or *Is*, black, or any other single color,” Gary K. Potter argued, “but because today and evidently tomorrow a Black Christ could possibly better embody God’s creative multifacetedness than a white one, or, at least, a White Anglo-Saxon Protestant one;

And because, symbolically, a Black Christ might stand a better chance of leading us all back into a world of mysteries (including the mysteries of

*blood*), away from the overlighted, white, rationalized, technologized, sanitized, plasticized, soulless world; away from the world of the disembodied intellect, in other words, to the domain of 'soul,' the domain of the heart.<sup>186</sup>

So crucial was the black rebellion against materialism that Christians must be ready to defend it; "should the establishment's heart harden against blacks because they prefer to nurse their pride in xenophobic segregation rather than marry symbols and obligations which would turn black into white, Soul into Wasp—then the Christian," the editors hoped, "would mount the barricade against the police power in the teeth of the white man's law.

He knows that both he and the black man are fair targets for a social order that not only knows not God, but that insists that those who do know Him must relegate His glorification to a private chamber; to a ghetto.<sup>187</sup>

The black revolution, because it was of a spiritual nature, portended a Christian revolution. African Americans, then, could be instrumental in "leading America and the rest of the Christian West from the rule of men to the rule of God."<sup>188</sup>

"The big question," the editors wondered, "is whether Christians will help him to do that."<sup>189</sup> It "is only along the path to Christ, the true light of man, that the American Negro will truly liberate himself from the darkness."<sup>190</sup> Their spiritual thirst could only be slaked by that of the Roman Catholic Church—Christ's Church. Such tutelage would teach that "the cure for a diseased social order is not to burn it down, or carve it into pieces," but to "implement the Christian thesis," erect the confessional state, "a political order that has time for the soul, because it is founded on the laws of God."<sup>191</sup>

Yet the Church seemed to be failing in its apostolic mission to the African-American community. If the African-American community was suffering from a

crisis of faith and needed Christian tutelage, where was the Church? “The voice of the Church seemed to be,” Michael Lawrence wrote, “one with that of the secular-liberal order, and that latter voice was unmistakably a death rattle.”<sup>192</sup> “To be sure,” the editors raged, “a few lonely clerics and laymen are still around to tell the Negro that Christ and Christian civilization are more than slum-clearance and the right to vote;

But the corporate Church has found nothing better to do for the Negro during the past twenty years than help found a Department of Religion for the Great Society with the uncomplicated function of mindlessly (and heartlessly) echoing secular panaceas. The Church is ‘for’ civil rights—of course! But is that *all* the Church has to say? Christ had so much else to say that He had no time for endorsing a single civil right.<sup>193</sup>

By echoing the liberal establishment, the Church, in effect, the editors noted, says to the African American that “Heaven means civil rights and integration and jobs and housing” and is “too busy making you like a white man to worry about your soul, brother.”<sup>194</sup>

## Education

The campus revolts in the 1960s, the editors posited, were—like the urban riots—another sign of the decadence of secular-liberal society. The secular-liberal university denied the existence of revealed truth and, subsequently, its efficacy in directing and animating all learning. Instead, the secular-liberal university relied wholly on a positivistic rationalism—which, unaided by revelation, admitted that no definitive truth was possible. The student rebellions were “a revolution against the liberal university’s denial of truth;” John C. Meyers

wrote, “against the admission, indeed the insistence, of liberal teachers that they have nothing really worth teaching—that they have nothing to offer the student really worth learning.”<sup>195</sup> Furthermore, under the secular-liberal scheme—because reasoning and experimenting could not lead to any definitive answers—any conclusions were ultimately relative and pointless to begin with, because the search for conclusions was, without eternal standards, inherently subjective (because it was conditioned by the subjectivity intrinsic to each man’s purpose for seeking answers). As contributor Russell Kirk noted, “Objectivity in the scholar is possible only when the scholar recognizes permanent objects—norms or standards—by which the opinions of the hour may be judged.”<sup>196</sup> Education, the editors lamented, was either an exercise in futility, or worse, the handmaiden of ideology.

Without truth—especially revealed truth on crucial matters, such as the purpose of existence—or the hope of acquiring it, students fell into despair and, consequently, held in contempt their educators and, by extension, their society. Without truth, students did not have a purpose in life, “an explanation for being, and a reason for pursuing potentialities of being that [would] justify their hopes of becoming adults,” Meyer wrote.<sup>197</sup> The modern American university, no longer interested in contemplating truth—and derivatively, then, no longer concerned with inculcating virtue—became a “mass production-factory resembling nothing so much as one of Henry Ford’s assembly lines,” the editors decried, giving students “some skills and information useful in the art of earning money. It is silent as to wisdom and beauty and virtue.”<sup>198</sup>

Secular-liberal education—because it was not a conduit of revealed truth—was in a predictable collapse. The editors were much more worried, however, about the state of Catholic higher education.<sup>199</sup> In 1967, representatives from the major Catholic universities issued the so-called Land O’Lakes statement on Catholic education, in which the administrators endorsed a break from the Magisterium—the teaching authority of the Roman Catholic Church. It was, in effect, the editors grieved, the sanctification for *the search* for truth—the worship of the secular-liberal god of academic freedom.<sup>200</sup> “This god has handed down a single commandment: a man is free to teach anything he likes in a university,” the editors wrote, “provided his peers—his fellow teachers—judge him to be ‘competent’ in his field. It is, on the face of it, an insipid, prosaic creed, hardly worthy of inspiring high devotion.”<sup>201</sup> Only a mind attuned to Christ, Who is Truth, and His Church, was capable, they believed, of a transcending reason. “Disciplines that touch directly upon the ultimate meaning of the real, and of man’s destiny,” the editors noted,

‘Find in the Church’s teaching what theologians call the ‘negative norm’—a paternal check against incipient error in the minds of scholars. But more important, on the positive side, these disciplines also discover in the Church’s doctrine the sharpest spur available to scholarly research. The Magisterium is the very rain which waters the mind, and it is the soil from which the spirit draws the questions that it addresses to the mystery of existence. Every contrary view—every attempt to withdraw scholarship from Christian belief—must posit a life of learning cut away from history, trapped perpetually in a solipsistic cage in which pedants address one another much the same way monkeys do in a zoo.’<sup>202</sup>

The editors, taking the traditional view of Catholic higher education, believed that the Church possessed the truth—as it was Christ’s Church; thus, the goal of education was to know such truth and to find new ways to elucidate such truth.

All knowledge, in all disciplines, then, should be conformed to the teaching of the Magisterium.

They deplored the secularization—the establishment of academic freedom—of the Catholic universities for a number of specific reasons. First, it was rooted in a misunderstanding of the relationship between knowledge and freedom. Knowledge that supposed that freedom was *the choice for truth*—obedience to the Magisterium—was true freedom; freedom, that is, from the constraints of a subjectivized learning and thus the ability for a transcending reason. In contrast, knowledge that supposed that *freedom of choice was truth*—obedience to academic freedom—was enslavement; enslavement, that is, to a subjectivized learning and the inability for a transcending reason. “The result—and this is the great unspoken truth about American education—is that over the years authentic freedom,” the editors noted, “has been honored more on Catholic campuses than anywhere else in the American academy. This is quite proper because Christianity created true liberty, just as it created the university.”<sup>203</sup> “It has been said that a ‘Catholic university’ is a contradiction in terms. That is not quite right. There is no University worthy of the name that is not Catholic.”<sup>204</sup>

Second, secularization negated the purpose of the Catholic university. What indeed was the point of the Catholic university if it did not teach that it had something to teach the secular world around it? The Catholic university—commissioned to communicate “the Way, the Truth, and the Life”—was innately missionary. To become like any other secular university was to ignore the qualification “Catholic” and reject its nature. It was also to corrupt the faith and

morals of the Catholic students. Dissident theologians could teach a pluralist understanding of Catholic teaching under the protection of academic freedom. The editors were astounded by Catholic University of America's resolution to retract—because of a demonstration on his behalf—their decision in 1967 to fire Charles Curran, a dissident theology professor, for doing exactly that—corrupting the faith and morals of students. “*Triumph* believes that the strike at Catholic University protesting the dismissal of Father Charles Curran, and the American bishops' subsequent surrender to the strikers as the price of reopening the school,” the editors wrote, “is the most important thing that has happened to the Catholic Church in America since the Vatican Council.”<sup>205</sup> It was the most important thing in the Catholic Church in America since Vatican II, they believed, because it was a collapse of episcopal leadership; the bishops—who “have had laid upon them by Christ Himself the obligation of teaching sound doctrine,” the “watchdogs of orthodoxy”—capitulated to academic freedom.<sup>206</sup> “From the beginning the bishops had only two alternatives to outright surrender. They could have shut down the university on their own initiative. How refreshing that decision would have been! It would have shown who is boss,” the editors relished,

Not only at Catholic University, but of the Catholic Church. It also would have made dramatically plain that at Catholic schools the claims of the magisterium take precedence over those of academic freedom. . . . The other alternative was to take to the public forum and teach. It might not have worked, but, curiously, it was not even tried. . . . Not one of the bishops stepped forward to tell the country, of which a large part is Catholic—to say nothing of the University community, whose commitment to the Faith would have assured at least an attentive hearing—that the teaching authority of the Church was at stake, and that the removal of Fr.

Curran had been a necessary step in asserting and defending that authority.<sup>207</sup>

“Academic freedom is nothing but a late and degenerate version of the Protestant heresy of freedom of conscience. One can understand how Protestants of little faith ran afoul of this superstition and allowed it to dissolve their faith,” the editors noted; “It is less clear why Catholics have followed Protestants into this trap, and have come to believe that, not truth, but merely the search for truth, is the goal of life.”<sup>208</sup>

Third, the more the Catholic higher education made itself an appendage of the secular system—which was a system that did not speak of truth, and thus God—the greater chance it had of collapsing. It was quite foolhardy, they believed, to adopt the secular-liberal view of education as secular-liberal America was collapsing. “Modern society, everyone agrees, is sick; but Harvard and Yale—who doubts the formative power of education?—have made modern society what it is; therefore,” they sarcastically remarked, “let’s gear Catholic education to Harvard and Yale.”<sup>209</sup> It was, in effect, to follow society to its demise. To reassert Catholic triumphalism in the university, however, would be tantamount to the denial of secular accreditation, but this was of no concern to the editors; “Catholic education does not need a secular seal of approval. A pontifical university adjusting itself to the standards of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools—really!”<sup>210</sup> “The time has come,” they reasoned, “to *found* a Catholic University in America.”<sup>211</sup>

The editors were even more concerned with primary and secondary education. Education, like the family and the Church, they reasoned, must be a

bulwark and conduit of the Roman Catholic faith. They quoted Pius XI, who wrote:

‘School, considered in its historical origins, is by its very nature a subsidiary and complementary institution to the family and the Church; and the logical consequence of this fact is not only that the public school must not be contrary to the family and the Church, but also that it must be positively harmonized with these, in such a way that these three environments—school, family, Church—will constitute the one sanctuary of Christian education lest the school be perverted and transformed into a pernicious influence on youth.’<sup>212</sup>

This was not the educational situation in the United States. The public school system was secular—the Supreme Court banned organized prayer in 1962—and, as such, had “nothing to say about God, who, ultimately, is the only thing worth studying;” it thereby “denies the very *being* of the soul” and was thus a “murder machine.”<sup>213</sup> The secular school was not, then, as was supposed by the general public, a neutral institution. An institution that denied God, the editors fulminated, was hardly neutral on the question of God; in fact, “such neutrality [was] impossible.”<sup>214</sup>

The deadly nature of secular education was compounded by two factors. First, the increasingly centralizing trend of education—which placed curriculum planning in the hands of educationists who viewed man as “a mechanistic, and not a moral, being”—further eroded the moral validity of education.<sup>215</sup> The editors believed that the school system would have to be “radically decentralized”—“Decentralization of the school system and the abolition of *all* units of control above the local school board are worthy objectives.”<sup>216</sup> However “attenuated may be the values cherished and the truths held by American

parents,” the editors reasoned, “they are to be preferred to those of the federal government as Coca Cola is to be preferred to arsenic.”<sup>217</sup>

Second, education was compulsory, which was “un-Christian.”<sup>218</sup> “Unanimous and authoritative Christian teaching,” the editors wrote, “grants to *parents* primary rights in the education of children. The state has no business whatever transgressing these immutable and transcending rights.”<sup>219</sup> “It is the fundamental right of *parents* to decide how their children should be educated, in what sort of school or in no formal school at all if that seems to be the best way to guide them toward their eternal salvation.”<sup>220</sup> “It is also true that Christianity imposes on parents a responsibility to educate their children,” the editors pointed out; “but for negligence of this obligation they are answerable not to the state, but to God, and to His Church.”<sup>221</sup> This “divinely-ordained” duty included, primarily, “moral education,” and such an obligation, they warned, was doubtfully fulfilled by turning one’s children over to the secular school system.<sup>222</sup> “Any parent,” contributor Robert W. Fox advised, “who makes an irrevocable surrender of his authority over his child,

Or any parent whose children today are of necessity in the public schools who does not exercise unceasing vigilance to counteract their influence and see to it that his children learn the moral and religious principles he wants them to learn, and do everything he can to effect the return of educational control to the hands of parents rather than the state, sins against God and against his children.”<sup>223</sup>

A primary objective of a Catholic politics must begin, the editors believed, with a nation-wide campaign to abolish compulsory school attendance laws “and to restore children to their parents.”<sup>224</sup> While decentralization and the abolishment of compulsory education laws were important, the editors believed that true

reform would begin when people understood that “Christ, not education, saves.”<sup>225</sup>

The condition of parochial schools was suspect also, especially given that “the recognizable purpose of the leading Catholic educators,” the editors believed,

Is to adjust Christian Truth to the reigning secular-liberal assumptions of modern society. . . . The Virgin Birth is obscured for the sake of harmony with the Biology curriculum . . . [and] the Gospel is perverted into the Social Gospel . . . [and] the rights of Truth are suppressed in favor of freedom of expression.<sup>226</sup>

Catholic schools, however, could be reformed. Unlike secular schools, Catholic schools, the editors boasted, “are built on foundations of stone—or, better, Rock.”<sup>227</sup> But the impending problem of financing them was forcing them to secularize. The editors—although they believed that “the state, any state, owes Catholic parents, in justice, help in the Christian education of their children”—preferred that the bishops reject state money, believing that it would lead to state manipulation.<sup>228</sup> They opposed the bishops’ tax credit proposal, to help parents afford private education, because “it would hang a federal sword over them [parochial schools]: at the first sign of Catholic independence from the increasing secular hegemony in American life, the federal government could—and very likely would—diminish or cut off entirely the monies the Catholic schools had come to rely on.”<sup>229</sup> The editors viewed more favorably the so-called “voucher plan;” while it still threatened federal manipulation, it, unlike any form of aid, had the “potential for a demonstration of the worthlessness of the state schools, those institutionalized dullers of the brain, gonadizers of the heart and solvents of the

family.”<sup>230</sup> The best solution, they reasoned, was for Catholic parents to “throw off their economic oppression . . . [by] eliminating the injustice that is implicit in the very existence of the exclusively tax-supported public schools.”<sup>231</sup>

Ultimately, however, the increasing secularization of Catholic schooling, the dwindling opportunity for Catholic education, the long-term reform required to reorder Catholic education to its proper purpose—“to make the Catholic school once again a religious environment, a place where the Faith is taught, where Jesus Christ is known, where the Church He founded is honored and her teachings loved”—in addition to the deadly nature of public schools, forced the editors to conclude that the only answer was for parents to “take up ‘their role as educators’ outside the system.”<sup>232</sup> This was the only way they could fulfill their sanctified calling—“the reordering into proper harmony of the three environments—school, family, Church.”<sup>233</sup> “Let all the parents look carefully on the children. . . . Without Christ they will die; their lives will lack meaning and direction. They will be condemned anew to live in the valley of death, without hope, without consolation,” contributor William Marra warned,

Their plight must steel us in our determination to show them the good things of God. We must make our own the words of the psalmist: ‘Let the coming generation be told of the Lord so that they may proclaim to a people yet to be born the goodness He has shown.’<sup>234</sup>

In such a task would Catholic families, the editors asked, become “The residents of a ghetto?”<sup>235</sup> “Perhaps,” they cautioned, but this ghetto would be markedly different from the ethnic ghettos of their ancestors, which were designed “to cushion” assimilation; rather, the new ghetto would be fashioned for neither the sake of ethnicity or cushioning—it “will be an imperial ghetto, a fortress in which

the royal people will not hide,” the editors boasted, “but will rather arm themselves for expansion, for conquest. That ghetto will itself be a school; in it will be learned the mission of Christians: ‘Go, teach all the nations.’”<sup>236</sup>

While such education could be assumed in the home, they were calling especially for the establishment of new missionary schools. Contributor Anne Carroll developed the curriculum for such a school.<sup>237</sup> The purposes of such a school, in order of importance, were “to glorify God, to help the students save their souls, and to prepare Catholic young people to Christianize society.”<sup>238</sup> The apostolic school was “built on three foundation stones”—all of which emphasized the exoteric nature of Catholicism—“a Christian community, the lived Christian life and an academic program permeated by the Christian vision.”<sup>239</sup> “The future of the Church in our country, and indeed the future of our country itself,” Carroll warned, “depends on the raising up of an army of Christian apostles who will bring Christ to America.”<sup>240</sup>

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the title of an article written by Frederick D. Wilhelmsen. See Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "The Sovereignty of Christ—or Chaos," *The Wanderer* (October 26, 1967): 1-12. Also, see Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, *Citizen of Rome: Reflections from the Life of a Roman Catholic* (La Salle, IL: Sherwood Sugden & Company), 314-325.

<sup>2</sup> Vatican Council II, "Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World," The Holy See, [http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_cons\\_19651207\\_gaudium-et-spes\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html) (accessed July 1, 2008).

<sup>3</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Autumn of the Country," *Triumph* 3 no. 6 (June, 1968): 7. The editors wrote the following of the secular-liberal order: "It had committed the country to a disastrous war which first it would or could not win, then could not sustain, and now could not safely or honorably terminate. Internally, it was beset by civil strife and social passions which it could neither assuage nor control. The home cities were alternately seething and sullen, and in either mood were rapidly repossessing the full panoply of barbarism. All of the necessary social bonds between races and classes and generations were dissolving. The system's gods, science and technology, were no longer loved. Its arts, accordingly, had turned cynical and brutish. The country's educational establishment, the avowed cornerstone of the system, was a shambles from bottom to top. The country's moral standards, having been sacrificed to the system's ideology of freedom, had simply disappeared. The country's churches, which once provided spiritual ballast for the system, had been largely absorbed by the system; they were now merely buildings which provided especially vivid acoustics for the winds of spiritual desolation that were withering the system dry." Editors, "60,000,000 x 0 = 0," *Triumph* 3 no. 12 (December, 1968): 41.

<sup>4</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Autumn of the Country," 9.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 7. A sign of this collapsing will, the editors believed, was the attack on the death penalty. The *Triumph* staff commissioned a Jesuit, Thomas J. Higgins, to articulate the natural law defense of capital punishment. He wrote: "Far from forbidding capital punishment, the natural moral law allows it. If man now lived in the condition of original justice where no one is afflicted with concupiscence, the state would not need the power of the sword. But, since we live in a world where so many men are malicious and unjust, there is need of force to defend right. It is reasonable that force be employed to counter force and when men act like brutes they may be coerced as brutes are. The exercise of coercion in defense of private right is entrusted to society, but in certain well-defined circumstances where the civil authority is unable or unwilling to protect one, an individual may kill an unjust aggressor in self defense. The state has the same right, so that capital punishment is an application to the state of the right of self-defense. But it is more. It is protection of the juridic order of which the civil authority is public guardian. The state may

---

separate from society, once and for all, an evildoer whom it judges to be a menace. This is both a measure of self-defense and the apportionment of deserved punishment." Thomas J. Higgins, S.J., "Why the Death Penalty," *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 21. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Merciful Penalty," *Triumph* 3 no. 8 (August, 1968): 9-10; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Justice is Truth," *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 10.

<sup>7</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "In Defense of Sin," *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 12-15; and Editors, "America is a Crime Wave" *Triumph* 2 no. 7 (July, 1967): 13-14.

<sup>8</sup> John Wisner, "Wisner's World: The Ideal Man," *Triumph* 2 no. 10 (October, 1967): 27; John Wisner, "Political Aspects of Solzhenitsyn's Exile," *Triumph* 10 no. 5 (May, 1975): 12.

<sup>9</sup> Editors, "The Land of the Sacred," *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 46.

<sup>10</sup> John Wisner, "Wisner's World: Maintaining Order," *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 24.

<sup>11</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Santa for Vice-President," *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 9.

<sup>12</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: What Prisons Are For," *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 10.

<sup>13</sup> Editors, "The Sickness of the West," *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 46; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: Merry Christmas," *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 7.

<sup>14</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Autumn of the Country," 9.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Editors, "The Land of the Sacred," *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 46.

<sup>17</sup> Editors, "The Sickness of the West," *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 46; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: Rerum Futurarum," *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 7. For other articles on the decadence of secular-liberal America (and modern civilization in general), and its impending collapse, see George A. Smathers, "Business and the Crime Wave" *Triumph* 2 no. 7 (July, 1967): 10-12, 14; Editors, "Red Paper Tiger," *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 38; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Moynihan on Cities," *Triumph* 2 no. 12 (December, 1967): 7; Editors, "The End of the City," *Triumph* 2 no. 12 (December, 1967): 37; John Wisner, "Wisner's World: The Transfer," *Triumph* 3 no. 7 (July, 1968): 34; John Wisner, "The Fall of the Liberal Republic," *Triumph* 3 no. 8 (August, 1968): 11-14; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Outlawing Adam and Eve," *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 7-8; Editors, "The Conspiracy Against Justice," *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 41; John Wisner, "Wisner's World: The Power of the Press," *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 17; Gary Potter, "Potter's Field," *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 27; Editors, "Yes. Or No.," *Triumph* 5 no. 10 (October, 1970): 41; Editors, "Present Imperfect: In Search of Law and Order II," *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 6; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Prayer of the Nation," *Triumph* 6 no. 11 (November, 1971): 9-10; Robert A. Miller, "The Rule of Demons," *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 11-16; Editors, "An Idea Whose Time Has Come," *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 45; Editors, "The Unassimilable R.C.," *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 45; Editors, "A Lenten Meditation," *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 45; Francis Canavan, "Individualism and the Malaise of Modernity," *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 22-25; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Race and Creed," *Triumph* 8 no. 10 (December, 1973): 8-9; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Why Do the Pundits Rage," *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 7; Editors, "Liberal Despair, Christian Hope," *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 45; Gary Potter, "Privacy Invasion: Part I," *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 11-16, 44; Gary Potter,

---

“Privacy Invasion, Part II: Mastering Our Reality,” *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 26-30; and Editors, “Brit Flap,” *Triumph* 10 no. 8 (October, 1975): 4.

<sup>18</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Transcending the Dialectic,” *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 16. Explicating the work of Francisco Canals Vidal and Donoso Cortes, Wilhelmsen noted that the modern dialectic, which sprung from the “baneful genius of Hegel and the bitter resentment of Marx,” insisted “on reviewing reality in antagonistic terms. The order of being is not the orchestration of plurality into unity,” Wilhelmsen elaborated, “but a field of battle in which conceptual distinction is hardened into existential opposition. . . . In our time this habit of seeing every reality as a thesis, destined to encounter its anti-thesis, has given birth to the philosophy of the perpetual Revolution. . . . The law of life is a war and the perpetual destruction of existent differences in the name of nihilistic uniformity is less a goal to achieve than the imperative of a spirit which looks upon otherness as hostility. (16) The Catholic view transcended the dialectic because of its analogical understanding of the relationship between the Trinitarian God and man (and thus the truth of existence or being). “If God is One only in being Three, and is Three only in being One, then His creation finds its unity through its very differentiation. The Real,” Wilhelmsen stated, “is not governed by a Monism . . . that sets out to smash an antagonistically conceived pluralism.” (17) The objective of any true Catholic politics, then, must be to reinstitute a political order based on this “supreme law of being”—to “restore the sovereignty of Christ to our bleeding world.” (17) Under the kingship of Christ, man lived in consonance with his true being and not in opposition to a differentiated existence, but one with it because of its differentiation. Evil was not an opposition, because it was “nothing in being,” Wilhelmsen wrote, it was “the lack of what ought to be, the laceration of the Good. . . . Evil ‘is’ only by feeding negatively off being.” (17)

<sup>19</sup> L. Brent Bozell, “Letter to Yourselves,” *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 12. The difference being, Bozell believed—besides superficial debates over the proper level of government intrusion into the economy—one of efficacy in the political and social order. Secular-liberalism was America’s consensus ideology, while conservatism was an upstart contender.

<sup>20</sup> Bozell, “Letter to Yourselves,” 13. The italics are Bozell’s. *Triumph* contributors criticized both Edmund Burke—the intellectual forefather of traditionalist conservatives—and Russell Kirk, the preeminent American traditionalist. Richard C. Schenk argued that Edmund Burke’s excessive “opposition to rule by abstract theory,” denied that man had access to “metaphysical doctrines” and ruled out the possibility of knowing “absolutes in moral or political realms.” (15, 16, 17) Burke’s overreliance on the empirical made him, paradoxically, Schenk contended, a “not so-unusual man of the Enlightenment.” (17) Richard C. Schenk, “Edmund Burke: Enlightenment Man,” *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 15, 16, 17. Contributor James Fitzpatrick, in a review of Kirk’s *The Roots of the American Order*, chided Kirk for both his hostility to the implementation of metaphysical truths into governing—a prerequisite, of course, for the confessional state—and, subsequently, Kirk’s praise of the American system, which ingeniously separated governing from the metaphysical order. James Fitzpatrick, “Is Conservatism Enough?” *Triumph* 10 no. 3 (March, 1975): 18-21. Also, see Robert W. Fox, “Arts and the Age: A Christian Humanism,” *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 34-35; and Russell Kirk, “Catholic Yankee: Resuscitating Orestes Brownson,” *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 24-26.

<sup>21</sup> Bozell, “Letter to Yourselves,” 13.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 13-14.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

---

<sup>26</sup> Bozell, "Letter to Yourselves," 14.

<sup>27</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "Politics of the Poor (Letter to Yourselves, Part II)," *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 13.

<sup>28</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "True Sin, True Myth," *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 16. In regard to the "poor," Bozell was not only speaking of the economically disadvantaged, but the poor in spirit. *National Review* editors dismissed Bozell's analysis of contemporary America as "morbid" and "Manichean" and his remedies as "angelistic" and "mutinous" and, thus, "incorrect" and "certainly anti-conservative." "We have got, in America, what we have got," they wrote—"It is not what we would have, but neither is it as bad as what we might have. To dismiss even contemporary America as one vast plot against the survival of our eternal souls is Manichean and boring." L. Brent Bozell, "Letters from Yourselves," *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 40. Bozell conceded the charge of anti-conservative, but noted that a "view of things that insists on bringing God back into the world and into the affairs of men, visible and resplendent in our public life, may be boring but it is not, lovers, Manichean. Mani kept God in his Heaven, even as the modern world stuffs Him away in its churches, and as modern journalism fits Him in now and then onto a 'religion' page. At Triumph we think it's great fun, and promises an enormously exciting future, and fills all kinds of vacuums, to spill Him all over the place." Bozell, "Letters from Yourselves," 40. In a 1971 interview, Bozell expressed that he was upset by the public's assumption that he was still linked with Buckley and mainstream conservatism. "It is a hindrance to be William F. Buckley's brother-in-law," Bozell remarked, "because people are under the assumption that I share his views. I do not. He is the right wing of the establishment. I consider myself outside the establishment." Alvin Rosensweet, *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, April 24, 1971.

<sup>29</sup> Conservatives would have argued, as John Crosby noted, that tradition helps mediate the moral law and the right order of things. Crosby argued that Western Civilization may mediate some of the moral law, but it was not, Crosby wrote, a "real part of Western Civilization," while "Society and history deeply influence our knowledge of the moral law . . . they are not the matrix of the law itself, for in its being it transcends both." John Crosby, "The Odd Couple: 'Conservatism' & 'The West,'" *Triumph* 10 no. 4 (April, 1975): 17. Bozell who once wrote that Western Civilization was "God's Civilization," admitted that while it was "true that Christianity and civilization cannot be kept apart, not if there is to be a Christian people," it was equally true, he wrote, "that Christianity is not civilization, and cannot be identified with any civilization, past or future." "I once wrote an article," he confessed, "arguing that Western Christendom was 'God's Civilization.' I was wrong about that." Bozell, "Politics of the Poor (Letter to Yourselves, Part II)," 14. The "truths of the West are true," *Triumph's* editors wrote, "not because the West may have held them, but because they were given by Christianity which is the custodian of Truth." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Why Gays Make Hay," *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 10. Crosby noted that to rely on one's tradition as the moral authority was particularistic and thus relativistic. The moral law transcended culture. If not, he explained, then the "Gulag prison system is no longer simply wrong, but only an affront to Russian tradition. Abortion is not wicked; the strongest stand you can take against it is that it is un-American. The crushing of the Hungarian Revolution was not unjust, it was only a blow to the identity of Hungarian culture. Christian martyrs in communist countries are not men who obey God rather than man; they run out to be much less than we had thought, they are only loyal to the religion of their fathers." Crosby, "The Odd Couple: 'Conservatism' & 'The West,'" 17. For other debates between the editors' and conservatives (namely, *National Review*), see William F. Buckley, Jr., "Reactions: Death of the Constitution," *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 3-4; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Still the Pope," *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 10; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Conservatives' Pasch," *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 7; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Panda to the People," *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 7; William Marshner, "Contra Gentiles: Turning on the Right," *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1973): 31; Editors, "Mindszenty's Triumph," *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 45; Editors, "The Dying of Cardinal Danielou," *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 46; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Right Wing Flapping," *Triumph* 10 no. 3 (March, 1975): 5.

---

<sup>30</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "The Death of the Constitution," *Triumph* 3 no. 2 (February, 1968): 14. The italics are Bozell's.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 13. The italics are Bozell's. He was quoting from Leo XIII's encyclical, *On the Christian Constitution of States* (1885).

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 14. The italics are Bozell's. In response to Bozell's article, Charles Rice wrote that "maybe the time has come to reject explicitly the implications here of Father John Courtney Murray's accommodation. Instead of paying homage to the pluralistic society maybe we should emphasize more strongly the ultimate degeneracy of such a society when it lacks, as ours does, a theologically-grounded set of limitations." Charles E. Rice, "Reactions: Death of the Constitution," *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 4.

<sup>33</sup> Buckley, Jr., "Reactions: Death of the Constitution," 3.

<sup>34</sup> Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: There Oughta Be A Law," *Triump* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 15.

<sup>35</sup> Michael Lawrence, "What's Wrong with the American Myth?" *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 19.

<sup>36</sup> Michael Lawrence, "Reactions: The American Myth," *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 29.

<sup>37</sup> The editors, then, would not have been concerned or given much attention to the debate over the nature of the First Amendment—whether it indicated disestablishment or a high wall of separation between Church and state. To them, even the disestablishment of the church was a dangerous divorce of politics and religion.

<sup>38</sup> Michael Lawrence, "What's Wrong with the American Myth?" 19.

<sup>39</sup> Michael Lawrence, "An Inaugural Address," *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 11-15.

<sup>40</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Democracy: Transitory Meteor," *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 7.

<sup>41</sup> Editors, "Judgment Day," *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 45.

<sup>42</sup> Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: Re: 'Up from Pluralism,'" *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 25; and Lawrence, "What's Wrong with the American Myth?" 19. Also, see Michael Lawrence, "An Inaugural Address," 11-15.

<sup>43</sup> Editors, "The Reaction," *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 42. "The country's basic conviction," the editors argued, "was liberal." Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Autumn of the Country," 9.

<sup>44</sup> Michael Lawrence, "Dirty Books Are as American as Cherry Pie," *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 13.

<sup>45</sup> For example, see Michael Lawrence, "Up From Americanism," *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): (14-18); Patricia Bozell, "The Wages of Pluralism," *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 19; and Michael Lawrence, "The Council's (Unheard) Message to America," *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 17-19.

<sup>46</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "The Confessional Tribe," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (July, 1970): 12. The editors believed that America was anti-Catholic. Such anti-Catholicism, they believed, pervaded

---

American culture, especially the media establishment. The editors wrote, for example, that *Time's* real, if occasionally obscured, thesis—in an article on the post-Vatican II Church—was that “the only acceptable posture for the man of faith is rebellion, which “would mean the end of the Faith.” Editors, “Its About Time,” *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 26. Farley Clinton wrote that “in the pages of the New York *Times* the signs of deep anti-Catholic feelings are frequently visible.” Farley Clinton, “Very Great Religious Leaders of Modern Times,” *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 20. Willi Schlamm wrote that “Anti-Catholicism is the anti-Semitism of the Protestant liberal.” Willi Schlamm, “Looks Genteel Pogrom,” *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 14. Also, see Anne Westhoff Carroll, “N.A.P.A.L.M.,” *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 20-23; Thomas A. Kuhlman, “Arts and the Age: The Irrelevant Critic,” *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 34-35; Michael Lawrence, “Pro Multis: Objective AntiCatholicism,” *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 19; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Look Who’s Dead,” *Triumph* 6 no. 11 (November, 1971): 10; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Race and Creed,” *Triumph* 8 no. 10 (December, 1973): 8-9.

<sup>47</sup> Bozell, “The Confessional Tribe,” 13.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 11-15.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 15. The tribe was to be catholic and thus trans-ethnic. This view was emulated in the editors’ thoughts on *La Raza*: “For whether or not the present configurations and direction of the movement [La Raza] are healthy, there can be no doubt at all that an effective Catholic politics in the future will require a central role for the Spanish-speaking Catholics of the country, especially in the Southwest. The greatest dangers to the movement come really from two sides—on the one hand, from the temptation to be merely racial, rather than cultural and religious; and on the other, from the temptation to be assimilated into the American mainstream rather than swell the current of the Catholic mainstream. . . . It is extremely important, however, that Catholic involvement proceed on recognizably Catholic terms, as part of a Catholic strategy, for Catholic ends. That is what Catholic politics is all about.” Editors, “Present Imperfect: Catholic Politics,” *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 8.

<sup>50</sup> L. Brent Bozell, “Near the Escorial: Live Politics: Catholic,” *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 19.

<sup>51</sup> Editors, “The SCC Guild Program: Building the Christian Commonwealth,” *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 18.

<sup>52</sup> Bozell, “The Confessional Tribe,” 15; L. Brent Bozell, “Life-Money? Diaspora?” *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 8; Bozell, “The Church and the Republic,” *Triumph* 8 no. 9 (November, 1973): 13. The editors wrote: “*Our program for the salvation of the United States is to Christianize it.*” Editors, “Reactions: Triumph in America,” *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 5. Also, see L. Brent Bozell, “The State of the Tribe,” *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 30. The confession tribe thesis was criticized by a number of readers. Albert C. Walsh wrote that the Second Vatican Council’s Decree on the Laity was an order “to Christianize the social order in which we live. We are not directed to undermine that order or to reject its authority or to deny its legitimacy. . . . Our mission as Christian-Americans must be to correct, reform and perfect our system of government and social order to make America a Christian country again.” (20) Frederick Gerard believed that Bozell expressed “a sense of defeatism which despairs of the Christian intellect attaining any degree of success in its task of enlightening that portion of the world we have been given to help save. All that is left is to throw one’s self upon the sword ‘to raise a symbol.’ Which may be as dramatic as hell, but is it really the fullest utilization of our resources and capabilities? Is it really the toughest way to fight the bastards? Or is martyrdom that comes too early and too easily a copping out?” (21) William Oliver Martin agreed with Bozell in his assessment of American society, but conceded that when it came to the response, Bozell was “at his weakest. But so . . . we *all* are, at this point. What is to be done? Mr. Bozell is asking us, for God’s sake, to *do something!*” (22) Stephen J. Tonsor wrote in response: “I believe that you harbor a defective idea of the Church and the role of the Church in the world. . . . You should

---

have no illusions about the purposes of civil government. It is not to make men good, it is not to save their souls, but simply to enable men to live together with a minimum of strife and disorder. Beyond this it cannot go and wise men ought to refuse the temptation to enact their faith and their moral sensitivities into law. . . . Your basic problem is that you cannot resist the temptation to translate religion into politics and politics into religion. All that I find objectionable in TRIUMPH derives from that error.” (23) Albert C. Walsh, Frederick Gerard, Wm. O. Martin, et al., “The Confessional Tribe Under Fire,” *Triumph* 5 no. 10 (October, 1970): 20-23. For further reading on Tonsor’s conservative views, see Gregory L. Schneider, ed., *Equality, Decadence, and Modernity: The Collected Essays of Stephen J. Tonsor* (Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2005). The editors’ call to form a tribe was, they believed, quite logical not only given the anti-Christian nature of secular-liberal society, but also because modern civilization was collapsing; and, as a result, the tribe was the new form of social organization emerging in the chaos—to protect what one valued—until order was restored. The Christian tribe was intended to “bear the King over the crossing” to the new Christian order. Bozell, “The State of the Tribe,” (30). Also, see Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “The Good Earth,” *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 11-16; Gary Potter, “Arts and the Age: The Electronic Tribe,” *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 30-34; and Michael Schwartz, “Four Post-Moderns: 4 Catholics, II: A Catholic Age Emerging?” *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 26-29. Wilhelmsen worried that, because of the enormous task of re-Christianizing the secular order, “the Catholic tribal solution” was “going to face danger from the Integrist temptation.” (14) The Catholic tribe could become esoteric; that is, “elitist, “excessively moralistic,” and “read damnation everywhere on the broad screen of the contemporary world: We—the chosen ones—have the key to the truth; we alone know what it means to be Catholic in a truly dense and incarnated fashion.” (14) This would be “to abandon any effort to evangelize and hence truly incarnate the Word of God in history,” he wrote; the Catholic faith was not exclusive, but exoteric, to be imparted to all. To abandon this purpose was to deny the purpose of the Incarnation. Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Toward an Incarnational Politics,” *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 11-14.

<sup>53</sup> L. Brent Bozell, “Near to the Escorial: On Going to Jail (I)” *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 31. Bozell, along with four others, was arrested for entering the George Washington University Clinic in Washington, D.C., in an attempt to stop the clinic from performing abortions. See Editors, “Present Imperfect,” *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 7-10, 42.

<sup>54</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect,” *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 7; and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Empty Womb, Empty Altar,” *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 20.

<sup>55</sup> Editors, “Yes. Or No.” *Triumph* 5 no. 10 (October, 1970): 41.

<sup>56</sup> Gerard G. Steckler, “Christians Must Become Disturbers of the Peace,” *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 18.

<sup>57</sup> Jeffrey A. Mirus, “Politics and the Dead God,” *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 26.

<sup>58</sup> Unsigned, “Society for the Christian Commonwealth,” *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 5. This was an advertisement for the SCC’s speaker’s bureau.

<sup>59</sup> The following was a list of the speakers: “Borisz de Balla, Anthony T. Bouscaren, L. Brent Bozell, Rev. Harold O.J. Brown, Farley Clinton, Ever Curtis, M.D., Christopher Derrick, Robert W. Fox, Hamish Fraser, Jerzy Hauptmann, Alice von Hildebrand, Dietrich von Hildebrand, Russell Kirk, Francis J. Kovach, Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, Michael Lawrence, William A. Marra, Wm. Oliver Martin, Donald G. McClane, Thomas Molnar, Gerhart Niemeyer, Rev. Edmund A. Opitz, Peter J. Stanlis, H. Lyman Stebbins, Georg B. Tennyson, Gaetano L. Vincitorio, Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, and John H. Wisner.” Unsigned, “Society for the Christian Commonwealth,” *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 5. For *Catholic Currents* and *Life in America*, see L. Brent Bozell, “Life-Money? Diaspora?” *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 8; and Editors, “Present

---

Imperfect: Life in America," *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 5. Wilhelmsen was the director of the Christian Commonwealth Institute (CCI). The CCI's curriculum included "Metaphysics, Aesthetics, Communications, European History" and the "Art of Play." "Formal studies," the advertisement read, "will constitute only a part—however important—of the life of the Christian Commonwealth Institute. An equally vital aspect of the student's experience will be his immersion in an organically Catholic *life style*. Authentic Christianity has never embraced the work ethic that so often suffocates American students. The Christian tradition insists on the superiority of leisure—contemplation, play: activity undertaken for its *own* sake. But leisure, the basis of culture, cannot be learned from a drawing board; its value can be appreciated only by experiencing, by doing it. The streets of El Escorial will thus be the Institute's classroom for learning the art of play." Unsigned, "The Christian Commonwealth Institute," *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 31. Also, see Unsigned, "Christian Commonwealth Institute," *Triumph* 6 no. 5 (May, 1971): 23. For the SCC Guild Program, see L. Brent Bozell, "Life-Money? Diaspora?" 8; Editors, "The SCC Guild Program: Building the Christian Commonwealth," 11-18. The SCC also established a press, the Escorial Press, and an elementary school, and conducted mass mailing campaigns, one of which was titled, "Stop Immorality on TV." L. Brent Bozell, "Life-Money? Diaspora?" 8. The SCC also developed a film, "*Jubilee—Holy Year 1975*," a "52-minute color movie. Focusing on a march by 150 Holy Year pilgrims from Assisi to Rome, and featuring as the core of its narrative text the Holy Year catechesis of Pope Paul VI." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Coming Attraction," *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 6; L. Brent Bozell, "Near to the Escorial: A Holy Year Film," *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 31; and Ronald Lamb, "Holy Year 1975," *Triumph* 10 no. 6 (June, 1975): 31.

<sup>60</sup> For information on YAF, which had a profound impact on the conservative political movement, see Gregory L. Schneider, *Cadres for Conservatism: Young Americans for Freedom and the Rise of the Contemporary Right* (New York: New York University Press, 1999). YAF suffered, the editors' believed, from the same libertarian errors that plagued the conservative movement. Telling to them was a return package that former *Triumph* staffers, *Rough Beast* editors, Gary Potter and John Wisner received from an advertising campaign for their journal. They sent out—with the help of Brad Evans, a YAF national director—copies of their first issue to the fifty state directors of YAF. The cover read: "The attack on life is the central political fact of today and fighting it is what this magazine is about," and on the back cover there was a picture of an aborted infant at the bottom of a trash can. Gary Potter noted: "We got no responses at all except two used condoms. That, as far as I was concerned . . . just about summed up the position of the 'conservatives.' Most conservatism in the United States is nothing but an expression of the right wing of the national liberalism. Those used condoms were testimony to that." Gary Potter, interview by Patrick Allitt, 4 March 1991, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA; and *Rough Beast* 1 no. 1 (May, 1970). In regard to another conservative organization, the John Birch Society, it appears Bozell's tactic may have been one of cooptation. The John Birch Society (JBS)—which was founded by Robert Welch—was a grassroots, conservative anticommunist organization that stressed the conspiratorial nature of the communist advance. Robert Welch, for example, argued in his book, *The Politician*, that Dwight D. Eisenhower was "sympathetic to ultimate Communist aims, realistically and even mercilessly willing to help them achieve their goals, knowingly receiving and abiding by Communist orders, and consciously serving the communist conspiracy, for all of his adult life." Robert Welch, *The Politician* (Belmont, MA: Belmont Publishing Company, 1963), 278. The JBS was an effective grassroots organization that promoted anti-liberal and anticommunist agendas that aided the conservative political movement. Yet, *National Review* editors William F. Buckley, Jr., James Burnham, and Frank S. Meyer decided that the organization did more harm than good to the conservative movement and excommunicated the JBS from the mainstream movement. See William F. Buckley, Jr., Frank S. Meyer, and James Burnham, "The John Birch Society and the Conservative Movement," *National Review* 17 (October 19, 1965): 914-1929. Possibly seeing a chance to bring Birchers into *Triumph's* radical Christian movement, Bozell argued that the "real trouble with the Birch thesis is not that it depends on an implausible conspiracy, but that it depends on an implausible remedy. For all of the thesis' apparent spookiness, the official Birch

---

response—‘exposure,’ ‘destruction’—is as thoroughly rationalistic and beholden to human means as the Encyclopedist deception that is said to have launched the Conspiracy of Evil in the first place. Yet the typical Bircher instinctively knows better. He knows that the One behind the desk (or lurking in the back room) is a Spirit, for whom there is only one rebuff. Begone. What he may be brought to know even better is that Satan can be spoken to in that way only by Christ, or by men adequately armed with Christ.” L. Brent Bozell, “Near to the Escorial: The JBS and the SCC,” *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October 1971): 31. For information on Robert Welch and the John Birch Society, see Edward G. Griffin, *The Life and Words of Robert Welch: Founder of the John Birch Society* (Thousand Oaks, CA: American Media, 1975); and Jonathan M. Schoenwald, *A Time for Choosing: The Rise of Modern American Conservatism* (New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2001), 62-99. And for a case study of the JBS in Orange County, California, see Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

<sup>61</sup> Unsigned, ed. *Frederick Daniel Wilhelmsen (Eminent Professor and Catholic Intellectual): A Tribute from the University of Dallas* (Dallas: University of Dallas, 1998), 62.

<sup>62</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Sons of Thunder,” *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 8. Part of the Sons of Thunder’s press statement read: “Interference with God’s plan for creation lies outside the authority of man and when a nation commits itself to this type of action, it violates the natural law and thereby commits itself to a policy of national sin.”

<sup>63</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Sons of Thunder,” 8.

<sup>64</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect,” *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 7; and Judith Martin, “An Attack on Ti-Grace,” *Washington Post*, March 11, 1971; and Editors, “God and Woman at Catholic U,” *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 21-22.

<sup>65</sup> Editors, “Rockefeller, Of Course,” 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 44.

<sup>66</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “A Parting of Friends,” *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 24.

<sup>67</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Violence, Anyone?” *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 9. Some of *Triumph*’s editors and writers prevented a leftist Catholic group from holding a debate on contraception in St. Matthew’s Cathedral in Washington, D.C. See Unsigned, “Practically Schismatic,” *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 8.

<sup>68</sup> L. Brent Bozell, “Near to the Escorial: On Going to Jail (III),” *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 19.

<sup>69</sup> L. Brent Bozell, “Near to the Escorial: On Going to Jail (II),” *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 21; Bozell, “Near to the Escorial: On Going to Jail (III),” 19. Also, see L. Brent Bozell, “Near to the Escorial: On Going to Jail (IV)” *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 31; and L. Brent Bozell, “Near to the Escorial: Live Politics: Black,” *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 19.

<sup>70</sup> Editors, “To Be the Christian System,” *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 45. Such institutional support included among other things, Catholic health insurance agencies, credit unions, co-ops, charitable institutions, professional associations, and presses.

<sup>71</sup> Vatican Council II, “Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity,” *The Holy See*, [http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decree\\_19651118\\_apostolicam-actuositatem\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651118_apostolicam-actuositatem_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008); and Editors, “The SCC Guild Program: Building the Christian Commonwealth,” 11-18. This section of the *Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity* reads: “Christ’s redemptive work, while essentially concerned with the salvation of men, includes also the renewal of the whole temporal order.

---

Hence the mission of the Church is not only to bring the message and grace of Christ to men but also to penetrate and perfect the temporal order with the spirit of the Gospel. In fulfilling this mission of the Church, the Christian laity exercise their apostolate both in the Church and in the world, in both the spiritual and temporal orders. These orders, although distinct, are so connected in the singular plan of God that He Himself intends to raise up the whole world again in Christ and to make it a new creation, initially on earth and completely on the last day. In both orders the layman, being simultaneously a believer and a citizen, should be continuously led by the same Christian conscience." Vatican Council II, "Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity." Also, see Hamish Fraser, "The Triumphalism of Vatican II," *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 18-22; Bernardino Montejano, "I. The Council Preserves the Tradition," *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 14-16; and Michael Lawrence, "The Council's (Unheard) Message to America," 17-19.

<sup>72</sup> Warren H. Carroll, "The West Come to Judgment," *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 43. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: Decimo Anno" *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 7. The editors wrote: "Our purpose, properly understood, is to work for the creation of those conditions under which the Christian Church may execute her political charge. . . . The Church's command is to renew the temporal order; the initiative, the choice of means, and the actual doing of the job are the work of the laity's obligation." Editors, "Judgment Day," 45.

<sup>73</sup> Editors, "The Queen," *Triumph* 6 no. 5 (May, 1971): 22. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: Merry Christmas," *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 7; and John J. Nicola, "Satan, Again," *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 36-38.

<sup>74</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Christmas in Christendom," *Triumph* 2 no. 12 (December, 1967): 10. Part of the modern derision toward the Incarnation was derived from the knowledge that the belief in a God-man savior was a reoccurring phenomenon in history, and that Christ was yet another conjuring of this desire for a savior and thus only a myth. Christopher Derrick dispatched these claims by noting that "men have argued as though the Christian claim could be undermined by a demonstration that the alleged point of intersection lay wholly within the line of mythology. Inevitably it odes: looking down the long perspective that line, one sees an unlimited series of Christ-like figures—trinities on high, from which gods or heroes come to save their people, born of virgins, suffering and triumphant, and equated mysteriously with our daily bread, with the wheat that dies and is buried and then rises again in the spring to be our nourishment and life. There are any number of such mythologies, affecting and the mind most powerfully, plainly corresponding to something very deep in ourselves and in the universe: Christianity is not in the least diminished or undermined by a frank recognition that lies within this series, is a member of this class. The case is, rather, the other way round: if Christianity had nothing whatever in common with all those ancient dreams and yearnings, its claim to fill our deepest needs would be so much the less plausible. In that case, it might really be said to lack 'relevance.'" Christopher Derrick, "Fact & Meaning in the Age of Aquarius," *Triumph* 6 no. 5 (May, 1971): 8.

<sup>75</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Hallowed Be Thy World," *Triumph* 3 no. 6 (June, 1968): 11.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, 11. The italics are Wilhelmsen's. Wilhelmsen wrote: "But the Incarnation of the Son of God in time, united with the dictate to 'restore all things in Christ,' calls for a sacramentalizing of the real, a hallowing of creation, an extension of the sacramental system by which Christ saves through His Church. This laying of hands upon the political and social order transfigures institutions, sanctifies work, and turns everything human into a sacramental. Wayside shrines: blessed fishing fleets: blessed burial grounds: guilds dedicated to the saints and to the Mother of God: oaths exchanged in court and vowed under promises made to God: coronation rituals woven into sacral liturgy: the lively promotion by magistrates of sound morals: the material aid given by government to Church in its evangelical mission—all these things and hundreds others like them tend to weave a golden web of sacrality around the world and to spread outwards into space and carry through time the Incarnation of Our Lord." Frederick D.

---

Wilhelmsen, "Toward an Incarnational Politics," *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 14. The act of sanctifying things was to orient them to God, so that they would become, John J. Mulloy noted, "channels of communication to the realm of the Holy and the Other. . . . So that they acquire in some measure the character and vital power of the supernatural," of the divine. In this way, they were sacred, they had the "*special quality of being connected with or ordained to the divine sphere in an exceptional way and degree*," Josef Pieper wrote. See John J. Mulloy, "Cleansing the Great Guilty Temple: A Reflection on the Wisdom of Christopher Dawson," *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 22; and Josef Pieper, "The Realm of the Sacred," *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 13. The italics are Pieper's. Also, see Josef Pieper, "The Realm of the Sacred: In the Presence of God," *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 19-22.

<sup>77</sup> Wilhelmsen, "Hallowed Be Thy World," 12.

<sup>78</sup> Wilhelmsen, "A Parting of Friends," 24.

<sup>79</sup> Wilhelmsen, "Hallowed Be Thy World," 14.

<sup>80</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: "Decimo Anno" *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 7.

<sup>81</sup> Wilhelmsen, "Hallowed Be Thy World," 11; and Michael Lawrence, "Up From Americanism," *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 14-18.

<sup>82</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Respondeo: Dicendum: A Farwell," *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 31.

<sup>83</sup> This task was indeed daunting given that for the last four hundred years society had been tearing down the sacral order that had been established in the Middle Ages. The Christian understanding of being was one in which "man saw all things as holding existence on suffrage from the Lord," which fostered "awe, reverence, [and] piety" for creation—for simply existing, for simply being—because Christ's being in itself sanctified the world. But the rationalist mind, originating in the Renaissance, conceptualized existence as have meaning or value only in becoming, only in transformation. Creation, then, was valueless in itself. Nature, then, "became something different," Wilhelmsen wrote, "Symbolized by mathematical constructs, conceived as a clock governed by rigid laws, nature was looked upon as a network of moving bodies devoid of qualitative differences and of ontological density. . . . What had been the Glove of God for Christendom—the world—became the raw material of Manchesterianism, its threads taken apart and then fed back into spinning jennies. Calvinism, hating the world, married the rationalistic spirit; and both of them, pumped by French lucidity and the greed of Dutch and English capitalism, engendered the Modern Age which today passed out of history." Wilhelmsen, "The Good Earth," 13-14.

<sup>84</sup> Wilhelmsen, "A Parting of Friends," 25.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 25. Despite the difficulties in Christianizing America, the editors believed that the new "electronic technology" would aid their quest. This type of technology was not like the mechanical technology, which took "things out of nature," but rather moved "information *about* nature." Wilhelmsen, "The Good Earth," 16. It was a medium of information and communication which could be used to unite and expand the Christian tribe, because its visual medium held out the possibility of a symbolic and personal form of communication, which was agreeable to the Catholic and tribal mentality. Wilhelmsen, "Toward an Incarnational Politics II: The Hour Is Short; The Hour Is Now," 28-31. Also, see Kristin M. Popik, "The Politics of Neuronic Man," *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 34-37. Wilhelmsen wrote that the new electronic technology will free the pope "from the need to rely on the older mechanical chain of command in order to transmit the awesomeness of his authority and power. Freed by technology from the need to transmit the Word and the Will of God through lesser figures, the Pope will bypass the possibility of being constantly misunderstood. He will be everywhere and at once in the very immediacy of his

person. Even now his iconic power is sensed by Hell." Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Pope as Icon," *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 14. For articles on the confessional tribe, Christian militancy, and the mission to Christianize America, see Gary Potter, "Potter's Field," *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 27; Arnold Lunn, "With No Apologies," *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 18-21; M. Marjorie Fuchs, "His Mercy Reaches From Age to Age," *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 24-26; Christopher Derrick, "In Defense of Triumphalism," *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 18-21; Gary K. Potter, "Potter's Field: Drawing the Sword," *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 39; Michael Lawrence, "Present Imperfect: Prologue," *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 7-10, 42; Michael Lawrence, "Present Imperfect: Epilogue," *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 42; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Bishops and Sons," *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): (8); L. Brent Bozell, "Near to the Escorial: The Heart of the Tribe," *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): (20); Editors, "God and Woman at Catholic U." 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): (21-22); Editors, "Present Imperfect: Mayday," *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): (5); Editors, "Establishing the Resistance" *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): (30); Lee Gilbert, "Letters to John and Mary Ann: Preamble to an Exodus" *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 24-26, 44; Editors, "Present Imperfect: 'What Floats on Top'" *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 9-10; Bozell, "Near to the Escorial: On Going to Jail (I)," 31; Bozell, "Near to the Escorial: On Going to Jail (II)," 21; Editors, "The SCC Guild Program: Building the Christian Commonwealth," 11-18; Bozell, "Near to the Escorial: On Going to Jail (III)," 19; Bozell, "Near to the Escorial: On Going to Jail (IV)," 31; Editors, "The Solzhenitsyn Witness" *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 46; Bozell, "Near to the Escorial: Live Politics: Black," 19; Bozell, "Near to the Escorial: Live Politics: Catholic," 19; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Doing One's Job," *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 8-9; Editors, "Hail, Lady of Victory" *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 46; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Decimo Anno" *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 7; Editors, "Support Your Local Bishop" *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 10; L. Brent Bozell, "Near to the Escorial: Stop the Death Merchants III" *Triumph* 7 no. 10 (December, 1972): 18; Editors, "Justice for the People" *Triumph* 7 no. 10 (December, 1972): 46; Editors, "Present Imperfect: In Restraint of Maude," *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 9-10; Warren H. Carroll, "The Modern University: Missionary Territory," *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 18-21; Editors, "Whither the Democrats?" *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 45; Editors, "Ecumenism or Catholicism: Two Politics," *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 46; Bozell, "Life-Money? Diaspora?" 8; Editors, "A Lenten Meditation," *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 45; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Baptizing the Country," *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 10; Thomas U. Mullaney, "The Rosary: Sword of Deliverance," *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 11-13; Albert Walsh, "Toward a Christian Social Order" *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 15-18; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Taking Liberties," *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (June, 1973): 7; Editors, "Present Imperfect: People Who Need PeopleHood," *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (June, 1973): 9; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Taxing Game," *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 8-9; Editors, "Present Imperfect: A Stitch in Time," *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 10; Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Respondeo: Didendum: J.S. Mills v. Popcorn," *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 16-17; Editors, "To Be the Christian System," *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 45; Michael Brock, "Lessons from 'Dagger John,'" *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 18-20; Editors, "Rockefeller, Of Course," *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 11-13, 44; Paul A. Fisher, "The New Hugh Carey," *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 26-27; Editors, "Mother Seton the Builder," *Triumph* 10 no. 2 (February, 1975): 45.

<sup>86</sup> The editors' criticism of America, especially their contention that the American system was inherently anti-Christian, elicited a harsh reaction from the Right. It was taken by the Right to be yet another 1960s-expression of anti-Americanism. The stance was simply too unpatriotic for contributor James Fitzpatrick: *When my face is stuck between the covers of Triumph, I am all yours. You hypnotize me. An aroma of incense from my altar boy days gives me a high. But then I go to work, and stop off for a beer, and paddle around a stream chasing trout with my kids, and, well, I'm not so sure things are as un-Christian as you think.* (14) In fact, he believed that *Triumph's* editors were acting too hasty, "America is lost and confused," he admitted, "not evil, a lost sheep, a prodigal son. . .and you know what that means if you're a Christian." (14) Fitzpatrick argued for the supposed dichotomy Saint Augustine set up between the City of God and the City of Man, the latter of which, Fitzpatrick contended, was not meant to save a man's soul, as Bozell

---

had posited, but to merely “ensure enough civil peace and international stability to allow the individual Christian the time . . . and space to work at it on his own.” (14) Withdrawal of support was only necessary when it was “truly impossible for a Christian to be a Christian in America. . . . And, dammit, the country just isn’t that sick.” (15) “We Catholics,” he exclaimed, “cannot leave. The blood of our fathers has been shed on too many beaches; too many plots of America soil have been watered with too much of our family’s sweat.” (15) James Fitzpatrick, “Dear Triumph: Do You Really Mean It?” *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 14-15. For other articles expressing Fitzpatrick’s view, see Thomas Graf, “Reactions: Dear Triumph,” *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 3-4. Charles G. Mills IV, “Reactions: Dear Triumph,” *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 4-5. James G. Colbert, Jr., “Reactions: Dear Triumph,” *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 5; and Albert C. Walsh, “Reactions: Dear Triumph,” *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 5-6. America’s “divorce of politics and morality” was not, Alan Simek argued, as Fitzpatrick assumed, derived or justified by Augustine, who envisioned a “tension” in men between the City of Man and the City of God (visible in the Church and the hearts of men) to help them reference the “commandment of love,” which was transcendent. (18, 17) Rather, it was derived from the tradition of “Machiavelli . . . Luther . . . Hobbes and Locke,” which “has attempted to sunder our lives into two separate halves, so that on the one hand we might follow the urges of power and ambition, instinct and desire, while as souls we remained open to receive God in the privacy of our being.” (18) “This wrongful separation of God and world, soul and body, faith and works, external and internal freedom,” Simek noted, banished both the tension in men between the City of Man and City of God, and, consequently the commandment of love in the public life, which was now open to the “snares of Lucifer” and making “war on Christ the King.” (18) “By America’s failure to live this tension it has failed *not* as a City of God”—*Triumph*’s staff was not promoting utopia—“but as a City of Man.” (18) Alan Simek, “The Commandment of Love,” *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 17-18. For other critical responses to Fitzpatrick’s letter, see Bozell, “True Sin, True Myth,” 15-16; Mario De Solenni, “A Is Not B Is Not C,” *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 16-17; Anne W. Carroll, “God and Country,” *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 18-19; Lee Gilbert, “New Jerusalem and the Word of God,” *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 19-20; William H. Marshner, “Effectus Odit Quorum Amat Causas,” *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 20, 42; and Cyrus Brewster, “The Bounty and Its Source,” *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 42.

<sup>87</sup> L. Brent Bozell, “True Sin, True Myth,” 15-16.

<sup>88</sup> Editors, “Judgment Day,” 45. In this particular article, the editors were concerned with the government’s financing of contraceptive devices and counseling, which violated the moral law.

<sup>89</sup> Editors, “A Question of Legitimacy,” *Triumph* 6 no. 12 (December, 1971): 46.

<sup>90</sup> Wilhelmsen, “A Parting of Friends,” 24.

<sup>91</sup> Lawrence, “What’s Wrong with the American Myth?” 18.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, 18. Marcel Lefebvre wrote, “The history of Christian faith manifests the providential role of the State to such a point that it can be legitimately contended that its participation in the eternal salvation of humanity is of outstanding, if not preponderant, importance.” Marcel Lefebvre, “The Case for Authority,” *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 16.

<sup>93</sup> Editors, “Ireland & Spain: Mirrors of Christendom,” *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 45. Robert Fox wrote “that humanity was created innocent but has become corrupted and condemned through original sin; that man’s original capacity for blessedness, its loss through disobedience, and its restoration through redemptive grace are truths which must control the right ordering of human life, whether of the individual, the nation or of human society as a whole.” Robert W. Fox, “Arts and the Age: Ye Shall Be As Gods,” *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 32.

---

<sup>94</sup> Bozell explained the advantages of the confessional state: “The first is that Christianity sees the public life, which is the responsibility of politics, as an extension of the interior life. . . . True, the public and the interior are distinct realms and are governed differently. To go no further, the grace that comes to man through private prayer or the Sacraments is of a different order from the grace which is meant to be found in the public life. But this grace is the favor of the same God and supports the same Truth. Therefore disharmony between the two realms is a sign that God has been excluded from at least one of them, and probably both. . . . ‘The world must speak of God; otherwise, man can normally have no access to him.’ The second advantage of the Christian conception is that the public life is not confined to what the state does, or what government does. The public life is whatever is not the interior life. This means that Christian politics is free to regard family and school, play and work, art and communication, the order of social relationships and the civil order, as integral parts of a whole: as integral and therefore mutually dependent aspects of civilization. . . . Christian politics is obliged to take this view of the matter, for the sake of the poor. What point is there in encouraging virtue in the family, and having it undermined in the school and on the street? What point in passing on truth by the unadorned world, only to have it repudiated by art? The liberal conception of politics came into the world with Machiavelli and Bodin, with Hobbes and Locke, and proceeded to reduce the science of politics to the science of the state. This has led, on the one hand, to wretched totalitarianism, where the state does everything; and on the other, to wretched libertarianism, where the state does nothing. The third advantage is a corollary to broadening the reach of politics. The Christian conception invites single-minded attention to the ‘quality’ of the public life. This idea has recently been co-opted by statist liberals (the phrase is theirs), and generally been denounced by conservative liberals. Both the initiative and the reaction are understandable. *Even* the custodians of the liberal system can discern the neglect of quality, and see that it is killing the system. . . . Indeed I have greater sympathy for the impulse, however belated and benighted, to attend to quality, than for the impulse to do nothing (except maybe say a prayer) about what everyone knows is corrupting the poor. . . . *Triumph’s argument is that the public life cannot provide support for the poor unless it provides sensible expressions of truth and beauty and love—unless it sets up sensible signs of the divine.*” L. Brent Bozell, “Politics of the Poor (Letter to Yourselves, Part II),” 12-13.

<sup>95</sup> Jeffrey A. Mirus, “Politics and the Dead God,” *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 24.

<sup>96</sup> Michael Schwartz, “Democracy: For Catholics Only,” *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 24.

<sup>97</sup> William H. Marshner, “Don Federico: Presente!” *Faith and Reason* 22 no. 4 (Winter, 1996): 250. The quoted portion was taken from the following story relayed by Marshner: “Fritz [Wilhelmsen] used to tell the story of a swing he made through New York, visiting and partying with the *Commonweal* crowd in the late ‘40s. They were literate, witty, pious (in their way) but unable to imagine anything better than tinkering about within democracy. ‘Yes, but what is your vision?’ Fritz asked them. They had no answer. Liberalism was their outer horizon; they could envision nothing beyond it. Fritz astounded them with a genuine alternative: Habsburg restoration, Christendom reborn from the Andes to the Urals.” (252)

<sup>98</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Respondeo Dicendum: Family Politics,” *Triumph* 10 no. 2 (February, 1975): 43. So it was also, then, with dynastic succession, a “son is the son of his father and *his* father inherited before him. These truths of being are prior to every legality, prior to all doctrine,” Wilhelmsen wrote, “they are simply one with the agathonic structure of Existence.” Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Charlie and Legitimacy,” *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 23. Wilhelmsen wrote: “Democratic republics simply cannot permit the principle of familial legitimacy to coexist with their own insistence that society is basically formed of individuals: hence the theorem, one man, one vote. The basic theological and metaphysical issue at question concerns the very structure of personhood. If I am principally *who* I am and not *what* I am, then society ought to be structured around the family: I am the Name that I am thanks to my parents. If, on the contrary, *who* I am is irrelevant; if the principle question concerning me has to do with *what* I am, then

---

democratic individualism ought to have its way.” Also, see Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Arts and the Age: Hapsburg AEIOU,” *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 32-35; Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Respondeo: Dicendum: The Form is the Point,” *Triumph* 8 no. 9 (November, 1973): 19. Also, see Editors, “Present Imperfect: A Gift to All Manner of Folk,” *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 7-8; and Editors, “Felix Aquaporta,” *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (June, 1973): 45. Also, see Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, “The Church and Our Age: Sovereignty or Servitude?” *Triumph* 3 no. 12 (December, 1968): 25-27. Monarchy, contributor Solange Hertz noted, was “the only form of government formally and positively sanctioned in Scripture and Tradition” and consonant with the “very order of Persons in the Most Blessed Trinity, where God the Father is Source of both the Son and the Holy Spirit.” Solange Hertz, “D’abord, the Home: Mama’s Manifesto,” *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 20.

<sup>99</sup> William H. Marshner, “Liberty and the Social Order,” *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 23.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, 24.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.* The liberal view militated against the Catholic understanding of God, who could not choose evil. The liberal view, Marshner explained, implied either that God had such liberty, which “would be to destroy the divine nature of itself,” or that God was “unfree”—and given the liberal view that “liberty is the supreme perfection”—then, it followed that “man is higher than God.”

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>108</sup> Wilhelmsen, *Citizen of Rome*, 318.

<sup>109</sup> Paul Cole Beach, “Realities: God and Caesar,” *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 29.

<sup>110</sup> Schwartz, “Democracy: For Catholics Only,” 25.

<sup>111</sup> Marshner, “Liberty and the Social Order,” 26.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>114</sup> Neil McCaffrey, “Utopia: Off Limits for Catholics,” *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 26. Contributor Philip Burnham criticized the editors’ and their confessional state theorizing. He wrote: “Repeatedly in articles and editorials *Triumph* sounds as though it possessed an obvious and explicit and detailed blueprint of *the* Christian and Catholic economic, political and social order . . . in contrast, for instance, to ‘Communism’ and to ‘the liberal Republic.’ There must be other readers and potential readers besides me who do not know any ‘Catholic social doctrine.’ I know we are supposed to love our neighbor as ourselves. We are to ‘give back to Caesar what belongs to Caesar—and to God what belongs to God.’ But you take it from there. What social actions and institutions would arise from a present or future generation whose members in their

---

own lives followed the 'law' of God and the desires, purposes and inspirations they obtained through prayer, penance, contemplation and grace—that is something this reader may occasionally in part guess, but does now know." Philip Burnham, "Reactions: Catholic Social Doctrine," *Triumph* 3 no. 8 (August, 1968): 6.

<sup>115</sup> William H. Marshner, "Contra Gentiles: Anabaptism: Off Limits, Too," *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 27.

<sup>116</sup> For further expressions of the staff's confessional state theories (and/or the problem with the division that the American system established between the spiritual and temporal order, see Christopher Dawson, "The Christian Church and the Democratic State," *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 21-24; Rousas J. Rushdoony, "Foundation of Western Liberty," *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 26-29; Lefebvre, "The Case for Authority," 13-16; Charles Rice, "We Hold No Truths?" *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 11-13; Lawrence, "Up From Americanism," 14-18; Lawrence, "An Inaugural Address," 11-15; Bozell, "Letter to Yourselves," 11-14; Bozell, "Letter to Yourselves, II," 11-14; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Commit Fortas Now!" *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 7; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Dr. Rafferty's Dilemma," *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 9-10; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Magazine's for Burning," *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 7-8; Lawrence, "Our First Three Years," 10-14; Mulloy, "Cleansing the Great Guilty Temple: A Reflection on the Wisdom of Christopher Dawson," 22-24; Mirus, "Politics and the Dead God," 24-26; Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: Catholics and Their History," *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 27; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Democracy: Transitory Meteor," 7; Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: There Oughta Be A Law," 15; Patricia B. Bozell, Realities: Monarchs and Ministers," *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 29; James G. Colbert, Jr., "Reactions: Tribal Advise," *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 6, 42; William H. Marshner, "A Mass at the Valley of the Fallen," *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 11-13; Beach, "Realities: God and Caesar," 29; Editors, "Ireland & Spain: Mirrors of Christendom," 45; Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: Does Politics Matter" *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 23; Montejano, "I. The Council Preserves the Tradition," 14-16; Lawrence, "The Council's (Unheard) Message to America," 17-19; Carroll, "The West Come to Judgment," 28; Editorial, "The Solzhenitsyn Witness," *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 46; Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: Woodstock Notes," *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 15; William H. Marshner, "Contra Gentiles: Non-Cartesian Sociology," *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 31; William H. Marshner, "Politique d'Abord," *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 11-15; Editors, "1972: Acceptable Year of the Lord," *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 45-46; Martin F. Larrey, "John Courtney Murray: A Reappraisal," *Triumph* 7 no. 10 (December, 1972): 23; John G. Schmitz, "Up From Politics," *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 24-27; Albert Walsh, "Toward a Christian Social Order," *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 15-19; Marshner, "Liberty and the Social Order," 23-26; Editors, "Felix Aquaporta," *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (June, 1973): 45; Schwarz, "Democracy: For Catholics Only," 24-25; McCaffrey, "Utopia: Off Limits for Catholics," 26; Francis Canavan, "Individualism and the Malaise of Modernity," *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 22-25; Neil McCaffrey, "The Last Word: Catholic Mathematics," *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 21; Wilhelmssen, "Respondeo: Dicendum: The Form Is the Point," 19; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Nixon v. the Media," *Triumph* 8 no. 10 (December, 1973): 7; Robert A. Miller, "Catholic Politics: Two Views: Forming a People," *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 30, 43; Editors, "Present Imperfect: A Stitch in Time," *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 10; Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, "The Trouble with Christian Democracy," *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 26-28; Robert A. Miller, "The Politics of Mercy," *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 11-15; Editors, "On Impeachment," *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 46; Thomas Barbarie, "Christian Manifesto," *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 18-21; Wilhelmssen, "Respondeo: Dicendum: Family Politics," 43; and Karl G. Schude, "Christian Culture: Blessing or Burden?" *Triumph* 10 no. 4 (April, 1975): 9-12, 22.

<sup>117</sup> Lawrence, "Up From Americanism," 17.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid.

---

<sup>119</sup> Hamish Fraser wrote that Second Vatican Council called “for the restoration of the temporal power of the Catholic laity.” (20) He noted that it was incorrect to assume that Vatican II condemned the confessional state—“as if it were possible on the one hand to insist on penetrating and perfecting the temporal order with the spirit of the Gospel,” he wrote, “and on the other hand to rule out in advance any question of the restoration of Christendom on twentieth century foundations.” (22) Hamish Fraser, “The Triumphalism of Vatican II,” *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 18-22.

<sup>120</sup> Lawrence, “Up From Americanism,” 18.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.* Charles Rice criticized Murray as well, not for his demotion of the confessional state, but for not developing a “middle ground” that would entail “a power in government to prefer theistic religion and to encourage theistic religious bodies.” (12-13, 38) Rice, unlike the editors, was not in favor of the confessional state. He believed that the state should not favor any particular theistic denomination (disestablishment), but must confess a general theism. The problem with the American system was that the Supreme Court, beginning in the late 1950s, defined state neutrality among theistic and non-theistic religions, which was not neutral. Rather, it has led to “an aggressive establishment of a secularistic agnosticism as the national religion,” which curtailed the freedom of theistic religion, which was a violation of the American tradition, and was much too radical of a separation of the temporal and spiritual orders, leading to moral degeneration. (12-13, 38) Charles E. Rice, “We Hold No Truths?,” *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 11-13, 38.

<sup>123</sup> Lawrence, “Up From Americanism,” 18. Also, see Lawrence, “The Council’s (Unheard) Message to America,” 17-19; and Montejano, “I. The Council Preserves the Tradition,” 14-16. Montejano wrote: “In conclusion, then, we have seen that the religious liberty proclaimed by the Council, rightly interpreted, does not exonerate us Christians from our missionary task, from our effort to make legal catholicity coincide with real catholicity, nor from our obligation to instaurate all things in Christ.”

<sup>124</sup> Editors, “The Election,” *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1968), 41; also, see Editors, “The Elections,” *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 45; Alan Simek, “Neither Either Nor Or,” *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 21-25. Although the editors printed an article by Mel Bradford that praised Wallace as a break from the status quo politics of the Democratic and Republican parties, they ultimately dismissed Wallace as a demagogic (race and economic) agitator, who was as mired in the secular-dialectic as much as his opponents, and dangerously promoted the “myth” that America could return to a more “pristine” republic. “In short, if the Wallace constituency is doing battle against the *philosophe* and his minions, it cannot be doing so under any mandate traceable to the basic arrangements of the American republic which, having declared its independence in phrases coined by the leading *philosophe* of the day and adopted a constitution as faithful as any could be to the Enlightenment, marched straight away from there to here.” Editors, “Wallace,” *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 46; and Mel Bradford, “A Southern Tribunate,” *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 16-18. The editors also printed an article by *Triumph* contributor, Warren H. Carroll, which urged Catholics to vote for John Schmitz, a Catholic congressman from California and the American Party’s presidential candidate, because he “really believes that God’s law reigns and that Christ is king.” The editors refused to make a judgment on Carroll’s contention that “Anyone who would establish a Catholic politics in America has everything to gain by joining and working for John Schmitz and the party he now leads.” Warren H. Carroll, “A Case for John Schmitz,” *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 23; and Editors, “Election ’72: The Morning Line,” *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 46. Schmitz’s Christian rhetoric caught the editors’ attention again the following year, when he proclaimed that “the regeneration of America absolutely requires a moral reform and a Christian awakening without parallel in our national history.” (25) But the editors believed that his Christianizing attempts—

---

through the system—had little chance of success. They also worried about his attachment to conservatism. They believed that political intervention must merely be a holding maneuver—that a Christian political revival could only follow Christian conversion; this is why they generally looked askance at third party opportunities. John G. Schmitz, “Up From Politics,” *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 24-27; Editors, “Right On—To Where?” *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 45; and Thomas J. Barbarie, “Papists and Peckerwoods?” *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 16-19, 31.

<sup>125</sup> Editors, “Election ’72: The Morning Line,” 46.

<sup>126</sup> Editors, “1972: Acceptable Year of the Lord,” *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 46.

<sup>127</sup> Ibid.

<sup>128</sup> Editors, “A Thousand [Catholic] Flowers” *Triumph* 7 no. 10 (December, 1972): 45.

<sup>129</sup> Bozell, “The Church and the Republic,” 10.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid. The editors assumed that Rockefeller was conspiring behind the scenes to become Nixon’s vice president after Spiro Agnew resigned due to bribery charges, which, the editors believed, “Rocky probably helped to engineer.” They were worried also about him possessing the vice presidency under Gerald Ford, and dreaded his possible candidacy for presidency in 1976. The editors remarked of the latter development that it was “a troublesome prospect for Catholics. For it just might give the Catholic people, for the first time in many years, a plausible reason to vote in a presidential election.” Editors, “Present Imperfect: Herod for King,” *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 7. The editors despised the pro-contraceptive and pro-choice Rockefeller, who was a powerful sponsor of contraception as a national and international policy to control population, and, who, as governor of New York, had supported abortion on demand legislation and vetoed legislative restrictions on abortion.

<sup>131</sup> Editors, “A Question of Legitimacy,” *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 46. Also, see Editors, “Present Imperfect: Outlawing Adam and Eve,” *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 7-8. A contributor wrote: “The rule of law draws its authority from the Supreme Lawgiver, and the only plausible reason men abide by it is because it purports to sanction the Natural Law which He has written into every man’s heart. The only alternative is to see the state’s law as based on a sliding scale of force, ranging from social pressure, through elitist social manipulation, to terror in all forms. Either a state acknowledges that it is not a law unto itself, or it becomes a tyranny no matter how gentle in its beginnings. A man should be punished, and always, when he deserves to be punished, but his just deserts come from the violation of his relationship to God, not his violation of a ‘reasonable multilateral arrangement. . . . The positivists said that law had behind it, not the sanction of right and wrong, but the sanction of social convenience. They thought that the general consent of the governed is revealed by the latest referendum, instead of something that flows from the unbroken, united experience of generations.” Hippolytus, “Is Abe Fortas a Sensible Social Necessity,” *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 13.

<sup>132</sup> Editors, “A Question of Legitimacy,” 46. Michael Lawrence wrote: “For if there can be no challenge to the decisions of the judiciary, and if those decisions can be as utterly unconnected with any sort of standard—constitutional or moral—. . . then what, finally, does obtain, if not mere whim?” Michael Lawrence, “Pro Multis: There Oughtn’t Be a Law?” *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 21. For another article critical of the judiciary, see Hippolytus, “Durham, Fortas, et al. v. Sirhan, St. Paul, et al.,” *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 11-14. Michael Lawrence wrote: “When the Supreme Court banned organized prayer in the public schools, it was banning virtually the last lingering honor of American society as a body was accustomed to paying to the obligation to express *society’s worship* of God. A classroom full of children praying is not simply a number of kids, each one individually in communication with God; it is, or ought to be, a microcosmic representation of American society declaring that it, the society, believes in and

---

worships and depends upon God.” Michael Lawrence, “Pro Multis: End of the Experiment,” *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 21.

<sup>133</sup> Editors, “Notes on the Tapes Case,” *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 9.

<sup>134</sup> Bozell had posited—in a critical study of the Warren Court, *The Warren Revolution* (1966)—an original thesis denying that John Marshall’s ruling in *Marbury v. Madison* (1803) established the precedent of judicial review, which was, Bozell believed, the mythical source of the Court’s justification as final arbiter of the law and subsequently, judicial tyranny.

<sup>135</sup> Bozell, “The Church and the Republic,” 11.

<sup>136</sup> Despite offering advice and printing an article summarizing his thesis challenging the conventional interpretation of *Marbury v. Madison* in *Triumph*, Bozell and associates never received a return for their efforts. Editors, “Notes on the Tapes Case,” *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 9-10; and Bozell, “The Church and the Republic,” 9-14.

<sup>137</sup> Editors, “On Impeachment,” *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 46.

<sup>138</sup> Editors, “The Tapes and the Truth,” *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 45. For other articles on Watergate, see Editors, “A Christmas Truce,” *Triumph* 8 no. 10 (December, 1973): 46; Editors, “Present Imperfect: The Impeachment Scandal,” *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 8; Editors, “RMN, RIP,” *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 46.

<sup>139</sup> Bozell, “The Church and the Republic,” 13.

<sup>140</sup> Editors, “The Republic and the Catholics,” 46. The italics are the editors’.

<sup>141</sup> Editors, “Catechism for a Catholic ADL,” *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 45.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid.

<sup>144</sup> Editors, “Up from Pluralism,” *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 45. *Triumph*’s editors criticized the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights because it worked within the constructs of pluralism. Editors, “Up from Pluralism,” 45; and Michael Lawrence, “Pro Multis: ‘Up from Pluralism,’” 25.

<sup>145</sup> Editors, “Ecumenism or Catholicism: Two Politics,” *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): (46)

<sup>146</sup> Wilhelmssen, “Respondeo: Dicendum: A Farewell,” 31. For other articles on the *Triumph* staff’s views on forming a Catholic politics and other political commentary, see Editorial, “Sirhan’s Sanctuary,” *Triumph* 3 no. 7 (July, 1968): 38; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Chicago,” *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 7; Editors, “Present Imperfect: RMN’s Inheritance I,” *Triumph* 3 no. 12 (December, 1968): 7; Editors, “Present Imperfect: RMN’s Inheritance II” *Triumph* 3 no. 12 (December, 1968): 7-8; Editors, “60,000,000 x 0 = 0,” 41; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Urban Renewal,” *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 9; Editors, “Present Imperfect: The S.S.,” *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 9; Editors, “Nixon’s Catholic Strategy,” *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 45; Editors, “The Elections,” *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 45; Michael Lawrence, “Pro Multis: Does Politics Matter?” *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 23; Editors, “Present Imperfect: The Emperor’s New Plan,” *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 7; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Endgame,” *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 8-9; L. Brent Bozell, “Near to the Escorial: Live Politics: Catholic” 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 19; Editors, “Present Imperfect: A Good Man Down,”

---

*Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 10; Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis, Vomitous News," *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 15; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Parents v. State," *Triumph* 7 no. 10 (December, 1972): 7; Editors, "Whither the Democrats?" 45; Editors, "Right On—To Where?" *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 45; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Nixon v. the Media," *Triumph* 8 no. 10 (December, 1973): 7; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Crisis of the Regime," *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 7; Paul A. Fisher, "The Catholic Vote: A Sleeping Giant," 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 11-15; Charles Shelton, "Catholic Politics: Two View: Forming a Bloc," *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 27-30.

<sup>147</sup> The encyclicals were rooted in natural law reasoning: Society, like the human body, was a living organism composed of different and necessary functioning parts. Each economic section of society, like each part of the body, performed a greater or lesser function; and compensation for a particular function was rewarded accordingly. Yet, each section, if compensated unequally, had equal dignity because each was vital to the survival of society and was thus guaranteed a return that ensured its welfare. This social bond was united by much more than social utility, but rather in the love for each person, which was rooted in the view that each person was God's creation and destined for beatitude with Him. Given the transcendental nature of man and woman, their ultimate purpose was not material accumulation or comfort, although this was a necessary and natural impulse, it must always be secondary to knowing, loving, serving, and glorifying God. (This was why socio-economic justice was secondary to concern for the moral health of society—man and woman must be right with God before all else.) Any economic theory, therefore, that placed material accumulation as the primary motive and purpose of humankind was false. The Church's social teaching rejected socialism and capitalism principally because they were rooted in a materialist view of man (there were a number of derivative reasons as well). In contrast to socialism, the Church defended the right of private property as a natural law (it was useless, moral theologians maintained, to defend private property from utilitarian grounds as did the capitalist, as the moral use of private property was sanctioned by God). Private property, the Church taught, was vital to the dignity of each person, allowing man and woman to provide for their family and impart their personality on the earth, but one's right to private property was not absolute. Furthermore, the Church taught that wealth was not inherently evil but neutral, but must be ordered to just and charitable ends. Economic inequality was natural and inevitable, but such suffering in itself was dignified, Christ himself was poor, and it allowed a greater chance to follow in His bloody footsteps. Yet, the Church taught that the state had an obligation to ensure a more just distribution of wealth, but not equal distribution (which violated nature—the Church rejected utopianism and looked on the world as it was). The state, however, was restricted by the principle of subsidiarity—that functions that can be performed by a lesser civil body must be allowed to do so in order to ensure human dignity and initiative—and the moral law. The primary responsibility for the poor was the Church's. Christians were called to charitable works—rooted in love of God and one another—the ultimate bond of the social order (as opposed to economic utility as in socialism and capitalism). L. Brent Bozell, "Present Imperfect: Paul with Leo: A Private Conversation," *Triumph* 2 no. 5 (May, 1967): 7-10, 36; Martin F. Larrey, "The Seamless Robe of Social Justice" *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 26-30; Thomas J. Barbarie, "A Christian Manifesto," *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 18-21; also, see Pope Leo XIII. "On Capital and Labor." The Holy See. [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/leo\\_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_15051891\\_rerum-novarum\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_15051891_rerum-novarum_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008); Pope Pius XI. "On Reconstruction of the Social Order." The Holy See. [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/pius\\_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xi\\_enc\\_19310515\\_quadragesimo-anno\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19310515_quadragesimo-anno_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008); Pope John XXIII. "On Christianity and Social Progress." The Holy See. [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/john\\_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_j-xxiii\\_enc\\_15051961\\_mater\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_15051961_mater_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008); Pope Paul VI. "On the Development of Peoples." The Holy See. [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/paul\\_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_enc\\_26031967\\_populorum\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_26031967_populorum_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008). For discussion on

---

Catholic social thought, see Michael Warner, *Changing Witness: Catholic Bishops and Public Policy, 1917-1994* (Washington, D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1995), 15-36; and Charles Morris, *American Catholic: The Saints and Sinners Who Built America's Most Powerful Church* (New York: Random House, 1997), 150-153.

<sup>148</sup> The editors joked about the efficiency of communism: "Ever hear the one about what happened when Communism took over the Sahara Desert? Well, nothing happened for twenty years. Then they announced a shortage of sand." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Ay, Ay, Allende," *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 7. Also, see Thomas Molnar, "Humane Socialism," *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 28-31.

<sup>149</sup> Editors, "Soul, Brother," *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 10-11; and Bozell, "Present Imperfect: Paul with Leo: A Private Conversation," 7; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: Economy Si, Economists No," *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 7. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: McGovernomics," *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 7.

<sup>150</sup> Barbarie, "A Christian Manifesto," 18. Bozell quoted Pope Paul VI's criticism of capitalism, which was fundamentally deficient because it "*considers profit as the key motive for economic progress, competition as the supreme law of economics, and private ownership of the means of production as an absolute right that has no limits and carries no corresponding social obligations.*" Bozell, "Present Imperfect: Paul with Leo: A Private Conversation," 7. The italics are Bozell's. Thus, the editors remarked that "Our cities were not broken by bombs, as were the German cities; and therefore they cannot be rebuilt merely by additions of steel and brick. Our cities were broken by a vigorous pursuit the American way of life." Editors, "The End of the City," *Triumph* 2 no. 12 (December, 1967): 37. The editors wrote: "We do not complain about the material side of life and man's nature. We are not Jansenists. It is not the proper enjoyment of material goods which is wrong—men ought always to have wealth enough to act in a fully moral fashion, so that poverty is not an occasion of sin. Nor is technology itself wicked . . . . But the rightful use of material things is in service of the higher ends of existence. Material prosperity is not an end in itself; it cannot redeem man, and it is the sin of modernity to suppose it can. It is modern hedonism which is wrong. So also with the gnostic dreams of modern civilization—the Utopian ideologies, the secularist institutions, the revolutionary prides born with the founding of the modern age itself. It is not the world, but belief in a secular redemption which leads to the stifling sins of modern existence." Editors, "Yes. Or No." *Triumph* 5 no. 10 (October, 1970): 41.

<sup>151</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "The Servile State Revisited," *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 20.

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid.*, 23. Bozell's emphasis.

<sup>153</sup> Editors, "An American Summer," *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 46.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>155</sup> Bozell, "The Servile State Revisited," 23.

<sup>156</sup> *Ibid.*, 20-23.

<sup>157</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Servile State, Phase II," *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 7. "Christians have the advantage of knowing on the Highest Authority that productivity is *not* the criterion of a person's worth; [Josef] Pieper points out that it is not even the right criterion of the value of work. The process of work, utilitarian work performed for some end, is not a good in itself; its value is measured by the good of its end, its goal. The good of the work of farming is not in the sweat of plowing the fields; it is in the crops harvested. . . . The only 'work' that is good in itself is precisely 'work' *done for its own sake*—that is, leisure." Thus, the editors concluded—and this was a vital economic aspect of the Christian state—"If it is the business of a society to

---

seek the good of its members, then one of its essential tasks is to erect a social order as conducive as possible to leisure. If there is a 'policy' on work, its aim will be to see to it that the conditions under which men work allow ample room and an even greater dignity for leisure. Such a policy would seem to exclude any thought of separating a mother from her children, or of matching a father to a 'computerized job bank' or a 'training slot'—merely for the sake of being productive." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Workfare," *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 9.

<sup>158</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Servile State, Phase II," *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 7.

<sup>159</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: A Living or a Life?" *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 8; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Life is Not a Living," *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 8-9.

<sup>160</sup> Mario de Solenni, "Baptizing Organiculture," *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 29.

<sup>161</sup> *Triumph* contributors debated its feasibility and the best methods. See Thomas A. Montgomery, "Agriculture is not a Plastic Bag," *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 11-14; Thomas A. Montgomery, "Agriculture Is Not a Plastic Bag II," *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 15-17; Peter R. Hunt, "God's Little Acre-and-a-Half," *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 24-26. It should be noted, however, that *Triumph's* editors envisioned America's corruption as thorough. They did not believe in a morally pristine countryside, immune from the city's moral corruptions. While Michael Lawrence noted that Washington, D.C., "was in fact a giant public toilet," he did not imagine that the flight to the countryside offered refuge. The notion that such a dichotomy existed was a "myth," he concluded. While he admitted that "there still is . . . something of a morality or civilization gap between urban and rural America," such a gap was closing quickly—"We American Christians cannot escape the decadence of America by leaving the city." Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: No Exit," *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 17.

<sup>162</sup> Editors, "Mortgaging Souls," *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 10.

<sup>163</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Mater et Magistra," *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 9.

<sup>164</sup> Editors, "Mater No, Magistra No," *Triumph* 2 no. 19 (October, 1967): 42.

<sup>165</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: HEW's Counter-church," *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 8; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The New Paternalism," *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 10.

<sup>166</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Mater et Magistra," 9.

<sup>167</sup> Ibid.

<sup>168</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Black Power," *Triumph* 2 no. 1 (January, 1967): 8.

<sup>169</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Mater et Magistra," 9.

<sup>170</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Economy Si, Economists No," *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 7.

<sup>171</sup> Editors, "A Lenten Meditation," *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 46.

<sup>172</sup> Editors, "Life is Not a Bowl of Cherries," *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 46; Editors, "A Lenten Meditation," 46.

<sup>173</sup> Editors, "Life is Not a Bowl of Cherries," 46.

---

<sup>174</sup> Ibid. For other articles on the economic depression of the 1970s, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Fazed Economy," *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (July, 1973): 7; also see Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Dry Look," *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 7. For other articles of the *Triumph* staff's views on economics, see John Wisner, "Atmospheric Stinks," *Triumph* 2 no. 1 (January, 1967): 20-22; John Wisner, "Up From Economics" *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 26-29, 34; William F. Rickenbacker, "The Communion of Economists," *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 11-14; Goetz Briefs, "The Sociology of Salvation," *Triumph* 3 no. 8 (October, 1968): 19-20, 22-23, 40; Gary K. Potter, "Potter's Field," *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 39; Robert W. Fox, "Arts and the Age: Beyond Economics," *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 28-30, 32; Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: What Are Those Dimes For," *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 31; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Mayday," *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 5; Mario de Solenni, "Usury: The Rise and Fall of a Moral Idea," *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 24-27; Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: Vomitous News," 15; Julius F. Harmon, "Nixonia's Old Ixonians," *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 16-18; Thomas J. Barbarie, "The Homelessness of George Meany," *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 21; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Debasers," *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 7-8; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Render to Cesar," *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 9; Larrey, "The Seamless Robe of Social Justice" 26-30; L. Brent Bozell, "Near to the Escorial: Doing Populorum Progressio I," *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 31; L. Brent Bozell, "Near to the Escorial: Doing Populorum Progressio II," *Triumph* 10 no. 2 (February, 1975): 15.

<sup>175</sup> Editors, "Soul, Brother," *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 10, 13. The editors printed an article by Henry Wetherby, a professor of English at Vanderbilt and an apologist for segregation, who criticized the Catholic Church for taking "a decisive stand on the side of Northern liberals." (19) "What is happening in the South amounts to social revolution, and in the other great revolutions of the past two centuries the Church has taken the side of the Christian establishment." (19) Segregated southern society was not, Wetherby argued, fascist, but an organic and thus naturally a paternalistic, and hierarchical society—an order predicated on the fallen nature of man and his redemption through Christ—that forged bonds between white and blacks in the South that were "in most cases genuinely charitable." (21) Paternalism, he suggested, not social engineering, fostered love and order. Henry Weatherby, "A Southerner's View: The Church and the South," *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 19-22. As for the forced busing, which triggered much racial strife in the northern cities in the early 1970s, the editors sided with the anti-integrationists. Their defense of the anti-integrationists followed their reasoning that community control of education was superior to federal control. "The key to the busing issue," the editors noted, is that "it must be seen not in terms of civil rights—which are creatures of the civil authority—but in terms of natural rights, specifically the natural right of parents to control the education of their children." Editors, "Busing: The Real Issue," *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 45. Russell Kirk, a contributor, stated that he was against school segregation "on the basis of color or 'race,'" but regretted that busing uprooted the student and undermined the natural segregation derived from community and cultural differences. (16) Forced busing "increases the disastrous alienation of the rising generation in our time: it cuts them off from the sources of social order—from family, church, community, class. It is not good to be educated in a crowd," Kirk explained, "but busing reduces pupils to human atoms, adrift in the Lonely Crowd—which so easily becomes a mob." (16) Russell Kirk, "You Can't Get to Zion on a School Bus," 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 16. For other articles on the editors views on forced busing, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: Democracy in Chicago," *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 9; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Yellow Peril," *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 8-9; Editors, "Present Imperfect: School Rebels Hang Tough," *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 7-8; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Love's Labor Found," *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 8-9.

<sup>176</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: 'The Reality of King,'" *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): (7)

<sup>177</sup> Ibid.

---

<sup>178</sup> Ibid. The italics are the Editors'. For more of this view of Martin Luther King, Jr., see Editors, "Soul, Brother," *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 14; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Myth of King," *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 7. The editors did credit King with preparing the way for the black power movement. Despite the fact that his "critique of the American way of life was hopelessly vague, and also parochially limited to the lot of his own people," and "not nearly as incisive and comprehensive as that of the Black Power school," it "attacked the three great pillars of the liberal Republic," the editors wrote: "rational discussion of issues; faith in the ballot box; respect for the law. And it has now brought every one of them down." Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Myth of King," 7.

<sup>179</sup> Editors, "Soul, Brother," 13.

<sup>180</sup> Ibid., 14.

<sup>181</sup> Editors, "Soul, Brother," 12-13..

<sup>182</sup> Editors, "The Negro Revolution," *Triumph* 2 no. 8 (August, 1967): 38.

<sup>183</sup> Ibid.

<sup>184</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Black Power," *Triumph* 2 no. 1 (January, 1967): 8.

<sup>185</sup> Editors, "The Negro Revolution," 38.

<sup>186</sup> Gary Potter, "Potter's Field," *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 37.

<sup>187</sup> Editors, "Jew and Black," *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 41.

<sup>188</sup> Editors, "Soul, Brother," 16; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: Black Power," *Triumph* 2 no. 1 (January, 1967): 7-8.

<sup>189</sup> Editors, "Soul, Brother," 16.

<sup>190</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Ali Stands Up," 7.

<sup>191</sup> Editors, "Soul, Brother," 16; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Black Power," *Triumph* 2 no. 1 (January, 1967): 8; Editors, "Soul, Brother," 16. Also, see Lawrence, "Our First Three Years," 14.

<sup>192</sup> Lawrence, "Our First Three Years," 12, 14.

<sup>193</sup> Editors, "The Negro Revolution," *Triumph* 2 no. 8 (August, 1967): (38)

<sup>194</sup> Editors, "Soul, Brother," 15. For other articles on racial strife and the Civil Rights and Black Power Movements, see John Wisner, "The End of Abolition," *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 15-17, 38; John Wisner, "Wisner's World: The Reverend M.L. King," *Triumph* 3 no. 6 (June, 1968): 34; Editors, "The Separatists, Black and White," *Triumph* 3 no. 8 (August, 1968): 37; John Wisner, "Wisner's World: The Negro Plaint," *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 27; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Invitation to Anarchy, I," *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 10; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Invitation to Anarchy, II," *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 10; Editors, "Adam's Only Sin," *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 37; Martha White Washington, "The Mad Society," *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 16-18; Gary Potter, "Potter's Field: Is the American Dream About to Burst?" *Triumph* 2 no. 8 (August, 1967): 31; John Wisner, "Wisner's World: A Secular-Liberal Failure," *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 21; Peter Wells, "The View from the Parish: Race Relations," *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 26-27; H.L. Weatherby, "A Southern Rebuttal," *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 31-33; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Burn Church Burn!" *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 8-9;

---

Julius Frasc Harmon "In North America Negro Girls Are Not Married for Their Money . . ." *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 24-27; Philip Zucchi, "South Boston: What Hath Busing Wrought?" *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 10-14; Philip F. Zuchhi, "Boston Busing Update," *Triumph* 10 no. 2 (February, 1975): 30-31; Martha White Washington, "Betrayal in the Schools," *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 16-19; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Senator Stennis's Frolic," *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 7.

<sup>195</sup> John C. Meyers, "Columbia's Ruddite Rebellion," *Triumph* 3 no. 7 (July, 1968): 18.

<sup>196</sup> Russell Kirk, "Arts and the Age: The Myth of Objectivity," *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 37.

<sup>197</sup> Meyer, "Columbia's Ruddite Rebellion," 18.

<sup>198</sup> Editors, "The Liberal University Drops Out," *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 42; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: Schools Are for Police," *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 7. For other articles dealing with the student rebellion, see Robert W. Fox, "The Student Hang-Up," *Triumph* 3 no. 3 (March, 1968): 14-15, 33; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Autumn of the Country," 7-9; John Wisner, "The Fall of the Liberal Republic," 14; Thomas Molnar, "Revolt on Campus," *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 25; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Business Dropouts," *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 8; Warren H. Carroll, "The Modern University: Missionary Territory," *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 18-21. The editors wrote: "Education, after all, is a relationship between a teacher and a learner; it can never be more or less than that. But obviously this relationship is possible only if the learner believes he has something to learn, and the teacher believes he has something to teach. The history of American education is the history of the progressive evaporation of those beliefs—the teachers' that he possesses a truth sufficiently credible to be worth passing on, and the learner's that he has something to gain by absorbing the teacher's wisdom. Accordingly, the American classroom, at every level, has dissolved into a bull session between students and their teachers about what to do in the absence of truth—in the presence of intellectual and spiritual bankruptcy; and the revolt on the campus is nothing but the students' verdict that that kind of conversation is not worth pursuing." But the turmoil plaguing the universities was traceable also to the parents, who were, the editors wrote, "insane." "They are the carriers of a way of life and a culture that know nothing of moral and spiritual limitations, and thus nothing of the real freedom that respect for these limitations opens up. They are 'permissive' because they haven't the faintest idea of what to forbid, or why; they refuse to provide the right to guidance because they themselves are the final, pathetic protagonists of a worldview, called liberalism, which flatly denies the availability of the support of the spirit." Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Autumn of the Country," 8. Carroll wrote that "There is every good reason, intellectually speaking, for undertaking a crusade—an apostolate—to bring Christ back into the universities. But I have another reason, which I hope may also be shared—because I know that Christ's enemy is there, and it's time we carried the battle to him." (19) "The modern Western university has poisoned the cultural wells of our civilization more than any other institution. Re-Christianizing the West can and should begin with it, reversing the process which has been destroying us. The best defense is always a good offense—to strike for the enemy's stronghold. If the Roman Empire was finally made Christian, then so can the modern university be." (21) Warren H. Carroll, "The Modern University: Missionary Territory," 19, 21. The editors also took notice of the counter-culture, which, they believed, was yet another manifestation of the moral rot of American society caused by liberalism. "The children who inhabit the Haight-Ashbury are the last expressions of modern WASP culture," they wrote, "which rests on the base hope that man is fundamentally good and needs no discipline. They have never had the moral direction and stiffening that all civilized people provide for their young. Thus, they read pornography because their liberal fathers told them that it might be art; they won't fight because their liberal fathers never told them that honor must be defended; they will not prepare for the future because their liberal fathers told them the machine would solve their problems; their religious ideas are of a simple animistic nature because their liberal fathers told them that the institutional Church was the antithesis of the charitable spirit. . . . They are a standing and visible reproach to the moral

---

imbecility of liberalism beginning with Locke and Mill, and working down through John Dewey to Robert Kennedy.” Editors, “Hippie, Son of WASP,” *Triumph* 3 no. 2 (February, 1968): 37. Lorenzo Albacete criticized the drug culture. He pointed out that purposeful or rational intoxication—and by using drugs one was indeed purposefully intoxicating themselves—went beyond a mere “profaning of creation,” but “a negation of it, a denial of its goodness,” because it was the choice “to escape the natural order,” in “a distortion of reality,” and prefer “an unreal world . . . over the world God made and said was good. It was to curse reality; it was Manichean. (16-17) Drug use was to “kill the natural receptivity of the soul and distort the *intimacy* of reality as it is given.” (18) Lorenzo Albacete, “Creation, Drugs and Politics,” *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 15-18. Also, see Robert J. Fauteux, “Arts and the Age: The Yellow Submarine,” *Triumph* 2 no. 10 (October, 1967): 35-37.

<sup>199</sup> Editors, “Ohio Blows Up,” *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 9-13; Also, see Gary K. Potter, “Storm Over Dayton,” *Triumph* 2 no. 2 (February, 1967): 9-13; Editors, “Collapse at Catholic U.,” *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 21-28; Also, see Gary K. Potter, “Potter’s Field: An Open Letter to the American Bishops,” *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 16; Editors, “Exit Catholic U.,” *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 42.

<sup>200</sup> Editors, “McCluskey’s Manifesto,” *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 37.

<sup>201</sup> Editors, “Ohio Blows Up,” 11.

<sup>202</sup> Editors, “Let’s Found a Catholic University,” *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 41. Also, see Editors, “Ohio Blows Up,” 9-13.

<sup>203</sup> Editors, “Ohio Blows Up,” 11-13. Also, see Potter, “Storm Over Dayton,” 9-13.

<sup>204</sup> Editors, “Ohio Blows Up,” 13. Also, see Gary K. Potter, “Storm Over Dayton,” *Triumph* 2 no. 2 (February, 1967): 9-13.

<sup>205</sup> Editors, “Collapse at Catholic U.,” 25-26. Also, see Gary K. Potter, “Potter’s Field: An Open Letter to the American Bishops,” 16; Editors, “Exit Catholic U.,” 42.

<sup>206</sup> Editors, “Collapse at Catholic U.,” 28. Also, see Gary K. Potter, “Potter’s Field: An Open Letter to the American Bishops,” 16; and Editors, “Exit Catholic U.,” 42.

<sup>207</sup> Editors, “Collapse at Catholic U.,” *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 21-28. Also, see Gary K. Potter, “Potter’s Field: An Open Letter to the American Bishops,” 16; Editors, “Exit Catholic U.,” 42. The editors blamed the bishops’ surrender to academic freedom on their preoccupation with administrating the Catholic Church. Traditionally, bishops in America were administrators and builders first (because they had to erect a Catholic civilization in a Protestant land. And they were excellent administrators and builders, the editors noted, but now the time had come to turn over administration to the laity, which would allow “bishops to perform without fetter the primary task for which they were called—that of governing the Church spiritually.” The editors believed that Catholic higher education should be downsized if it was to remain pure and effective. Editors, “Collapse at Catholic U.,” 28.

<sup>208</sup> Editors, “Collapse at Catholic U.,” 26-27.

<sup>209</sup> Editors, “McCluskey’s Manifesto,” *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 37.

<sup>210</sup> Editors, “Let’s Found a Catholic University,” 41.

<sup>211</sup> *Ibid.* One group of Catholics, deploring the state of Catholic higher education, opted to found Thomas Aquinas College, which incorporated the so-called Great Books curriculum and

---

subjected itself to the teaching authority of the Church. Ronald P. McArthur, a founding member, noted that at Thomas Aquinas College, it was understood that “The Catholic faith is the governing principle of the entire life of a Christian, and thus also his intellectual life,” and that the “Magisterium of the Church is the proximate norm for believers, and its universal teaching, whether extraordinary or ordinary, is to be received not only in obedience, but also from the very desire to better understand Revelation.” Ronald P. McArthur, “Thomas Aquinas College,” *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 19. In addition to questioning the value of a Great Books curriculum, Frederick D. Wilhelmsen doubted the very survival of the traditional university and thus the worth of Thomas Aquinas College. Given his belief that society was undergoing tribalization, especially the Catholic population, which was increasingly alienated from secular-liberal society, he believed that the education of the future—structured around the Catholic tribe’s mark, their faith—would transcend culture, class, and national barriers and thus the traditional classroom and university. Higher education would be, he believed, a “‘university of no-place’ centered around this vision, [and] staffed by a handful of great professors.” “What Catholics will need,” he noted, was “not a reform of the old but new forms for the eternally true.” Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “Are the Great Books Enough?” *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 24. Incidentally, in 1977, *Triumph* contributor, Warren H. Carroll, along with other members of the Society of the Christian Commonwealth founded Christendom College. The founding statement read: “The only rightful purpose of education is to know the truth and to live by it. The purpose of Catholic education is therefore to learn and to live by the truth revealed by Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, ‘the Way, the Truth, and the Life,’ as preserved in the deposit of faith and authentically interpreted in the Magisterium of the Roman Catholic Church, founded by Christ, of which the Pope is the visible head. That central body of divine truth illumines all other truth and shows us its essential unity in every area of thought and life. Only an education which integrates the truths of the Catholic faith throughout the curriculum is a fully Catholic education.” Christendom Founders, “Founding Statement,” Christendom College, <http://www.christendom.edu/news/quickfacts.shtml#history> (accessed June 20, 2008). The college’s mission “is ‘to restore all things in Christ.’” Christendom College, “Mission Statement,” <http://www.christendom.edu/news/quickfacts.shtml#history> (accessed September 1, 2008) Also, see Mary Jo Weaver and R. Scott Appleby, eds., *Being Right: Conservative Catholics in America* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1995), 312-315

<sup>212</sup> Editors, “The Future,” *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 30. This quote was taken from Pius XI’s encyclical *On Christian Education* (1929). See Pope Pius XI, “On Christian Education,” *The Holy See*, [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/pius\\_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xi\\_enc\\_31121929\\_divini-illius-magistri\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_31121929_divini-illius-magistri_en.html) (accessed September 6, 2008).

<sup>213</sup> Editors, “Collapse at Catholic U.,” 27; and Editors, “The Future,” 30. Lawrence noted that the Supreme Court decision was “banning virtually the last lingering honor of American society as a body was accustomed to paying to the obligation to express *society’s worship* of God. A classroom full of children praying is not simply a number of kids, each one individually in communication with God; it is, or ought to be, a microcosmic representation of American society declaring that it, the society, believes in and worships and depends upon God.” Michael Lawrence, “Pro Multis: End of Experiment,” *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 21.

<sup>214</sup> Editors, “The Future,” 30. Also, see Michael Lawrence, “Pro Multis: Straight Talk on Schools,” 23.

<sup>215</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Up from ‘Education,’” *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 8-9. An example of this was the introduction of sex education. The editors were adamantly opposed to a wholly rational discussion and dissection of sex, which was “usually so crudely naturalistic as to instill in a child a mechanistic, entirely biological attitude to sex, with no suggestion at all of its spiritual mysteries,” especially outside of the family. Editors, “Present Imperfect: Red Plot or Red Herring?” *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 8. This was “simply perversion.” Sex—its proper moral understanding and mysteries—they reasoned, could only be

---

communicated within the context of the “love and self-sacrifice” that bonded the family. Editors, “Present Imperfect: Sex + Education = #!x\*#,” *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 10. Without this attending moral context, there would be a breakdown in the morals governing sex. “Every teenager today probably knows more of the clinical details of sex than his great-grandparents knew in their married lives. Yet promiscuity, perversion and sexual criminality,” the editors noted, “are also more widespread today than ever before.” Editors, “Present Imperfect: Red Plot or Red Herring?” *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 8. Also, see Paul Cole Beach and James Likoudis, “Sex Education: The New Manicheanism,” *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 11-19; Ann A. Imperi, “Becoming a What?” *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 12-14; and Editors, “Present Imperfect: Becoming a Pushover,” *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 9.

<sup>216</sup> Editors, “Chaos in the Schools: A Proposal,” *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 41; and Editors, “Present Imperfect: Up from ‘Education,’” *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 8-9.

<sup>217</sup> Editors, “You’d Better Believe It,” *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 45.

<sup>218</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Amish Fight for Christian Freedom,” *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 9.

<sup>219</sup> Ibid.

<sup>220</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Amish n’ Dandy,” *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 8.

<sup>221</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Amish Fight for Christian Freedom,” 9.

<sup>222</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Up from ‘Education,’” *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 8-9.

<sup>223</sup> Robert W. Fox, “Public Schools in the Courts: U.S. v. Parents,” *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 18.

<sup>224</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Amish n’ Dandy,” 8.

<sup>225</sup> Editors, “Chaos in the Schools: A Proposal,” *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 41.

<sup>226</sup> Editors, “The End of Catholic Education,” *Triumph* 3 no. 7 (July, 1968): 37. Also, see Annette Fedele, “The Secularization of St. Thomas School: A Case Study,” *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 20-22, 44. One other point of worry was the change in catechetics. Contributor Joan Zola pointed out that the new catechisms emphasized “a personal relationship with God rather than knowledge about him.” She found this problematic in two regards; first, it neglected theology and taught it poorly in contrast to the rigorous memorization technique of the Baltimore Catechism (and thus hindered the missionary ability of the laity); second, although its devotional emphasis was laudable, the school’s mission was to develop the intellectual side of worship, while the home and the Church emphasized the devotional side of Catholic worship. Joan Zola, “The New Catechisms: Towards Empty-Headed Catholics,” *Triumph* 2 no. 7 (July, 1967): 22.

<sup>227</sup> Editors, “Education: The End of the Dreams,” *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 46.

<sup>228</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Try It, You’ll Like It,” *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 8.

<sup>229</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: The Bishops’ Charge,” *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 8. Also, see Editors, “Present Imperfect: The Schoolhouse and the Trough,” *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 10.

<sup>230</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Try It, You’ll Like It,” 8.

- 
- <sup>231</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>232</sup> Editors, "The Future," 30; Editors, "The End of Catholic Education," 37.
- <sup>233</sup> Editors, "The Future," 30.
- <sup>234</sup> William A. Marra, "The Genesis of Holy Innocents School: A Practical Guide for Parents," *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (Mary, 1972): 19.
- <sup>235</sup> Editors, "The Future," 31.
- <sup>236</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>237</sup> Carroll implemented her plan. She established the Christian Commonwealth School (kindergarten through the eighth grade) in Warrenton, Virginia. See Anne W. Carroll, "The Apostolic School Revisited," *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 24-26.
- <sup>238</sup> Anne W. Carroll, "The Apostolic School," *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 12.
- <sup>239</sup> Ibid., 14.
- <sup>240</sup> Ibid. Also, Anne W. Carroll, "The Apostolic School Revisited," 24-26; Diane Moczar, "The Apostolic School Should be a Good School," *Triumph* 10 no. 5 (May, 1975): 22-23; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: Build, Baby I," *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 8. For other articles on education, see Editors, "The Maryland Case," *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 38; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Freedom at Dayton U," *Triumph* 2 no. 1 (January, 1967): 8-9; Joan Zola, "Big Brother's Baby," *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 18-20; Peter Wells, "The View from the Parish: Catholic Education," *Triumph* 2 no. 10 (October, 1967): 25-26; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Muggerridge Comes Home," *Triumph* 3 no. 3 (March, 1968): 10; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Marching Through Mississippi," *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 10; Editors, "Let Them Eat Cake," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 41-42; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Gracey Case," *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 9-10; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Freedom Now," *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 9-10; C. Stephen Hatchcock, "With the Gracays: Suffer the Littler Children to Come Unto Me," *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 16-19, 44; James Likoudis, "Arts and the Age: Power to the Parents," *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 34-35; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Power to the Parents," *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 7-8; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Syllabus of Horrors," *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 10; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Free at Last," *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 7; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Supreme Court on Schools," *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 8; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Prayer of the Nation," *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 9-10; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Coup d' Ecôle," *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 10; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Father Nixon, Father McHugh," *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 8-9; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Faith of Their Fathers," *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 10; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Lie Down, Parents," *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 7-8; Padraic Pearse, "The Murder Machine," *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 11-14; Solange Hertz, "The Crack in the Board," *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 23-26; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Cost Analysis Saves?" *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 10; Robert W. Fox, "Arts and the Age: The Importance of Not Being Laddie," *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 32-34; Pertinax, "The Catholic Interest," *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 31; Michael Brock, "Lessons from 'Dagger John,'" *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 18-20; Editors, "Present Imperfect: School Rebels Hang Tough," *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 7-8 against forced busing; C. Stephen Hathcock, "Almost Heaven, West Virginia," *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 20-23, 45-46; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Love's Labor Found," *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 8-9; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Up Disestablishmentarians!" *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 10. For studies on the development of both Catholic higher education and the parochial school system, see Philip

---

Gleason, *Contending with Modernity: Catholic Higher Education in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); and Timothy Walch, *Parish School: American Catholic Parochial Education from Colonial Times to the Present* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1996).

## CHAPTER VI

### TO MAKE CHRISTENDOM

Insofar as men are sinners, the threat of war hangs over them and will so continue until the coming of Christ.

—*Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*<sup>1</sup>

Every act of war directed to the indiscriminate destruction of whole cities or vast areas with their inhabitants is a crime against God and man, which merits firm and unequivocal condemnation.

— *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*<sup>2</sup>

Generally, Catholics—clergy and laity alike—supported twentieth-century American foreign policy, with some exceptions.<sup>3</sup> This consensus, however, began to break up during the Vietnam War. Catholic support henceforward became much more nuanced. *Triumph's* editors exemplified this transition. Anticommunist in their very being, but no longer believing in the United States as the standard bearer of Christendom—a fact punctuated by its failure in Vietnam and its immoral nuclear policy—they looked for world leadership from the most unlikely of places: Spain and Ireland, the last remnants of Christendom, and in the Global South. These places, vibrantly Christian, they reasoned, were the possible sources of a new Christendom.

## Cold War

*Triumph's* staff believed that Soviet-led global communism was the gravest threat to world peace and Christian civilization. As Roman Catholics, they were innately anticommunist; the editors noted that “you reconcile Communism the way St. Michael reconciled the Devil.”<sup>4</sup> Yet Bozell’s and Wilhelmsen’s pre-*Triumph*, militant anticommunist rhetoric faded almost into non-existence. Bozell’s, Wilhelmsen’s, and the staff’s anticommunism never waned—to be sure. Had the United States been converted to Catholicism; had its leaders, laws, and institutions confessed the Catholic faith; had it waged war according to the tenets of the Catholic Just War Doctrine, *Triumph's* editors would have been in the vanguard of those urging war to make Christendom, which, they believed, included the destruction of Soviet-led global communism. They would have justified such militancy on the basis that the confessional state—because it acted out of love (its purpose was to save souls) and because Soviet-led global communism was inherently at war with Christianity—had the moral obligation to destroy communism and thereby preserve and spread the faith.

To the editor’s dismay, however, this was not the situation. Their increasing indifference to the Cold War, then, was derived not from a lack of anticommunist fury, but due to the changing nature of the United States. Only a Christian sword could slay communism, but the secular-liberal United States was an increasingly anti-Christian nation. For the editors, then, the anticommunist

struggle could no longer be a secular-state affair, but a Christian affair; and because *Triumph's* staff, and the Vatican, did not have any divisions to command, the only recourse was Christian conversion for the building-up of a secular sword for the pope.

The United States' lack of a Christian will was evident to the editors, especially Bozell and Wilhelmsen, before the formation of *Triumph*. They could never forget the betrayal of Hungary (or the rest of Eastern Europe after World War II). The United States' abandonment of Hungary in 1956—as well as its general failure to roll back the Iron Curtain—was the siren bell of its abdication as the sword of Christendom. On the tenth anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution, the editors printed a sermon—given during the uprising—by Stanley Parry, a political philosophy professor and priest at the University of Notre Dame. Parry had noted in 1956 that the lack of response had demonstrated that the “light of faith has indeed flickered low in the West”—that we “see too dimly by it,” and that the suffering and dying of the Hungarians was not theirs alone, but it also was “Christ who is dying in His members. And so we too are dying.”<sup>5</sup> United in the Mystical Body of Christ, Christians had an obligation to their Christian brethren, to Christ, to minister to those of His Body who were suffering. Parry noted also that the impossible uprising focused “attention on the spiritual character of the issues that are at stake;” the Hungarians were motivated not by temporal purposes, but by the Spirit, by “issues concerning truth itself,”

‘The attempt was hopeless from the beginning; there was no temporal purpose behind it, but rather a purpose whose farther reaches escape the bounds of history, and whose full significance can be grasped only in the

perspective of the struggle between Michael and Lucifer, between Christ and Satan.’<sup>6</sup>

Parry hoped that such sacrifices “will not have been in vain if they teach the confused minds of Christendom this truth.”<sup>7</sup>

But the United States had failed to learn this lesson. “What has happened over the past decade,” the editors lamented,

Is that the purgatory of the people of Eastern Europe has all but disappeared from the American consciousness. The prayers designed to hasten their liberation no longer get prayed. The familiar hopes for their ‘eventual release from captivity’ no longer get hoped, at least not publicly by anyone of importance.<sup>8</sup>

The United States government, the editors wrote, “no longer *distinguishes* between the captive peoples and their Communist rulers; it no longer feels constrained to speak and act as though the U.S. were, even in spirit, *for* the people, *against* their regimes,” rather, it “now feels free to speak and act,” they argued, “as though the people and the regimes were the same thing; it now openly speaks and acts *in support* of the Communist regimes in the name of ‘building bridges’ between East and West.”<sup>9</sup>

“Having possessed an absolute monopoly of nuclear power a scant twenty years ago (which means the power to command the immediate surrender of any government on the planet),” the editors noted in 1967, “the U.S. is now in the position of asking the Soviet Union to desist from steps that could require our surrender in the not too distant future.”<sup>10</sup> “The explanation,” the editors concluded, was “largely a matter of the spirit.”<sup>11</sup> “The great battle in heaven was fought between spirits, and the battle on earth, the only one that counts,” the editors asserted, “will always be fought between men who are moved by the

spirit. This is a truth that Christianity will have to relearn if it is ever to rise again as a force in history.”<sup>12</sup> But the United States, its political and religious leaders, failed to frame the Cold War in such a context, as “a temporal effort to defend and magnify Christendom,” because the nation placed its faith in secular liberalism, which at its philosophical roots, like communism, was the “urge to drive God out of the world, to divinize man,” and, it, the editors concluded, “*has* taken over.”<sup>13</sup> “The liberal democracies are unable to sustain an anti-Communist war because, at bottom, they share with Communism a common view of man’s relation to the cosmos,” the editors concluded; “It follows that anti-Communism can no longer be regarded . . . as an American enterprise, even as a Western enterprise. It is now . . . only a Christian enterprise.”<sup>14</sup>

The editors envisioned an actual “U.S. rapprochement with Soviet Europe” and doubted a reversal of this policy—noting that such chances were “as good as the prospect that Wilhelmsen’s proposed expedition [to Hungary in 1956 with University of Santa Clara students] would succeed in holding off Khrushchev’s Mongols”—but hoped that it would demonstrate that the “notion that today the U.S. pursues an *anti-Communist* foreign policy is simply untrue.”<sup>15</sup> What was developing, then, was the synthesis of the modern dialectic—the trajectory toward the deification of humankind; the subsequent secularization of human society and the emergence of the global, God-less totalitarian state. “There *is*,” the editors remarked, “increasingly less for the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to fight about.” “With the accelerating pace of the American plunge into total secularization,

The kind of society developing here and the kind developing there are increasingly difficult to distinguish. The elimination of God; the apotheosis of man in the name of his science and techniques; the concentration and bureaucratization of political power; the drive to conformism, to manipulate personalities and ideas through diverse forms of social engineering; the emphasis on material comforts, the mindless worship of sheer utility—these are powerful historical currents running in both societies, there differing progress in each being only a matter of degree.<sup>16</sup>

“There is reason for TRIUMPH to resist the Soviets to the death,” the editors exclaimed, “but not really for the American establishment.”<sup>17</sup>

This view, they believed, was manifest in the failure of the Czechoslovakian uprising prompted by Czech liberal democrats in the spring of 1968. The failure exhibited the loss of faith in secular-liberalism. The Czechs failed to mount a resistance to the Warsaw Pact troops who invaded their country, because secular-liberalism was not worth dying for, and the secular-liberal United States failed to come to the aid of the Czechs “*because it is official American policy not to inconvenience the Russians*”—because it could no longer find cause “to impress on Eastern Europe the superiority of the American way over the Russian way.”<sup>18</sup> “Such is the faith of moribund liberalism,” the editors diagnosed; “it can no longer kindle the faintest spark, much less fan a spiritual flame; it has been reduced to a mere whine in history which, in the summer of 1968, found a suitable frequency on Radio Prague.”<sup>19</sup> “If a nation hasn’t faith in itself, it cannot spread its faith,” but the solution, the editors urged, was “not to try to restore the liberal faith, which is a false faith, it is to give the country a new one.”<sup>20</sup> This faith and purpose—to make Christendom—would transcend the secular liberal-communist dialectic and “reach out, not to Dubcek ‘liberals,’ and much less to the Brezhnev hardliners—but to the burgeoning Christian revival in

those unhappy mountains and plains,” the editors wrote, “which still ring with the glories of the civilization that Washington and Moscow have now joined in burying.”<sup>21</sup>

What developed under Richard Nixon’s presidency—manifest in his policy of détente—then, in conjunction with the synthesis of the secular-liberal and communist systems, was “largely a power struggle,” in which the Soviets were still very much “offensive minded,” while liberals were “content to settle for a Condominium,” and were “concerned only that its sphere of influence be left intact,” but made “the fatal mistake of attributing its own limited ambitions to its enemy in the mirror.”<sup>22</sup> The new world order, the editors concluded, was based on an “Eastwestestablishment”—both the United States and the Soviet Union were “being driven by history to find a common ground,” and if successful, “the result will be a World Establishment made safe (for a while) for the diversity for its liberal and communist components.”<sup>23</sup> Such a development, however, was “not safe for Christianity.”<sup>24</sup> The “Eastwestestablishment” was “the evaporation of the antagonisms between formerly antithetical systems,” Michael Lawrence elaborated, “their nascent merger into a world-wide synthesis of balanced power—in tension with each other, offsetting each other on a hundred fronts, doubting each other, but seldom exhibiting essential differences in values or policy.”<sup>25</sup>

The editors disdained power politics, which they branded as “the kind of aimless obsession with purely national interests and ambitions which destroyed European civilization in 1914 and will ultimately wreck any nation whose

purposes are no grander than to survive.”<sup>26</sup> The editors were, however, realists and did not ignore power; in “an imperfect world . . . political power is a necessity; hence, perhaps, power politics as well.”<sup>27</sup> They believed, however, that such power should be rendered unto Jesus Christ’s vicar—political power, that is, should serve the universal and objective moral interests of the Roman Catholic Church, which sought the salvation of all men and women. The “seeking or retention of power for its own sake, without a moral purpose, cannot be justified,” the editors warned, it “becomes a kind of amusement for a particular breed of men—politicians—who use it, ultimately because they have made a career of politics, just as another man who makes a career of carpentry uses a hammer.”<sup>28</sup> Once a nation has “liberated itself from the inconvenience of moral principle, it will, like a machine,” the editors noted, “respond automatically to the mechanics of power.”<sup>29</sup> Both secular ideology and power politics, devoid of a Christian purpose, were futile approaches to foreign policy, because both, the editors wrote, were constructed on the “superstition that justice, and therefore peace, can be secured without reference to Him who is Justice, and therefore Peace.”<sup>30</sup>

## Vietnam

The Vietnam War—the hot war of the Cold War—was the dominant foreign policy issue of the 1960s and early 1970s, and, for *Triumph’s* editors, America’s failings in Southeast Asia were emblematic of its collapsing Christian purpose.<sup>31</sup> Yet they supported the war initially, which demarcated them from the

Catholic Left, even when the editors withdrew their support, their conclusions were rooted not in varying degrees of pacifism, but in just war doctrine.<sup>32</sup>

In the mid-1960s, “approximately 200” Catholic pacifists developed a resistance movement in opposition to the Vietnam War.<sup>33</sup> The Berrigan-wing of the Catholic Left—led by priests Daniel and Philip Berrigan—staged a number of dramatic protests against the war, including most notably, the actions of the “Baltimore Four,” which, in October, 1967, poured blood on draft files they had stolen from the draft board in Baltimore; the actions of the “Catonsville Nine,” which, in May, 1968, used homemade napalm to destroy stolen draft files; and the actions of the “Milwaukee Fourteen,” which, in September, 1968, also used homemade napalm to set fire to stolen draft files. These acts spurred a spiraling of such demonstrations against the war so that by “October 1970, over 250 draft offices had been raided.”<sup>34</sup> The Catholic Left raided draft boards and corporate offices, but also offices of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and even had sabotaged trucks at an air force base and railroad tracks that led to a munitions factory.<sup>35</sup>

*Triumph's* editors did not believe the Catholic Left's pacifism was rooted entirely in the Gospels, but instead in the secular and utopian conceptions of humankind. War—because of the persistence of concupiscence—was a perpetual tribulation until the coming of Christ. Pacifism was utopian. Willmoore Kendall—a founding editor of *National Review*, a Catholic convert, and a professor of political philosophy at the University of Dallas—provided the journal's most memorable attack on Catholic Left pacifism. Kendall argued that

the chances of eliminating war indeed were utopian, but this did not mean that *Triumph's* staff (and the Catholic tradition) were indifferent to or uncritical of war, but that their thinking acknowledged reality. This was not to resign oneself—as the Catholic Left viewed it—to historical determinism which denied humankind's free will and thus to ignore the potential of individual moral action to prevent war; rather, such "proposals for eliminating war are utopian," Kendall wrote, "because man's will *is* free—that so far as we know war is unavoidable because man wills it to be unavoidable, and commits *freely* the acts that lead to war."<sup>36</sup>

But the innateness of war, for Kendall, was not rooted entirely in man's fallen nature; although, he acknowledged that there was a fairly good chance that "even the best-laid schemes for perpetual peace will, sooner or later, smash themselves against the stone wall of innate and ineradicable human viciousness."<sup>37</sup> Kendall argued also that the proposals for eliminating war were utopian because they were "as good as and no better than the chances of eliminating from the hearts of man *not* the worst that is in them, but, paradoxical as it may seem, the best that is in them."<sup>38</sup> Wars sprung not only from "man's viciousness or predatoriness," but also "out of his noblest aspirations;" Kendall wrote:

The aspiration to understand, the aspiration to penetrate the meaning of the universe in which he lives; the aspiration to distinguish between the good and the bad, the true and the false, the beautiful and the ugly; the aspiration to *identify* himself with the good, the true, and the beautiful; the aspiration, finally, to sacrifice himself, to give the last full measure of devotion, in order that the good shall prevail.<sup>39</sup>

"Ask me to believe that the would-be reformer of human nature can produce a breed of men who will turn their backs on predacity and I shall not accuse you of

insulting my intelligence,” Kendall concluded, “but ask me to believe that they can produce for us a breed of men who will not rally to the standards of . . . Jesus . . . and you ask me to believe the unbelievable.”<sup>40</sup>

John Wisner, in this same line of thought, argued that William Tecumseh Sherman’s famous declaration that “War is Hell” was a “secular liberal superstition,” and therefore, a misconception of war. “We Christians think that war is a deep and complicated spiritual exercise,” Wisner wrote, “where truth and justice are in question, often ending in a meeting with God. The liberals, knowing nothing of these glories, define it through the mouth of the liberal General Sherman simply as hell.”<sup>41</sup>

Contributor Joseph F. Costanzo, also addressing the Catholic Left, explained the basis of Just War Doctrine—that war could be “waged only as an assertion of moral right . . . [when] rooted in the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense,” when all other options for peace had been exhausted.<sup>42</sup> Such self-defense, however, was not one option among others, including the choice to absolve oneself from self-defense. While it was true, Costanzo conceded, that a reading of the Sermon on the Mount might predispose one to think that the message of the Gospel is pacifism, he noted that scripture cannot be read without the context of Christ’s “other recorded teachings,” which give a fuller understanding of the Christian obligation. “God, the author of our human nature, willed that men live in *civility*, and under public laws designed to maintain a social order dedicated to the requirements of *justice*. If, then, civilized living . . . is the fulfillment of divine intent,” Costanzo concluded, “it follows that there is a

divinely ordained natural-law right and *obligation* to preserve civilization.”<sup>43</sup>

Which included fighting communists—the enemies of civilization. In a rebuke to Catholic pacifists, Costanzo noted that “The commandment of love does not abrogate the demands of justice, but rather presupposes them.”<sup>44</sup> He clarified the point with a new rendering of the story of the Good Samaritan:

Had the Samaritan come by when the bandits were assaulting the traveler, and swung his staff with great force to bruise and repel the aggressors (and perhaps in the process risk his own safety or life), would he have been less good? I think his goodness would have been still greater. ‘He who lays down his life for his friend will find it.’ . . . The pacifist, like the priest and Levite, passes by.<sup>45</sup>

Yet it was not only the Catholic Left’s pacifism that bothered *Triumph’s* editors, but also the unorthodoxy of the Berrigan-wing of the Catholic Left, which, to *Triumph’s* editors, placed the Berrigan-wing “within the secular dialectic” and made their Catholicism “flabby.”<sup>46</sup> “The values of the Catholic Resistance, that is to say,” the editors noted, “do not differ in any substantive way from the values of the liberal secularist system. The Berrigans are in prison, physically; but they are also trapped intellectually and spiritually inside the secularist dialectic.”<sup>47</sup> They wrote:

They have never asserted that their Catholicism—the teaching of their Church—is the foundation of their dissent. Indeed, they increasingly write off the institutional Church as insensitive to their needs, not so much failing as *refusing* to be nourished by the only source of enrichment that could truly make of them something different from the Establishment they so despise: refusing to build their politics around the Christian tradition.<sup>48</sup>

Real Catholic radicalism “would never accept,” the editors wrote, “the cop-out, which the Berrigan brothers have so easily acquiesced in, of anguishing over the killing in Vietnam while entirely ignoring the far greater carnage committed in

abortion mills at home.”<sup>49</sup> “But of course obstructing the war in Vietnam requires,” the editors pointed out, “no moral heroism; since everybody now opposes the war, the particular means may offer some risk of imprisonment, but no risk at all of sacrificing one’s standing in the community of fashion.”<sup>50</sup> The Berrigans, then, were “as formidable as the Doublemint Twins;” their politics—a “happy symbiosis” with secular liberalism—“has become cliché in the land,” they wrote, “about as daring as a vote for Hubert Humphrey. Their ‘witness’ is tiresome theater, about as satisfying by now to the connoisseur of symbolic politics as burning leaves in the backyard must be to an arsonist.”<sup>51</sup>

Unlike the Catholic Left, *Triumph’s* editors initially supported American military escalation in Vietnam, viewing it as a just war, because, ostensibly, it had the “glorious purpose of preventing Communist dominion over yet another nation.”<sup>52</sup> The editors were leery, however, of the United States’ objectives in Vietnam and gave cautious approval:

We are patriots; but we are Christians first. We support the war, provided it is a war worthy of a Christian’s sacrifice. It is not such a war if our soldiers are asked to die merely to hasten the day when Asian Communists will agree to help install a Southeast Asia branch of HEW [Health, Education, and Welfare]. It is such a war if its proximate purpose is to eliminate Communism’s local power base, and if its ultimate purpose may plausibly be viewed as an attempt to advance the Christian order. Since the war began, certainly since the murder of President Diem, our government has shown little interest in such purposes. Will it begin to? We suspect not unless Christians start explaining the wisdom of doing so, which we shall proceed to do.<sup>53</sup>

By the following year the editors became even more pessimistic. “It is the kind of war it is,” the editors concluded, “not because the enemy is what he is,

but because we are what we are. We do not take the necessary steps to win the war; we do not, in point of fact, even seek a decisive military verdict.”<sup>54</sup>

The editors’ critique of the war was articulated most fully by the journal’s military specialist, John Wisner, a paratrooper in the Second World War.<sup>55</sup> Wisner concluded in April, 1968, after the Tet Offensive, that the “war in Vietnam is, from every important perspective, lost.”<sup>56</sup> Wisner argued that there were “two main causes of the United States’ defeat.”<sup>57</sup> The first was a political failure derived from the United States’ faith in “liberal rationalism,” which was predicated on the belief that “Religion is a poor basis for society; reason is the only guide men need; liberty unqualified is the highest goal”—this was a flight from “objective reality” or the “will of God.”<sup>58</sup> Man, it is assumed, Wisner wrote, “is free in history to pursue his own internal ends rather than the ends imposed on him by the Lord of History.”<sup>59</sup> Wisner noted that this secular-materialist view of society also was the communist view, which made it increasingly difficult for the secular-liberals to find sufficient reason for fighting in Vietnam.<sup>60</sup> The communist and liberal views contrasted sharply with the Christian conception of society, which envisioned government as a “reconciliation of God and man”—it must be used to restrain the fallen nature of man and aid his quest for spiritual salvation.<sup>61</sup> Ngo Dinh Diem’s regime represented the latter, but the United States’ adherence to liberal rationalism led it to permit the assassination of Diem—a tragic mistake.

The French had planted, Wisner argued, “the Christian ideas of social and political organization” in Vietnam with “surprising success.”<sup>62</sup> “Christianity,” then,

“was a reliable force which Americans could use in the region in the fight against Communism. With the help of the local Christians,” Wisner argued, “we had a chance of winning that war. The removal of the Christian leader Diem therefore was a mistake,

Probably an irreparable mistake; it destroyed the confidence of the local Christians in us; it deprived us of the only really useful force at our disposal in the area. As long as Diem was there with his talk about the need to restrain sin, the need to compensate for the fear and ignorance of men by appropriate civil institutions, and the need to get right with God, we had a reason to be in Vietnam—a motive, a sense of righteousness. We had power because we represented something historically significant. But by allowing Diem to be killed we killed all that.<sup>63</sup>

“By murdering Diem,” Wisner concluded, “we broke the Christian spirit” in South Vietnam and “destroyed any possibility of obtaining a political hold there,” or “sufficiently rousing” the South Vietnamese to fight the communists.<sup>64</sup>

The editors were delighted with the political success of Catholics in the 1967 elections, which returned Catholics to power in South Vietnam. General Nguyen Van Thieu, a Catholic convert, was elected president, while the South Vietnamese senate was controlled now by “pro-Diem Catholics.”<sup>65</sup> This reinforced their view that the South Vietnamese were convinced of the efficacy of Catholic-Christianity to resist the communist onslaught. “The Vietnamese people—regardless of religion—seem to have identified purposeful resistance to Communism with the Christian leadership that stood athwart Ho Chi Minh’s ambitions in the first place,” they wrote; but they were still pessimistic, realizing that its only usefulness “depends on our own government’s willingness to learn from the reflexive wisdom of an ancient people who saw and apparently still see in a Christian regime the only plausible alternative to barbarism.”<sup>66</sup>

The second cause of the United States' defeat in Vietnam, according to Wisner, was due to a military failure, also rooted in liberal rationalism. "In order to make himself independent of God, liberal man resorted, among other things, to technology."<sup>67</sup> Americans had placed their "faith in the universal efficacy of technology and the machine"—what he termed "Americanism"—or the conviction that "if something is done mechanically, it is done better. . . . But the real meaning of the conviction is," Wisner lamented, "that those who have it act independently of objective reality (formerly known as the will of God)."<sup>68</sup> This conviction had been extended to warfare. The United States—namely in its strategy of aerial bombardment—had incurred the wrath of God by setting up a false dichotomy between objective reality and warfare. "War is a purgation of sin . . . but is also a measure of manhood;" in war, Wisner argued, God "measures manhood by demanding sacrifices," which could be made only when man was exposed to (in contrast to being insulated from war through the use of technology) danger and death and thus to the spiritual nature of war that demanded in response a resolute will—this was the test of his manhood.<sup>69</sup> By undergoing this test, man acted—given also that he acted for truth and justice—in accordance with God's will and thus was moved by the spirit. "Victory goes to those who will make the greatest sacrifices for it," Wisner wrote, "and the evidence of the will to win is not the size of the bomb one tosses, but one's willingness to close with the knife."<sup>70</sup> The inherent danger in forgoing these sacrifices—or tests—which had become manifest in Vietnam, was threefold. Man was not steeled for warfare (because man could hardly be moved by the

spirit if he eschewed the sacrifice that war, that God, demanded).<sup>71</sup> He was guilty of sin (because it was “a crime to kill . . . without accepting the risks and sacrifices that are proportionate to the killing”); and, he had lost moral control over the means of waging war (because technological warfare was not limited to the proportional means demanded by men restrained by an understanding of the spiritual nature of warfare or God’s will).<sup>72</sup>

“Force uncontrolled by the moral,” Wisner noted, “can only make deserts.”<sup>73</sup> Man’s contact with the spiritual nature of war and his moral control over it was held in direct proportion to his ability to control his weapon; the greater his ability (the closer he was to God’s will), the greater was his contact and control. “Hence the superiority of the six-inch knife over the flying machine as a weapon of war,” Wisner wrote.<sup>74</sup>

The United States’ overreliance on technology was fueled, as a result of the liberal rationalist’s faith in technology as a replacement for God, in man’s subsequent self-seeking or self-absorption. Once “the liberal revolution dispensed with the need to conform to God’s will, the Christian formation of man—intended to please God by supplying firm sentiments of duty and honor—was abandoned too. The Christian conception of man denying himself,” Wisner wrote, “was replaced by the Freudian conception of man indulging himself; and now our colleges are full of sniveling cowards whose dearest ambition is to avoid looking face to face at a Tokinese.”<sup>75</sup> “The key to victory at war is the bayonet wielded by the resolute man. Until we send Freud back to his sewer and begin forming men to please Christ,” Wisner warned, “we will never win at war again.”<sup>76</sup>

The spiritual and moral failings had led to defeat, which was especially devastating, then, because what was “being tested in Vietnam is not the error of the Army but the error of the nation. . . . What is at stake is our faith in our conception of reality”—the faith in liberal rationalism and technology.<sup>77</sup> “If we admit that sixteen million primitive Tonkinese can drive our tanks, planes, radar, helicopters, battleships, trucks, cranes, isotopes, atom reactors, spaceships and electric toothbrushes out of the country,” Wisner wrote, “our country will collapse from the shock.”<sup>78</sup> But, there was hope in such a failure; “the defeat of 200 million Americans by 16 million Tonkinese unequipped with industry or technology will destroy,” he wrote, “the illusions of technology, free man from the machine, end the U.S. imperial position, and bring on for historical consideration what will hopefully be more serious questions.”<sup>79</sup> We must “cease producing men who expect an outside force, a machine or a bureaucracy, to take care of them,” Wisner instructed, and “start producing men capable of making the lacerating, painful and correcting contact with objective reality, formerly called God.”<sup>80</sup> This began, he wrote, with a redirection of national purpose, to render it unto God—we “will have to recognize that only Christ saves, or clear the decks of history.”<sup>81</sup>

By early 1968—after Johnson had announced his intention to seek negotiations with North Vietnam—*Triumph's* editors were convinced that the war was over. The United States had been defeated, they believed, because it lacked a Christian purpose and the moral means of waging war. “No one, literally no one, among our liberal governors,” the editors complained, “can now

remember why we fought the war. . . . They cannot recall that the purpose of all of this was—to keep South Vietnam free from Communism. For to remember that would be to acknowledge the catastrophic dimensions of our defeat.”<sup>82</sup>

Johnson’s decision to open negotiations was a means of “suing for peace”—the editors concluded and noted that “Orientals, in such circumstances, walk off the stage and shoot themselves. Liberal democrats . . . become sick and quit.”<sup>83</sup>

But, they warned,

Mr. Johnson’s humiliation and retirement is really only a symbol of the nation’s humiliation and retirement. By quitting the war we have quit being a great power. . . . What makes a great power is a will and a capacity to affect history. We have discovered that America no longer has either.<sup>84</sup>

“It is quite possible that as it walks off the stage of history the liberal Republic will shoot itself;” yet, “Christians know that there can be life after the grave for men—and nations—that turn to the Faith.”<sup>85</sup>

Johnson’s decision to negotiate was a turning point. The war was no longer intended to keep South Vietnam free of communism. The editors wrote:

It may be stated this way. The old war—the one the United States was more or less officially fighting for a more or less identifiable purpose, and which a Christian could support as long as he believed the government took the purpose seriously and was seeking to achieve it by just means—has ended. Whereupon a second war—one which still kills people and still ravages the county, even though its original purpose has been abandoned—began.<sup>86</sup>

The war, then, was no longer just, but the editors were not entirely ready to issue a wholesale moral condemnation of the war. They admitted that they still were conflicted because of their obligations as patriots. Although this obligation was “increasingly at odds” with their obligations as Christians, they noted that there was still some ground for a synthesis of obligations, which included upholding

national honor, protecting the army, and honoring the nation's "promises to allies, to avoid, sealing the defeat of the allies in the course of salvaging its own interests."<sup>87</sup> The latter was especially important to the editors and probably the primary reason for their hesitation to condemn the war. They were concerned for the survival of Catholics in South Vietnam—to abandon the war effort could become, depending on the degree of abandonment, tantamount to their death sentence.

The editors did not believe that Richard Nixon's control over the war would change any of their previously held conclusions that the United States was defeated and that it was defeated because it placed its faith in secular liberalism—a change in commander-in-chief could hardly overcome such fundamental problems. Yet there was the possibility that Nixon could affect a change toward recovery (by admitting defeat); they would, however, be disappointed.

Nixon, like Johnson, wanted to negotiate his way out of the Vietnam imbroglio. The editors—if understanding that the war was over—were intolerant of the Paris peace talks, because they involved negotiations with the North Vietnamese and Vietcong communists. "Any really fresh approach to Vietnam," the editors noted, was "to break off the Paris talks," which for the communists, were only "means of waging war"—they were "meant to legitimize the NLF [National Liberation Front]."<sup>88</sup> The "*only* party the U.S. has any business 'negotiating' with is the government of South Vietnam. This is the party," the editors declared, "to which all of our legitimate commitments run, and with which

lie all realistic hopes of providing for the safety of the parting allied armies and salvaging a non-Communist future for the South.”<sup>89</sup> It was the United States’ priority, the editors believed, to secure the sovereignty of South Vietnam: “while we are struggling for our own spiritual rebirth, let us not smother that country’s still discernible Christian spirit in our ashes.”<sup>90</sup>

The editors’ criticism of Nixon’s policy of “Vietnamization” was twofold. First, it left “an unbeaten army . . . [in] the field supported by the world Communist enterprise,” which was especially problematic because the South Vietnamese army was “*not* capable of standing alone, any more than it was when U.S. troops came to its rescue five years ago.”<sup>91</sup> This was painful for the editors, because it indicated a wholesale abandonment of the Catholic convert Nguyen Van Thieu—who had honored “the standards, in both his personal and public life, of Christian statesman”—and his government, which, for the editors, represented the Catholics in South Vietnam.<sup>92</sup> The latter would become their primary concern as the United States came closer to withdrawal, especially given that the editors were fully convinced that Southeast Asia would fall to communism. “There is probably no hope at all of establishing a new defense line on the Southeast Asia mainland. That is to say, the ‘domino theory’ will probably go into effect in Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, mainland Malaysia and Singapore,” the editors concluded, “no matter what the pace and manner of the bugout from Vietnam.”<sup>93</sup> The editors argued that the United States was obligated by the moral law to develop “realistic plans . . . for averting the massacre,” which meant “nothing less than giving the probable victims of the coming Red fury in Southeast Asia the

opportunity *now* to leave the peninsula and gain sanctuary in safer lands. . . . It must be the goal of American statesmanship to secure the shelter and provide the means of reaching it.”<sup>94</sup> The editors wrote:

As it was in the beginning, the South Vietnamese cause has become again the cause of Catholics everywhere—to preserve a people from conquest by Communism and the Church from the oppression and the massacres that inevitably follow. America’s Catholics share Thieu’s responsibility in a special way. Their ability to commit their country’s military forces to the cause in a helpful way is gone, if it ever existed; but they, and their bishops, do have it within their power to mount a public campaign of prayer and mortification for their brothers in Indochina—a campaign at once demonstrative and spiritually efficacious. Let this Prayer of the Faithful rise at every Sunday Mass across the land from the throats of the Catholic people: That President Thieu and his people be preserved and defended against all the wiles of Satan, and that our prayers be accepted in reparation for our own sins toward South Vietnam, hear us, O Lord!<sup>95</sup>

Second, the policy of Vietnamization—in the face of American withdrawal—served to disguise the “staggering failure, not only of our arms, but of our morals and derivatively of our politics” by shifting the blame for the success of the communists toward the South Vietnamese, and Thieu specifically, and perpetuated America’s supposed invincibility and its faith in secular liberalism.<sup>96</sup> Vietnamization was “a perfect synthesis of . . . two apparently contrary American psychologies”—that as “a natural consequence of the loss of moral purpose, Americans began to lose interest in the sacrifices necessary for serious prosecution of the war” but “did not want to feel that their changed attitude toward the war amounted to a dishonorable surrender of noble intentions,” the editors wrote.<sup>97</sup> They accused the government of “conducting a rear-guard action by a variety of means—psychological, military, diplomatic—designed to cover the American withdrawal with the appearances of non-

defeat.”<sup>98</sup> This was especially problematic for the editors; they believed that the recognition of defeat was an “indispensable condition for national rejuvenation and renewal”—because it would expose the failures of secular liberalism.<sup>99</sup>

The editors used the My Lai Massacre to elaborate their moral critique of what they viewed as an *indiscriminate* bombing campaign in Vietnam, which, Potter wrote, had killed “thousands upon thousands of civilians.”<sup>100</sup> “What Calley did was to commit murder,” Potter wrote, “but what B-52 bombardiers do is also to commit murder.”<sup>101</sup> Yet, there was a distinction. Calley had, Potter speculated, murdered with passion—a prerequisite for such face-to-face killing—which was an intrinsically human quality. Thus, “one can respect Calley and imagine befriending him, though he be a murderer, precisely because of his passion, in a way that one can never respect,” Potter wrote, “or even relate to, the technician-bombardier, cold and mechanical, *unmanly* as he is—to say nothing of the men who send the bombardiers to war.”<sup>102</sup> “If a Nuremberg tribunal hangs Calley,” Potter asked, “why shouldn’t it hang President Nixon too?”<sup>103</sup> It would be wrong, Potter concluded, to “repudiate” Calley, to “throw him to the world, while leaving undisturbed, unreformed. . . without overthrowing . . . a whole technopolitical system that makes possible, that actively sponsors more inhuman, indeed *unhuman* acts (as his was not),” which would be something that neither history nor God would forgive.<sup>104</sup>

The editors likewise noted that Calley had indeed committed a sin, but doubted that he had committed a legal crime. Calley was charged with murder because he killed civilians, but “in order to establish murder, so defined, as a

*legal crime,*” the editors asked, “would not the government have to argue that killing innocents in wartime is contrary to the law that governs the military forces of the United States?”<sup>105</sup> The editors wrote:

The government that ordered the bombing of German civilians in World War II, that dropped atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, that promises to exterminate sixty million Russian civilians in the event of a new major war, that has proudly searched and destroyed and body counted in Vietnam for nearly ten years, could not very plausibly make that argument.<sup>106</sup>

The editors believed that the effort to “single out Calley for punishment” would “keep hidden the truth that American military strategy holds killing noncombatants no crime as long as it is done at a distance,” that is, “by missiles, bombs, artillery—and not face to face. Murder, after all, is more easily prescinded from at 30,000 feet than at six.”<sup>107</sup>

The editors offered in March, 1972 a plan for surrender:

1. *Concession of defeat.* . . . 2. *Staged withdrawal of all American armed forces in consultation with the non-Communist governments on Indochina.* . . . 3. *No more bombing.* Excepting strictly tactical support of ground forces, the immorality, if not the futility, of this weapon as wielded by the American command in Vietnam has been convincingly established. 4. *Military and economic aid to the allied governments for a fixed period.* . . . The American people are bound by honor to the allied peoples to help their governments continue resistance as long as they can and wish to—or, in the event of an enemy take-over, to help refugees reach sanctuaries. . . . 5. *No more interference in the internal politics of the allied peoples.* . . . 6. *No more bribe offers.* . . . There is no possibility of America subsidizing North Vietnam without simultaneously undermining the peoples she is still honor-bound to support. 7. *Release of hostages.* . . . America still has the strength to make an effective answer that is consistent with her withdrawal from the war. The U.S. Navy and Marines should enter Haiphong harbor, sever all sea and air traffic, and occupy the city. The occupation force would withdraw only with all of the prisoners of war on board.<sup>108</sup>

Writing in 1975, in a “final reckoning on the Vietnam war,” the editors recounted the causes of the United States’ defeat: the murdering of Diem and the

American faith in secular liberalism (and subsequent reliance on technology), which extinguished any Christian purpose the war may have had and consequently decimated America's moral courage.<sup>109</sup> But instead of admitting failure in 1968, we "embarked on our ugly exercise in pretense and deceit" in an attempt to mask our defeat for seven years."<sup>110</sup> Alas, the editors concluded, our defeat, with the fall of Saigon, could no longer be masked—"we must finally admit the surrender to ourselves."<sup>111</sup> This in itself was a victory. It posed a fundamental question "of what kind of people we are."<sup>112</sup> Christians must not despair, the editors preached,

Communism is Christ's enemy and Our Lady promised us at Fatima that ultimately the original source and prime stronghold of its power will fall before the King of Kings. In the meantime, ours is the calling to tend the flame of faith and hope, which no government and no surrender can extinguish, which calls men not only to endurance, but heroism.<sup>113</sup>

Such endurance and heroism might be the seeds for rejuvenation in a new faith "which sees politics as merely a temporal expression of the Christian faith," they wrote, "which sees international politics as nothing but a mission."<sup>114</sup>

### Nuclear Weapons

In the 1950s and early 1960s, Bozell and Wilhelmsen believed that using nuclear weapons against the Soviet Union, the human analogue of Hell on earth, could be a sacred act (given that such weapons were directed at military targets and that any civilian casualties were unintended). They revised their views during their years at *Triumph*. Indeed, *Triumph's* editors became very critical not

only of the United States' nuclear war policy but of nuclear weapons and/or scientific weapons in general. This change was predicated on a number of factors.

First, and most basically, the United States, the editors concluded, no longer had a Christian purpose; thus, they no longer envisioned any crusading role for the nation. While the Soviet Union indeed was an evil threat, so was, if to a lesser degree, the United States. To strike down the Soviet Union with a secular-liberal sword would be to use evil to fight evil, but such an end—according to the moral law, which prohibited evil acts, even those intended to produce good, did not justify the means.

Second, the editors believed that “in spite of more than 50 years of atheistic propaganda and persecution of believers,” there was evidence that Christianity was surviving in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.<sup>115</sup> They attributed the survival of Christianity to the revival of nationalism. Russians and Eastern Europeans “received their national identities at the same historical moment that they received their identity as Christians through baptism,” the editors noted, and “Nations, no less than individuals, are that which God knows them to be.”<sup>116</sup> Even more important than nationalism to the survival of Christianity was the climate of persecution. “History has repeatedly demonstrated that Christianity is nourished by the blood of martyrs, and thrives in the midst of persecution. The real danger,” the editors wrote, “lies in its being lulled to sleep through comfort and security, and perverted through hedonism.”<sup>117</sup> “Perhaps now that we Americans no longer pray at the foot of the altar for the

conversion of Russia,” they wrote, “we should humbly petition 70 million Russian Christians to pray for the conversion of the United States.”<sup>118</sup>

They also attributed the survival of Christianity to Fatima, where Mary appeared in an apparition to three small children and urged the faithful to pray for the consecration of Russia.<sup>119</sup> “Thanks to Fatima,” the editors remarked, “there no longer seems to be a danger that Bolshevism will triumph over Christianity in Russia”—“At the behest of the Mother of God, Christians around the world prayed for the conversion of Russia daily over decades of decades.”<sup>120</sup>

“Christianity is an increasingly vital force in Russia,” Bozell wrote—“perhaps more vital there than anywhere in the world. Russia’s coming conversion to Christianity is now wrapped, it would appear, in the mystery of Fatima, but it seems to be as sure a fact of the world’s life as any that can be postulated.”<sup>121</sup>

Fatima, they believed, was responsible for the grace that “moved Alexander Solzhenitsyn” to be a force of Christian hope for change in the Soviet Union.<sup>122</sup>

“What an example Solzhenitsyn is,” they wrote, “that after the persecution he has suffered, and still faces, he still hopes. And what a missionary he is, therefore,

What a witness to the power of Christ, that even in the atheistic desert of the Soviet Union, grace flows like a mighty river, unimpeded by all that the most vicious haters of the Lord can do to dam it up.<sup>123</sup>

“It may be presumed,” they concluded, “that the grace which moved Alexander Solzhenitsyn continues to move others. Though they are obscure,

They are legion. That may be Solzhenitsyn’s most important consolation in his exile from the Russia he so passionately loves: the knowledge that others remain behind, slaking the thirst of Russia’s soul with sacramental waters and voicing over and over again the prayer that Holy Russia shall one day be free of her chains.<sup>124</sup>

The walls of the mighty Soviet empire—it appeared—might come crumbling down not because of nuclear weapons, but because of prayer.

The third factor in the editors' changed view on the use of nuclear weapons, was the United States' switch from a "counter-force" nuclear strategy (which targeted the enemy's opposing missile sites) to a "counter-value" strategy (which targeted an enemy's cities). Such a policy was developed in the 1950s and was refined further in the 1960s under Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara as the policy of "Mutual Assured Destruction." It was designed to prevent a Soviet first strike by promising in return a massive retaliation—which necessarily included targeting cities—that would decimate the Soviet population beyond an acceptable (or even survivable) number.

The Second Vatican Council had come close to criticizing the possession of nuclear weapons—noting that "scientific weapons" can "inflict massive and indiscriminate destruction, thus going far beyond the bounds of legitimate defense"—and absolutely condemned targeting civilians, stating that "any act of war aimed indiscriminately at the destruction of entire cities of extensive areas along with their population is a crime against God and man himself. It merits unequivocal and unhesitating condemnation."<sup>125</sup> The editors adhered to the Council, reasoning that nuclear war could be rationalized if the intention was "the destruction of the enemy's military arsenal" and the killing of non-combatants was to "be a 'side-effect,'" but the current United States' city-busting strategy was forbidden by God.<sup>126</sup>

The evil of the strategy was not lessened by—as it was supposed—its defensive or deterrent stance. Rather, it “is in this ‘second-strike,’ ‘defensive’ role, paradoxically, that its principal evil lies,” contributor Gary K. Potter wrote.<sup>127</sup> “A ‘first-strike’ capability, even aimed at civilian populations,” he noted, “is only that—a capability; therefore, barring a strategically located madman or a mistake, a cool, calculated human judgment by the holder of the capability is needed to turn it into an actuality.”<sup>128</sup> “It is otherwise with a ‘second-strike’ capability,” he argued, “for the whole concept of deterrence in nuclear war depends on the practical absence of the ‘human element’ in the escalating chain of events. Counter-value is designed to go into effect automatically,

With computerized rapidity, with even the presidential signal programmed in advance. If the enemy launches in strength, our bombs must instantly be thrown at his cities—without deliberation. They must be, if we are to *have* deterrent. Counter-value strategy presupposes, in short, that the element of moral choice and decision has for all practical purposes been eliminated from our reaction.<sup>129</sup>

“From a moral standpoint,” he concluded, “any nation committed to Counter-value is not able to choose good, it has already chosen evil.”<sup>130</sup> The editors pointed out that “in moral terms the purpose is equivalent to the act. For it is the essence of a credible deterrent that retaliation to an attack be assured, contingency removed, the power of future choice relinquished,” they wrote—  
“There is no getting around it: our whole national existence has been hinged to a present decision to commit automatically, in response to an act by another nation over which we have no control, an absolutely forbidden moral crime.”<sup>131</sup>

Furthermore, the counter-value strategy—because it eliminated choice—eliminated humankind from the means of waging war; the strategy was

predicated on an automatic, machine response to a Soviet first strike. “The condition of the spirit is irrelevant in a war waged with modern scientific weapons,” Potter wrote, “except in a negative way: the most abject coward may operate the weapons, yet still ‘win’ the war”—as no sacrifice was required man was ineluctably divorced from the spiritual nature of war that Wisner spoke of and thus was in opposition to God’s will.<sup>132</sup> “Further, the condition of the spirit can be negatively registered insofar as it must already show a certain insensitivity, or numbness, in order for men even to intend to use the weapons of which we speak; with the weapons’ actual use, the spirit is liable to become callous,” Potter concluded, and “This callousness of spirit, or tendency toward spiritlessness, in modern warfare, signifies a diminution of the humanity of the men who wage it.”<sup>133</sup>

The counter-value strategy was predicated also on a vindictive retaliation—or a frightful vengeance; after a Soviet first strike, the United States would subsequently murder millions of innocent Russian civilians, which violated the just war reasoning that war must be waged to restore peace, not inflict vengeance.<sup>134</sup>

Potter concluded, then, that the United States should renounce its “counter-value” strategy:

As a nation, we must leave the evil road. Leaving it will leave us at the enemy’s mercy? No, it will leave us at God’s; and His Mercy is infinitely preferable to His Justice. That is the only certain answer Christians can give. Christians can hope that by training themselves hard in the use of the knife and the rifle they might have as much success against an aggressor’s immoral weapons as the Vietnamese tin can has had against our nuclear navy. But all that Christians can *know*, if forced to choose between defense of their country and observance of God’s laws, is that

they must throw themselves on Divine Providence or abandon title to their Christianity.<sup>135</sup>

The editors wrote that to not abandon the “counter-value” strategy was to “scorn the judgment of God” and leave America open to his wrath, which may take the “form of the Russians and/or their bombs.”<sup>136</sup>

“An imprudent, immoral policy cannot be followed with impunity forever. In a very short time,” the editors concluded, “the U.S. may have to face a horrible choice: incinerate millions of innocents, or surrender to Communism. Neither of these choices is prudent, neither is moral.”<sup>137</sup> The editors proposed a different option. They reasoned that the use of nuclear weapons, if not an ideal solution, could still be justified—should not a nation use the means at its disposal, so long as they are employed morally, that are necessary to its survival? Any such policy, they argued, must be based in just war theory that “the only legitimate end of technique is injury to the enemy’s military force—whether one’s army is at stake, or the survival of one’s people or one’s civilization.”<sup>138</sup> If moral reasoning was employed, then, “America’s genius will instinctively be harnessed to the search for an adequate technology of *counter-force*,” which included an anti-ballistic missile shield.<sup>139</sup> They wrote:

For instance: We will attempt to defend our cities. Just as we are obliged to spare Russian non-combatants, we are obliged to protect our own. . . . We will attempt to develop an offensive strategic weaponry, including the para-military weapons of espionage and sabotage, capable of isolating nuclear installations and penetrating whatever protection is given them. We will attempt to develop moral reliance on conventional weapons for land warfare that do not blur the distinction between warrior and non-combatant.<sup>140</sup>

“The alternative to population destruction must not be capitulation, as in Vietnam. There is no time to be lost,” they warned—“If a nation that can place men on the moon will not even *try* to make a sword pleasing to God, it might as well forget His mercy and prepare for His justice.”<sup>141</sup>

The editors tried, then, to forge a position that transcended the Left-Right dialectic. The Left’s pacifist position, “Better Red than Dead,” could rightly be dismissed as “sentimental utopianism” and thus “at a profounder level, inhuman,” because it denied “man’s fallen nature” and, as Kendall pointed out, his “noblest aspirations.”<sup>142</sup> Yet the Right’s militarist position, “Better Dead than Red,” was equally unattractive, because it, like the Left’s, denied the “luminous centrality of the human person,” which was “not a ‘resource,’ to be depleted or served as one’s judgment of cosmic ecology dictates. This person,” rather, the editors wrote, “is a thing of God’s; the person *belongs* to God.”<sup>143</sup> “It is an enormous *hubris*, in both left and right, that is fundamentally responsible for the dialectic,” they wrote:

We must keep the planet in being, says the left. We must keep the country and the civilization in being, says the right. Yet all being is an extension of the will of God. The planet, the civilization, the country, is—will be—at His pleasure. Christians today can and should fight for the good, but *only* with weapons and battle plans that seem pleasing to God.<sup>144</sup>

“The Christian response to the dialectic is, then: Better Dead or Red than Sin,” they reasoned.<sup>145</sup>

The editors moved increasingly toward a position in which nuclear weapons—any uses whatsoever—were immoral. This trajectory was predictable. The editors condemned the use, as well as the possession, of

chemical and biological weapons, because they were “designed to inflict suffering on whole populations, civilians and soldiers, men and babies alike.”<sup>146</sup> But they condemned them also, as early as 1969, because “any weapon with the power to suck away the enemy’s life without exposing the killer to the encounter of personal combat is intrinsically immoral, because it assumes a God-like, and therefore inhuman prerogative.”<sup>147</sup> It is difficult to envision, then, how nuclear weapons—or any type of aerial assault—could be morally justified in the editors’ view. Yet they believed, as late as 1972, that aerial bombardment, used as “strictly tactical support of ground forces,” in Vietnam was permissible.<sup>148</sup>

By 1971, however, Bozell posited an argument—probably influenced by the reasoning of the Jesuit moral theologian, John Ford—against the moral permissibility of any use of nuclear weapons. The side-effect (or “double-effect”)—the collateral damage, that is, which inevitably killed civilians—was not unexpected and thus not unintended in their use, which made them inherently immoral (not only in use but in possession), even including the defensive-natured development of a “solid ABM-Counter-force capability.”<sup>149</sup> He wrote:

Common sense tells you that thermonuclear warfare, no matter how fastidiously it is programmed, is simply not confinable to morally acceptable limits. You can reduce the toll of innocent life by zeroing in on military targets, but you cannot eliminate it. The killing of innocents, whether from radiation fallout or the immediate effects of the blast, is a necessary corollary of the decision to shoot: it is no accident, no mere ‘incident’ to the primary intent.<sup>150</sup>

In a 1972 editorial, the collective editorial position gravitated towards, while not adopting, Bozell’s position. They concluded that any type of nuclear warfare was, in all likelihood, immoral in two respects; first, the “secular, nation

state” was morally illegitimate and thus presented no morally valid reason for fighting or using such weapons, even if the weapons were morally permissible; second, it was “difficult . . . to conceive of a use of them that might be moral.”<sup>151</sup> Thus, they wrote, while “the pacifist position looks no better theoretically than it ever has in the long debate within Christianity over the morality of war,” the unavailability of both moral cause and moral weapons, means that “a position which might be called ‘practical pacifism’ is becoming harder to resist.”<sup>152</sup> They reasoned, however, that there was “a kind of profound irresponsibility in ‘practical pacifism’ in an age when Christian peoples and therefore the hopes for a renewed Christian civilization are under the gun in more and more extensive reaches of the globe.”<sup>153</sup> They noted also that such a “Practical abdication of the social apostolate is no more compatible with the Gospel, after all, than immoral war.”<sup>154</sup> They were confounded by such uncertainty and hoped that “the Holy Father” would continue “to develop his teaching, and ever more systematically,” on modern warfare.<sup>155</sup>

### The Solution

What was the solution to America’s decadent secular-liberal foreign policy, the Soviet threat, America’s failures in Vietnam, and the moral bankruptcy of its military strategies? The solution, the editors believed, was to Christianize America, establish a confessional state and thus a national purpose that was “rendered unto Him”—forging the United States as a “new secular sword for the

Vicar of Christ”—and then set about making Christendom; that is, a confederated world order that rendered its power unto the authority of Christ’s vicar.<sup>156</sup>

They despised the world order developing under the United Nations, because it was yet another expression of modern man’s absolute faith in rationalism—as man’s sole guide and source of authority—as expressed in its faith in parliamentarianism to sustain world peace.<sup>157</sup> Yet war was not derived from reason alone, but also from passion; thus, peace was not derived from reason alone but also “moral force,” or obedience to God’s will—men, the editors wrote, “require something more arresting than reason, a moral conviction, or perhaps a burst of six, to stop them.”<sup>158</sup> The hope to please God and the fear of His wrath, not ideological abstractions, restrained the rationalizations and passions of men; this was why the United Nations, the editors scoffed, “has never had the kind of authority to limit legitimately the sovereignty of Trinidad/Tobago, let alone a real nation.”<sup>159</sup>

Christ’s authority, as expressed through the Roman Catholic Church, was the only real supranational power that could establish peace because it had supernatural authority—it was, in effect, the supreme objective authority, as it was above the earthly political fray. All men were subject to Christ and thus his vicar on earth. To transcend the anarchic order of power politics, the editors noted that there were “only two ways that lasting peace may be had.”<sup>160</sup> Either “entrust world hegemony to one worldly power”—and witness the emergence of “global totalitarianism,” a world order that seeks peace by forcing conformity—“or insist that all worldly powers defer to the authority of Someone above them, from

Whom they derive whatever legitimacy their power has,” and witness the development of a true, confederated, and thus free, world order, because every nation is subject to Christ.<sup>161</sup> This was the only way to a true, if not everlasting, peace, because in such an order, law was derived from Christ, Who was above all, and not the subjective, and therefore resented, device of one nation, class, or group.<sup>162</sup>

The editors understood, though, that Christendom was a future development. They did believe, as with domestic politics, that a practical participation was necessary to mitigate the worst effects of a secular-liberal foreign policy and to tilt policy considerations toward furthering the interests of Catholics internationally—to care for all members of the Mystical Body of Christ. They hoped for the development of a worldwide Catholic unity and purpose—empowered by the political attention Catholics could command in their respective countries due to their sheer numbers—“for magnifying the Catholic people” and their interests.<sup>163</sup> The “Church, in the historical labors of her pilgrimage, has gathered a mighty harvest,” Bozell calculated—“her Irish and her Italians, her Poles and her Lithuanians, her Vietnamese and her Philipinos, her Africans and her Americans—600 million faithful give her a potential global strength that eclipses all of the pretensions of the great powers.”<sup>164</sup>

For their part, the editors envisioned some sort of foreign policy pressure group, like the powerful Jewish lobby for Israel.<sup>165</sup> There are “three lessons” the editors noted that Catholics could learn from Jews (this in response to the Jewish

community's ability to raise governmental concern for Jews in Russia, especially pertaining to their right to immigrate):

(1) The clout is the direct result of the Jews being and acting as *a people*. . . (2) The Jews' anti-Soviet clout shows, by contrast, the poverty of Christian anti-Communist clout—or even feeling. The contrast is spotlighted by the presence in Congress of Father Robert Drinan, S.J., who has prominently associated himself with the Jewish people's cause of freedom for their Soviet co-religionists, but has never been known to acknowledge by a single peep the Christian heritage of the vast majority of the Soviets' slaves, let alone the Catholic identity of whole nations of them. (3) If the Catholic people's anti-Communism is to be revived and articulated, it will have to be through the services of the most militant expression of the Catholic people's interests.<sup>166</sup>

The editors' principal concern was for Catholics behind the Iron Curtain.

They wrote in response to the apparent apathy of American Catholics to evidence of the persecution of Lithuanian Catholics, that “They know of the plight of their fellow Catholics in Lithuania, but they do not raise their voices in protest. Their silence amounts to a ‘thumbs down’ signal for the oppressors to finish the kill.”<sup>167</sup> “Where is the Catholic outrage against injustice and brutality inflicted upon Catholics in all Iron Curtain countries and in parts of what passes as Christendom? Catholics, too,” they urged, “must never hesitate to raise the cry: ‘Let my people go!’”<sup>168</sup>

### “Mirrors of Christendom”

*Triumph's* editors—though they did not always hold them as ideal or even legitimate—supported rightist authoritarian regimes over their socialist counterparts. In this regard, they seemed to have a similar mindset of the

American Right; that while rightist authoritarian regimes were not ideal, they were superior to such leftist and/or socialist regimes. The former, it was reasoned, usually preserved the Church, the military, and other traditional institutions that served to limit the power of dictators or military juntas, while leftist regimes, although rhetorically more democratic, tended to dissolve such traditional institutions because they were seen as obstacles to freedom, which gave them a dangerous monopoly of power and led to the development of what James Burnham, *National Review's* foreign policy expert, called totalist regimes.<sup>169</sup> Leaders of such regimes, possessing such absolute power over a turbulent social order—fostered by the dissolution of traditional authorities—were more prone to rule with deception and terror in order to compensate for this disorder, because their power was absolute, and they were bound to become impatient and more radicalized when their social utopia failed to develop.

*Triumph's* editors were optimistic, for example—in contrast to the liberal intellectual establishment—about the Greek military regime that seized power in the mid-1960s. Importantly, the regime demonstrated that it could prevent a socialist revolution—a shining credential. The editors concluded:

*Triumph* agrees that the Greek military government is un-American. After all, it is militantly anti-Communist. It jails without apology those who attack the public security. Perhaps most damaging of all, its rulers are strict Christians who watch the public morality with a stern eye, who take their oath of office from the Orthodox Archbishop, Primate of Greece. That is why it is an un-American government. Nevertheless—or, perhaps because of that—there are persuasive reasons for thinking it could become a *good* government.<sup>170</sup>

When the editors believed that Spain was under the threat of a communist takeover in 1975, they argued that “Under the circumstances, the Spanish

government is surely entitled—no *obliged*—to resort to extraordinary means to maintain national cohesion and order: means proper to a state of siege.”<sup>171</sup>

The editors’ support of Francisco Franco’s regime was a further example of this mentality to support rightist-authoritarian regimes; Bozell, and especially Wilhelmsen, were attentive throughout the journal’s ten-year existence to political developments in Spain. The editors’ principal attraction to Spain was Carlism and its Catholic culture; they would even come to criticize Franco eventually for allowing religious liberty, implementing centralizing reforms (*Triumph’s* editors supported the Carlists in their objective of a loosely confederated Spain), and for choosing Prince Juan Carlos, from the liberal Bourbon line, to be his successor, rather than choosing the Carlist claimant, Prince Carlos Hugo.<sup>172</sup> Yet Franco would always be remembered to *Triumph’s* staff as the knight slayer of the communist dragon. In addition, his authoritarian rule preserved, in the editors’ estimation, Spain’s Catholic culture. Warren Carroll recalled an event that supported their view:

In one memorable episode in Spain, he [Wilhelmsen] used his walking stick to break the window of a shop displaying pornography (when Franco still lived and the sale of pornography in Spain was therefore still illegal). When the police came he told them just why he had done it, whereupon they took him around the corner to a bar and bought him a drink. Alas, nothing like this would happen in Spain today.<sup>173</sup>

Spain was a remnant of Christendom—a living relic of a confessional state. The editors gloried in Spain’s rich Catholic history; they often repeated the words of the Spanish historian, Menendez y Pelayo, who remarked: “Spain—evangelizer of half the globe; hammer of heretics; the light of Trent: Spain—the sword of Rome; the cradle of Saint Ignatius—this is our grandeur and our unity.

We have none other.”<sup>174</sup> Paradoxically, the editors looked toward a future revolution—the birth of a new Christian order—derived from the ideals of a pre-modern, Catholic-confessional Spain. Spain was not, however, the only remnant of Christendom.

Ireland, like Spain, was essentially Catholic—another surviving remnant of Christendom and the hope for a future Christian order. Reflecting on both countries, the editors remarked:

Spain and Ireland have no destiny other than the permanent defense, and advancement, of the Incarnated Faith. . . . Providence seems to have dictated that these two lonely sentinels of civilization so sanctify their public life that, if ever divorced from this service, they must perforce read themselves out of history.<sup>175</sup>

The editors even fantasized of a “Dublin-Madrid Axis,” a “Pan-Celtic Imperium” “ready to march again, Eastward to recapture the lands from which it emerged in the dawn of history.”<sup>176</sup> As Catholic-confessional countries, they were missionaries in a pagan world—the two imposing front towers on a Gothic cathedral, reminders of the transcending glory of Christian civilization and the gateway to its rebirth.

The editors were, however, increasingly worried about the pressures of modernization and the effects the forces of secularization would have on both countries. To divorce their countries from the Church would be disastrous and certainly would lead to “national suicide.”<sup>177</sup> “It would be ironic indeed were Spain and Ireland to isolate the Church in her sanctuary,” the editors lamented, “because of an unseemly desire to enter the wasteland of the secular West in the very moment in which that world crumbles into the dust of history.”<sup>178</sup>

Let Ireland and Spain keep the Cross and the banner of Christ the King at the center of their lives. Only thus can they fulfill their historic destiny as evangelizers of the world, guardians of civilization, the conscience of the West, and the hope of a better, therefore Catholic, tomorrow.<sup>179</sup>

The editors' interest in Ireland and Northern Ireland was intensified because of the conflict in the late-1960s that erupted in Northern Ireland between the minority Catholic population and the Protestant majority. The conflict—triggered by a civil rights movement initiated by the Catholic minority to combat discrimination in education, employment, housing, and politics—escalated into a brutal war waged between Catholic paramilitary groups and Protestant paramilitary and police forces and the British army.<sup>180</sup>

The editors protested the discrimination against Catholics in Northern Ireland, but they were hesitant, at first, to become very involved. They worried that the conflict would *devo/ve* into a secular-liberal political struggle. “We confess to some difficulty,” the editors admitted, “in summoning enthusiasm for a rebellion couched in the banal and fatuous ‘civil rights’ phraseology that our oppressed comrades have adopted.”<sup>181</sup> If the struggle was of a secular-liberal political nature, an uprising “for the sake of civil rights,” then it “is merely another parochial political quarrel;” but, if it was a revolt against the forces that deny the whole of Ireland “a Catholic land,” the expression of its Catholic self—its “national character,” its “soul”—then that “would be a truly Holy Cause,” the editors wrote, “which the Angels and the Saints would make their own.”<sup>182</sup>

The editors importantly, then, identified Northern Ireland as an illegitimate political entity that denied Ireland, a Catholic island, the expression of itself—a revolt against such an oppression was without question just; “the most just of

wars.”<sup>183</sup> Not only was the struggle of North Irish Catholics just, but even an invasion of Northern Ireland by the Republic of Ireland was considered just because it too was a defensive action, because, they reasoned, the whole of Ireland was intrinsically Catholic. The editors believed that such an invasion would be justified also because confessional states—which they believed Ireland was at the time—were the only states that could rightly enforce their will on the “interest of men outside [their] borders,” because such expansion was inherently missionary and thus salvific.<sup>184</sup> The unification of Ireland under Catholic rule, then, was a righteous objective and the only sure path to peace, the editors reasoned, because it was the only solution that conformed to reality—the reality that Ireland was a Catholic land. The only “mitigation of this inexorable certainty,” the editors wrote, was the “remotely plausible . . . isolation of Belfast as a free city, a Protestant Island in the Catholic sea, a refuge for Orangemen who will neither leave Ireland nor live in peace in a Catholic country.”<sup>185</sup> The editors hoped, then, that the Republic of Ireland would intervene to unite the island:

In another, less insipid age we would look for the Republic’s able-bodied men to be crossing the border to come to the aid of their hard-pressed comrades; but that is doubtless too straightforward and dramatic an action to expect now. Nevertheless, the Republic of Ireland can and should pursue the reunification of the country (it has never recognized the division anyway) as official policy—and unashamedly exploit the present turmoil in Ulster to that end. If the Most High God is to continue to bless the cause of Ireland, it will have to continue to be a Christian cause.<sup>186</sup>

Yet this type of intervention became increasingly less likely and less justified as Ireland began to secularize itself by disestablishing the Church in the early 1970s. The editors worried that these were concessions to England to

obtain a settlement to the conflict that was favorable to Ireland. Such a settlement, the editors warned, would be a “crime against history . . . the memory of hundreds of martyrs would be insulted, [and] the soul of Ireland would be traduced.”<sup>187</sup> In such a case, “the spiritual sons and daughters of St. Patrick and St. Bridget should unite to wage war,” they wrote, “Strengthened as their ancestors were strengthened—by the rosary and the Mass—they should fight to the death for the resurrection of a Catholic Ireland.”<sup>188</sup>

The editors put their faith increasingly in the extra-legal, Provisional-wing of the Irish Republican Army (IRA).<sup>189</sup> At first, they believed that the Provisional IRA was waging an “un-Christian war in Ulster,” and concluded that the cause was not righteous “if Irishmen no longer fight a war as Christians.”<sup>190</sup> But a number of factors precipitated a change in this policy. First, Ireland was becoming increasingly secular. The disestablishment of the Roman Catholic Church in 1972 was met with bitter and sarcastic remarks from the editors that “Ireland had qualified for the twentieth century; had joined the ranks of fully modern, secular republics; had embarked on the road that will, by and by, lead her to civilizational equality with Scandinavia . . . and America . . . and England . . . Congratulations, Ireland.”<sup>191</sup> Second, the editors believed that the Provisional IRA was, although imperfectly, reflecting righteous intentions—they professed an intention to strike military, rather than civilian, targets. Furthermore, the editors believed that the Provisional IRA was misrepresented by the secular-liberal press, which exaggeratedly portrayed the Provisional IRA as terroristic and underreported British brutality.<sup>192</sup> They believed also that Provisional IRA

members were devoutly Catholic.<sup>193</sup> Third, the editors were infuriated with direct British intervention and rule, including the presence of the British army, which, they believed, employed brutal pacification methods. *Triumph's* staff was convinced of such brutality by Bishop Thomas J. Drury's report on Long Kesh, a British internment camp. Drury wrote:

'I was shocked and outraged by the obscene conditions of the Camp . . . . I left Ireland fifty years ago as a young man, but even in those days cattle were not kept in such rotten condition. The only things lacking in Long Kesh are the furnaces and the gas chambers! . . . Long Kesh is clearly designed to disorient its victims. In plain language, it is designed to torture, degrade, and drive the men out of their minds—and it succeeded in the case of poor Patrick Crawford: but Patrick is in Heaven because he was a good young man—and anyway, he did his hell on earth in Long Kesh.'<sup>194</sup>

The Irish were “up against a Third Reich without a Hitler—an England that sees Irish Catholics as *Untermenschen* who can be accused,” the editors concluded,

Without evidence or trial, of unspeakable crimes and carted off to concentration camps with not so much as a peep from the press or governments of the ‘Free World’—indeed, can count on the free world press to calumniate the Irish as criminals! With Bishop Drury we join in praying that God be with our people in Ireland.<sup>195</sup>

The Society for the Christian Commonwealth, *Triumph's* parent organization, sent member Paul A. Fisher to Northern Ireland to investigate the situation.

Fisher reported that the “British police state,” which “is Northern Ireland,” was carrying out a campaign of “savage terror” against Catholics.<sup>196</sup>

Such factors, then, led to a more conciliatory, even praiseworthy, view of the Provisional IRA. The editors called on Irish Catholics “to take from the Provisionals their central resolution not to rest until English troops and English rule have been eliminated in the North,” but that Catholics should “impress on the

Provisionals that their tactics must comport with the Christian moral teaching on war—that indiscriminate terrorism must cease forthwith.”<sup>197</sup> All Catholics, they instructed, “must never lose sight of the fact that Catholics are involved in a war, the most just of wars, and that the ultimate aim is an Irish nation reunited in public confession of the Catholic Faith.”<sup>198</sup> The editors posited the following plan:

1) the IRA should aim the whole of its offensive action against British soldiers and military and police targets; 2) the Dublin government should begin a diplomatic campaign to remove [William] Whitelaw and the English troops from Ulster; 3) Ulster Catholics should defend and expand the no-go areas in the North’s cities and place them under the laws and protection of the Irish Republic, although these Catholic communes would be governed presumably for the time as autonomous entities. 4) Ulster Catholics should refuse to play any civil or military role in the administration of the Whitelaw regime; as soon as the impact of these preliminary measures has been felt the Republic should guarantee for Orangemen the full rights that men of all religions enjoy under her constitution, move her own troops into the North, intern any English soldiers and any diehard Protestant militants who may remain, and unfurl the flag of Eire at Armagh, proclaiming all of Ireland a Catholic nation once again.<sup>199</sup>

The editors were dismayed, however, by their realization that the Provisional IRA, even if devoutly Catholic, was not interested in establishing a Catholic confessional state; yet, they did not withdraw their support, because they reasoned that a liberated Ireland was still a Catholic Ireland and one unhindered from being so once the British were removed. They believed that this still was a moral objective “that history, in our view, justifies abundantly,” and they had hopes that the cause of independence, which had an indelible Catholic character to it—in addition to the Provisional IRA’s plan for a united *but* confederated Ireland—had a “likelihood of inhibiting the Republic’s present drift

toward materialistic secularism.”<sup>200</sup> Thomas J. Barbarie still urged Catholics to support the Irish Northern Aid Committee, an American-based organization that provided relief for dependents of political prisoners in Northern Ireland, which the Society for the Christian Commonwealth supported also.<sup>201</sup>

Yet *Triumph's* editors could not ignore the reports of terroristic violence reportedly inflicted by the Provisional IRA.<sup>202</sup> The editors admitted that “the Provos have too often given in to the temptation, utterly barred to the Christian, to make total war, terroristic war: *once* is too often.”<sup>203</sup> The editors thundered:

*The IRA's war cannot include tactics directly intended to kill civilians, or flagrantly oblivious of danger to civilians, and remain just. Numbers are not relevant here. A deliberate policy of occasionally sniping at noncombatants would be as evil, qualitatively, as a policy of mass bombings of orphanages.*<sup>204</sup>

They believed, however, that the Provisional IRA's record was “distinguished in the annals of guerilla war-makers precisely by the lengths to which they routinely go in order to maintain the distinction between combatants and non-combatants.”<sup>205</sup> They argued also that it was the duty of American Catholics, “not to call upon the Provos to abandon the just cause of their war,” but “to recall them to just means in pursuit of that cause.”<sup>206</sup> They maintained that the “war's goal of eliminating the British presence in Ireland deserves wholehearted support even as every instance of unjust warmaking deserves condemnation.”<sup>207</sup>

Global South

*Triumph's* editors and contributors were leery of decolonization in Africa. They believed that European colonists had provided the seeds of Christian civilization. Otto von Habsburg, a *Triumph* contributor, wrote of Portuguese Angola that the Church brought the faith, "and with it civilization, knowledge, education, even a better organization of public health and agriculture."<sup>208</sup> Africa was not ready, they concluded, to be rid of its European Christian tutors. Without such an influence, Africa was destined to return to barbarism. The editors believed, for example, that the white, Christian Rhodesians were the source of Rhodesia's (Zimbabwe's) civilization:

The ruin of the Rhodesian whites would unquestionably ruin for the foreseeable future all hope of civilization for Rhodesian blacks. The very real danger to the Negro population from other Negro nations and tribes is constantly underestimated. Where white rule has vanished elsewhere in Africa, civil war between different tribes, which have no tradition of political unity or stability, is the natural result. In the last analysis, if any progress whatever is to come to Black Africa, it must be under some external influence. . . . What can never be supplied again, however, is a population with the earned rights, the long residence, the growing experience, the Christian outlook, and the personal interest in the country's welfare which the white Rhodesians now have.<sup>209</sup>

Charles de Gualle's decision for Algerian independence "opened the door to the progressive and planned destruction of civility in French Algeria," Wilhelmsen wrote, and thus "abandoned to the desert an entire province of the European Order. Today that province is returning to the nothingness from whence France saved it a century ago."<sup>210</sup>

The editors feared that the barbarism that ensued after European retreat favored the advance of communism. "On the surface there is no reason to consider a completely Africanized Zambia as a cause for Western alarm,"

Thomas Molnar wrote, but “in reality, Africanization most often means a green light for internal unrest [and] Communist interference.”<sup>211</sup> Communists, Molnar concluded, were carrying on a “relentless war” under the cloak of chaos in Africa.<sup>212</sup>

The collapse of colonial empires, the editors concluded, was precipitated not only by the rise of black Africa and global communism, but was derived also from the decadence of the secularized European states, which now lacking a Christian purpose, could find no sufficient reason to maintain their colonies.<sup>213</sup> *Triumph's* staff was aware of the exploitive aspects of colonization, but hoped that colonial powers would be driven by a missionary cause—which, contributor Otto von Habsburg wrote, “sees in the native the brother in Christ whom he has the duty to help”—rather than an economic-imperialist who sees “an underdeveloped, inferior being, whose destiny it is to serve the masters.”<sup>214</sup>

Yet if decolonization was alarming, the editors also saw great hope in Africa. The editors noted that the West was no longer the great repository of the Catholic faith and that “Christianity is more and more a positively visible factor in other areas of the world—its heartland is moving south, and nowhere is its potential more stunning than in Africa.”<sup>215</sup> If Africa “is to be a part of the new Christendom,” they wrote, “there are compelling reasons to suspect it may be its center.”<sup>216</sup> “The magnificent African church,” the editors wrote, has “given the world a number of cardinals and bishops whose resplendent orthodoxy makes Europe the ‘dark’ continent.”<sup>217</sup> Because of its resplendent faith—and because of the rise of secular, socialist, and centralist governments—they believed that

the African church was “on the threshold of God’s severest gift, one given only to those who have the faith to receive it, the gift of martyrdom.”<sup>218</sup>

The editors were attracted to the Global South because its people, they reasoned, were closer to creation, because, for the most part, they were free of the crippling effects of secularization and were unencumbered by the technological barrier that western man erected between himself and reality. They had, therefore, closer contact with its beauty and goodness, and thus, were much more capable of understanding the reality of existence—its origin, God. “Standing apart from the disastrous intellectual and political poverty of the modern age, the Third World possesses the key to the shape of the post-modern world,” the editors believed; “Its people possess the spontaneous love for existence which modernity has lost. They can love, they can cry, they can sin, they can die, like children of creation in tune with the symphony of reality.”<sup>219</sup>

Yet the editors’ hope for Africa as a new Christendom was dwarfed by their visions of Latin America’s potential. Latin Americans, like Africans, were close to reality, and thus God, but they also possessed already, to a much greater degree, the most perfect theological expression of that reality, Roman Catholicism: “The Catholic reality of Latin America present everywhere in the individual and public life of its people elevates this symphony [of reality] into the intimate life of the Triune God.”<sup>220</sup> Latin America, like Spain and Ireland, was the “expression of an authentic, *exoteric* Christianity—a religion that is in the very marrow of the nation in which it lives.”<sup>221</sup> A society so integrally Catholic could be expected to act Catholic. “When this kind of relation exists between a people

and its religion,” the editors noted, “in an area as enormous and potentially powerful as Latin America, there is almost no limit to the glories that people can make in the world.”<sup>222</sup> John Dombrowski concurred; he called Latin America “the last survivor of Christendom,” and believed it was “thus a place from which to launch a new birth of Christian culture, a new effort to build a world community pleasing to God.”<sup>223</sup> While the world lacked a sufficiently strong Catholic-confessional state to serve as the secular sword for the pope, the editors had hope that a united Latin America could emerge as a world power and fill such a role.

Given the potential of Catholic Latin America, the editors were concerned with any developments that threatened the Catholic order of existence. One such threat was American imperialism, which could—with its Protestant, secular-liberal, and capitalist influences—potentially dilute the vibrancy of Latin Catholicism. The editors were concerned especially with the United States’ “inherently evil” effort “to castrate South America” by promoting artificial birth control as a solution to the supposed problem of overpopulation.<sup>224</sup> Yet the editors reasoned—because they believed that Pope Paul VI’s encyclical *On the Regulation of Birth* (1968), which reaffirmed the Church’s stance against contraception, “was received with great enthusiasm among people, churchmen, and government leaders” in South America—that “God may nevertheless draw some good from it,” including liberation from Yankee imperialism:

South Americans have for decades put up with economic exploitation and political manipulation, but they will not brook interference in the really important matters of life, such as religion and family. These things are sacred to the point that South Americans will fight to defend them. U.S.

population policies may, paradoxically, be the instrument whereby South America is finally freed from foreign domination and given the freedom to accomplish its proper role in the world, as the only thoroughly Christian continent.<sup>225</sup>

“Latins seem to flourish,” Dombrowski noted, “in direct proportion to the dignity and respect afforded to the Catholic Church: which means, almost by definition, when they are not busy adjusting themselves (or being required to adjust) to the wishes of the United States.”<sup>226</sup> America’s failure to appeal to Latin America, the editors concluded, resulted from its “deliberate refusal to see Latin American culture for what it is—a way of life and a hierarchy of values based largely upon the Catholic faith.”<sup>227</sup> “We must allow Latin America to develop according to the norms of its own culture, toward its own goals, by its own means,” they reasoned—“The continent has come of age, and we must stop trying to control it, and begin trying to understand it.”<sup>228</sup> The editors called on American Catholics “to protect Latins against a new round of interventionism,” but also urged them to look to Latin America for education in the Catholic order of existence, of which Americans, even American Catholics, were sorely ignorant.<sup>229</sup> “The politico-moral tables have turned,” the editors argued; “it is now time for (Catholic) Latin America to teach and for (un-Catholic and leaning toward anti-Catholic) North America to learn. No readily available teacher is better equipped; and no pupil could be more urgently in need of instruction.”<sup>230</sup> Latin America, Dombrowski wrote, “has much to teach us.”<sup>231</sup>

The editors were concerned also with the development of liberation theology, which emphasized the social and materialist nature of humankind and thus stressed political and social transformation to improve its socio-economic

conditions. The Church traditionally emphasized the individual and spiritual nature of man and woman, and thus stressed their individual moral transformation to improve their chances of salvation. Historically, the Church in Latin America was aligned with the privileged classes, which were seen by liberation theologians as the forces of socio-economic oppression. This was deemed as a betrayal of the Church's mission to serve the poor—specifically, not the spiritually poor, but the materialistically poor. Liberation theologians, then, envisioned a new role for the Church in Latin America, a socio-economically transformative role, and sought to align it with the cause of social revolution for greater social justice.<sup>232</sup>

In part, Pope Paul VI's encyclical *On the Development of Peoples* (1967) spurred the growth of liberation theology. He emphasized both the urgent need for social justice and its importance in fostering a healthy moral order. "When we fight poverty and oppose the unfair conditions of the present," Paul VI wrote, "we are not just promoting human well-being; we are also furthering man's spiritual and moral development, and hence we are benefiting the whole human race."<sup>233</sup>

*Triumph's* editors believed that liberation theology was part of the secular-materialist zeitgeist. Thomas Molnar wrote that liberation theology was a "dangerous mixture of Christian and revolutionary gospel."<sup>234</sup> "Translated into lay language and practice, such a theology—in reality a prestigious name for an ideology—preaches class-war, economic nationalism, general pauperization, and the dictatorship of new, ruthless *caudillos* like Fidel Castro," Molnar wrote—"The theology of liberation merely sprinkles holy water on their unholy enterprises."<sup>235</sup>

Molnar predicted even that “if the revolution does come to that continent, it will not be the work of the (basically inefficient) Communist movements, but that of the Catholic clergy.”<sup>236</sup> The political programs of the Liberation theologians were, Molnar argued, impractical and too simplistic to alleviate the economic troubles that plagued Latin America—they would probably even exacerbate such problems by stunting economic progress.<sup>237</sup>

Liberation theologians, in “selling their souls to Marxism . . . are traitors to the poor they purport to represent by abandoning the Faith that constituted them a people. Because,” the editors wrote, “they thus undermine the only authentic force for the reconstruction of the social order, they too are, to the builders of the future, useless.”<sup>238</sup> Neither the reactionaries—the “Generals who resort to torture”—nor the “revolutionaries who throw bombs to the tune of ‘theologies of revolution,’” were directed toward Christ, who alone can save, and were thus “slaves to the same dead past.”<sup>239</sup> Neither, then, could “be the voice of living, just, Catholic Latin America. To Latin America, to the Third World, to the post-modern future,” the editors wrote, “Christ offers His Vicar, the Spiritual Man who judges all things, to whom, still, every human thing is subject.”<sup>240</sup>

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> Austin Flannery, O.P., ed., *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents* (Northport, New York: Costello Publishing Company, 1981), 987.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 990

<sup>3</sup> Generally—both the Roman Catholic laity and especially the hierarchy—through both world wars and through the early Cold War, were staunch supporters of American foreign policy ventures. There were, however, deviations from such a consensus prior to the 1960s. Despite hierarchical support for the First World War, Irish-American Catholics—who had lobbied the Woodrow Wilson administration for Irish Home Rule—were wary of an alliance with their country's centuries-old nemesis, England; while German-American Catholics found it difficult to support a war against their homeland. Before the sinking of the *Lusitania*, Sebastian Messmer—a German-Swiss, American bishop—remarked that the German invasion of Belgium was “just punishment for its treacherous conduct.” Charles R. Morris, *American Catholic: The Saints and Sinners Who Built America's Most Powerful Church* (New York: Random House, 1997), 132. Militantly anticommunist—the Church's social encyclicals *On Capital and Labor* (1891) and *On Reconstruction of the Social Order* (1931) and especially *On Atheistic Communism* (1937) condemned socialism and communism—American Catholics were angry at Franklin D. Roosevelt when he granted diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Union in 1933. James Hennesey, S.J., *American Catholics: A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1981), 270. Catholics were dismayed also with the Calvin Coolidge and Roosevelt administrations' decisions for non-intervention in Mexico's church-state conflicts in the mid-1920s and the mid-1930s. Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 250-251, 270-271; and Morris, *American Catholic*, 230-231. Catholics had hoped for intervention to protect the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico from the anti-Catholic reforms instituted by Mexican revolutionary leaders, Plutarco Calles and Lázaro Cárdenas. And while the United States did not intervene in the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939), most Americans supported the republican forces, while the majority of Catholics, fifty-eight percent, supported Francisco Franco's nationalist forces (“while 83 percent of Protestants favored the Republicans”). Morris, *American Catholic* 234; and Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 272. Also in the late 1930s, Father Charles E. Coughlin, the famous “radio priest” admired fascism. While bishops expressed uneasiness with the United States' alliance with the Soviet Union during World War II—and because most Catholics did not yet fully understand Roosevelt's betrayal of Poland and Eastern Europe at Yalta—the Second World War was, along with the early years of the Cold War, the zenith of Catholic support for American foreign policy. Morris, *American Catholic*, 242-245. Yet, there were noted deviations. Coughlin continued to support the Axis powers until 1942, until the Roosevelt administration censured his publication, *Social Justice*, and pressured the Archbishop of Detroit, Edward Mooney, to censure his radio program. Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 274-275. In a much different form of dissent, Dorothy Day, co-founder of the Catholic Worker Movement and editor of its newspaper, *The Catholic Worker*, maintained her and the movement's pacifist position during a war in which Catholics constituted an estimated twenty-five to thirty-five percent of the nation's enlisted men. *The Encyclopedia of American Catholic History*, s.v. “World War II and American Catholics;” and Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 278. While not a pacifist, the Jesuit moral theologian, John C. Ford, criticized the Allied policy of “obliteration bombing,” which targeted innocent civilians, as “intrinsically wrong” and “forbidden absolutely by natural law,” and stated that the use of atomic weapons against Japan was “the greatest and most extensive single atrocity of all this period.” John C. Ford, “The Morality of Obliteration Bombing,” *Theological*

*Studies* 5 (September, 1944): 272; quoted in John T. McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom: A History* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2003), 227-228; and John C. Ford, "Notes on Moral Theology, 1945," *Theological Studies* 6 (December, 1945): 540; quoted in McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom*, 228. Likewise, the lay-directed, liberal Catholic *Commonweal* also criticized the Allied policy of obliteration bombing as "the murder of innocent people and the suicide of our civilization." Rodger van Allen, *The Commonweal and American Catholicism: The Magazine, The Movement, the Meaning* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 91. *Commonweal's* editors were joined by the editors of the *Brooklyn Tablet*, the *Catholic World*, and the *Sign* in their condemnation of the use of atomic weapons against Japan as a grave violation of the moral law. Rodger Van Allen, *The Commonweal and American Catholicism*, 92-93. As during the Second World War, Catholics, led by New York's Francis Cardinal Spellman, the "American Pope," supported American foreign policy during the early years of the Cold War. See John Cooney, *The American Pope: The Life and Times of Francis Cardinal Spellman* (New York: Times Books, 1984). Catholics, excepting the Catholic Worker Movement, were America's staunchest cold warriors. Charles Morris writes that during the Cold War, Catholics, "for once . . . had been far in the vanguard of public opinion. Hardly less satisfying was the fact that large elements of the liberal Protestant establishment and the Jewish intelligentsia, who had long looked own their noses at Catholics, were on the wrong side of the consensus. As Patrick Moynihan put it: 'To be an Irish Catholic became prima facie evidence of loyalty. Harvard men were to be checked; Fordham men would do the checking.'" Morris, *American Catholic*, 245. For further information on American Catholic anticommunism, see Patrick Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America, 1950-1985* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 16-48; Donald Crosby, *God, Church, and Flag: Senator Joseph McCarthy and the Catholic Church* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978); Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 289-296; Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969), 437-450; and Morris, *American Catholic*, 245-254. During the mid-fifties, however, a divide began to develop between Catholic intellectuals. Certainly, a Left-Right dichotomy existed among Catholic intellectuals prior to the mid-1950s, but it was exacerbated by disagreements over the benefits of capitalism, the Catholicity of the welfare state, the utility of McCarthyism, the morality of the Civil Rights Movement, the effectiveness of "Containment," and the value of decolonization. Their conflict was derived ultimately from their disagreements over the nature of liberalism—America's consensus ideology. Catholic conservatives at *National Review* believed that liberal Catholics were erroneously linking themselves with the secular liberalism born in the French Revolution, which was, at its philosophical roots, anti-religious, relativistic, and utilitarian and akin to communism and therefore incapable of stemming Soviet-led global communism. Liberal Catholics argued that American liberalism, unlike European or "continental" liberalism, safeguarded individualism and did not deify the state, and thus was much more benign than its European counterpart. Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in American*, 16-82. Both sides, however, like the Catholic hierarchy and laity, maintained their support in the 1950s for a muscular, anticommunist foreign policy. This Catholic consensus in support of American foreign policy was shattered by the Vietnam War.

<sup>4</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Spain's Crisis of Love," *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 10. For anticommunist articles, see William Oliver Martin, "A Christian-Communist Dialogue?" *Triumph* 1 no. 10 (October, 1966): 17-25; Erick von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, "Radical Christianity," *Triumph* 2 no. 2 (February, 1967): 19-20; Editors, "Present Imperfect," *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 7; William Oliver Martin, "Death Without Tears," *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 14-17; William Oliver Martin, "Mr. Popov Answers Himself," *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 30-32, 34-35; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Reasonable Pueblo," *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 9-10; Paul Cole Beach, "Soviet Terror," *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 16-18; Editors, "Rumbles," *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 46; Paul Cole Beach, "Khrushchev and Stalin's Ghost," *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 22-24; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Blood Money," *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 9-10; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Voice for the Silent," *Triumph* 8 no. 7

---

(July, 1973): 9-10; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Sign of the Times," *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 10.

<sup>5</sup> Editors, "Hungary Remembered," *Triumph* 1 no. 3 (November, 1966): 37.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> Editors, "Mr. Johnson Remembers Hungary," *Triumph* 1 no. 3 (November, 1966): 38. There was one beacon of hope, however, the so-called "Lion of Hungary," Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty, the Primate of Hungary, who—pursued by the communist authorities during the Soviet invasion—took refuge in the American embassy in Budapest. His continued presence there represented the survival of Catholic Hungary. His "imprisonment" in the embassy "was the best way available of keeping the world reminded of the real nature of the struggle between Christianity and Communism," the editors wrote—"his admirers must suppress the prayer for a speedy climax to Mindszenty's martyrdom. It would be a humane prayer, but it is not one the Cardinal would utter; for it misses the whole point of what he is doing." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Mindszenty Holds On," *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 9. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Right Place to Die," *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 8-9; Editors, "Mindszenty's Triumph," *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 45; and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "With Mindszenty," *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 31.

<sup>9</sup> Editors, "Mr. Johnson Remembers Hungary," 38.

<sup>10</sup> Editors, "Whither Anti-Communism?" *Triumph* 2 no. 2 (February, 1967): 37.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Spirit of Mao," *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 8.

<sup>13</sup> Editors, "Whither Anti-Communism?" 37.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. The editors summarized the collapse: The fact is that the last time the United States made a plausible demonstration of principled anti-Communism was in 1952, the year the American people elected Dwight Eisenhower on a platform that pledged the 'liberation' of the 'enslaved peoples' behind the Iron Curtain. In Asia, that demonstration lasted about six months—as long as it took President Eisenhower to make peace in Korea with a Communist government still in possession of its slaves. In Europe, and as it affected the principal Communist power, the demonstration was maintained for a little over two years—as long as it took President Eisenhower to arrange a summit meeting with Soviet leaders at Geneva. The Spirit of Geneva was given flesh and blood a year later when the American government looked on idly while the Soviets crushed the Hungarian Revolution. It was confirmed as permanent American policy in 1959 when Nikita Khrushchev visited the United States in the Spirit of Camp David." Editors, "An American Summer," *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 45.

<sup>16</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Enemy in the Mirror," *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 7. The editors noted that there was freedom to dissent in the United States, but they argued that "no one is dissenting."

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

---

<sup>18</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Burying Czechoslovakia," *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 7.

<sup>19</sup> Editors, "Czechoslovakia," *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 41. Dietrich von Hildebrand was offended by the editors' criticism of Czechoslovakians for failing to fight for their freedom. He wrote the following in a letter to the editors: "it is incomprehensible that a Catholic magazine should pass such an immature irresponsible judgment on this unfortunate people. Most of the world was full of admiration for the courage and wisdom of Dubcek and other members of his government; but you call their performance an *opera bouffe*, on the grounds that not enough blood was shed to warrant your taking it seriously! Is it really your view that there can be no heroism without copious bloodshed? That a truly marvelous national self-restraint is proof that a people are swine? Has it no bearing on the matter, that resistance would have been hopeless from the very beginning, and would have played right into Soviet hands? I deeply regret that your meritorious magazine should have made such a blunder, manifesting an unjust and uncharitable attitude toward a people heroically enduring a great tragedy, a people for whom I should have thought every man—especially every true Catholic—must feel a deep sympathy." Dietrich von Hildebrand "Reactions: Czechoslovakia" *Triumph* 3 no. 11 (November, 1968): 39.

<sup>20</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Burying Czechoslovakia," 7.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Enemy in the Mirror," 7.

<sup>23</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Eastwestestablishment," *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 7.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> Michael Lawrence, "Our First Three Years," *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 11.

<sup>26</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Ring Around Asia," *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 7.

<sup>27</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The President in Rumania," *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 8.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.* Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: Alliances I," *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 7.

<sup>29</sup> Editors, "An American Summer," *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 46. The editors wrote the following of Henry Kissinger: "The temptation is to deplore a state of affairs in which a man can become Secretary of State who has been prime expositor of the thesis that dealing and living comfortably with Red China and Soviet Russia today is of a piece with nineteenth-century diplomacy's acceptance of Austria-Hungary, France, Russia and Prussia as the legitimate powers-that-be. But that would be a cheap shot. No responsible American leader has suggested since the early fifties that the United States makes, indeed can make, moral distinctions among the great powers." Editors, "Present Imperfect: HAK: the Catholic Interest," *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 8.

<sup>30</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Age Two," *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 7. For other articles on American foreign policy, see Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: 'Our Problem,'" *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 44; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Panda to the People," *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 7; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Los von Fulda," *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 9-10; Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: Vomitous News," *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 15; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Keep on Truckin'," *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 7. In the latter article, the editors remarked that economic collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union

---

was “proof that the Kremlin is not the only government that is an enemy of Christians.” Also, see Editors, “Present Imperfect: If the Crown Fits,” *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 9; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Nixon v. Jackson,” *Triumph* 8 no. 10 (December, 1973): 7-8; Editors, “Present Imperfect: A Stitch in Time,” *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 10; Editors, “Italy is a Modern Country,” *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 8; Editors, “Present Imperfect: England Stinks,” *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 9; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Ultra,” *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 10; Emilian E. Novak, “Cardinal Mindszenty’s Testament,” *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 20-23.

<sup>31</sup> The Catholic hierarchy and laity initially supported American involvement in Vietnam. For Catholics, the war effort was initially a morally justified defense of a Catholic regime against communist aggression. The majority of Catholics supported American involvement to promote democracy, protect Catholics in South Vietnam (including a million Catholic refugees from North Vietnam), and to contain what they viewed as Soviet-led global communism. *The Encyclopedia of American Catholic History*, s.v. “Vietnam War and American Catholics.” Catholics supported the war at a higher percentage than the general population. In 1965, fifty-nine percent of Catholics supported the war compared to fifty-two percent of the general population. David J. O’Brien, “American Catholics and the Vietnam War,” in *War or Peace? The Search for New Answers*, ed. Thomas Shannon (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1981), 147. In a 1966 pastoral letter issued by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, the bishops wrote: “In the light of the facts as they are known to us, it is reasonable to argue that our presence in Vietnam is justified.” Hugh J. Nolan, ed., *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops, Volume III 1962-1974* (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1983), 76. Cardinal Spellman, who was Military Vicar to Catholics in the Armed Forces, was more enthusiastic. In a sermon in Saigon, he stated: “The war in Vietnam is, I believe, a war for civilization. Certainly it is not a war of our seeking. It is a war thrust upon us. We cannot yield to tyranny. We hope and pray that through the valor and dedication of our men and women in our armed forces, we will soon have a victory for which all of us are praying. Less than victory is inconceivable.” Quoted in O’Brien, “American Catholics and the Vietnam War,” 126. Spellman portrayed the war as a moral crusade and was pictured “not simply with generals and G.I.s but blessing bombers and machine guns.” Cooney, *The American Pope*, 299. Catholic support for the war, however, eroded over the next couple of years. The turning point, for Catholics and the general population, was the 1968 Tet Offensive, which, despite being a military victory for the United States, became a political catastrophe for the Lyndon Johnson administration, which had been indicating that victory was imminent. In the following months, Johnson ended American military escalation in Vietnam, announced that he would not seek reelection, halted the bombing of North Vietnam, and began peace talks with the North Vietnamese. By October 1968, Catholic support for the war dropped to forty-two percent, while forty-nine percent were now opposed. Catholics, however, still supported the war in greater proportion to the general population—the support among the general population fell to thirty-seven percent, with fifty-four percent opposed. O’Brien, “American Catholics and the Vietnam War,” 147. By 1971, Catholic support had eroded further, only thirty-six percent of Catholics supported the war, while fifty-seven percent were opposed. O’Brien, “American Catholics and the Vietnam War,” 147. In 1971, the American Catholic hierarchy officially withdrew its support for the war. In their *Resolution on Southeast Asia*, the bishops stated: “At this point in history, it seems clear to us that whatever good we hope to achieve through continued involvement in this war is now outweighed by the destruction of human life and of moral values which it inflicts. It is our firm conviction, therefore, that the speedy ending of this war is a moral imperative of the highest priority. Hence, we feel a moral obligation to appeal urgently to our nation’s leaders and indeed to the leaders of all the nations involved in this tragic conflict to bring the war to an end with no further delay.” Nolan, ed., *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, 289.

<sup>32</sup> The liberal *Commonweal* editors initially supported United States involvement in South Vietnam, but by 1965 the editors reasoned that the United States had violated just war guidelines using means out of proportion to the objectives desired and condemned the war as morally unjust, urged a withdrawal, and eventually applauded the Catholic Left’s moral demonstrations

---

against the war. Van Allen, *The Commonwealth and American Catholicism*, 153-160. Catholic just war doctrine—the criteria for judging the moral validity of force—stated that wars must have a just cause, that is, they must be self-defensive in nature; that the side seeking self-defense is a just authority deserving to be restored sovereignty; that there is a reasonable chance of success; that all means of peaceful resolution have been exhausted and that war is the last recourse; that war must be guided by just conduct, meaning that the war effort must be proportional to the objectives sought (including the restoration of peace); and that warring parties must discriminate between soldiers and civilians—the intentional killing of civilians is absolutely forbidden. *The Modern Catholic Encyclopedia*, s.v. “Just War.”

<sup>33</sup> Charles A. Meconis, *With Clumsy Grace: The American Catholic Left, 1961-1975* (New York: Seabury Press, 1979), xi. The movement was in part born out of the Catholic Worker Movement, which practiced an anarchic-pacifism. William A. Au writes: “Anarchism reflected the Catholic Worker conviction that freedom is the gift of God in Christ which must be prophetically affirmed in the face of all determinist philosophy and state coercion. Freedom demands resisting all the implicit and explicit ways in which society controls individuals and forces them to conform to standards which demean them as persons and destroy their sense of conscience and personal responsibility. Pacifism, Dorothy Day insisted from the inception of the Catholic Worker, is the only philosophy in accord with the Christian life demanded by Christ in the Sermon on the Mount. Thus nonviolence became the Catholic Worker norm for all political action.” *The Encyclopedia of American Catholic History*, s.v. “Catholic Peace Movement.” The Catholic Worker movement also provided a model of civil disobedience. Other important factors in the origins of the Catholic Left, were the Civil Rights Movement, Pope John XXIII’s encyclical, *On Establishing Universal Peace in Truth, Justice, Charity and Liberty* (1963), and the Second Vatican Council’s *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World* (1965), which was critical of modern warfare and legitimized the right of conscientious objection. For the Catholic Left’s origins, see Meconis, *With Clumsy Grace*, 1-32.

<sup>34</sup> O’Brien, “American Catholics and the Vietnam War,” 138.

<sup>35</sup> Meconis, *With Clumsy Grace*, 119-120.

<sup>36</sup> Willmoore Kendall, “The Reasons for War,” *Triumph* 1 no. 2 (October, 1966): 31.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>41</sup> John Wisner, “Wisner’s World” Our Moral Imbecility,” *Triumph* 2 no. 7 (July, 1967): 25; and John Wisner, “Reactions: ‘War is hell,’” *Triumph* 2 no. 10 (October, 1967): 6.

<sup>42</sup> Joseph F. Costanzo, S.J., “Pacifism Is Not Peace,” *Triumph* 1 no. 3 (November, 1966): 18.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 19. The first set of italics are Costanzo’s; the second set are the author’s.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 20

---

<sup>46</sup> Editors, "Establishing the Resistance," *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 30; Editors, "Present Imperfect: "Boreiganism," *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 8-9.

<sup>47</sup> Editors, "Establishing the Resistance," 30.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>51</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: "Boreiganism," 8-9. The editors did offer some praise of the Berrigan-wing of the Catholic Left, noting that the "fashionable Resistance has two things to its credit: it is not collaborating with the death-dealing state: and it recognizes that something more than pretty speeches is required to come to grips with the horrors of that state. But that is not enough; before and beyond all else, a Catholic movement must be Catholic. No ideology ever died on the Cross." Editors, "Establishing the Resistance," 30. Michael Lawrence wrote that "to read Berrigan, I have recently discovered, is to experience exactly the same intellectual stimulation as to see Berrigan on, say, the Dick Cavett show—which is to say, no stimulation at all," and concluded that "Catholic left-radicalism has but two alternatives: it can drop the adjective 'Catholic,' as many in the movement already have, for all practical purposes, and become simply a squadron of the secular left; or it can develop a theory; which ought always to mean, for Catholics, discover a theology; which can only mean, for these Catholics, not going beyond Murray but behind him, to the tradition he discarded, which has a King." Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: Woodstock Notes," *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 15. For another article on the Berrigan-wing of the Catholic Left, see The Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Catholic Conspiracy," *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 7-8.

<sup>52</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Why Do Nations Rage?" *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 7.

<sup>53</sup> Editors, "The War," *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 37. Also, see Editors, "Editorials," *Triumph* 1 no. 2 (October, 1966): 7; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Viet Riddles," *Triumph* 3 no. 2 (February, 1968): 7-8; Editors, "Present Imperfect: 'The Second Vietnam War,'" *Triumph* 3 no. 7 (July, 1968): 8. Bozell did not believe that Pope Paul VI's encyclical, *On Prayers for Peace During October* (1966) was a condemnation of the United States' policy in Vietnam. Although Paul VI called for peace in the world and Southeast Asia, he also noted, Bozell pointed out, that such peace "must rest on justice and the liberty of mankind, and take into account the rights of individuals and communities." (8) And Bozell believed that peace with communists was, as Paul VI noted, "fluid and unstable," and "has to be sought from Him who is the Prince of Peace." (8) But Bozell could not ignore Paul VI's passionate plea for peace and concluded that the Pope's softening stance was due to him being "unwilling to line up the Vatican on the side of anti-communism as *represented by American policy*. This is not to say that Paul views Communism unrealistically; unlike John, he has never provided grounds for misgivings on this score. But like John, Paul doubtless remembers Budapest, and what that surrender accurately foretold about America's taste for being the secular arm of an effective anti-Communist crusade. Moreover, the Pope may be pondering the question that haunted Whittaker Chambers in *Witness*: Do America and the West any longer offer the world a sufficiently desirable alternative to Communism—judged by the Christian *Weltanschauung*—to warrant the sacrifice of mortal combat?" (8-9) L. Brent Bozell, "Christi Matri Rosarii," *Triumph* 1 no. 2 (October, 1966): 8-9. The editors were not, then, demoralized by Pope Paul VI's increasing neutrality in the Cold War. They did not believe that he was abandoning anticommunism—that his strategy was the result of "papal anti-anti-Communism"—but that he was merely recognizing the reality of the situation; that the papacy was "absolute[ly] defenseless" because of "the total and complete absence of any secular arm with which the Church might advance or even defend the cause of God." "Looking

---

out upon a hostile world—East and West—the Holy Father cannot find a single friend, nation or people, with generosity and nobility enough to aid him,” they concluded. Thus the Pope was forced to bargain with devils to keep the Church alive. Editors, “Present Imperfect: ‘Beggars Can’t Bargain,’” *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 8. Also, see Pope Paul VI, “On Prayers for Peace During October,” *The Holy See*, [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/paul\\_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_enc\\_15091966\\_christi-matri\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_15091966_christi-matri_en.html) (accessed September 6, 2008); and Robert A. Miller, “The Politics of Mercy,” *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 11-15. When Pope Paul VI ordered Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty to step down as Primate of Hungary—a decision criticized by right-wingers—the editors supported his decision, again noting that Paul had no secular sword. They wrote: “Paul’s cause, and Mindszenty’s, is the Catholic Church. In the phrase, ‘anti-Communism,’ properly understood, Catholicism is that to which communism is opposed. The arsenal Paul has available to him in working for the Church in Hungary and the rest of Eastern Europe consists entirely of the Church’s own resources; it includes not one round of ammunition from ‘the West’s’ stockpile. Those who share Paul’s cause must trust him; or, mistrusting him, must resign themselves to seeing nothing done for the Suffering Church. We stand with the Pope.” Editors, “Mindszenty’s Triumph,” 45.

<sup>54</sup> Editors, “Whither Anti-Communism?” 37. The editors wrote: “We have said, and mean, that we [the people of the United States] prefer a negotiated settlement because we are afraid to bear the moral responsibilities of victory. If Harrison Salisbury were to charge down the Ho Chi Minh trail tomorrow with Hanoi’s offer of unconditional surrender between his teeth, we would promptly send him back with the demand that the Viet Cong do its part in making Southeast Asia safe for diversity.” For other articles dealing with the United States’ supposed lack of purpose in Vietnam, see Editors, “Present Imperfect: War for What?” *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 7; and Editors, “Present Imperfect: Peace for What?” *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 7. The editors were not satisfied by the varying positions of individual Catholic bishops. They rejected Archbishop Spellman whose patriotism, was rooted “on the unfortunately antiquated theory that the government is committed to purposeful anti-Communism,” or the leftist critique, which was articulated by the Archbishop of Atlanta, Paul J. Hallinan, who called “for ‘Selmas for Peace’—a slogan quite deliberately selected, evidently, to signify a wish to transfer the conduct of foreign policy from the civil authorities to the street. To what end,” the editors asked?” Editors, “Present Imperfect,” *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 7. Also, see *The Encyclopedia of American Catholic History*, s.v. “Vietnam War and American Catholics.”

<sup>55</sup> “John [Wisner] . . . had a distinguished career in World War II. He saw real action in Normandy,” Gary Potter noted, “I happened to be looking at maps in S.L.A. Marshall’s history of the D-Day landing, and there on one map, beside the box labeled ‘General Gavin’ and the box labeled ‘General Ridgeway’ was a box labeled ‘Lieutenant Wisner.’” Gary Potter, interview by Patrick Allitt, 4 March 1991, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

<sup>56</sup> John Wisner, “Wisner’s World: The Causes of Defeat,” *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 15.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>58</sup> John Wisner, “Vietnam Imbroglia,” *Triumph* 1 no. 2 (October, 1966): 29.

<sup>59</sup> John Wisner, “A Fault in the Democratic System,” *Triumph* 2 no. 5 (May, 1967): 21.

<sup>60</sup> Wisner, “Vietnam Imbroglia,” 29.

<sup>61</sup> Wisner, “A Fault in the Democratic System,” 21.

<sup>62</sup> Wisner, “Vietnam Imbroglia,” 29.

---

<sup>63</sup> Ibid.

<sup>64</sup> Wisner, "Wisner's World: The Causes of Defeat," 15. The editors were in agreement that the decision to remove Diem was based in a false liberal abstraction that the "moral connection between a people and its leaders is immaterial. All that is necessary to legitimize a leader is a constitution and a majority of the electors." "It is because [Henry Cabot] Lodge [Jr., United States Ambassador to the Republic of Vietnam] entertained these superficial democratic views," they noted, "that he failed to treat Diem with the respect due him. Diem had the moral power to arouse the Vietnamese to defend themselves against communist aggression. Having broken this moral power neither Lodge nor any liberal-democrat since has been able to find anything to take its place; and since the Vietnamese were no longer sufficiently motivated to defend themselves, the Americans had to provide the arms, money and blood necessary to defend the country. It is just punishment for frivolous murder." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Vacancy in Vietnam," *Triumph* 2 no. 8 (August, 1967): 7-8. Thomas A. Lane wrote that Diem "was one of the truly great Christian leaders of the twentieth century. He was both philosopher and wise magistrate. He blended in his person the best of Christian and Confucian culture. He was deeply compassionate and selflessly dedicated to the welfare of his people." And he added that "the American destruction of Diem represented a crippling blow to Christian civilization in Southeast Asia." He also noted that the United States' decision to get rid of Diem "was not a blunder. American liberals have *deliberately* made war on the surviving remnants of Christian culture, just as liberalism in general has *deliberately* made war on Christianity for two hundred years." Thomas A. Lane, "Why We Lose: America v. Christianity," *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 26. For similar views, see Michael Lawrence, "On the Irrelevance of American Foreign Policy," *Triumph* 3 no. 3 (March, 1968): 13; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: Vietnam," *Triumph* 10 no. 6 (June, 1975): 7-8.

<sup>65</sup> Editors, "Democracy's Revenge," *Triumph* 2 no. 10 (October, 1967): 41.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

<sup>67</sup> Wisner, "Wisner's World: The Causes of Defeat," 15.

<sup>68</sup> Wisner, "A Fault in the Democratic System," 22. In many respects, *Triumph's* editors were anti-technology, because, they wrote: "There is no power strong enough in our secular-liberal society to limit and control the activity of technology. So left uncontrolled, technology threatens society with a series of plagues like those God visited on Egypt . . . . In our time we have suffered from poisonous air, dirty water, murderous automobiles, the need to live in caves and so on." They did not dismiss technology altogether, however, they believed that in a Christian society, it would be limited and its uses moral. Editors, "Present Imperfect: 'The Flying Plague,'" *Triumph* 2 no. 12 (December, 1967): 8. For articles critical of technology, see Editors, "Lunar Lunacy," *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 37; Gary Potter, "Potter's Field: A Little Quite, Please," *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 30; John Wisner, "Wisner's World: Boiling One's Brains," *Triumph* 3 no. 3 (March, 1968): 27; Gary Potter, "Anti-Technology," *Triumph* 3 no. 8 (August, 1968): 19; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Fly Me to the Moon," *Triumph* 3 no. 12 (December, 1968): 8-9; Editors, "Present Imperfect: 'S-St-Stop!'" *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 8; Frederick D. Wilhelmsen and Jane Bret, "Work and Leisure," *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 11-15; Frederick D. Wilhelmsen and Jane Bret, "Work and Leisure II," *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 24-27. The editors were worried about the damage done to the environment by technology, but they were wary of the environmentalist movement, because of its alliance with the population control movement, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: 'Ecology Wants You,'" *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 9; Editors, "Ecology: Whose Rebellion?" *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 41; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Views: Yours and Mines," *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 8.

---

<sup>69</sup> Wisner, "Wisner's World: The Causes of Defeat," 15.

<sup>70</sup> Wisner, "A Fault in the Democratic System," 23.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.

<sup>74</sup> Wisner, "Wisner's World: The Causes of Defeat," 15. In response to the strategy of aerial bombardment, the editors wrote that "to maintain contact with the realities of war, it is necessary to meet and subdue the enemy 'face to face on the ground.' But for a nation to undertake that kind of combat on a scale that is now essential for an American victory requires serious commitment to an idea—to the spirit. . . . Our men in the field are tough and brave and willing to sacrifice. But our country is not. We are losing the war because we are not moved by an idea sufficiently strong to recommend the sacrifices that are necessary to win it." Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Bombing Bust," *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 8.

<sup>75</sup> Wisner, "Wisner's World: The Causes of Defeat," 15.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid.

<sup>77</sup> Wisner, "A Fault in the Democratic System," 23.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

<sup>79</sup> Wisner, "Wisner's World: A Lesson of the War," 21.

<sup>80</sup> Wisner, "A Fault in the Democratic System," 23.

<sup>81</sup> Wisner, "Wisner's World: A Lesson of the War," 21; and Wisner, "A Fault in the Democratic System," 23. Wisner wrote: Nations are not great because they can bring to bear on other nations vast material resources. They are great because know where the spirit is and how to serve it. . . . Christ saves not only for stuffing sinners into Heaven; but also by putting men in touch with the truth and reality they need. To do such a foolhardy thing as to wage war without first begging on one's knees in fear and trembling for the mercy of God will first produce inexplicable agony, and will lead to eventual disaster." Wisner, "A Fault in the Democratic System," 23. Some readers were dismayed with Wisner's conclusions. J.E. Pournelle argued that evidence demonstrated that the United States was winning the war; that setbacks were the result of "a failure of will on the part of the Administration," not due to some inherent flaw in the makeup of the country. Thus, he concluded that Wisner's "repeated comments about this lost war must follow, then, from a desire that it be lost." Pournelle wrote: "Well, what must we say of the man who wishes the slaughter of the country's troops, who wishes her to lose a vital war in a vital theatre; who wishes, apparently, that a country containing a large number of Catholics fall into the hands of the enemy determined to destroy the Church; and who wishes this, not because he desires the victory of the enemy, but as an object lesson to his own land?" J.E. Pournelle, "Reactions: Patriots? Knaves?" *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 6. Lawrence R. Brown believed that *Triumph's* editors were dealing in abstractions: "This defeat has resulted not from vague, imprecise flaws in our society or national character, dependence on machines, lack of spiritual commitment, and so forth, but from the political and military policies purposefully established and followed by the U.S. government in Vietnam, North and South." The United States lost the war, Brown reasoned, because it fought a limited war, and it did not employ the appropriate pressure it could have on North Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia to end the war. Lawrence R. Brown, "Reactions: On Vietnam," *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 39.

- 
- <sup>82</sup> Editors, "The End of the War," *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 41.
- <sup>83</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>84</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>85</sup> Ibid. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: Khesanh? What's That?" *Triumph* 3 no. 8 (August, 1968): 7.
- <sup>86</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect; The Second Vietnam War," *Triumph* 3 no. 7 (July, 1968): 8.
- <sup>87</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>88</sup> Editors, "Vietnam: The Earnest Money," *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 41.
- <sup>89</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>90</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>91</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Setting Up Thieu," *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 8.
- <sup>92</sup> Ibid., 8-9. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: Thieu's the One," *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 7-8; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Offensive War," *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 7-8; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Prayer of the Faithful," *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 9.
- <sup>93</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Alliances II," *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 7.
- <sup>94</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Captive People," *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 9.
- <sup>95</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Prayer of the Faithful," 9; Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: Fifth Column in the Senate?" *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 7-8; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: S.O.S.," *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 5-6.
- <sup>96</sup> Editors, "The Great Patriotic War," *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 41.
- <sup>97</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Understanding Cambodia: 7 Easy Lessons," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 9-10.
- <sup>98</sup> Editors, "The War Is at Home," *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 41.
- <sup>99</sup> Editors, "The Great Patriotic War," 41. This deceit was, however, but a manifestation of the United States' decadence. The United States was in "decline not so much because of the failure in Vietnam as because of the lie that there has been no failure; not so much for the sin of treachery against others as for the attempt to conceal the sin from our own people." The Christian, in contrast, the editors wrote, "is thus uniquely able to offer rejuvenation to America—that rejuvenation which begins with an honest look at reality, a confession of failure and sin, and a firm purpose of amendment." Editors, "Nixon's Redeployment," *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 41.
- <sup>100</sup> Gary K. Potter, "Potter's Field," *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 38; Also, see Gary Potter, "'Counter-Value' III," *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 39. Michael Lawrence stated that "I thought, and still do think, that there was sufficient moral justification for the US intervention in Vietnam. As time went on I began to think that the manner in which we were fighting was atrocious and that we had forfeited our moral position by the way we did it. I thought that there was a tendency not to discriminate between combatants and non-combatants. That was getting far enough out of hand that it seemed to me a once morally just cause had become contaminated

---

by morally indefensible tactics.” Michael Lawrence, interview by Patrick Allitt, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, 27 February 1991, Emory University, Atlanta GA.

<sup>101</sup> Gary K. Potter, “Potter’s Field,” *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 38.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid.

<sup>105</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Wasting Calley,” *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 7-8.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., 8. The editors wrote: “The whole purpose of trying lieutenants and captains for a legal non-crime is to avoid having to try generals and presidents for a moral crime.”

<sup>107</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Calley Country,” *Triumph* 6 no. 5 (May, 1971): 5-6.

<sup>108</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Seven Points,” *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 7-8.

<sup>109</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: No Peace, No Honor,” *Triumph* 10 no. 5 (May, 1975): 8-9.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid.

<sup>114</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Alliances II,” *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 7. For an article detailing the editors overview of the war, see Editors, “Present Imperfect: The Emperor’s Old Clothes,” *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 5. In a forum, the editors and contributors debated the issue of amnesty. In the nine person forum, only two people, John Wisner and Michael Schwartz, argued that draft dodgers and deserters should be granted amnesty. Wisner argued that dodging and desertion were indeed serious moral crimes, but only when war entailed a serious moral purpose, which the Vietnam War lacked. “In these circumstances how can one talk of betrayal, cowardice and neglect of duty in regard to those of our young men who preferred to make love in Canada to war in Annam? It was impossible to find anything in Annam capable of fixing the attention of young Americans generally as being worth the sacrifice of life. The ones who were there were there in the spirit of youthful adventure.” John Wisner, “Amnesty: Yes of No? War, Sacrifice, Brotherhood,” *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 12. Schwartz argued that because even our government refused to fight amnesty must be granted; otherwise, the illusions of the war—the United States’ moral failings—would be perpetuated. Michael Schwartz, “Amnesty: Yes of No? To Do Justice and to Heal the Nation,” *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 14. The rest of the contributors were decidedly against amnesty, which contrasted the view of the American bishops who supported amnesty in their *Declaration on Conscientious Objection and Selective Conscientious Objection* (1971) and in their *Resolution on Southeast Asia* (1971). See Nolan, ed., *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, 286, 290-291. Warren H. Carroll argued against amnesty from a practical approach. “Certainly a man who disapproves of his country’s laws has a right to leave that country. But is he justified in demanding to be allowed to return once the war is over, free and clear, without ever having paid any penalty, having sojourned abroad while his fellows died to save South Vietnam from Communism? If he is, then how is anyone in the future ever going to be able to distinguish between the draftee who flees because of a genuine conscientious objection to war in which he is to fight, and the draftee who flees out of old, garden-variety cowardice?” Warren H. Carroll, “Amnesty: Yes of No? The Hard

---

Road Should Be Hard,” *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 11. Neil McCaffrey argued that: “Human justice will be outraged if these punks get away with their contemptible conduct. It was bad enough to send soldiers on a dirty, thankless and perhaps hopeless assignment. If we now exonerate their lily-livered fellows without exacting just punishment, we will be guilty of the ultimate in disgraceful conduct.” Neil McCaffrey, “Amnesty: Yes of No? The Unrepentant Sinner Cannot Be Forgiven,” *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 12. Paul Fisher argued that amnesty would “desecrate the graves of legions who have paid the supreme sacrifice. It would be a foul degradation and mockery of the widows and children of them that bore the battle and the mothers that bore them. For each who shirks his duty, another must replace [him]. . . . Amnesty, in effect, denies equality by granting some a superior right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It pardons and pampers the pusillanimous and the selfish, and penalized those who, in the words of Pericles, laid valor at their nation’s feet as their most precious possession.” Paul Fisher, “Amnesty: Yes of No? Resist the Law, Resist God,” *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 12. Bozell wrote that amnesty would “be understood as a vindication of the secular left’s critique of the Vietnam War, and a raising of that critique to the level of a national judgment. That is not, by any Christian standard, progress.” L. Brent Bozell, “Amnesty: Yes of No? Amnesty: Cui Bono?” *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 13. James Fitzpatrick agreed with Bozell; he argued that amnesty would be “a retroactive surrender to the ‘movement’—the hippy, yippy, pinko, peacenik, internationalist, Marxist boys. It would be an admission that their Leninist analysis of the war was correct.” James Fitzpatrick, “Amnesty: Yes of No? Forgiveness Yes; Capitulation, No.” *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 43. Also, see Gary K. Potter, “Amnesty: Yes of No? Is There a Nation to Forgive Them.” *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 14, 43; Alan Simek, “Amnesty: Yes of No? Resistance to the Law Must Uphold the Law.” *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 43-44; and Editors, “Present Imperfect: ‘You Can’t Go Home Again,” *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 7-8.

<sup>115</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Holy Russia,” *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 8. The editors wrote: “Soviet authorities estimate that the USSR might contain 50 million Russian orthodox Christians, 12 million Roman Catholics, 4.5 million Greek Catholics, 2 million Baptists and one million Lutherans.” Editors, “Correction Notice,” *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 10.

<sup>116</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Holy Russia,” 9.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.* The editors wrote: “Perhaps because of their unsung sufferings, Christians living behind the Iron Curtain are spiritually stronger than those living in the West, according to Archbishop Fulton J. Sheen. . . . [who] said that ‘Christ without the cross is weak, effeminate, dull. Who picks up Christ without the cross? Our Western, affluent society. The ascetic principle of Christianity has moved to the totalitarian states, and that’s why they [the persecuted Christians behind the Iron Curtain] are strong.’” Unsigned, “Catholic Currents,” *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 47.

<sup>118</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Holy Russia,” 9. For further examples of the editors views that Christianity was surviving in the Soviet empire, see Editors, “Present Imperfect: The Sounds of the Silent,” *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 9; Rimvydas Giedraitis, “Lithuania: The Tragedy and the Triumph of the Church of Silence,” *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 11-15, 43. Giedraitis wrote: “The Soviets have ruled Lithuania for 30 years and to outward appearances it may seem, as students often joke, that the score is Lions 30, Christians 0. However, the success of the City of God does not lie in the material power and glory of the ‘classless society.’ The Christian understanding of history is presented by the parable of the wheat field in which the good and the bad grow and ripen together: the bad gets worse—but the good gets better. It is in this time of persecution and suffering that the underground Catholic Church in Lithuania is nurturing much good, and winning many great victories.” (43).

<sup>119</sup> *The Modern Catholic Encyclopedia*, s.v. “Fatima.”

---

<sup>120</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Holy Russia," 9; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: Alexander's Crime and Punishment," *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 8-9.

<sup>121</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "Toward a Catholic Realpolitik," *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 13.

<sup>122</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Alexander's Crime and Punishment," *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 8-9. Alexander Solzhenitsyn was a Russian author whose works, such as *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* and *Cancer Ward*, exposed the horrors and soullessness of Stalinism. Solzhenitsyn's criticism of the Soviet regime, the editors believed, represented the survival of Christianity in the Soviet Union. The editors quoted extensively from his Nobel Prize acceptance speech: "So perhaps that ancient trinity of truth, goodness and beauty is not simply an empty, faded formula as we thought in the days of our self-confident, materialistic youth? If the tops of those three trees converge, as the scholars maintained, but the too blatant, too direct stems of truth and goodness are crushed, cut down, not allowed through—then perhaps the fantastic, unpredictable, unexpected stems of beauty will push through and soar to that very same place, and in so doing will fulfill the work of all three.' Now the 'place at which the tops of those three trees converge,'" the editors interpreted, "is . . . God. When Solzhenitsyn goes on, then, to expand on this hope that art, literature—beauty—will *save the world*, he means: even when truth is crushed, even when goodness is cut down, God will still break through the barriers men put up against Him, still show himself in the world, reflected in beautiful things—God will still save the world." "This is not the shallow optimism of secular liberalism," the editors happily instructed, "it is the Christian virtue of hope." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Beauty Saves," *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 10. Also, see Mark Taylor's review of Solzhenitsyn's *August 1914* (April 1973)—Mark Taylor, "Arts and the Age: Protecting a Nation's Soul," *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 32-35—and Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Siberian-Fatima Axis," *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 9; and John Wisner, "Political Aspects of Solzhenitsyn's Exile," *Triumph* 10 no. 5 (May, 1975): 11-14.

<sup>123</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Beauty Saves," 10.

<sup>124</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Alexander's Crime and Punishment," *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 8-9.

<sup>125</sup> Vatican Council II, "*Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*," The Holy See, [http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_cons\\_19651207\\_gaudium-et-spes\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html) (accessed July 8, 2008).

<sup>126</sup> Editors, "McNamara's Valedictory," *Triumph* 3 no. 3 (March, 1968): 38; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: Bear Market in SALT," *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 5. "Its moral significance is that the safety of America is no longer provided for by the weapons and psychology of war," the editors stated, "but by the weapons and psychology of genocide." Editors, "McNamara's Valedictory," 38.

<sup>127</sup> Gary Potter, "'Counter-Value' III," 20; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Summit," *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July 1972): 46.

<sup>128</sup> Potter, "'Counter-Value' III," 20.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.* The Counter-value strategy is "morally defenseless" because, the editors wrote, "it depends absolutely on an intention-coupled-with-an-ability to massacre innocents, which is absolutely forbidden by the moral law as defined by the Catholic Church." Editors, "War Catechism," *Triumph* no. 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 41.

<sup>130</sup> Potter, "'Counter-Value' III," 20.

---

<sup>131</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Bear Market in SALT," 6.

<sup>132</sup> Garry Potter, "Potter's Field," *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 38.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid.

<sup>134</sup> Editors, "McNamara's Valedictory," 38.

<sup>135</sup> Gary Potter, "'Counter-Value' III," 18. Potter wrote, "It has been said (I have not verified it) that Cardinal Spellman once made an inventory of the Saints and determined that those who had professions a greater number have been soldiers than anything else. . . . But should a military force take as its 'primary duty' the destruction of innocent non-combatants, it is nearly certain that the man who serves that purpose would never attain sanctity; and it is doubtful, if he is knowing, whether he can even save his soul." Garry Potter, "The Non-Trial and Crucifixion of Robert C. Margetts, Major (U.S.A.F.)," *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 39. Also, see Garry Potter, "'Counter-Value' America's Pact with Hell," *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 11-17; Gary Potter, "'Counter-Value,' II," *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 16-19. Some readers were upset with the staff's criticism of the United States' nuclear strategy. Victor F. Spelta wrote: "Do Mr. Potter and the Major really see a difference between one person (a soldier) who has a rifle and a uniform, and another person (a civilian) who could grow food for that soldier or make bullets for that rifle? The root of the author's confusion is his assumption that taking civilian lives is taking innocent lives." Victor F. Spelta, "Reactions: The Non-Trial of Major Margetts," *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 4. Some readers believed that *Triumph* seemed to be succumbing to the utopian-pacifism of the Catholic Left. In response to Potter's criticism of the "counter-value" strategy, Brian D. O'Rourke wrote: "Minor Point: Russian missiles are pointed at us. Maybe even at 927-15<sup>th</sup> St., N.W. [*Triumph's* offices] because those Russians have uncanny intelligence. Also Russians probably do not read Mr. Potter (exceedingly politic of them) and probably do not have American Catholic Hero Air Force button-pusher (and Loyal Patriot). Also probably do not have Herefords grazing nearby. In short, Russian likely not to get uptight about Vatican II on war. Russians are not big medievalists. Major Point: Mr. Potter and Cesar Chavez induce country and Mr. Nixon to eat drugged grapes whereupon missiles are redeployed and aimed at Russian missile sites (loud cheer; Ethel Kennedy, eating grapes, enters stage on cloud of love). Russians, who are tricky devils, fire first strike wiping out American cities, cows, North Dakota, *Triumph*, Mr. Potter and anonymous Loyal American Officer Button-Pusher. Retaliation: our missiles (hopefully protected by evil devil's work ABM) off to destroy—destroy what? Aha! Empty Russian missile sites. Smart move. Moral to the end, the very end." Brian D. O'Rourke, "Reactions: Counter-Value," *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 4. Thomas Lane wrote: "In concluding that we should disarm and fight the Communist conquerors with knives, Mr. Potter reduces his thesis to absurdity. He argues that the triumph of evil must be accepted because men may not use the weapons required to contain it." Thomas A. Lane, "Reactions: Counter-Value," *T 4* no. 11 (November, 1969): 4.

<sup>136</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Bear Market in SALT," 6; and Editors, "Our Toothless Terror," *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 42. For further criticism of the "counter-value" strategy, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: A U.S. First Strike?" *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 7-8; Frank Armbruster, "Defending America: Unthinkable?" *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 16-18; Editors, "Present Imperfect: We Like Ikle" *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 9; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: Reality Now!" *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 7.

<sup>137</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Surviving II," *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 10.

<sup>138</sup> Editors, "War Catechism," *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 41.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid.

---

<sup>141</sup> Ibid.

<sup>142</sup> Editors, "Wars, Left, Right, Christian," *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1970): 41.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid.

<sup>146</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Stop CBW!" *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 7. Such weaponry could not be restricted to the battle field and they were not intended to be; they wrote: "There can be no equivocation," the editors thundered, "the use of CBW [chemical and biological weapons] is absolutely forbidden a national that wants to consider itself limited to morally just means of warfare," and demanded that United States government "dismantle every military program in the business of producing CBW weaponry." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Stop CBW!" *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 7-8. For other articles dealing with the editors' condemnation of chemical and biological weapons, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: #!x?\*#!, I," *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 8; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Do You Renounce CBW and All Its Works?" *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 7-8; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: Binary Bombs," *Triumph* 10 no. 3 (March, 1975): 7-8.

<sup>147</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Stop CBW!" *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 7. *Triumph* reader John J. Hartl noted that the editors' views—that "a Christian might argue that any weapon with the power to suck away the enemy's life without exposing the killer to the encounter of personal combat is intrinsically immoral, because it assumes a God-like and therefore inhuman prerogative"—would reduce the United States to "conducting only the most primitive sort of warfare. Would the denial to the American people of the advantages of war technology be 'moral' when it would most certainly result in their enslavement to Bolshevism, to which the very name of God is anathema? The surest way to encourage aggression," Hartl concluded, "(and that included CBW) is to become relatively weak militarily. We will have only ourselves to blame if we succumb to Satanism through our own enervation and specious reasoning. It is disconcerting to find, amidst such excellence, an epistle advocating one facet of the fallacious leftist-liberal disarmament doctrine. In your most justified disgust with secular liberalism and moral decadence in American have you perhaps failed to distinguish between its immorality and legitimate national defense? In your anger with secular liberalism would you deliver both the God-fearing and the Godless into the hands of Satan?" John J. Hartl, "Reactions: Stop CBW," *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 4.

<sup>148</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Seven Points," *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 7-8. Also, see Thomas J. Barbarie, "The Crime and Punishment of General Lavelle," *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 11-14; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: Dry Rot," *Triumph* 7 no. 10 (December, 1972): 9-10.

<sup>149</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "Near the Escorial: Defending America: Impractical?" *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 31.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid. "What is more," Bozell noted, "the risk that a thermonuclear artillery duel would escalate into deliberate strikes against cities is obviously larger than that a conventional war would escalate into a nuclear one; it is far larger than is morally tolerable."

<sup>151</sup> Editors, "War in Our Time," *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 45.

<sup>152</sup> Ibid.

---

<sup>153</sup> Ibid.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid.

<sup>156</sup> Michael Lawrence, "On the Irrelevance of American Foreign Policy," 13; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: Beggars Can't Bargain," *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 8-9. Lawrence wrote: "The game of history has some procedures . . . some rules . . . the first rule is: However well equipped you are to play it, the object of the game is Christendom; if you are not trying to make Christendom, you are not in the game; and if you are not in this game, you do not deserve to be a great power. Perhaps it is also time to recognize that this game has an Enforcer, and that there are still many things—not the least among them, our national purpose—that must be rendered unto Him." Lawrence, "On the Irrelevance of American Foreign Policy," 13. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: 'Pope without a Sword,'" *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 8.

<sup>157</sup> Editors, "Up From the UN," *Triumph* 1 no. 4 (December, 1966): 38.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid.

<sup>159</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Why Do Nations Rage?" 7.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid; and Thomas Molnar, "Disarmament: A Bad Dream," *Triumph* 2 no. 2 (February, 1967): 27. The editors admitted that an attrition of faith had mitigated the power and authority of the Church. Without faith in God, man and woman no longer sought to please Him. But this did not mean that God did not rule only that man ignored Him to their damnation. But they believed that the papacy was still strong; "there is simply no other jurisdiction in the world that carries the prestige and commands the respect of the Vatican," the editors wrote, the "Pope has no divisions, he has practically no territory. Yet in the eyes of the world today—unlike other days—these deprivations are not weaknesses, curiously, but strengths." It was his Unseen Power that still commanded authority. "The papacy—unlike any court or assembly the powers might throw up—does have authority. This authority, in its true dimensions," the editors noted, "is recognized by few if any of the powers; yet it is probably suspected, sensed vaguely, by most of them; and it is the kind of thing that haunts with proximity, like the Faith. The decisive consideration, however, is not the reputation of the Pope's authority, but the fact of it." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Happy New Year," *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 7-8. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: Why Not?" *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 9. Thomas Molnar noted that the utopian ideologues' effort to establish a secular world government would lead ultimately to a monopolization of power, but this would not ensure any sort of peace. "Oh yes, 'wars' would be abolished, all right, Molnar wrote, "There would be only 'local insurrections' by elements 'hostile to mankind.' Violence would not diminish, only freedom." Armed nation-states, Molnar argued, were imperfect, and the system in which they operated was anarchical, but, such a situation guaranteed "a measure of diversity and (let us not be afraid of the word) *division*" which provided for a fluid power struggle, "without which a single secular ideology, aided by modern techniques, would close in on us . . . and block all roads, finally and irrevocably" toward "global totalitarianism." The chaotic system of armed nation-states—and the "present risk of national armaments . . . in spite of Hiroshima"—would have to suffice until the Church "once again asserted itself as an effective counterforce against purely secular authorities. What form a new Christian-oriented international order might one day take is impossible to foretell; it is only possible to say that the day may be far off." Molnar, "Disarmament: A Bad Dream," 27. The editors did not like the Common Market which

---

was organizing Europe into a technocratic order, and was “intended to homogenize Europe into an abstract unity through economic organization, to the detriment of local and regional interests.” They hoped for its demise—“What is at stake in France, and in Europe, is the death of one kind of man and the formation of another who will look for joy, solace and even dreams in something like, well, Coca-Cola.” Editors, “Present Imperfect: Look Up, America,” *Triumph* 10 no. 6 (June, 1975): 8. The editors, however, were not nationalists, because nationalism was a secular-liberal creation that fostered loyalty to the state over the Church. See Editors, “Present Imperfect: Habsburg’s Europe,” *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 7; Otto von Habsburg, “Diplomatic Challenge,” *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 18-19.

<sup>163</sup> L. Brent Bozell, “Toward a Catholic Realpolitik,” 14.

<sup>164</sup> Ibid.

<sup>165</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Dr. K’s Remedy,” *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 7. *Triumph’s* editors were critical of Israel. They accused Israel of mistreating the Arabs; they criticized Israel for seizing the Arab half of Jerusalem in the Six-Day War in 1967; and they called for the establishment of a Palestinian state and for international jurisdiction over Jerusalem. They were critical also of the United States’ for supposedly favoring Israel, which they blamed on the influence of American Jews. Of vital importance to editors was peace in the Holy Land. The “Catholic interest remains,” the editors stated, not protection of the state of Israel, but “simply stated: *peace in Palestine*.” They did not believe that Israel’s policies fostered peace. “Palestine must be saved from the scourge of violence not simply because it is the birth land of the Church, nor simply because the Lord, His Blessed Mother, the saints and patriarchs trod its soil,” the editors wrote, the “Holy Land is something more: it is the land of Christian hope and promise, it is the land of Armageddon, of the Apocalypse, the Second Coming.” To establish such a peace, they believed that best solution was a papal protectorate over the Holy Land—“a Christian sensibility dictates preference for a papal protectorate over the ancient land”—but realized that this was highly unlikely, because an “ejection” of the Jewish nation “now is conceivable only against a landscape of gutted and desecrated holy places, probably millions dead, a war of possibly apocalyptic intimations.” They noted that “what *God wills*—in Pope Urban II’s splendid phrase at the time of the First Crusade—is that Christian men intervene to make peace in the Holy Land, to make it safe for Christian pilgrims.” Editors, “Peace in Palestine: Deus Vult,” *Triumph* 8 no. 9 (November, 1973): 45. The editors also—following the requests of the pope—pleaded for a universally governed Jerusalem (in a manner approved by “the three great monotheistic religions”). Editors, “Present Imperfect: Middle East Linkage,” *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 9; and Editors, “Present Imperfect: Jerusalem, Jerusalem,” *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 7-8. They blamed part of the problem on American Jews. “Far from being an outcast minority in the U.S., American Jews have an enormous and inordinate influence on the government and the media, and thus on public opinion.” “Under the circumstances,” they noted, “the double standard is all but inevitable. . . . The double standard also operates in regard to attacks on non-combatant civilians. When Arab terrorists plant a bomb on an El Al airliner, America is morally aghast. But no comparable judgment is made of the official Israeli government policy of retaliation for such attacks, even though an Arab civilian is as much a civilian as a Jew, and ought to be equally protected from the ravages of war.” Editors, “Present Imperfect: Jews, Arabs, Christians,” *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 9. So great was the Jewish influence on American policy in the Middle East, they believed, that there was a “well established policy of our leaders to permit the interests of the American state to be subordinated to the interests of the Jewish state and of the global Jewish tribe.” (8) “We do not think it is right for American Jews to put the interest of a foreign state ahead of the interest of the American state when the two are in conflict,” the editors stated, “This judgment is based on the natural patriotism that every man owes to his country.” (8) The editors believed that Catholics, however, should put the Catholic interest above the interests of the state. It was not hypocrisy in eyes of the editors. The Catholic Church was the new Jerusalem, the new judge of nations. The interests of the Church were universal. But this Catholic obligation, to put the interests of the Church above the

---

state, was not an obligation or right that could “be extended to the benefit of Israel or of the Jewish people. Israel is not the Church, it is not even a church; and the Jewish people are not a people and the Jewish religion is not a religion which Catholics—or any other Americans—can recognize as having claims superior to natural patriotism. In short, it can make a difference in politics, as in other matters, whether or not you are a Catholic.” (9) The editors wrote: “We who seek to build a Christian commonwealth in this land do not expect matters to be always thus; and on the day when America is able to move from Christian premises, we will not be happy to find our country’s foreign policy mortgaged to Israel. For that event could require an abrupt shift in policy, which could be injurious to both nations. It is better, surely to begin lifting the mortgage now.” (9) Editors, “Present Imperfect: America and Israel,” *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 8-9. For other articles on Israel, see Editors, “Present Imperfect: A Bishop’s Bishop,” *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 8; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Jews, Arabs, Christians,” *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 9; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Balance of Power, Mid-East,” *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 8; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Generally True,” *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 7; and Editors, “Present Imperfect: Palestine: Towards Justice,” *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 9.

<sup>166</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Balance of Power, U.S.A.,” *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 8-9.

<sup>167</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: ‘Détente’ in Lithuania,” *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 9.

<sup>168</sup> *Ibid.*, 9-10.

<sup>169</sup> For example, see James Burnham, “Third World War,” *National Review* 4 (August 24, 1957): 154; James Burnham, “Third World War,” *National Review* 12 (January 6, 1962): 24; James Burnham, “Third World War,” *National Review* 12 (January 30, 1962): 60; James Burnham, “Third World War,” *National Review* 13 (August 14, 1962): 97; James Burnham, “Third World War,” *National Review* 19 (May 16, 1967): 510; James Burnham, “The Protracted Conflict,” *National Review* 26 (October 25, 1974): 1223; and James Burnham, “The Protracted Conflict,” *National Review* 27 (January 17, 1975): 27.

<sup>170</sup> Editors, “The Greek Way,” *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1966): 37. For further examples of the editors’ and staffs’ support of rightist regimes, see Thomas Molnar, “Report from Brazil,” *Triumph* 1 no. 3 (November, 1966): 36; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Portugal,” *Triumph* 3 no. 11 (November, 1968): 9-10; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Up the Republic,” *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): (8-9); Editors, “Present Imperfect: Our Man in Manila,” *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 9; Carlos Lopez, “Exclusive from Chile,” *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 11-12; Unsigned, “Report from Chile: ‘Plan Z,’” *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 18-20; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Peron’s Progress,” *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 8-9; Editors, “Present Imperfect: LAD: Ideology over Charity,” *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 8-9; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Chile v. CIA,” *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 8-9; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Portugal: It Begins,” *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 7-8.

<sup>171</sup> Editors, “Pobre Espana,” *Triumph* 10 no. 8 (October, 1975): 2-3. Also, see Editors, “The Plot to Take Over Spain,” *Triumph* 10 no. 5 (May, 1975): 6-8.

<sup>172</sup> The editors, however, would become disenchanted with Prince Hugo, who Wilhelmsen labeled a “quasi-Marxist,” and supported Hugo’s brother, the more conservative Prince Sixto Enrique de Borbón. Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, “The Future of Catholic Spain,” *Triumph* 10 no. 6 (June, 1975): 30. Also, see Editors, “Report from Spain: New ‘States Rights’ Challenge to Franco,” *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 36; Editors, “Present Imperfect: The Reign in Spain,” *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 8-9. For other articles on Spain, see T. Dean Flowers, “Reactions: The Confessional Tribe Under Fire,” *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 3-

---

4; L. Brent Bozell, "Near to the Escorial," *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 26; Annabelle Z. Andrade, "Burgos: Black Legend Revisited," *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 12-14; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Iberian Imperative," *Triumph* 10 no. 4 (April, 1975): 7. Long-time contributor Gary Potter was dismayed with the journal's focus on Spain and Carlism. In reaction to *Triumph's* endorsement of the Carlist claimant, Potter wrote the following: "as a foreigner I do not believe I have the moral right to urge on the Spaniards one royal dynasty over another, especially if a serious conflict between the various dynastic claims could lead to another civil war. Unfortunately, *Triumph* (a journal known in some influential Spanish circles) now appears to have endorsed the Carlist claimant . . . . I wish to disassociate myself from an endorsement of the Carlist dynasty, not because I lack sympathy with the Traditionalist Communion, but for the reason I have stated here. Viva Cristo Rey!" Gary K. Potter, "Reactions: The Reign in Spain," *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 40. Furthermore, some readers criticized what they believed to be an excessive romanticizing of Spain and Carlism. Thomas Graf wrote: "But the truth, it seems to me, is also that some people who write for *Triumph* are idolizing Renaissance Spain as French revolutionaries idolized Republican Rome; all the while spreading their own 'Black Legend' about the U.S. as a land of secularism, war, pollution, pornography, contraception, pre-natal infanticide, and virtually nothing else." Thomas Graf, "Reactions: Black Legend" *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 5-6. Stephen J. Tonsor argued that America's problems would not be solved "by dressing up in the rags of Spanish romantic politics and attempting to force a juncture of religion and civil order." Stephen J. Tonsor, "The Confessional Tribe Under Fire," *Triumph* 5 no. 9 (October, 1970): 23.

<sup>173</sup> Warren Carroll, "In Memoriam: Dr. Frederick D. Wilhelmsen," *Faith and Reason* 22 (Winter 1996): 244.

<sup>174</sup> Editors, "Ireland & Spain: Mirrors of Christendom," *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 45.

<sup>175</sup> Ibid.

<sup>176</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Alliances III," *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 8.

<sup>177</sup> Editors, "Ireland & Spain: Mirrors of Christendom," 45.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid.

<sup>180</sup> For information on the conflict in Northern Ireland, see Sydney and W.D. Flackes, *Conflict in Northern Ireland: An Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 1999); and J. Bowyer Bell, *The IRA 1969-2000: Analysis of a Secret Army* (London: Frank Cass, 2000); and Diarmaid Ferriter, *The Transformation of Ireland: 1900-2000* (London: Profile Books, 2004), 610-641.

<sup>181</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Criost Ri Abū!" *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 10.

<sup>182</sup> Ibid. The editors wrote: It is a simple matter, really: if the troubles in Ulster can be the occasion for the elimination of a geographical sore on Ireland's Catholic body, serious Christians around the world will rejoice in union with their Irish brothers. But if Ulster is merely a British expression of Martin Luther King's Alabama, then the Christians of the world can be expected to feel sympathy, but no more, for Miss Devlin and her cohorts, whose civil rights cause is, after all, a domestic political matter." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Ireland for the Irish," *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 7.

<sup>183</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Nation Time," *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 9.

<sup>184</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Ireland for the Irish," *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 7.

---

<sup>185</sup> Editors, "Ireland: Illusion and Reality," *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 46.

<sup>186</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Ireland for the Irish," 7.

<sup>187</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Greening of Ulster," *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 9.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid.

<sup>189</sup> The Irish Republican Army (IRA) split into two factions in 1969, the "Official" IRA and the "Provisional" IRA, because of disagreements over the tactics of the organization's principal objective: a united Ireland, especially in relation to the outbreak of violence in Northern Ireland. The Official IRA sought a greater degree of negotiation and political involvement, while the Provisional IRA sought a military solution to their objectives. See Sydney Elliot and W.D. Flackes, *Conflict in Northern Ireland: An Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 1999), 374-376, 400-415.

<sup>190</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Greening of Ulster," 9.

<sup>191</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Erin Goes Blah," *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 9.

<sup>192</sup> For examples of the staff's conviction of a media bias against the IRA, see Editors, "Bombs, Bias, and a Bishop's Blessing," *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 45; Unsigned, "Ulster's Strangled Cry for Justice," *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 22-23, 43-44; and Robert A. Miller, "Nation Time," *Triumph* 8 no. 9 (November, 1973): 24-25.

<sup>193</sup> See Unsigned, "How Catholic is the IRA," *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 14-15. James Fitzpatrick worried that many Irish-American and other American Catholics were indifferent to the fate of the Provisional IRA because of its connections to Sinn Fein, the socialist political wing of the IRA. Fitzpatrick tried to mitigate such indifference by writing an apologia for Sinn Fein. Patrick argued that Sinn Fein's socialism was "far different from the Soviet or Chinese model, and should not be guilty by that association; it is a form which impresses me as being more in the line of a Chesterton-Belloc program than anything found in Eastern Europe. Moreover, Sinn Fein's choice seems prudential in nature, not doctrinaire or ideological. . . . The fact that they are aspirant socialists might make the Fenians lousy economists, but it does not put them into an immoral position from which Roman Catholics must instinctively recoil." He concluded that "Sinn Fein is not socialist *because* they are Catholic. They are socialist, *and*, almost universally Catholic." (14) The adoption of socialism, then, was pragmatically, not ideologically driven. It was a defensive response to the invasion of foreign capital; furthermore, he noted that Ireland was too nationalistic to become a wing of the communist international, and that secularization would not be as thorough because of the richly Catholic culture that permeated Ireland. Fitzpatrick declared: "I find it [Sinn Fein's socialism] a plausible response to the truly unique situation of Ireland, which has to be judged apart from Cold War instincts. Certainly Irish-Americans should do some investigative reading before they react in knee-jerk fashion and close the book on the subject." (16) James Fitzpatrick, "The Irish American and Sinn Fein," *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 13-16. Fitzpatrick's defense of Sinn Fein was criticized by a couple of readers, who argued that socialism was socialism and thus an evil to be condemned. See David R. Wade, "Reactions: The Irish American and Sinn Fein," *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 4, 6; and Karl Keating, "Reactions: The Irish American and Sinn Fein," *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 6. In a response to his critics, Fitzpatrick qualified Pius XI's warning in his encyclical, *On Reconstruction of the Social Order*, that "no one can be at the same time a sincere catholic and a true socialist," which had been invoked by one of his critics, by arguing that "'True socialist' refers to the Marxist, atheistic, anti-Catholic, dictatorial, nihilistic, and totalitarian ingredients in the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century stew called 'socialist.' It was not a condemnation of

---

government regulation and control of the economy on a more limited scale—such as the scale” promoted by Sinn Fein. James Fitzpatrick, “Reactions: The Irish American and Sinn Fein,” *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 6, 43.

<sup>194</sup> Editors, “Bombs, Bias, and a Bishop’s Blessing,” *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 45.

<sup>195</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>196</sup> Paul A. Fisher, “Ulster: The Faces of Terror,” *Triumph* 8 no. 10 (December, 1973): 17. Fisher wrote: “A casual drive through the streets and the countryside suggested the reality of a modern Reign of Terror. Interviews with a number of those who bear the vicious scars of British violence confirmed the enormity of a genocidal effort that the world to its shame ignores. These people desperately need the help of Americans, particularly Irish and Catholic Americans. . . . Belfast is the center of this barbarous rule, and even visitors who have experienced military operations, as I have, are shocked and appalled to see hordes of combat troops in full battle dress roaming the city on foot and in heavily armored vehicles, with their fingers on the triggers of high-powered rifles. . . . The heavens were weeping as we left Ireland. As our plane passed through the mist of tears I prayed that God would exorcise the malignant evil that grips this agonized land.” Fisher, “Ulster: The Faces of Terror,” 16-19. Also, see Unsigned, “Ulster’s Strangled Cry for Justice,” *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 22-23, 43-44; and Thomas J. Barbarie, “Belfast Reports,” *Triumph* 10 no. 5 (May, 1975): 15-17.

<sup>197</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Nation Time,” 9.

<sup>198</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>199</sup> *Ibid.*, 8-9. William Whitelaw was the Northern Ireland’s Secretary of State under direct British rule.

<sup>200</sup> Editors, “The IRA & Ireland’s Future,” *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 46.

<sup>201</sup> Thomas J. Barbarie, “From the Bronx, With Love,” *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (June, 1973): 16-17. Also, see Editors, “Present Imperfect: Help for Ireland,” *Triumph* 8 no. 10 (December, 1973): 9; and Unsigned, “Ulster’s Strangled Cry for Justice,” 22-23, 43-44.

<sup>202</sup> Some of *Triumph*’s readers were also worried about the Provisional IRA’s violent methods, see Fr. Keith Rooney, “Reactions: The Irish Question,” *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 3-4; and Mrs. M. Crisp, “Reactions: The Irish Question,” *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 4.

<sup>203</sup> Editors, “The IRA & Ireland’s Future,” *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 46.

<sup>204</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: The Provos’ Burden,” *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 10.

<sup>205</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>206</sup> Editors, “The IRA & Ireland’s Future,” 46.

<sup>207</sup> *Ibid.* For more articles on Ireland and Northern Ireland, see Unsigned, “Report from Ireland: The Anti-Life Movement at the Starting Gate,” *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 29-31; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Things You Should Know,” *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 10; Editors, “Present Imperfect: North Ireland: Why the Violence,” *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 8-9; Editors, “Present Imperfect: England’s Dirty Little War,” *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1975): 9-10; Robert A. Miller, “Arts and the Age: Just War: The IRA’s Case,” *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1975): 36-39; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Bloody Lies,” *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 9-10; Editors,

---

"Present Imperfect: Ireland: The Way to Peace," *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 10; Editors, "Present Imperfect: England vs. Ireland," *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 9-10.

<sup>208</sup> Otto von Habsburg, "Remnant of Colonialism or Christian Commonwealth," *Triumph* 2 no. 1 (January, 1967): 13.

<sup>209</sup> Editors, "Rhodesia—Tragic Farce," *Triumph* 2 no. 1 (January, 1967): 37.

<sup>210</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Reactions: The Lesson of de Gaulle," *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 5-6.

<sup>211</sup> Thomas Molnar, "Meanwhile, Here on Earth," *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 20.

<sup>212</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>213</sup> For example, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: Realism in Macao," *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 8.

<sup>214</sup> von Habsburg, "Remnant of Colonialism or Christian Commonwealth," 14. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: To Lose All, to Gain All," *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 10.

<sup>215</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Africa—Love It or Leave It," *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 10.

<sup>216</sup> Editors, "Biafra Lives," *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 41. For other articles on Africa and Decolonization, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: Bloody Ignorance," *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 7; Editors, "The Future of Portuguese Africa," *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 45; Gaspar, "Uganda's New Martyrdom," *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (July, 1974): 11-15; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Biafra Won't Go Away," *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 9; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Biafra," *Triumph* 3 no. 11 (November, 1968): 9.

<sup>217</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Pray for Cardinal Malula," *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 9.

<sup>218</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>219</sup> Editors, "The Spiritual Man," *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): (46)

<sup>220</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>221</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Viva Cristo Rey," *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 9.

<sup>222</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>223</sup> John Dombrowski, "A Catholic Continent Awakening," *Triumph* (August 1969): 14.

<sup>224</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Machismo," *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 10.

<sup>225</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>226</sup> Dombrowski, "A Catholic Continent Awakening," 14.

<sup>227</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Rocky Road," 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 9.

<sup>228</sup> *Ibid.*, 10.

---

<sup>229</sup> Editors, "Alianza para la Cristiandad," *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 46.

<sup>230</sup> Ibid.

<sup>231</sup> Dombrowski, "A Catholic Continent Awakening," 14.

<sup>232</sup> For liberation theology, see Thomas Bokenkotter, *A Concise History of the Catholic Church: Revised and Expanded Division* (New York: Doubleday, 1990): 410-412; and *The Modern Catholic Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Liberation Theology."

<sup>233</sup> Pope Paul VI, "On the Development of Peoples," The Holy See, [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/paul\\_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_enc\\_26031967\\_populorum\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_26031967_populorum_en.html) (accessed July, 9 2008).

<sup>234</sup> Thomas Molnar, "Iglesia Y Revolución," *Triumph* 3 no. 6 (June, 1968): 18.

<sup>235</sup> Thomas Molnar, "South America Updated: The State of the Revolution," *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 43.

<sup>236</sup> Ibid., 28.

<sup>237</sup> Thomas Molnar, "Report from Brazil," *Triumph* 1 no. 3 (November, 1966): 36.

<sup>238</sup> Editors, "The Spiritual Man," 46.

<sup>239</sup> Ibid.

<sup>240</sup> Ibid. For other articles on Latin America, see Robert A. Miller, "What the Communists Are Up to in Chile," *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 20-23, 44; and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Report on Argentina: A New Peron?" *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 19.

## CHAPTER VII

### REDEEMED TO HIS LIKENESS

The Church . . . teaches that each and every marital act must of necessity retain its intrinsic relationship to the procreation of human life. . . . This particular doctrine . . . is based on the inseparable connection, established by God, which man on his own initiative may not break, between the unitive significance and the procreative significance which are both inherent to the marriage act.

—Pope Paul VI

When I was in nurses training, twenty years ago, I spent about six weeks working in a ward which was mostly composed of abortion cases. It was there I learned the horror of what it means to kill a vital, normal human being; to hold one of these little humans in the palm of the hand and watch the strong, hopeless beat of the heart is something too sad to try to describe. Whenever the horror of abortion is mentioned I have that mental image of a heart trying so desperately to live. . .so truly hopeless. The only reason I am able to write about it is because I baptized each little human, and through this wonderful Sacrament the aborted ones gained Heaven from an earth which had rejected them. May God have mercy on us!

—Ruth Johnston <sup>1</sup>

Many influential women's liberationists clamor for indiscriminate abortion on demand. Some state legislatures are giving into these hypocritical demands. These women believe they are somehow helping their 'sisters.' Who are their sisters? What type of liberation are they preaching? Obviously it never occurred to these 'concerned' women that statistically speaking half of the thousands of aborted children would inevitably have been females who will now never know what 'liberation' did to them.

—Jerry Krebs <sup>2</sup>

The absolute sanctity of human life, beginning at conception, as the Roman Catholic Church has taught, was, and is, rooted in the view that God

created man and woman, through love, in His image and likeness. And, even though man and woman rejected God and lost this likeness to Him, He sent, out of love, His Son, Jesus Christ, who through His birth, death, and resurrection redeemed man and woman to God's likeness, reconciled them with Him, and gave them the opportunity for eternal beatitude with Him. That is, the Church teaches Christ redeemed man and woman; they could return to God, the Father, through the Son with the aid of the Holy Spirit. God makes and redeems man and woman so that they may come to know, love, and serve Him and thus return to Him. Human life, then, was sacred as it was God's. The Church taught (and continues to teach) that any act that disregards life either by impeding it through contraception (a denial of love and life) or by ending it unjustly—at any level of development—violates the sacredness of human life as it denies that God is the origin, sustainer, and purpose of life.

*Triumph's* editors, then, were horrified by the popularity of contraception, especially the government's promotion of its use—a grave violation of the moral law—which, consequently, they believed, delegitimized its authority. They were horrified further, but not surprised, by the gradual liberalization of abortion laws in the 1960s and by its wholesale validation in 1973. Abortion, they reasoned, was a natural corollary to the accepted use of contraception. As contributor Charles Rice noted, "If you are going to pursue the right to decide when life begins it's not surprising that you'll start trying to decide when it ends."<sup>3</sup> At the root of this anti-life society, was, the editors believed, a Manichean mindset—a hatred, they reasoned, of physical existence. These grave violations of the moral law were

certain proof, they believed, of America's anti-Christian nature, which now, for those who still doubted, was manifest in such egregiously sinful acts.

Contributing further to America's moral decadence was the feminist attack on what Saint John Chrysostom called the "*ecclesiola*," or the "church in miniature"—the family—which feminists undermined, they charged, by attempting to de-nature women by directing them away from their divinely ordained, maternal being.<sup>4</sup>

### Contraception

Roman Catholics, prior to the 1960s, constituted a subculture in American society, and their opposition to contraception was a part of this cultural divergence. Prior to the 1930s, however, even Protestant religious leaders opposed contraception. Indeed, the legal bans on contraception, dating back to the nineteenth century, were enacted by Protestants.<sup>5</sup> The Great Depression, however, "fundamentally altered" this anti-contraceptive consensus.<sup>6</sup> Protestants moved toward acceptance of contraception—as witnessed at the Lambeth Conference in 1930, at which the Anglican bishops "voted to permit the use of contraception among married couples with 'a morally sound reason.'"<sup>7</sup> Catholics, that same year, were concretized in their opposition to it by Pope Pius XI, who, in his encyclical *Casti Connubii*, reasserted the Church's ban:

Any use whatsoever of matrimony exercised in such a way that the act is deliberately frustrated in its natural power to generate life is an offense against the law of God and of nature, and those who indulge in such are branded with the guilt of a grave sin.<sup>8</sup>

The Church's teaching, increasingly at odds with Protestant morality and American culture, became, Leslie Woodcock Tentler argued, "a kind of tribal marker—a proud if onerous badge of Catholic identity."<sup>9</sup> Yet by the 1960s, Catholic lay adherence to the Church's teaching decreased precipitously. This was caused, in part, by Catholic intellectuals, who began to accept and accommodate for a more developmental view of Catholic moral teaching, instead of relying on the supposed objective, universal, and immutable natural law, which forbid, the Church taught, the use of contraception.<sup>10</sup> The invalidation of legal bans on the use of contraception and cultural pressures—including the gradual diffusion of Catholics to the suburbs, which eroded tribal identity, and the absorption of a Protestant ethos; that is, the development of a more individualist moral perspective, led to a breakdown in Catholic opposition to contraception (the use of which seemed practical, morally inconsequential, if not moral, and beneficial to conjugal love.)<sup>11</sup>

Two other developments in the 1950s also affected this change among Catholics. They were Pope Pius XII's acceptance of the so-called rhythm method—taking into account the cycle of ovulation to regulate birth—and the development of the contraceptive pill, which, ostensibly, did not, as previous methods, "impede the natural function of sexual intercourse by imposing an artificial barrier between egg and sperm," but instead prevented pregnancy by suppressing ovulation.<sup>12</sup> Many Catholics believed that the contraceptive pill might be morally acceptable, given that the Church did not believe that the sex act was invalidated by taking into account the woman's natural infertile period,

which was a form of regulation. Furthermore, although artificially (and ostensibly), the contraceptive pill, like the rhythm method, did not directly frustrate the sex act—the ovum simply were not present.

The Second Vatican Council issued no exceptional statement on the matter, but Pope Paul VI had appointed a commission in 1963 to study it before issuing a definitive statement. The majority of the commission, “80 percent,” argued for a change in the Church’s teaching; this development became known to the public and “predisposed” American Catholics to expect change.<sup>13</sup> The mere calling of the commission seemed to put the traditional teaching in doubt.<sup>14</sup>

*Triumph’s* editors were well aware of the sizeable opposition to the Church’s traditional teaching both outside of and within the Church; they believed that the opposition was due to an ignorance of the supernatural mystery of sex.

The editors wrote:

The world deems the Church mad to have hitched its whole moral authority to this wretched piece of intransigence. Millions of Catholics and near Catholics and apostate Catholics over the years have felt the same way: if only the Church would give ground on this one, the rest would be easy to take. But this wretched piece of intransigence is the key to the mighty mystery of sex, which unlocks the door to the even more awesome mystery of life, which in turn reveals the reality of the supernatural. If the Church does not own this key, it does not own any keys at all.<sup>15</sup>

The editors were opposed to contraception, because it interfered with the generative process, which had God as its source and principal.<sup>16</sup> The sex act was an act of love only when it remained open to God (that is, procreation)—“Can love express itself,” contributor Germain Grisez asked rhetorically, “while it pushes away the finger of God lest His touch give life?”<sup>17</sup> Disconnecting the sex act from procreation de-sacralized it—it was a denial of life, which was, in effect,

a denial of God and His life giving touch. “This is what contraception attacks,” Grisez wrote.<sup>18</sup> The will to use contraception was a will set against life—against God; a very denial of life’s supernatural origins (and, consequently, the source of human dignity).<sup>19</sup>

Few events gave the editors greater joy, then, than Pope Paul VI’s encyclical *On the Regulation of Birth* (1968), which they greeted as a “Great Day in the Morning!”<sup>20</sup> “Paul VI decided to take on the whole word, not bellicosely, but bravely, and with his eyes wide open. It was time the world learned,” Bozell wrote, “the facts of Life.”<sup>21</sup> What were these facts? What was the encyclical’s thesis? That conjugal love was not a utilitarian function, but “in itself intrinsically good,” because—according to God’s design—love was the creative drive to procreate.<sup>22</sup> “As God’s love is the creative principle in the universe, so love is everywhere creation,” Bozell quoted Dietrich von Hildebrand, “and there is a profound significance in the nexus—at once symbol and reality—whereby from the creative act in which two become one flesh from love and in love, the new human being proceeds.”<sup>23</sup> “The Pope was able to show why no Christian could,” Bozell wrote, “on his own motion, interpose an obstacle between giving love and giving life.”<sup>24</sup>

In his encyclical, Pope Paul VI, basing his teaching in natural law, stated “that each and every marital act must of necessity retain its intrinsic relationship to the procreation of human life” because of the “inseparable connection, established by God, which man on his own initiative may not break, between the unitive significance and the procreative significance which are both inherent to

the marriage act.”<sup>25</sup> Pope Paul VI taught, then, that in God’s design, all marital acts were to be a uniting of man and woman in mutual love and fidelity (the unitive significance) and open to the transmission of life (the procreative significance). The two were inextricably linked. To preserve the unitive significance, the sex act had to consist of five qualities; it had to be marital, an act of the free will, charitable, acted out in an exclusive and life-long fidelity, and it must be “fecund” or productive—it was “not confined wholly to the loving interchange of husband and wife; it also contrives to go beyond this to bring new life into being,” Pope Paul VI stated.<sup>26</sup> The marital act, then, if not open to procreation, violated its unitive significance; such an act was not charitable if it was not left open to new life.

Contraception, then, including anovulants, violated both the unitive and procreative significances of the marital act.<sup>27</sup> Yet Pope Paul VI taught that marital partners, “if there are well-grounded reasons for spacing births,” may “take advantage of the natural cycles immanent in the reproductive system and engage in marital intercourse only during those times that are infertile.”<sup>28</sup> This was not, Pope Paul VI explained, inconsistent. In the latter method, the “married couple rightly use a faculty provided them by nature,” and respected God’s design, still recognizing Him as the “Author of Life,” while contraceptives “obstruct the natural development of the generative process” and make man the decider of when life begins.<sup>29</sup> The recourse to the natural periods of infertility—because such marital acts were subject to God’s laws of nature—did not violate the procreative significance; yet, it also preserved the unitive significance.

Although admittedly such an act was not intended for procreation, but love only, it still was in accord with God's design, because love was, in itself, good and because the marital act did not have to *lead* to procreation to remain good, but only had to remain *open* to God's design, which was not violated by recourse to the laws of nature. In other words, the sex act during the *natural* infertile period did not, as contraception did, interfere with God's design.

The encyclical was unpopular. Pope Paul VI anticipated such dissent stating in his encyclical that the Church, "no less than her divine founder, is destined to be a 'sign of contradiction.'"<sup>30</sup> Bozell noted a persistent effort in the secular-liberal media to emphasize that the encyclical was not an infallible teaching, which was strange, he noted, because the world "officially holds that the Pope is just another Italian anyway."<sup>31</sup>

The editors were infuriated with criticism from the secular world of Pope Paul VI's encyclical. They were infuriated especially with the 2,600 scientists who issued a critical statement on the encyclical at the annual meeting of the American Association of the Advancement of Science. The scientists called the Church's moral policies "antiquated and anti-human" and argued that "Pope Paul . . . has sanctioned the death of countless numbers of human beings with his misguided and immoral encyclical."<sup>32</sup> Not only did the editors deem such criticism absolutely invalid, but they found it supremely hypocritical of scientists to offer moral judgment. The holocaust, after all, was "made possible by science's efficient methods of mass extermination."<sup>33</sup> "How many men must suffer from science's advancing liquidation of nature, before we begin to liquidate scientists?"

How many deaths and insanities,” they asked, “must we endure from science’s machines and therapy couches? How full must the cancer wards become of men who have breathed the air science has polluted? How many thalidomide babies must there be?”<sup>34</sup> “We therefore propose to load three prominent scientists into an Apollo spacecraft,” the editors wrote, “and fling them into lunar orbit, there to remain until they repeat, three times:

‘Christ is God and Pope Paul is His Vicar.’ After this purifying *auto de fe*, it would be un-Christian to return our friends to their temptations to muck up the earth. Therefore NASA will be asked to push the button again, this time zooming them into orbit around the sun, there to sink ever closer to the fiery bosom of God, until, finally they flame into eternal union with the Lord of the Heavens.<sup>35</sup>

But it was not the world’s reception of the encyclical about which Bozell and the rest of the editors were principally worried. They were well aware of the contradiction that existed between the Church and the secular world. The encyclical was widely unpopular also among Catholics—a Gallup poll reported that only “28%” of American Catholics supported Pope Paul VI’s teaching, while “54%” were opposed.<sup>36</sup> In addition, eighty-seven theologians developed a statement in which they expressed their dissent from Pope Paul VI’s teaching and then publicized their objections at a press conference.<sup>37</sup>

This dissent brought to the forefront the debate over the binding nature of encyclicals. Most of the dissenters argued that *On the Regulation of Birth* was not an infallible teaching—especially given Pope Paul VI’s reliance on the natural law (an outdated concept for an increasing number of theologians)—and believed in the possibility of dissent in expression and *practice*.<sup>38</sup> Bozell believed that while the teaching was not made *ex cathedra*, or declared infallible by Pope

Paul VI, it already was either an infallible teaching (he noted that before 1963 most moral theologians believed that the Church's ban on contraception was already an infallible teaching) and did not need infallible definition, or was an irreversible teaching taught through the centuries, not in error, and waiting for an infallible definition without the possibility of substantial change.<sup>39</sup> Regardless, Catholics were to show obedience to the magisterium; Bozell quoted the Second Vatican Council's *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* (1964), which stated that "religious submission of will and of mind must be shown in a special way to the authentic teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff, even when he is not speaking *ex-cathedra*."<sup>40</sup>

The dissent was "not just a rebellion in favor of live prevention," Bozell believed, "but against authority itself. It reveals," he wrote, "a denial that the teaching Church *has* binding authority in the area of morals."<sup>41</sup> Such a revolt against authority was based, the editors believed, in the modern world's view of freedom, which the modern world defined as "essentially a negative thing; it is the absence of constraints; it is the capacity to say 'no' to everything that limits self," while the Christian view of freedom was "entirely positive . . . the capacity to say 'yes' to God, to Truth; it is Truth, St. John says, which *makes* men free. Freedom is thus psychologically and metaphysically *dependent* on authority."<sup>42</sup> Yet the revolt was not rooted in a clash in the conscience between freedom and authority, but in "a *clash of authorities* in which the question is whether self or some intruder on self (like God) will prevail."<sup>43</sup> Because a "wrestle in conscience is never felt in terms of freedom," the editors noted, "but always in terms of

competing claims to authority; and the verdict of conscience is always expressed, not in terms of liberty, but as a command. Do we not speak of ‘following’ our conscience?”<sup>44</sup> “The real question is *which* authority speaks with the more authoritative voice: and the great hang up of modern man, which is destroying the modern world,” the editors concluded, “is that he cannot imagine a higher authority than himself.”<sup>45</sup>

The Church’s stance against contraception had indeed isolated it, but the editors were hopeful. It was, they noted, “a splendid isolation, which once again places her in a position to lead history, and thus to usher in, little by little, a new morning.”<sup>46</sup> They could not, therefore, countenance internal rebellion, which undermined the Church’s stance, indeed its salvific isolation. What was particularly agonizing for the editors was the non-schismatic nature of the dissent. They would have been disappointed by a schism, but such a situation would have served the purpose of excising the heretical elements. Instead, it appeared that a much worse situation was developing—what the editors labeled a “Renegade Church” within the Church, or “‘Catholic’ laymen and clerics and bishops who will not leave the Roman Communion, and who are not forced to leave it, but who publicly desert the obligations of the Catholic Faith, and the allegiance they owe to Christ’s Vicar.”<sup>47</sup> They believed also that until the “habit of Authority . . . is relearned,” the “Catholic Church will appear to be foundering no less than the foundering world she is commissioned to save.”<sup>48</sup>

The editors praised Patrick Cardinal O’Boyle for disciplining such renegade priests in Washington, D.C. “who refused submission to the encyclical”

because it clashed with their consciences.<sup>49</sup> The priests erred in a threefold manner in holding their individual consciences superior to that of the Church's authority. The conscience "is not something absolute and incapable of error," O'Boyle taught; "by the authorization of Jesus Christ, her divine Founder, the Catholic Church . . . teaches us what is necessary if we are to fulfill the will of God," and "the solidly firm teaching of the Church protects us against many erroneous judgments . . . we Catholics are blessed compared with those who do no accept the authority of this divinely established moral teacher."<sup>50</sup>

The D.C. priests' refusal to uphold the Church's teaching was "a betrayal of the priestly ministry," the editors wrote, "because—above all—it is a denial of the efficacy of Grace. To hold what the renegade priests hold about conscience is to deny that God gives man the Grace to know the truth"—as communicated by the Roman Catholic Church—"and the Grace to act according to the truth," that is, the ability to fulfill the teaching; "it is, in sum, to deny the connection between God and man, the cord by which God draws man to Him."<sup>51</sup> Because of his stance, the editors rated O'Boyle "a bishop for the ages. That his own age seems likely to scorn him is a judgment not on him, but on the age."<sup>52</sup>

The Church's teaching on contraception was an urgent concern to the editors. Especially frustrating and damning, in their view, was the government's promotion of contraception. They singled out December, 1970 as the month "America sealed the loss of her soul," because the government—through the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970—authorized financing for contraceptive devices and counseling and established the Office of

Population Affairs “to coordinate population control programs.”<sup>53</sup> It was, the editors concluded, “the most solemn possible expression of a deliberate, careful decision of the American government to disregard the moral law.”<sup>54</sup> It was an attack on the sanctity of human life—that God was its origin. Such a violation indicated to them also that the American system was becoming totalitarian. “When a political system recognized no higher-than-human authority, then the authority of the state, and therefore its potential power, are unlimited,” they lectured; “and when such a political system presides over a social order that has lost the recognition of man as a spiritual being”—which it had done by officially denying the sanctity of human life by denying God as its origin through the promotion of contraception—“then anything, literally *anything* can happen. There is no manipulation and control of man that is outside the permissible reach of the state.”<sup>55</sup> The American system, because it violated the Christian’s “cardinal rule of politics”—that “the things of God not be rendered unto Caesar,” especially that which “is certainly to be rendered only to God: authority over life itself”—was proven “defective.”<sup>56</sup> Its authority was morally illegitimate. It was the mission of the Church to serve as a check on the authority of the state, by denying it legitimacy if it did not exercise its power in accord with the moral law—in effect, rendering its power provisional or conditional.

Catholics could not remain aloof, as if the decision did not affect their own private morality, because they, “along with everyone else, are going to be *paying* for the counseling, for the condoms and IUDs and pills, for the Office of Population Affairs. We cannot,” the editors concluded, “pretend that the

government's sin is no affair of ours."<sup>57</sup> "What is forbidden to Christians is the *doing* of evil, in this case abetting, supporting, participating in—whatever a citizen may be asked to do—to facilitate an assault on the very heart of creation," they wrote: "The most fundamental tenet of the Christian morality—the holiness of human life—is now under direct attack by the American government."<sup>58</sup> And the government was forcing Catholics to take part.

Catholics, the editors urged, must take it upon themselves as an urgent matter to renew the temporal order indeed, it was "a moral imperative"—"to work for the creation of those conditions under which the Christian Church may execute her political charge."<sup>59</sup> While the bishops were the teachers of the moral law, "the initiative, the choice of means, and the actual doing of the job are the work of the laity," the editors wrote.<sup>60</sup> Yet the editors worried about the bishops—who, despite their support of *On the Regulation of Birth*, were simply not militant enough for them; they were not vociferous enough in their condemnation, nor instructional on how Catholics could conform the secular law to the moral law.<sup>61</sup> "Perhaps the bishops will yet lead," they pleaded; "We ask them to do so, because Christians will need their shepherds as they ride into a battle that can end only in victory or civil disobedience."<sup>62</sup>

The editors believed that the fear of a population explosion that would cause worldwide economic, political, and social instability, fostered the government's promotion of contraception.<sup>63</sup> The editors believed, however, that the so-called population explosion was a "myth."<sup>64</sup> "Chief pillar of the myth is the popularized Malthusian notion of a geometrically expanding population inevitably

outstripping resources,” but they argued that “Not only has population *not* grown at a constant, invariable rate, but quantum advances in agricultural technology and food science have pushed production far beyond the expected limits.”<sup>65</sup> Yet they did not believe that the increase in population was a result of the birth rate—indeed, they argued that the birth rate of industrial nations had “declined,” while that of the Third World “remained constant.”<sup>66</sup> Rather, the population increase, they wrote, “has resulted principally from declining *death* rates and increased average life spans due to advancing technical sophistication in medicine, sanitation and public health. More people live after birth now, and for a longer time.”<sup>67</sup>

They did not believe, furthermore, that such growth meant that the world was “approaching the limit of its resources,” because of technological advances in agriculture and because it “can be plausibly argued . . . that ‘surplus’ population creates the impetus for technological progress.”<sup>68</sup> But even then, they noted, “medical technology can only extend the human life span so far,” which “seems now to be reaching its outer limits;” therefore, it appeared, for those who “worry about such things,” that the population growth—because it was dependent upon an increase in an ultimately limited life span—“may peak in the near future at a point well within the world’s capacity to provide a decent existence, *without* any resort to worldwide repression in the form of coercive programs of contraception, sterilization and abortion.”<sup>69</sup>

The editors, to be sure, did not worry about population growth, but only the fear of it, which fostered the mentality to control it; this “demographic mind looks

upon the human race as a crop,” Bozell wrote, to be manipulated to whatever degree “to achieve the desired equilibrium.”<sup>70</sup> This type of demographer, Bozell wrote, would “have to burn.”<sup>71</sup> “The demographic mind, you see,” Bozell wrote, “has its gaze fixed on a certain garden,

And this garden is guarded by a certain Cherubim, a little fellow, whose watch is accompanied by a flaming sword which has been ordered to swing in every direction, against every intruder who might approach the way to the tree of life. Earlier in this garden a considerable drama has been enacted. Another tree, which holds the knowledge of good and evil, has already been eaten; it has made men gods; it has created the demographic mind.<sup>72</sup>

Existence—whether it was or was not to be—was not for humankind to tamper with; it was to *be* at God’s, not humankind’s, will. Bozell dramatized the point:

There is a boy in Bombay, a little fellow. His stomach is swollen. A single rag hangs about his loins. His face is drawn, well beyond his eight or nine years. He wanders, apparently aimlessly, through squalid streets. There is a greater supply of him than there is demand. He disturbs the ecological balance. He is socially inconvenient. The demographic mind eyes him and observes it would be better had his father been sterilized, or his mother aborted him—or, better still, had he never been conceived. He disagrees. He points to the flaming sword.<sup>73</sup>

“The life, the personhood, he cherishes (if no one else does) is a once-given gift; there will never be another like it . . . What the demographic mind can do is prevent a life, block a gift,” Bozell wrote, “whose nature is known only to the giver, whose enjoyment and destiny are designed specifically for the given. What it can do is prevent the unfolding of a mystery.”<sup>74</sup> “The demographic mind, which is humanitarian,” he wrote, “believes that the poor helpless, despised and rejected should not have been allowed to *be*.”<sup>75</sup> But the little boy in Bombay, he asserted, “prefers to be”—he “was wanted by his maker, and probably by his

parents, and now he wants himself.”<sup>76</sup> “The boy might have had more of the world’s things if the world were other than the one Mr. [Robert] McNamara and Mr. [Nelson] Rockefeller have helped organize,” but their remedy “is to have denied him the one possession he has.”<sup>77</sup> “Consider the tree in the garden,” he reflected—its “fruit is not crops, or races, or nations, *but persons*. It is not fit for, it will blind, the gaze of the demographic mind. But it can be seen by cherubs. And it is guarded by a flaming sword.”<sup>78</sup>

In addition to the fear of a population explosion, the editors believed that the contraceptive mentality was, in part, a eugenics mentality—“eugenic racism,” they wrote, “animates the contraception movement.”<sup>79</sup> Some of its participants believed that “decent people with names like Rockefeller and Ehrlichman,” they wrote, “should not have to put up with and provide for so many people with names like Leroy Brown and Carmelita González who infuse the welfare rolls with black and brown passion. Or to put it bluntly,

The visceral instinct of the movement, and the not-so-visceral motivation of its financiers, is this: stop the damn blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and other inconvenient specimens from overrunning the land of the Anglo and the home of the Saxon. After all, how many domestics can the economy absorb?<sup>80</sup>

Wilhelmsen wrote that “the ‘over-population’ ogre . . . is but a cloak hiding the panic of WASP America in the face of more vigorous peoples who breed and breed—and just go on breeding—as healthy folks have done since Adam and Eve.”<sup>81</sup> They believed that such a view—that racism was a source of the contraceptive movement—was born out by the fact that the movement was

successful; the population growth in the United States had reached zero, but advocates still championed birth control measures.

The editors believed also that the movement's aim was to curb the growth of Catholics. "Catholic fertility," contributor Farley Clinton wrote, "is deeply felt as a threat to the Establishment."<sup>82</sup>

Yet the basis of the contraceptive mentality—as the fear of a population explosion and racism were but the symptoms—was "the resurgence of a sinister Oriental heresy."<sup>83</sup> "The controlling mind-set of the American government on the issue of population control—indeed of the whole established order in this country—is Manichean and is profoundly anti-Christian," the editors wrote.<sup>84</sup> Manicheanism was an ancient heresy that posited a dualist view of creation in which the "principle of good—the force of the spirit—and the principle of evil—the drives of the body—were eternally at war for the conquest of man's soul."<sup>85</sup> Importantly, then, "material life was essentially evil, and therefore to reproduce life was evil. Thus sex, which involved the making of new life, was sinful of its very nature."<sup>86</sup> The telltales of the Manichean mindset were that the secular liberals were not pained by "the suffering or unhappiness of the concrete man, but the kind of world that is," and their "reflexive response" was not to "alleviate hardship," but to "wage wars against poverty, illiteracy and disease, and the announced object of these wars is the 'eradication' of the abstract enemy—the purification of the evil world."<sup>87</sup> "These signs are especially telling," they noted—"coming at a time when the material conditions in which men live are far less oppressive than at any previous moment of history."<sup>88</sup>

But what of the objection that the secular liberal “proposes to *improve* material life”—indeed “it is central to his whole concept of progress”—yet herein was the intrinsic link, the editors believed, between the Manichean mindset and the secular liberal.<sup>89</sup> The latter’s “method for purifying the world,” for improving it, was to stop life—“the population control people propose to enhance the enjoyment of life by preventing life,” they wrote, which demonstrated a “hostility to life,” which made evident their “hatred of life.”<sup>90</sup>

The Christian, in contrast, understood poverty as natural and not as “a manifestation of the evil of nature; to be poor, he knows, may as often as not be conducive to holiness.”<sup>91</sup> The Christian is moved by human distress, not out of contempt for existence, but out of love, because “he sees in each human person the image of God and thus the proper object of love. . . . His concern, therefore, is always with the poor *man*, the sick *man*, the unhappy *man*; and he knows, instinctively,” the editors wrote, “that the very worst service he can render his brother, born or unborn—the most heinous crime he can commit—is to deprive his brother of the life God meant him to have.”<sup>92</sup>

Michael Lawrence, in a review of Paul R. Ehrlich’s *The Population Bomb* (1968)—which contributed to the fear of a population explosion—quoted extensively from Ehrlich’s introduction to demonstrate his Manichean motivation for writing the book; that Ehrlich “fears and despises” people:

‘I have understood the population explosion intellectually for a long time. I came to understand it emotionally one stinking hot night in Delhi a couple of years ago. My wife and daughter and I were returning to our hotel in an ancient taxi. The seats were hopping with fleas. The only functional gear was third. As we crawled through the city, we entered a crowded slum area. The temperature was well over 100, and the air was a haze of dust

and smoke. The streets seemed alive with people. People eating, people washing, people sleeping. People visiting, arguing, and screaming. People thrusting their hands through the taxi window, begging. People defecating and urinating. People clinging to buses. People herding animals. People, people, people, people. As we moved slowly through the mob, hand horn squawking, the dust, noise, heat, and cooking fires gave the scene a hellish aspect. Would we ever get to our hotel? All three of us were, frankly, frightened. It seemed that anything could happen—but, of course, nothing did. Old India hands will laugh at our reaction. We were just some overprivileged tourists, unaccustomed to the sights and sounds of India. Perhaps, but since that night I've known the *feel* of overpopulation.<sup>93</sup>

Christopher Derrick believed that the whole age would be characterized as Manichean—as “a life-hating generation.”<sup>94</sup> “One is told that it is correct to propose a limitation upon the number of babies,” he wrote, but “grossly incorrect to propose a limitation upon the number of cars. Do we love cars more than babies, concrete more than grass, computers more than human wisdom?”<sup>95</sup> “The contraceptive society,” Lorenzo Albacete concluded, “has chosen cars.”<sup>96</sup>

The Manichean mindset, indeed, was damnable, because it prevented and ended life, but it also, the editors believed, portended further moral abominations and subsequently, the dissolution of society. Charles Rice argued that the government's promotion of birth control made the “real danger in America . . . not the Population Explosion, but the Copulation Explosion.”<sup>97</sup> The relaxation of sexual standards, namely the promiscuous sexual behavior encouraged by contraception, had dangerous consequences. The “universal practice of contraception,” encouraged by the government, Rice wrote, was “both cause and effect” of the “headlong and selfish flight from responsibility.”<sup>98</sup> “Ours is a secularized society. We have lost sight of God. We have turned away, not only from a transcendent commitment to a Creator but also from any firm

commitment to others. The standard of conduct," he wrote, "is increasingly our own individual convenience and our own pleasure. The philosophy of unrestraint is in the ascendant, and the pursuit of pleasure is not to be impeded by considerations of ethics or the welfare of others."<sup>99</sup> He believed that such a condition, both a cause and consequence of the practice of contraception, heralded the breakdown of order, because individuals were no longer willing to discipline themselves internally, which would, thus, be followed by "repression by the state if society is to survive."<sup>100</sup>

"Unrestrained birth control," then, portended the suicide of society, because the "pervasive practice of contraception, with its promotion of promiscuity and its weakening of responsibility, is destructive of family" the "basic unit of civilized society."<sup>101</sup> "No society can long survive unless promiscuity is restrained or at the least discouraged and unless a solid family life is promoted," Rice argued.<sup>102</sup> "The solidity of the family should be a principal end of our domestic policy," he concluded, which entailed not only ending the subsidization of contraception devices and counseling, but positive discouragement; the government "*should actively discourage it and should not provide contraceptive assistance even to those who voluntarily request it.*"<sup>103</sup> The government, he noted, also should "forbid the sale, or other provision, of contraceptive devices, including pills, to unmarried persons under 21" and "actively undertake to dissuade teenagers from pre-marital sexual intercourse."<sup>104</sup> Charles Rice, unlike the editors, was not in favor of a confessional state but believed that such action could be justified, not "because it is sinful according to the edict of any particular

religion, but because it poses a clear and present danger to the endurance of the family as the basic unit of society.”<sup>105</sup>

Through an explication of Pere Lacordaire’s views on chastity, Mark Pilon, like Rice, condemned what he believed was a sexually promiscuous society. The contraceptive society attacked the virtue of chastity, which was “a vital ingredient of any strong and healthy nation,” because it bridled lust.<sup>106</sup> “Chastity is the species of virtue which pre-conditions the life of virtue as a whole; for when moderation of the sexual appetite is lost,” Pilon wrote, “men become consumed in their own debauchery. The individual and eventually society fall victim to decay and death.”<sup>107</sup> Yet if society were to survive and remain free and civilized by preserving the virtue of chastity, “it must be Catholic for only a Catholic society knows how to *institutionalize* chastity.”<sup>108</sup>

Chastity “is integral to the Catholic way of life as to no other,” not only in the chastity of its religious life, but also in its married life, which it encouraged through the prohibition of contraception—in contrast, the “last century has demonstrated the inability of other churches,” Pilon wrote, “to preserve chastity in marriage against the onslaught of birth control.”<sup>109</sup> This was because the Church enshrined virginity, or “perfect chastity,” which it “has always considered . . . preferable *in itself* to all other states of life. . . . And it would seem that what is relative must derive from, depend upon, what is perfect.”<sup>110</sup> In other words, it seems that “the primacy of virginity . . . [is] necessary for the existence of every other form of chastity,” and subsequently the survival of virtue and the vitality of

society.<sup>111</sup> “The decision, then, is between freedom in the Church or slavery outside.”<sup>112</sup>

Contraception portended sexual perversion, because it separated the unitive and procreative significances (or the fidelity and fecundity) of the sex act. In other words, it ignored God’s design. If the sex act was separated from the procreative act, it was no longer a true act of love and divorced the act from its sacred character—it was in effect a denial of God as the origin of the act (as it was a gift of love) and as the principal presence (as its purpose was procreative). If the sacredness of the sex act was ignored (*God’s design was no longer respected*), the act was a biological release, rather than a transcendent union, and it followed that all sorts of sexual perversions were possible—what Francis Canavan labeled the “logic of contraception”—including promiscuity, as discussed above, but also non-marital and adulterous sex acts.<sup>113</sup> It heralded also, the editors lamented, the increasing acceptance of homosexuality. How indeed could a society condemn homosexuality if sex was defined merely as a biological release?<sup>114</sup> “The contraceptive mentality—the cultural mind-set conditioned by a radical cleavage between sex and the transmission of life—finds perhaps its most perfect expression in public acceptance of homosexuality,” the editors wrote—“It can come as no surprise, then, that the latest fascination in American pop culture is with the gay life.”<sup>115</sup>

Homosexuality, the editors wrote, was “a monstrous disruption of the life lived in accordance with the divine call, a glaring stab, in fact, at the heart of such a life, which beats where *the connection is between love and life.*”<sup>116</sup>

Homosexuality, then, was a stance “against life and love”—“That is why a Christian society’s laws never in any way tolerate homosexuality, the editors wrote, “no matter what the conditions of age or circumstance.”<sup>117</sup> Like “the Christian man or woman, the Christian society faces homosexuality with infinite loathing for the sin, unending compassion for the sinner. And unlike any other, the Christian society is able to offer the homosexual the means of his redemption,” the editors wrote: “it can show him that the grace flowing out of the pierced Heart of the Redeemer is his opportunity to fashion out of his homosexuality a cross to be carried in love, to life.”<sup>118</sup>

The editors did not believe that a secularized and pluralist America could take a stance against homosexuality—on what authority, they asked? While Catholics were supported in their condemnation of it by a higher law (Christ’s law), they did not believe that substantial objections to homosexuality could be made on any appeal to tradition, preference, or practicality. “How, after all, does a secularist straight go about demonstrating,” the editors asked, “that the natural loathing he has for homosexual practices, and the horror with which he probably regards their public legitimization, are not matters merely of cultural prejudice or personal preference? The answer is he doesn’t, he can’t.”<sup>119</sup> The editors were angered that contraception fostered sexual perversions, but they were more enraged by the murder it portended.<sup>120</sup>

## Abortion

The editors were horrified by the gradual liberalization of abortion laws in the 1960s and especially by the *Roe v. Wade* decision in 1973, but they were not surprised. Abortion, they believed, was a natural corollary to the denigration of life, expressed through the acceptance of contraception, which separated the sex act from an association with God. Humankind, not God, had become the decider of when life began and had fashioned itself, then, as the master of life. If life was denied its transcendental origins and, by extension, its transcendental identity, then what would prevent further tampering? If life was stripped of its transcendental dignity—its sacredness—then what would prevent murder?<sup>121</sup>

Like the acceptance of contraception, the editors believed that the acceptance of abortion was derived from a fear of a population explosion and the resulting god-like, demographic mentality, which was, in part, racist and classist.<sup>122</sup> Most basic to the acceptance of abortion, like that of contraception, was the Manichean mindset—abortion, they wrote, was “perhaps the most perfect expression of Manichean hatred for material creation, for new life.”<sup>123</sup> So hateful of life was the mentality of the abortionist that the editors found its historical equivalent in the Holocaust. “Let us be candid. Advocates of abortion,” they wrote, “have far too much in common for our comfort with the monsters of the Third Reich.”<sup>124</sup> “There is no serious moral distinction,” contributor Christopher Derrick wrote, “between Hitler’s ‘final solution’ of the ‘Jewish problem’ and our present society’s final solution of the pregnancy problem.”<sup>125</sup>

The author of Manicheanism—as he was the author of all heresy—was Satan. “It must be recognized that the entire anti-life movement is radically anti-God and therefore anti-human; at the same time and by the same token it is profoundly, ontologically satanic. What better way to serve Satan,” reader Constantine P. Belisarius wrote, “than to kill off the future lovers of God.”<sup>126</sup> “Certainly the daily offering of thousands of unborn infant lives to death by our liberationist society must be pleasing to Satan,” Robert A. Miller wrote, “even as it calls down from Heaven the wrath of God.”<sup>127</sup>

Indeed it was Satan’s lies, the editors believed, that provided the euphemistic deceptions that advanced the acceptance of abortion. As in the contraceptive movement, euphemistic phrasing cloaked the anti-life character of the abortion movement. Abortion, it was argued, would improve the quality of life for those involved—an overcrowded population, but especially the quality of life of the mother.<sup>128</sup> Indeed, the early state laws permitting abortion were justified as means “to protect the mental well-being of the mother.”<sup>129</sup> That it could be legitimately recognized that the health of a mother would be improved by aborting her child was “convincing evidence that our society is not only evil, but mad. It requires no expertise,” the editors wrote, “but merely a modicum of common sense and a little experience in life to perceive that *there are no circumstances whatever* in which the killing of her unborn child can ‘protect the mental well-being’ of an expectant mother.”<sup>130</sup> “If a woman, having another human being—*her* child—within her, can prefer to kill it rather than to endure whatever anxiety and pain its life may bring her,” they posited, “then her

understanding of the moral laws governing human life, as well as her own humanity, has been monstrously distorted—either by her own sinfulness or by false ideas inculcated in her by an apostate society.”<sup>131</sup> The author of such distortion “knows all this, of course,” the editors wrote; “He is an expert in the use of human weakness to exalt his own power and occasion the damnation of men. He has been doing it ever since he held his conversation with Eve in the Garden.”<sup>132</sup>

Abortion was, in fact, increasingly rationalized as a means to alleviate the suffering, not only of an overextended mother, but paradoxically, the never-born child, who would never have to starve or be born with any type of deformity.<sup>133</sup> Diane Moczar did not deny that the choice for life in these cases would involve suffering. But the Catholic understands, she noted, not only that God “has willed the existence of each new life, but that He wills it knowing the suffering the child will endure and yet permitting it;” such suffering must be born with “a deep faith in the providence of God and a firm belief that all innocent suffering has a purpose and can be turned to good by Him.”<sup>134</sup> This was little understood by the secular-rationalist mind as it was a mystery assented to in faith.

Without God, the secular-rationalist “modern world finds suffering horrifying, intolerable,” she wrote, “because it sees no meaning in it;” therefore, “Suffering is to be relieved at any cost, death being preferable to extreme pain.”<sup>135</sup> It is assumed, then, in the secular-rationalist mindset, that abortion is “‘kinder’ in ‘certain cases,’” because it alleviates pain; such notions have become justification for abortion and a wider application of the entire anti-life movement,

but “behind them stands the Father of Lies,” she noted, “who was a murderer from the beginning.”<sup>136</sup> But Catholics know that life is precious in any case and under any circumstance, because “God has made this child for Himself; He has redeemed him with His own Blood; He loves him with an infinite love and awaits him with an eternity of happiness;” she wrote, “He wishes us to alleviate his suffering as much as we can, but what we cannot, He will turn to His own divine purpose, uniting it to His suffering on the Cross.”<sup>137</sup> In other words, Catholics understood that suffering was innate to human nature—it was to be born with faith and cared for with love—but trumping any notions of the importance of the so-called quality of life, which was relative, was the sanctity of life in its very being, external conditions notwithstanding, as it was God’s, redeemed by Him, loved by Him.

Given the editors belief in the sanctity of unborn life, but witnessing its increasingly casual murder at the hands of abortionists, catalyzed in them a strident pro-life militancy. “We are not . . . merely prohibited from resorting to abortion. We know for certain that it is wicked,” the editors wrote—“that it is abominable to take an innocent human life. That is an absolute rule, and, so far as we can, we are obliged to fight in defense of those who others would slaughter.”<sup>138</sup> Indeed, by June, 1970, the editors decided on direct action. They attempted to stop the George Washington University Clinic, in Washington, D.C.—which they suspected of performing so-called “therapeutic” abortions—from aborting any unborn children. The demonstration turned into a scuffle when

five demonstrators, including Bozell, entered the clinic and were accosted by police officers. All five of the men were arrested.<sup>139</sup>

“What is the duty of the Catholic” in regard to abortion, Wilhelmsen asked that same month.<sup>140</sup> “St. Thomas Aquinas insisted—and this is engraved on the entire Catholic tradition of law—

*That any law mortally violating God’s Law is mortally sinful; and that an obligation, itself binding in conscience before the awesomeness of God’s Eternity, rests upon those subjected to this tyranny to resist it with every weapon at their command, whether or not the weapon is condoned by the civil law.*<sup>141</sup>

“And some, thank God, will discharge that duty. How? The occasion will properly determine the means. But let this be understood,” he wrote: “the proper means may require the execution of the executioner.”<sup>142</sup> “I do not speak in my own name,” he insisted:

I would not presume to do so in such a grave matter. I speak in the name of the entire weight of the Roman Catholic tradition of morality. That tradition does not tolerate the murder of children, and if the faithfulness to the tradition requires martyrdom by the State, then let the State do its worst!<sup>143</sup>

“The time has come for Christians to realize that now they must stand up and be counted and, if necessary, shot down,” Belisarius wrote, to “testify with their blood to the Lordship and Sovereignty of Jesus Christ above and beyond any and all merely terrestrial duties, loyalties and ties. Let us bear our breasts to the bullets of the infanticides and their benighted minions.”<sup>144</sup>

Catholics, the editors believed, had an obligation to stop abortion. But any efforts “to protect and defend innocent life may not employ means that directly attack innocent human life,” they wrote; “there can be no indiscriminate violence,

no terrorism—as there never can be in a cause that pretends to march under the rubric of Christian obligation.”<sup>145</sup> Nor, they noted, “can such a cause legitimately be won by the adoption of a ‘compromise’ which is itself morally impermissible: there can be no question, for example, of eliminating the need for abortion by wider dispensation of contraceptives.”<sup>146</sup> “*Anything* else goes,” they reasoned, “if it has a reasonable hope of bringing” an end to America’s anti-life posture.<sup>147</sup>

The editors’ militancy was a product mainly of their view that abortion was murder, but it was derived also from their view that the bishops of the United States simply were not combative enough in their stance against abortion. As such, they were not the guiding light of resistance (to America’s anti-life culture), desperately needed to awaken American Catholics from their pluralistic slumber. Of course the bishops were adamantly against abortion and they *routinely* made known their moral objections, but the editors envisioned more; it was no longer time to proffer objection, it was time, they believed, to command dissent. “It is time to go to the housetops. It is time, in the name of God, to cry stop!”<sup>148</sup> Public society was thoroughly secularized and thus anti-Christian and not “equipped for a dialogue with Christianity: the Church is clearly called at this moment, not to converse, but to *instruct*, and not only as to how men should act privately, but how they should act publicly—politically.”<sup>149</sup>

Bishops were the guardians and teachers of the Catholic faith and leaders of the Catholic faithful. It was, above all, their responsibility to magnify the Church’s teachings and lead the faithful in opposition to what, in Catholic teaching, was a gross violation of the moral law.<sup>150</sup> The bishops had an

obligation to defend the unborn. The Church, after all, was the Church of the poor, founded by Christ to serve the poor, and, the editors wrote, this “burden is hers before Heaven.”<sup>151</sup> “And of course there will never, ever, be any poor who are poorer than unborn children,” they noted, “who are not yet favored with even the power to cry, to as much as murmur a protest against an attack on the single possession they have: life.”<sup>152</sup> The editors acknowledged that the bishops had opposed the anti-life movement, but that “the record also shows that they have done so less vigorously, less consistently, certainly less conspicuously than they have begged funds from that same civil authority for their failing school system.”<sup>153</sup> “What if our shepherds,” they hoped, “were to become *fierce*?”<sup>154</sup> “Let them call for a Christian mobilization—a rising, by whatever means are appropriate—against a government that, for as long as it is embarked on this evil road, cannot be considered legitimate. Let them—let us—be prepared,” they wrote, “for an exile from the American political system for as long as it takes to liberate from Caesar the things that are God’s.”<sup>155</sup>

Yet the bishops did not declare war. Rather, the statement that they issued on abortion in April, 1970, the editors’ lamented, was “calm, measured, reasoned, a debater’s brief instead of a crusader’s banner.”<sup>156</sup> As such, it was a “contemptible surrender” to the anti-life movement.<sup>157</sup> The defense of the unborn, they concluded, “must pass” to those lay Catholics who believed that society’s denial of the sacredness of life was “an act of war;” “the fight must begin.”<sup>158</sup> Indeed, the bishops’ statement precipitated the *Triumph*-led demonstration at the George Washington University Clinic, which was a way to

bear witness to the absolute sanctity of life, in all stages, that was not otherwise clearly demonstrated, they believed, in any type of militant stand by the bishops. “The bishops have surrendered,” they wrote—“There is no point any more in looking to them for leadership in the opposition to the country’s blood lust.”<sup>159</sup> The editors, then, envisioned a crusading laity, until the bishops recovered their thunder as the guiding light of resistance to abortion.<sup>160</sup>

The editors wanted the bishops to stop being administrators; they “must either choose to fight—with every resource the circumstances demand—or they will go down in disgrace.”<sup>161</sup> The editors provided an insight into the type of militant leadership they expected from their bishops. When Governor Nelson Rockefeller vetoed a bill in 1972 that would have repealed “abortion on demand in New York State,” they wrote a fictitious response from the archbishop of New York, Terence Cardinal Cooke:

‘Catholics—and indeed all persons who have not blotted from their minds the reality of the unborn child’s humanity—have only one clear opinion remaining. The democratic processes have failed to bring human law into harmony with divine law. Therefore we must move outside those processes to exert whatever pressure is necessary to save innocent lives. I therefore solemnly counsel and encourage the Catholics of the Archdiocese of New York to engage in any or all of the following activities: 1. Massive and repeated protest marches . . . 2. Around the clock picketing of the Governor’s office and the Governor’s mansion, and of all of the hospitals and clinics involved in the killing of unborn babies. 3. Sit-ins and other forms of obstruction at the above-mentioned places by those who are willing to risk the loss of measure of civil freedom for the sake of the innocent. 4. Prayer vigils at the above-mentioned places, especially by those whose age or station in life precludes more hazardous activities. 5. Refusal to pay state income taxes by those whose obligations to their own families permit them to bear the penalties involved. 6. Sit-down strikes or resignations on the part of those employed by the State of New York. . . . Further pastoral guidance will be forthcoming from this office. All priests of the Archdiocese will be available for counseling to help individual Catholics determine what course of action will best bear witness

to the cause of human life. These activities will continue to be encouraged as long as babies are legally killed in New York State. . . . For the sake of the hundreds of thousands of babies doomed to death, we are called to act and to act forthrightly. . . . If the commandments of God are to be taken seriously in this country, we can countenance no further compromise. May God bless you.<sup>162</sup>

The editors noted that in reality, Cardinal Cooke, in his comments on Rockefeller's veto, "did little more than express regrets;" meanwhile, the "veto still stands, and the babies still die."<sup>163</sup>

What of the Catholic laity? They were, in part, immobilized by lackluster bishops, the editors reasoned, but surely they still were aware that the Catholic Church taught that abortion was murder, and most surely followed such a teaching. Then how explain the precipitous rise of a pro-abortion movement? Catholics, rather than fulfilling their role as bearers of truth, as citizens of the Church that was the judge of all political orders, were anesthetized by pluralism to the gradual legalization of abortion. They had come to believe that their beliefs, their truths, were simply *their* set of beliefs and truths; they could not expect, nor should they try—for this would have been un-American—to promote their faith in the public order as any sort of absolute truth on which the public orthodoxy should be constructed. And pluralism led toward secularization—a complete separation between the public and religious orders—because the absolutist nature of religion was incompatible with pluralism. Catholics, then, according to pluralism, were heretics to the American faith if they expressed their Catholic faith as catholic. This relativist and secularist conception of the political order had dire consequences—indeed the gods of pluralism and secularism were now to be worshipped, the editors wrote, "with the sacrificial blood of children."<sup>164</sup>

The consequences of this view were manifest to the editors in the, ostensibly, Catholic-leaning *National Review*. The *National Review* editors decided to print an article by Clare Booth Luce, a Catholic, who attempted to reconcile Catholics with the legalization of abortion via pluralism.<sup>165</sup> Patricia Bozell wrote a response, not so much directed at Luce, but at *National Review's* editorial decision—principally her brother, William F. Buckley, Jr.'s—to print the article, which implied, the editors believed, an acceptance of a pluralist (and thus ultimately secular) public order, and, by extension, the acceptance of pro-abortion laws, but it also made clear the erosion that pluralism affected on the morals of American Catholics.

Pluralism fostered a relativist political order—each idea was “accorded equal respect” (there were no overriding truths) and any resulting conflicts were “to be resolved by a democratically produced ‘consensus’” (the public orthodoxy was in a perpetual state of flux).<sup>166</sup> But a relativist political order was incompatible with the Roman Catholic faith. “The Church recognizes, as a matter of social fact,” she wrote, “that all societies are ‘pluralist’ to one degree or another—and America more so than most. But variety in the social order, the Church believes,

Does not ordain variety in the moral order—the moral law is one. The moral law is a ‘Catholic thing’ only in the sense that the Church is uniquely authorized to define it. But since its origin is nature and nature’s God, the law’s application is universal. *All* are governed by it.<sup>167</sup>

Yet, she noted—and this she believed was demonstrated by Luce’s article—many Catholics assured themselves that pluralism was ordained by the Second Vatican Council’s *Declaration on Religious Liberty*; but, this was an

incorrect understanding of the declaration and indicated that they “either had not read the Declaration, or did not really care what it said. Religious liberty, according to the Council,” she quoted from the declaration,

‘Is subject to certain regulatory norms. In the use of all freedoms, the moral principle of personal and social responsibility is to be observed. In the exercise of their rights, individual men and social groups are bound by moral law.’ And government ‘action *is to be controlled by juridical norms which are in conformity with the objective moral order.*’<sup>168</sup>

“A non-Catholic’s right to worship with impunity, in other words,” she thundered, “does not imply a non-Catholic’s right to kill babies with impunity.”<sup>169</sup> Catholics that reconciled the legalization of abortion with their Catholicism did so by way of “theoretical” and then “practical commitment” to pluralism, the “official American ideology,” and had thus sided “*against* the Church, *in favor* of the state.”<sup>170</sup> She labeled such Catholics “America-first Catholics,” because their first allegiance was to America’s pluralist political order.<sup>171</sup> Such an allegiance had led them to accept the legalization of abortion and thus made manifest the erosion of their faith—the latter was the effect of pluralism:

If the moral law, as defined by the Church, is not binding on non-Catholics, then the whole claim the Church makes for the law—that it is grounded in God and nature—is false. And if that claim is false, then the authority that makes it—the Church—is unreliable in the field of morals, and cannot plausibly command the allegiance of Catholics any more than of non-Catholics. Thus, Catholics are finally liberated from the Church-state conflict. They are free at last to make an unqualified pledge of allegiance to the American state and to the ideology for which it stands. They are free, even in their personal judgments, to *learn* right and wrong from the verdicts of pluralism.<sup>172</sup>

As the editors noted, “the moral ideas a people holds, its views of right and wrong, will be reflected in its laws, its politics,” but it was equally true that “what a people believes politically will help shape its morality.”<sup>173</sup> In other

words, to submit to a pluralist and thus relativist public order, was to submit eventually to a relativist moral order.

L. Brent Bozell demonstrated the point by noting that the Catholic response to the airing of a pro-contraceptive, pro-abortion program on the Public Broadcasting System (PBS) was to demand equal time on PBS. “*What? Equal time for Life? To argue politely, democratically with Death? This is the radical, definitive demonstration,*” he wrote, “of the upsidedownness of the American public order—and not just in its forms, its political game rules, but in its substance—that we should be led even to think of settling for such a bargain.”<sup>174</sup> “Life is not an ‘issue’ about which Catholics and their moral associates have a point of view that, in fairness, deserves airing. It is not simply the object of a moral imperative. Life is,” he noted, “the very stuff of existence. It is an act, the divine act,

That makes being be. / Am Life, said the Lord: and the invitation to participate freely in Life, that the Lord may be glorified, is His supreme favor to man. To thwart the favor, to merchant Death, is an act that cannot be measured. . . . It is, itself, Death. What can be measured, and what in our time will be the measure of the Catholic people, is how those who now own the favor of Life fight Death.<sup>175</sup>

*Triumph's* staff mobilized to fight “Death.” Through their parent organization, the Society for the Christian Commonwealth, they helped formulate Americans United for Life, which was an ecumenical anti-abortion organization that sought to develop a national anti-abortion media campaign—which included the publication of *Life in America* (a newspaper devoted to “the fight for human life”) and the development of a speakers bureau—and offered such services as pregnancy counseling and adoption referral.<sup>176</sup> They also helped organize the

National Right to Life Congress—to unite all pro-life groups—and orient them towards lawful, but effectively, militant tactics.<sup>177</sup>

Entering the fight over abortion entailed political participation in the same political order that the editors viewed as intrinsically immoral (and thus deadly)—the same political order that they believed was useless to participate in, because it was collapsing (because it did not, nor could it, possess any path to recovery). Indeed, they acknowledged that abortion was “a symptom, not the disease,” which was ultimately “society’s rejection of a universal and binding moral order,” for which the “only cure” was “to recommit society to that order.”<sup>178</sup> To construct a confessional order was their long-term objective, which could be delayed by their participation in a dying order. Yet, while the abortion movement convinced them even more of the decadence of American society and its impending death, they believed that political participation was absolutely necessary. “The legislative battles must be fought, the debate must be carried on at all levels: but on the reasoning a physician uses in fighting the spread of an infection while trying to treat its cause,” they wrote; “For the battle to restore society’s reverence for life can only be won through the construction of a society that reverences the Lord of life.”<sup>179</sup> They sought, then, to *link* the objective of ending abortion with re-Christianizing America.

This mindset brought the editors into conflict with the majority portion of the movement, which was not as radical as *Triumph* editors. If ending abortion was the movement’s principal goal, the editors envisioned an onslaught against

the whole Manichean mindset. This included attacking abortion where it began—with the political and social acceptance of contraception.

Both Charles Rice and Michael Lawrence sought to do this by highlighting the practical link between contraception and abortion.<sup>180</sup> While many pro-lifers assumed that contraception led to a decline in abortion, both Rice and Lawrence argued for an inversion of this assumption—that there was “a direct proportion between the social habit of contraception and widespread demand for abortion.”<sup>181</sup> To accept contraception was to admit that procreation must be controlled by humankind to improve the quality of his life, which consequently, conceded the rationale for abortion. Those who promoted contraception and abortion, they noted, did not separate these issues as they believed they were the same methods (both were efforts to rationally control the population) for the same objective (to improve the quality of life). They were the same methods, Lawrence reasoned, for the same problem—that of overpopulation.<sup>182</sup>

Bozell agreed with Rice and Lawrence, but believed that the principal justification for linking the issues of contraception and abortion was to be located in their theological connection—that contraception was an “infinitely greater” sin and was the source of the evil that had led to abortion.<sup>183</sup> The purpose of human life, Bozell noted, was to glorify God in “a radically imitative” way—the principal act of which (for the married laity) was the mutual and fecund sex act; as God created life out of love, so man and woman—as a gift from God—were called to create life through their mutual and fecund love, to be “co-creators” with God.<sup>184</sup> To deny this gift, this co-creative calling—because there was an “*existence of a*

*divine love*,” Bozell wrote, “*that yearns for an openness to the gift of life*”—was to reject God’s love.<sup>185</sup> The use of contraception, then, intrinsically was both a denial of life and the refusal of God’s love. It was the “the willful prevention of human life, a deliberate No-saying to the highest expression of God’s love, His offer of Life in Himself,” Bozell wrote, “and so it is proscribed by the first and greatest Commandment: ‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind, and with thy whole strength.’”<sup>186</sup> Abortion, in contrast, was the “willful destruction of human life,” already existing, which “merely cuts short a human experience of life” and was accordingly, he noted, “proscribed by a derivative Commandment, the fifth: ‘Thou shalt not murder.’”<sup>187</sup> “Contraception blocks the very entrance to Life; it refuses to cooperate with God in making a being be;” he wrote, it “denies *Him* the love of a new son. Is there a greater evil that men can do? Is there a greater horror, as mirrored now in explicit public policy and almost universal private practice, that a nation can embrace?”<sup>188</sup>

The issues were to be linked, then, by an understanding that the use of contraception, as it was a denial of life, was the refusal of God’s love, which was the base evil that made abortion possible. Once man and woman rejected God’s love, once they no longer loved God, so would they soon forget the sacredness of life—which was sacred because it was brought into existence and sustained *by God’s love*—and legalize abortion.

The *Roe v. Wade* decision—which barred legal restrictions on abortions during the first trimester of pregnancy—was not, to the editors, a watershed

event; as “the logic of Nazism had long since made it clear, long before the first ovens fired into life, the tremendous carnage that was coming,” so, they reasoned, was America’s holocaust of the unborn “announced and advertised long ago” by a consistent anti-Christian slide into barbarism.<sup>189</sup> “By 1973, rejection of the Catholic teaching about life was not only articulated public policy in most departments of the American civil arrangement—from the Presidency down; it was, more importantly,” the editors wrote, “the strongest and deepest current—what we call the mainstream—of American culture: that dominant set of commitments and aspirations that make a civil society what it is. To this policy and culture the Supreme Court was eminently faithful.”<sup>190</sup> Nor, then, would the decision be a significant day in history books. So as “the date on which the first Jew was put to death under color of Nazi law” is slighted for a concentration on “the civilizational swamp into which Nazism had led Germany, the swamp out whose mire grew the monster that killed the millions,” so “it is that January 22, 1973, will probably *not* live in history as a day of infamy.”<sup>191</sup>

Yet the editors believed that the decision was important, because it would make evident, for those Catholics who still needed convincing, that the United States was fundamentally anti-Christian. Had the government not authorized the murder of the unborn? It was from only this vantage point—from the recognition of the thoroughly anti-Christian nature of the United States—that Catholics could affect change, could, that is, build a new system. The decision, then, had the ability to set Catholics apart “from the rest of the citizenry as never before,” they

believed, “not in righteousness,” but in a renewed accountability to the moral law.<sup>192</sup>

Despite the acute legal sense of the editors, they were not overly concerned with the decision itself. It was, they tersely argued, illogical, unprecedented, and inventive; all of which were hallmarks of the long-ago positivist turn in American jurisprudence.<sup>193</sup> The consequence of which was to bind the interpretation of the law, or indeed its invention, to fluctuating ideological considerations—that is, the law, as decreed by the Supreme Court, was intrinsically manipulable, relative, and subjective.<sup>194</sup> Yet, notwithstanding the predictability of the decision—which made it quite useless to analyze—it still provided, because of the gravity with which people viewed the decision, an important constitutional lesson. “If the Supreme Court has performed any useful service in its decision on abortion,” the editors wrote, “it is to put the Constitution in its proper light,” which, as the Court decided, is that it “embraces the right to kill, but not the obligation to protect and nurture innocent human life.”<sup>195</sup> It could never be assumed again that the Constitution “frames a political ethic satisfying to the demands of Christian justice, or even natural justice.”<sup>196</sup> Because, they concluded, “It must be viewed in the quite practical—no cynical—light of an instrument beneficial to justice only if properly manipulated; and equally manipulable in the service of injustice.”<sup>197</sup> The Constitution, as Bozell had argued years earlier, was but the tool of the reigning ideology—in this case secular liberalism, as it invoked no authority higher than the people.<sup>198</sup> It was not, they noted, “a pleasant lesson,” teaching as it did that “the American political

order is without a grounding in justice.”<sup>199</sup> “But it is a necessary lesson if the Supreme Court’s anti-life decision is to be anything,” they wrote, “but that incidental moment in history when America’s slide into the slime of barbarism was formally ratified.”<sup>200</sup>

The *Roe v. Wade* decision further intensified the paradox the editors confronted over political participation. The decision had blaringly reaffirmed, more than any other event, their belief that the American order was inherently anti-Christian, and thus irredeemable, which made participation seemingly futile. Yet, they noted, a “great body of Americans who hate abortion still believe that there is recourse within the system,” and “any strategy that would now turn its back entirely on constitutional action must be a strategy to deprive the millions of leadership and to risk alienating them permanently.”<sup>201</sup> The strategy, then, was to “have one foot inside the system”—so long as the pro-life movement focused on a constitutional amendment to ban abortion, which they viewed only as a stopgap measure.<sup>202</sup> And while they noted that “Virtually nobody believes that a constitutional amendment will really be obtained,” they pointed out also that “virtually nobody believes that there is anything else to strive for,” which presented a possible opportunity to teach these confounded but passionate “millions” of an alternative; that the ultimate solution was to form a public order subject to Christ’s vicar.<sup>203</sup>

What was the specific obligation of Catholics in light of the *Roe v. Wade* decision? Their immediate duty was “to pursue with all possible vigor a campaign to amend the federal Constitution so as to assure civil protection to the

unborn.”<sup>204</sup> The second obligation was to sever their loyalty to the American order. “The chief illusion to be dispelled,” the editors wrote, “is the comfortable superstition that allegiance to the American public order is still compatible with allegiance to the Catholic Faith.”<sup>205</sup> “Millions of innocent children are *now* scheduled for slaughter because the whole civil authority of the land is bound to permit and support the slaughter. For that reason, if for no other,” they noted, “the moral bonds of civil allegiance are necessarily suspended for Catholics; and restoration of the bonds requires a change, not in the Catholic position, but in the American position.”<sup>206</sup> Catholics, then, outside of their efforts to pass an amendment banning abortion, were to become separatists. This was the only morally tenable position, because it was the only way to affect real change. “The stance of the Catholic people . . . cannot be that of supplicants pleading for a civil reform congenial to their sensibilities,” they instructed; “rather it must be that of forced exiles, having laid down their own terms for reconciliation.” The American order, they reasoned, must not be reformed, but formed into something else that conformed to Catholic faith. As such, “Catholics,” they wrote:

Can have no hesitation about conforming their conduct to the norms of a law higher than the civil law. This means, in principle, that they will claim the right of civil disobedience. It means, in practice, that they will adopt such tactics as are conducive to observance of the higher law—now by persons in their individual capacities, eventually, God willing, by some civil authority. . . . Another way of saying this is that law and order can no longer be a slogan for Catholics.<sup>207</sup>

“In short, the effort to amend the Constitution must not be seen as a limitation on Catholic politics,” they wrote, “but rather as one means among others of activating and advancing Catholic politics.”<sup>208</sup> This type of movement

must uphold, logically, they reasoned, *the* Catholic position; it could not include half-measures, concessions to therapeutic abortions (any and all forms of abortion were murder and should be forbidden) or exclude the contraceptive issue—it must express the whole Catholic teaching on life, which was the only sure guarantee, they believed, for the protection of life. “To condone contraception, even tacitly, is to unravel the whole thread that ties together the Catholic teaching about life and love. Admit contraception,” they wrote, “and every stricture on sexual practice can be dismissed—and is now being dismissed by our contraceptive society—as a Puritan hangup. View married carnality as merely a license for an orgasm,

And there soon will be neither marriage nor family in any Christian sense, and human carnality in general must sink beneath that of the beasts. More: if man does not see himself as a co-creator of life made in the womb in God’s image, he will seek to be a creator of life made in a test tube in the image of some scientist’s or politician’s twisted notion of social convenience.<sup>209</sup>

“I am He Who Is, says Yahweh; and I am the Life, says Christ; and from Them eternally proceeds the Lord and Giver of Life. By casting itself against life, America has not merely cast aside a fundamental commandment”—note Bozell’s reasoning in this editorial comment—“it has chosen to oppose God Himself in the profoundest way open to man.”<sup>210</sup>

The editors’ dogmatic inflexibility on the issue of life fostered immediate disillusionment with the national pro-life movement—which they hoped would reflect the Catholic position—specifically with the National Right to Life Committee, which was much more willing to countenance a pragmatic approach, including ignoring the issue of contraception, conceding therapeutic abortions,

and distancing itself from any Catholic appellation.<sup>211</sup> To ignore the issue of contraception was to treat the symptom but not the disease.<sup>212</sup> To concede any form of therapeutic abortion was to forfeit “the sole unifying principle that justifies the very existence of a pro-life movement—the principle that human life is a gift of God. . . . And the movement,” contributor John Short argued, “would self-destruct were it to sell out that principle.”<sup>213</sup> To distance itself from the Catholic position, indeed not to become a Catholic movement, was to enter the struggle insufficiently armed. It was the Catholic Church alone, the editors chorused triumphantly, that professed the truth on the sanctity of life in its origin, God’s love—and therefore provided the only true bulwark for the defense of life. This is what Bozell meant when he wrote: “If the life movement is serious about locating American politics at Auschwitz, it will become serious about acquiring the armament for dealing with Auschwitz in the Lord’s name.”<sup>214</sup>

The editors were not concerned with pluralistic niceties, because, as evidenced, they believed that the Church possessed the truth for all men and all societies, but also for political practicality. The anti-life movement, after all, they believed, was “not simply a narrow drive for legalized abortion,” it was, Short wrote, a “sweeping program aimed at revolutionizing moral belief and practices and the social and political institutions which reflect and support those beliefs and practices.”<sup>215</sup>

By the mid-1970s, the editors believed that the pro-life movement was dead, in any effective sense, and was “going nowhere.”<sup>216</sup> This was due to the fact, they believed, that “America does not want to restrict the right to abortion,”

but also because of the failings of the pro-life movement, which had become too secular and too compromising.<sup>217</sup> They traced this failure to a division between two groups in the pro-life movement—those pro-lifers (including Catholics), who believed that America’s acceptance of permissive abortion was “a jarring inconsistency, a blot on an otherwise clean record,” and tended toward compromise believing that “Some amendment, *any* amendment, must at least cosmetically cover the blot,” and those who perceived that “a record upon which the indiscriminate slaughter of millions of innocents appears is unlikely to be otherwise immaculate.”<sup>218</sup> The latter tended not to reform but to revolution, sensing as they did that the problems were structural.<sup>219</sup> The editors counted themselves among this “second breed,” which envisioned a “revolution that ‘will have to go the whole route.’ A route that ends in ‘Heaven’”—a “Christian Revolution.”<sup>220</sup>

Without Catholic unity, and thus, “unable to impose by the strength of their unified leverage a political reform,” the movement became secular and impotent.<sup>221</sup> In “the absence of wholehearted and universal Catholic participation, the ‘right-to-life’ movement has neither the strength nor the spiritual depth,” they concluded, “to move the political process.”<sup>222</sup> The editors concluded that the secular, national pro-life movement, then, was no longer a viable option for those Catholics “who have not surrendered to the liberal malaise.”<sup>223</sup> For such “apostolic Catholics,” their obligation was “neither educational nor political in the narrow sense of those words”—for “they can neither enlighten nor ballot the Americans to humanity”—but was “one of conversion.”<sup>224</sup> “The pro-life struggle,

that is to say, has become more clearly than ever a religious struggle. Its mission,” they instructed, “is the evangelization of the Americans: bringing them truth within Christ’s Mystical Body, as the only sound means of causing them to cease their war on It.”<sup>225</sup>

The ineffectiveness of the national movement, if disheartening, was also hopeful, as it further demonstrated the reality—and thus foreshadowed the solution—that the Catholic position was incompatible with the American system; when even reformist possibilities were ineffective, Catholics could recognize that its “heart beats to an un-Christian rhythm.”<sup>226</sup> They “must now see themselves as commissioned, not to amend the American Constitution,” the editors wrote, “but to amend the American Way.”<sup>227</sup> From this vantage point came the solution of conversion, which was, Lawrence reiterated, “the only hope of establishing justice in this land.”<sup>228</sup> But also peace; as Donald Demarco noted, the “child’s taste of peace in the mother accounts for his thirst for peace in the world,” and once birthed, man is searching “to recover peace.”<sup>229</sup> The “genesis of all desire for peace is within the mother,” and to undermine the “dignity and beauty of the mother-with-child” with abortion, was to “destroy the wellsprings of peace.”<sup>230</sup> War will certainly be with us, he concluded, “as long as we make war on motherhood and the innocent harbinger of peace within her.”<sup>231</sup> The “world cannot accept Christ or peace or love when it accepts abortion. The babe in the primal state of the womb brings us a message. It is a message,” He wrote, “from another world—from God. Abortion is the decision not to listen to God and to ignore His most convincing argument for peace.”<sup>232</sup> The feminist war against

motherhood—her divinely-ordained being—was yet another part of secular-liberal America’s refusal to listen to Christ.<sup>233</sup>

## Feminism

Hundreds of students, as well as priests and nuns, filled Maloney Hall on March 10, 1971 at the Catholic University of America to hear Grace Ti Atkinson speak. She was a feminist activist and a critic of the Roman Catholic Church. Hundreds more gathered in the Nursing Auditorium to watch her on closed-circuit television. Atkinson originally was banned from speaking at the Catholic University by its president, Clarence C. Walton, because in past lectures she had blasphemed the Virgin Mary. Students, however, challenged the ban in court and won—a judge ruled that Atkinson had a constitutional right to speak at the university. That same night, in reaction to Atkinson’s appearance, around 1,500 people attended a “mass of reparation” at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception located adjacent to the campus.<sup>234</sup> There also were demonstrators outside Maloney Hall, including a contingent of the red-bereted Sons of Thunder, who were on their knees praying the rosary. An old man carried “a gilt edged pictured of the Virgin Mary and the words, ‘Do you love Mary? Pray with us for insults to the Mother of God.’”<sup>235</sup> Another sign read: “Mary Liberated the World Through Her Divine Son.”<sup>236</sup>

Back inside the Hall, Atkinson ridiculed the virgin birth, at which point Patricia Bozell arose from her seat and shouted out—“I can’t let her say that”—as

she ran toward the podium and proceeded to slap Atkinson.<sup>237</sup> Patricia Bozell then left the auditorium and prayed with the Sons of Thunder. Atkinson, meanwhile, attributed the outburst to the desperation women felt at being “had” by the Church—that is, tricked into becoming principally procreators; elsewhere, she had stated that the “Church’s chief source of income” was “women’s vaginas.”<sup>238</sup>

The feud continued the next day at separate press conferences. Atkinson, after learning the identity of her assailant, remarked that “Mrs. Bozell is a prostitute for her husband and for the Church.”<sup>239</sup> Patricia Bozell defended her actions: “I have been brought up to believe that intolerance of blasphemy is a Christian duty.”<sup>240</sup> “How could other members of a presumably Catholic audience snivelingly, and masochistically, applaud an illiterate harangue against the Mystical Body of Christ? The president of Catholic University, Dr. Walton, and his associates,” she stated, “had to choose between obeying the commandment of a secular court and the Second Commandment of God. Men would have chosen to obey God and endure the consequences.”<sup>241</sup> “I am,” she smilingly concluded, “proud to be a woman.”<sup>242</sup>

Patricia Bozell’s effort to strike Atkinson was seen as an act against blasphemy—as *Triumph’s* editors reported, “*blasphemy* was the challenge to which this Christian woman reacted from the depths of her being”—and, by extension, it was an act against the secularization of Catholic universities.<sup>243</sup> Note, for example, her derision of Catholic University administrators, who, in her estimation, conceded the Catholic integrity of the university by submitting to the

dictates of students and the secular law. Atkinson's criticisms of Mary and of the Catholic Church were attacks on the Catholic conception of womanhood—of which Mary was the exemplar; that woman were divinely ordained as mothers and nurturers. This is what Atkinson ultimately blasphemed—the sacredness of being mother and nurturer. Patricia Bozell acted, therefore, against what she viewed as the vulgar feminist notion that such a conception was but a male-engineered and artificially imposed role to subjugate women and perpetuate a state of female inferiority.

For *Triumph's* editors, the role as mother and nurturer implied the subordination of wife to husband, but it did not suggest a qualitative judgment that man was superior to woman, but posited rather innate (rather than artificially imposed) complementary differences and purposes to glorify God.<sup>244</sup> Feminists undermined this complementarity between the different sexes, the editors worried, by positing female equality—that man and woman could have the same purposes—which would, in effect, serve to eliminate distinctions (and thus the necessary complimentary roles). This would, ultimately, destroy the family—a divinely-ordained community designed to aid the pursuit of salvation, teach and spread the faith, and serve as the bedrock of civilization—for which the woman was the wellspring.<sup>245</sup>

Wives were to be subordinate to their husbands. “Women must recall often that they are to obey their husbands as the Church obeys its Head,” Anne Westhoff Carroll wrote, “thereby showing their children the need to refer all things back to Christ.”<sup>246</sup> “As long as she is married, her husband is her head, but even

so, only in the sense that Christ is the Head of the Church. Like Christ,” Solange Hertz wrote, “he should elicit her loving obedience by ‘sacrificing himself for her, to make her holy,’ as St. Paul explained to the Ephesian husbands.”<sup>247</sup> “She submits to her husband’s authority not because she’s weaker, or inferior, or anything else, but because she submits to Christ. This authority—his and Christ’s—is exercised for her benefit, not his,” she wrote, “and in consequence he must treat her ‘the way Christ treats the Church, because [she] is his body.’”<sup>248</sup>

In the view of the editors, feminists had misread marriage. They had read it within a non-Christian context in which obtaining power, not serving Christ, was the objective of life; thus, they determined that because it was man who had power historically, woman was the inferior or marginal creature.<sup>249</sup> But all authority in the Christian context was Christ’s, and all power was to be rendered unto Him; it was not to be used for the domination or exploitation of his wife, but for her betterment—for the right ordering of roles, his as provider, and hers as nurturer, which helped her maximize her divinely ordained purpose and therefore live in consonance with her true being. Accordingly, feminists posited a false dialectic; they envisioned an inherent and selfish competition for domination constituting the relationship between man and woman and read history as such, seeing men—who had wielded the most power—as their antagonists, who had subjugated women and enshrined the latter’s supposed inferiority in all cultural, political, religious, and social institutions.<sup>250</sup> It was in this light that feminists viewed the marital relationship, in which man had the most power, and deemed

the woman's role as mother and nurturer as exploitive and the source of her supposed inferiority.

*Triumph's* staff did not equate such a role with inferiority. Patricia Bozell believed that women were actually "superior to men."<sup>251</sup> Women, serving principally as mothers and nurturers, were very significant; through such a role they served a vital function in the economy of salvation. This significance, however, was rooted in their differences from men. Here again, they argued, feminists misread the situation. They sought to synthesize their false dialectic by positing another falsity—the equality and, by extension, similarity of man and woman; "they are proclaiming out loud that women are no good at all," Hertz wrote, "that to qualify as human beings they must be like men."<sup>252</sup>

Rather, women gave witness to their significance—their redemptive role—when they portrayed their human nature, analogously, to the Holy Spirit and modeled their lives after Mary. Hertz explained that God created man and woman differently and complimentary to project His trinitarian love in the world. As God is more one in the union of three distinct Persons so "Adam was made two so that mankind could be more truly one."<sup>253</sup> "Man and woman are distinct as sexes, but like God they share the same nature—our human nature. And," Hertz wrote, "because of this union between the sexes we are able like God to produce a third person who also shares our common nature" (thus projecting, by incarnating, the trinitarian order).<sup>254</sup> While the woman shares the same human nature with man and her children, "*she portrays it differently*. It's essential that

she do so. Women must be women so that men can be men. Otherwise,” she noted, “God’s trinitarian life cannot be projected clearly in the world.”<sup>255</sup>

The woman was “patterned,” furthermore, “after the Holy Spirit in the Blessed Trinity;” note, Hertz pointed out, that there “is no question of inferiority, but only of order and relationship.”<sup>256</sup> As the Holy Spirit is the “Giver of Life” and the “Paraclete, the ‘Helper,’” so woman, she wrote, “has only one vocation: motherhood.”<sup>257</sup> A woman “may not always be called to natural, physical motherhood,” she noted, “but she is always called to spiritual or supernatural motherhood. By the power of the Holy Spirit every baptized woman is meant to become the mother of Christ.”<sup>258</sup> This was how Christian mothers helped engineer salvation—by projecting the trinitarian order into the world and thereby giving and nurturing life—they increased the Christian seed and therefore helped sow redemption.

The perfect human analogue of the Holy Spirit whom women were called to imitate, was Mary. While Eve had acted against Adam and thereby “disrupted the trinitarian order of the sexes” and ushered in man’s fall, Mary undid Eve’s sin through her obedience to the will of God, but also to man—“She obeyed without question,” Hertz wrote, “a husband who was her equal neither in grace nor destiny.”<sup>259</sup> It was Mary’s obedience to her *life-giving* purpose, to God’s will, and, by extension, her husband’s authority, that helped her engineer man’s redemption. Mary’s obedience, furthermore, was derived from her faith—as Hertz pointed out: “She became the Mother of God because she was blessed with faith; she wasn’t blessed with faith because she was the Mother of God.”<sup>260</sup>

Women, then, were called like Mary to be arks of faith on Earth—testaments of obedience in faith to God’s will; specifically, they were to have faith in their calling as givers of life, as mothers, that their seed would help hasten the coming of the Kingdom, that indeed the “Son of one of us,” she wrote, “will one day finally and irrevocably crush the head of the serpent and all his brood.”<sup>261</sup>

The feminist assault on the uniqueness of the woman—her generative being—was at its root an attack on the family. The movement for the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) was “only incidentally concerned with women,” the editors wrote; it “is above all a prescription for the restructuring of the social order and the dismantling of its central unit—the family,” which “was a creation of the woman.”<sup>262</sup> The family was presided over by the woman, “as from a pedestal—a pedestal uniquely fashioned by the God of the Christians for His Mother. . . . All women stand under this Providence, inherit this right, and no constitutional amendment can repeal it;” but, the movement’s attempt “to do so,” they noted, “could destroy society.”<sup>263</sup> Thus, the editors wrote that the “entire staff of *Triumph* is opposed to the ERA. We *know* we are opposed to it. We even despise it. It is against our principles. . . . We are unequivocally against ERA.”<sup>264</sup> If the housewife falls, Hertz wrote, so does the “basic cell of society.”<sup>265</sup>

The Christian family was sacred; indeed, it was “a cell of the Mystical Body of Christ, a whole church in miniature,” Hertz wrote, that by “its very nature partakes of the promises Christ made to the greater Ecclesia.”<sup>266</sup> Like the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, its nature was one (though it contained different members, it was one body under Christ), holy (it was “a divine creation

from the beginning”), catholic (it was universal and missionary), and apostolic (it was built “on the same rock as the Church,” she wrote, “it too shall withstand the gates of hell as long as it remains in union with Peter. And like her it will teach its children, and through them the world”).<sup>267</sup> “Due proportion kept,” Hertz stated, “what the Holy Spirit says of the dedication of a church applies to any Christian home:

‘Terrible is this place; it is the House of God, and the Gate of heaven; and it shall be called the Court of God. . . . This place has been made by God; it is a mystery beyond measure and free from all stain. . . . My house shall be called the house of prayer, says the Lord: in it every one that asks receives: and he that seeks finds, and to him that knocks it shall be opened.’<sup>268</sup>

The family, then, like the Church, had a salvific mission; specifically, it was to rear Christian soldiers “destined to battle the Adversary—and win.”<sup>269</sup>

The primary nurturer of the family was the mother, while the father’s role, which must be analogous to God the Father, was as “worker, ruler and provider” of the family; the mother’s role—to reiterate—analogue to the Holy Spirit, was that of life giver, nurturer, sustainer.<sup>270</sup> The most vital nurturing and sustaining role of the mother—as the family was principally a conduit of Christianity—was that of teaching the faith. “The first doctrinal milk must flow from her, from her very being,” Hertz wrote, “as it does from the Church.”<sup>271</sup> She was, in regard to the faith, the Church in miniature, “both *mater* and *magistra*.”<sup>272</sup>

The maternal role, given the salvific nature of the family, was vital, and not, as some feminists claimed or implied, a menial task. Rather, given the greater mission of the family, it was sacred work. “The chores this world excoriates as mindless drudgery,” Hertz wrote, “are, for her, sacramentals for the

remission of sins, hers and others'.<sup>273</sup> “When domesticity is called drudgery all the difficulty arises from a double meaning in the word,” Hertz quoted G.K.

Chesterton: “I admit the woman drudges in the home—

As a man might drudge at the Cathedral of Amiens or drudge behind a gun at Trafalgar. But if it means that the hard work is more heavy because it is trifling, colourless and of small import to the soul, then, as I say, give it up; I do not know what the words mean.<sup>274</sup>

Yet feminists encouraged women to find fulfillment outside of the home, which was, Hertz wrote, “to tear her from her duties in the divine economy” of salvation.<sup>275</sup> Working outside the home discouraged the mother’s procreating and nurturing role. “This state of affairs suits the world very well. Its ideal working woman is hardly an incubator, as women’s lib complains, or even a sex object. It’s a *mule*,” Hertz wrote, “a smooth-bellied sexless hybrid with feminine configurations answering to ‘Molly’ or some other female appellation, who is incapable of procreation, but can outwork an ox.”<sup>276</sup> The feminist attack on the generative role of the mother precipitated the breakdown in her role as nurturer. When work was placed above her generative role, Hertz wrote, then “the divine image is destroyed in mankind both individually and collectively.”<sup>277</sup> The woman who chose to work outside of the home was no longer in consonance with her maternal being and no longer projected the trinitarian order in the world.

The only choice for the Christian woman, then, was one of martyrdom—to “suffer to give witness, to cling to the simple truth of her vocation before her persecutors”—for her family and society.<sup>278</sup> “Unless God himself places her in conditions which require her to work,” Hertz wrote, “the Christian mother today must quite simply sacrifice her career—morally quite expendable—to the greater

good of her motherhood. The Trinitarian structure of society depends on her witness.”<sup>279</sup> “To run a home is to tend to a sanctuary,” she wrote—“God’s presence must be kept there ‘without ceasing’ by prayer, study and the homely liturgy of housework.”<sup>280</sup> Here again, Mary was the exemplar. “It’s precisely fidelity to her maternal vocation that constituted her Queen of Martyrs,” Hertz wrote.<sup>281</sup> “Had she sought to save her own life as so many of her daughters are doing, by pursuing a career significant only to herself or the world, she would have lost not only her own life,” she pointed out, “but ours too. The Christian mother who ignores her spotless example isn’t engineering Redemption. In due time her eyes, like Eve’s, will be opened on the inevitable fall of the Human race.”<sup>282</sup>

The editors’ anguish over what they viewed as secular-liberal America’s attack on the sanctity of sex, life in the womb, and the family convinced them of the validity of their thesis that America was morally decadent and was headed for collapse and that the only cure was to turn to the Church of Rome. They believed that this attack was an explicit rejection of God, and it widened their eyes and ensured their rejection of any pragmatic compromises with the American state and society.

## NOTES

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Ruth Johnston, "Reactions: Abortion," *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 3.
- <sup>2</sup> Jerry Krebs, "Reactions: The Kiss of Death," *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 43.
- <sup>3</sup> Charles Rice, interview by Patrick Allitt, 3 March 1991, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.
- <sup>4</sup> Solange Hertz, "The Crack in the Board," *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 23.
- <sup>5</sup> John T. McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom: A History* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company), 216-249.
- <sup>6</sup> Leslie Woodcock Tentler, *Catholics and Contraception: An American History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), 7, 1-14, 73-129.
- <sup>7</sup> McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom*, 162.
- <sup>8</sup> Pope Pius XI, "On Christian Marriage," The Holy See, [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/pius\\_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xi\\_enc\\_31121930\\_casti-connubii\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_31121930_casti-connubii_en.html) (accessed July 10, 2008).
- <sup>9</sup> Tentler, *Catholics and Contraception*, 9.
- <sup>10</sup> McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom*, 189-215.
- <sup>11</sup> Tentler, *Catholics and Contraception*, 10; and McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom*, 216-249. For the history of Catholics and contraception, see Tentler, *Catholics and Contraception*; and McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom*, 216-249.
- <sup>12</sup> *The Encyclopedia of American Catholic History*, s.v. "Humanae Vitae: Its Reception in America."
- <sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>14</sup> The editors noted, quoting from Pope Paul VI himself, that the appointing of the commission did not call into question the Church's opposition to contraception defined in Pius XI's encyclical, *On Christian Marriage* (1930), or imply that the teaching was "not binding as if the magisterium of the Church were in a state of doubt;" rather, what was in consideration, the editors believed, was an evaluation of anovulants. Editors, "Birth Control: The Pope Has Spoken," *Triumph* 1 no. 4 (December, 1966): 37.
- <sup>15</sup> Editors, "Birth Control: The Pope Has Spoken," 37.
- <sup>16</sup> Pope Paul VI, "On the Regulation of Birth," The Holy See, [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/paul\\_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_enc\\_25071968\\_humanae-vitae\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_25071968_humanae-vitae_en.html) (accessed July 9, 2008).
- <sup>17</sup> Germain G. Grisez, "Contraception and Reality, Part II," *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 21.
- <sup>18</sup> Germain G. Grisez, "Contraception and Reality, Part II," 21. "Contraception does attack human life—not of course life already existing—but life in its very beginning," contributor German

---

Grisez wrote. “The will to prevent conception,” he argued, “is a will turned against human life in advance, a will so opposed to life that it chooses to anticipate and effectively prevent a new person from coming to be. This is why St. John Chrysostom thought this sin even worse than murder. . . . One’s conception is his origin, the beginning of his life, his link to the community of men before him, the first of all the gifts he receives from his parents, his first relationships with God, who stretches forth His creative hand and . . . gives both life and an eternal destiny with the touch of His omnipotent finger.”

<sup>19</sup> Germain G. Grisez noted that many of the arguments for contraception were rooted in a “commonsense realism”—that the use of contraceptives was much more realistic to the demands of modernity, given that they reduced the demands on the community (by limiting the population), and the demands on the family (by stabilizing it), and the demands on the individual (by placating his or her sexual nature). Yet, he reasoned, such perceptions of reality were subjective (and ultimately relative), as they were not informed by the teachings of the supernatural Church or God’s will, but derived from “what we care about. . . . A realistic solution to the Jewish problem—according to Hitler—was genocide,” he added. (22) Grisez also warned that to follow such a view would be to follow the Protestants into error. The assumption that it was realistic to change the Church’s teaching—because it was much more practical to permit the use of contraceptives, than demand that people abstain from their use—to prevent a large-scale defection from the Church, was the same assumption that motivated Protestants to adjust their teaching, but “on the whole,” Grisez pointed out, “their churches have not gained ground.” (22) “The Protestant search for relevance to the present has only caused the loss of the real relevance Christianity always has to the world,” he wrote: “That it offers salvation, reconciliation of sinful man to God, the coming of His kingdom, the transformation of all human things to a divine meaning and value. Those who ‘progressed to’ secular standards or morality found very soon that they had left behind that supernaturalism that is the whole meaning and value of the Gospel.” (22) The Church’s teaching on contraception was deemed ridiculous by the secular world, but Catholics “should not be scandalized at the necessity of accepting as the will of God what seems absurd,” Grisez wrote. (23) “Contraception is not wrong because it involves a bit of rubber or a pill”—as the commonsense realists imagine—“It is wrong,” he argued, for the very supernatural reason, that “it implies a will to prevent the beginning of life.” (23) “Those who live by the realism of this world always will find Christianity irrelevant. But if the Church of Christ were to concur in the realism of the world,” he concluded, “it would become nothing but salt that had lost its savor.” (24) Germain G. Grisez, “Contraception and Reality,” *Triumph* 2 no. 2 (February, 1967): 21-24. In another article, Grisez focused on the popular justification for contraceptive use that sexual intercourse was necessary for conjugal love and “that contraception is necessary to make this intercourse possible.” (19) Grisez doubted that even if such a view was true that it would “justify contraception,” but he concluded that the assumption was “false.” (19) “If sexual intercourse is going to express and foster true conjugal love, it must be chosen with the utmost freedom for the sake of love,” but “If a person desires sexual release in such a way that foregoing the release leads to trouble,” he noted, “then coitus can hardly be a free and generous gift of self.” (20) “Love cannot be a compulsion upon the self and thus a restriction of freedom;” he wrote, “rather, it must be an act of the self in full expression of its freedom. Contraceptive intercourse, so often proclaimed *necessary* for the sake of genuine conjugal love, is at best an ambiguous act of love. Is it the person saying, ‘I love you’? Or is it a conditioned reflex saying, ‘I demand release’? The force of an animal impulse that cannot be curbed by reason is something quite different from free self-donation in authentic conjugal love.” (20) “Ideally,” he concluded, “a married couple should not feel that sexual intercourse is necessary. They should not feel compelled to engage in it,” rather, “It should be an available option, a way of communicating with each other, a way of celebrating the pervasive communion of fidelity in which they live, a means of cooperating in the initiation of new life.” (20) Germain G. Grisez, “Contraception and Reality, Part II,” *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 18-21. Also, see German G. Grisez, “Reactions: Prof. Grisez Replies,” *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 5-6; and German G. Grisez, “Contraception and Reality, III,” *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 27-30. Christopher Derrick doubted the possibility of a revision of the Church’s teaching on contraception, given the reasons for its restrictions on contraception and its

---

consistency on the matter. The “whole question of the *Magisterium*, of the Church’s teaching authority,” he wrote, “would have to be looked at in a completely different light. Some would say, in fact, that a whole series of theological ideas—hitherto regarded as central to ‘the Roman Catholic position’—would have become self-contradictory and therefore untenable.” Henceforward, he concluded, “It would not be easy to see a unique depository of revealed and certain knowledge, guided by the Spirit into all truth, in a Church that contradicted itself so flatly.” Christopher Derrick, “Love, Honesty, Babies: A Pagan View of Sex,” *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 19.

<sup>20</sup> Editors, “Great Day in the Morning!” *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 42.

<sup>21</sup> L. Brent Bozell, “Thou Shalt Love Life,” *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 19.

<sup>22</sup> L. Brent Bozell, “Thou Shalt Live Love,” *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 26.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> Pope Paul VI, “On the Regulation of Birth.”

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> This author employs the term contraception without the qualifier “artificial,” because while the term is defined as the “deliberate prevention of conception or impregnation”—see *Merriam Webster*, 10th ed., s.v. “contraception”—which would seem to include natural methods of regulating birth, the Church does not consider sex acts during the natural infertile periods as contraceptive sex. This is because in the Church’s understanding, the recourse to the infertile period is not rooted in an *intention* to deny life—as the Church believes the use of contraception is—rather, it is rooted in an intention to obey God’s design. As Pope Paul VI stated: “to experience the gift of married love while respecting the laws of conception is to acknowledge that one is not the master of the sources of life but rather the minister of the design established by the Creator.” Pope Paul VI, “On the Regulation of Birth.”

<sup>28</sup> Pope Paul VI, “*Humanae Vitae*.”

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>31</sup> L. Brent Bozell, “Thou Shalt Love Life,” 19.

<sup>32</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: A Place in the Sun,” *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 7.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>36</sup> *The Encyclopedia of American Catholic History*, s.v. “*Humanae Vitae*: Its Reception in America.”

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*; and Tentler, *Catholics and Contraception*, 266. Few issues in the post-Vatican II era, if any, have been as divisive in the Church as its teaching on contraception. By divisive, this

---

author does not mean primarily among Catholics—although there is a division between those who follow the Church’s teaching and those who do not—both Left and Right Catholics have disparaged the Church’s teaching on contraception. Rather, by divisive, this author is referring mainly to the division, or rather the disconnect that the Church’s teaching on contraception has fostered between the magisterium and the laity. Most Catholics, it is commonly accepted, ignore the teaching, which, it is assumed, has created a general lack of respect for other Church teachings. More and more Catholics, it is acknowledged, do not envision all of the Church’s teachings as lesser and greater parts of a whole, constituting a seamless fabric of moral truth, but rather as lesser and greater parts that do not constitute a seamless fabric of moral truth. This has fostered a subjective selectivity in adherence to the Church’s teaching authority. The individual conscience, that is, not the Church, decides what moral teachings are important and those that are not. Naturally, this has led to the Protestantization of American Catholicism and a breakdown in unanimity and the growth of apathy. To rectify the situation (although much of the Left, admittedly, cherishes the idea of a pluralistic faith), it is commonly assumed that the Church must abandon its teaching on contraception. But believing that the Church must avoid fostering further doubt about its authority, it must be disposed of by arguing that contraception is either consonant with the natural law (so argues the Right) or an antiquated moral teaching that can be abandoned because moral teachings are developmental (so argues the Left). Both sides base their view on an assumption that contraceptive sex is absolutely—without doubt, without question, without challenge—necessary. It is not this author’s intention to challenge this assumption, but to challenge rather the derivative assumption, already mentioned—that because contraception is supposedly necessary, the Church’s ban on it is the reason for the current state of apathy in the American Church. It is this author’s view that such apathy is the result of a decline in faith that preceded Pope Paul VI’s encyclical, *On the Regulation of Birth*. Faith in the supremacy of individual and subjective authority over that of a transcendent and objective authority—the root cause of apathy in the Church—if aided by the encyclical, began before its promulgation. The trajectory in American society, on the issue of religious values, has been toward their individualization. And it is more plausible that the Americanization of Catholics—that is the individualization of their faith, which began before the encyclical—and the so-called “spirit” of adaptation fostered by the Second Vatican Council, whether authorized or not, have encouraged the pluralization of the faith and the resulting apathy.

<sup>38</sup> Much of the theological dissent was rooted in the Pope Paul VI’s reliance on the natural law, which many theologians were abandoning in preference for a more experiential or developmental view of Catholic moral teaching. The natural law, in their estimation, would tie the Church’s moral teachings to antiquated cultural systems. See McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom*, 189-215.

<sup>39</sup> L. Brent Bozell, “Thou Shalt Love Life,” 19-24.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 24.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> Editors, “Great Day in the Morning!” 42.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup> Editors, “The Renegades,” *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 42.

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

<sup>49</sup> Editors, "Cardinal O'Boyle," *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (November, 1968): 42.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: "Still Bishop of the Year," *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 10; Editors, "Present Imperfect: State in Fide," *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 7.

<sup>53</sup> Editors, "Judgment Day," *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 45.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Militants, Arise!" *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 9.

<sup>56</sup> Editors, "Judgment Day," 45.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid.

<sup>58</sup> Editors, "Leap Into What?" *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 41.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid. and Editors, "Judgment Day," 46.

<sup>60</sup> Editors, "Judgment Day," 46.

<sup>61</sup> The editors wrote, for example, that the "President [Richard Nixon] sent a major legislative proposal to Congress asserting that '*we should establish as a national goal the provision of adequate family planning service within the next five years to all those who want them but cannot afford them,*' not a single bishop stepped forward to object. . . . No American president, certainly not Richard Nixon, would have dared to pilot this leap into the world of life-manipulation without persuasive evidence that the Catholic population had been neutralized, that the will and nerve of the Catholic hierarchy had evanesced." Editors, "Leap Into What?" 41.

<sup>62</sup> Editors, "Leap Into What?" 41. For other articles criticizing the government's promotion of contraception, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: Caesar Cleans Up," *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 8; and Editors, "Present Imperfect: Where Are All the Catholic People," *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 9-10.

<sup>63</sup> Editors, "Leap Into What?" 41.

<sup>64</sup> Editors, "The Myth Exploded," *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 45.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid. Collin Clark argued that statistics proving overpopulation were wrongheaded. He noted that Malthusians believe "that while improvements in agricultural productivity may come, their consequence is always an increase in population, which brings the human race back as near to the edge of famine as before. We can now see that the 'Malthusians' have got things upside down. It is not an improvement in agricultural productivity which promotes population growth. *It is population growth which promotes improvements in agricultural (and industrial) productivity.* And the reason why things happened this way and not the other way round is fundamentally that the new and more productive methods, at any rate when first adopted, call for harder work and changes in settled habits." Collin Clark, "Starvation or Plenty?" *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 16-17. Also, see Michael Lawrence, "Paul Ehrlich: Bombardier," *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 26-28.

---

<sup>66</sup> Editors, "The Myth Exploded," 45. Fred Domville argued that the real problem in the United States was depopulation. "The key to our population growth is the birth rate, which has historically been a healthy sign of our country's vigor. It reached a low point in the Depression and was further hampered by the Second World War. Then it made a dramatic comeback, rallying for over a decade before it peaked in 1957. Thereafter it headed down, and has been plunging ever since." Fred Domville, "The Depopulation Bomb," *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 19.

<sup>67</sup> Editors, "The Myth Exploded," 45.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid. Also on population, see Unsigned, "Tabling the (Population) Question," *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 26-27.

<sup>70</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "Is Demography a Mortal Sin?" *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 12.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., 13.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid. The italics are the author's.

<sup>79</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Science of Racism," *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 7. Also, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Sons of Thunder," *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 8.

<sup>80</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: We Could Be Wrong," *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 8. They believed that the contraception movement was driven also by economic discrimination. See Editors, "Present Imperfect: With This Loop, I Thee Wed," *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 9-10.

<sup>81</sup> Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Empty Womb, Empty Altar," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 20. They believed that the racist impetus for the contraceptive movement motivated the United States' global promotion of contraception—which was meant to limit the population growth of supposed inferior Third World peoples. Editors, "Present Imperfect: Robert Strange Pill," *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 9. Also, see Editors, "The Myth Exploded," 46.

<sup>82</sup> Farley Clinton, "Very Great Religious Leaders of Modern Times," *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 23. "(It is significant that claims over the right to live, and the concession to the state of legal authority to eradicate large sections of the population," Clinton wrote, "were seen first not in Hitler's Germany but ten or fifteen years before Hitler, in our own country, in the sterilization laws of many states. . . .)"

<sup>83</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Robert Strange Mani," *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (November, 1968) 9.

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibid. The italics are the editors'. The editors wrote: "The nation's Calvinist and Social Darwinist traditions seem to have coalesced in a Manichean synthesis. Dr. Mary Calderone, who was for eleven years medical director of the Planned Parenthood Federation, typified it with the comment that contraception is a 'polio vaccine' for today's 'dangerous epidemic of babies.'" Editors, "The Myth Exploded," 46.

<sup>85</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Robert Strange Mani," 8.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., 8-9.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid. It is important to note that the editors believed that racism was an expression of the Manichean mindset. They did not believe that there was a contradiction. Although racists sought the marginalization or elimination of one group and the magnification of their group, thus preferring *their* life, the editors maintained that racism was rooted in a hatred of *other* life. "Manicheans, old and new," they wrote, "have a way of desiring the elimination of someone else's life, not their own." Editors, "The Myth Exploded," 46.

<sup>93</sup> Lawrence, "Paul Ehrlich: Bombardier," 28. Lawrence argued that Ehrlich's book was full of generalizations and inaccuracies.

<sup>94</sup> Christopher Derrick, "Love, Honesty, Babies: A Pagan View of Sex," *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 34

<sup>95</sup> Ibid. Elsewhere Christopher Derrick wrote: "It is considered very correct and realistic nowadays to propose a strict limitation upon the number of people. But if you propose a similar limitation upon the number of cars you will encounter fierce contradiction: progress dictates that cars must reproduce their kind endlessly, at whatever the cost in life and amenity." Christopher Derrick; quoted in Lorenzo Albacete, "Arts and the Age: Aphrodite and a Roman Prelate," *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 29.

<sup>96</sup> Albacete, "Arts and the Age: Aphrodite and a Roman Prelate," 29. Furthermore, the editors believed that Planned Parenthood sought to promote contraception among the poor. The organization "*hates* babies, with the hellish hatred of despair. Having rejected Him Who is the source of all goodness in man, they have rejected Hope. They therefore despise the happy sons of God," they wrote, "who know how to laugh and how to make love. They will not endure the fruitfulness of Christ's Body, and so they seek to rot its weakest members, the poor. Editors, "Present Imperfect: With This Loop, I Thee Wed," *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 9-10.

<sup>97</sup> Charles E. Rice, "Government and the Copulation Explosion," *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 16.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., 17.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid.

---

<sup>100</sup> Ibid.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., 19.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid.

<sup>106</sup> Mark Pilon, "Virginity as a Political Problem," *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 26.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid., 26-27.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., 27.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., 26.

<sup>113</sup> Francis Canavan, "The Logic of Contraception," *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 26. (26-27, 38). Also, see German G. Grisez, "Contraception and Reality, III," 29-30; and Peter Riga, "Humanae Vitae and the New Sexuality," *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 18-20.

<sup>114</sup> This author does not mean to suggest that sex according to God's design—and the Church's interpretation—was not a biological act, it was this as well. In the Catholic view man and woman are at once both spiritual and material creatures, not both a spiritual and material creature as if each had two natures. Man and woman are of one spiritual and material nature. Thus, Pope Paul VI stated in his encyclical *Humanae Vitae* that contraception "is equally repugnant to the nature of man and of woman, and is consequently in opposition to the plan of God and His holy will." Pope Paul VI, "Humanae Vitae." Christopher Derrick wrote: "Let me therefore suggest, first of all, that there is something inherently dishonest—almost schizophrenic—in the act of contraceptive love-making. The body wants one thing, very plainly: each of the *bodies* concerned is intending a pregnancy and a baby, and brings into play a most elaborate machinery that has no other function or meaning whatsoever. But for reasons good or bad, the conscious mind doesn't want that natural and congruous consequence at all. You are split in two, therefore the action becomes split-minded, dishonest, meaningless. You are entering into a fundamentally false relationship with a person whom you profess to love." Christopher Derrick, "Love, Honesty, Babies: A Pagan View of Sex," 20-21. Peter Riga wrote: "The contraceptive mentality, I maintain, radically contradicts the inner syntax of human sexuality itself, and therefore ultimately destroys the humanity of the people who insistently act upon it. The very essence of the sex act, from a biological point of view, is procreative. We must clearly understand—under pain of sharing the new Manichaeism—that man's biological substratum is an essential dimension of him, and that radical separation from it disintegrates him at his basic root. This is above all true of the woman. The consequences of 'free sex' for her are especially disastrous since what she thereby denies is an essential and deeply rooted dimension of her very being. That is why abortion is basically an attack, not only on her child but on herself." Peter Riga, "Humanae Vitae and the New Sexuality," *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 20. Also, see German G. Grisez, "Contraception and Reality, III," 28-29.

---

<sup>115</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Absolving Homosexuals," *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 10.

<sup>116</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: All the Queen's Men," *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 10. Emphasis added.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.* In contrast, a society's acceptance of homosexuality was, the editors wrote, a "heinous crime" because "it is a cruelty to the sinner, for it masks his sight of the sin."

<sup>118</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: All the Queen's Men," 10. The editors supported the U.S. Bishops teaching on homosexuality. "The new guidelines [from the Bishops] affirm that opinions asserting a 'right to variety in sexual expression contingent upon sexual orientation' are erroneous and must be answered with firmness. Homosexual acts," they quoted the bishops, "are 'contrary to the will of God' because by their very nature they 'exclude all possibility of procreation of life.' If the homosexual is not able to overcome his inclinations, the instructions recommend the practice of chastity and the benefit of forming stable friendships. The guidelines acknowledge that compulsive behavior may mitigate the free will of homosexuals in many cases, but do not recognize any compulsion so complete as to eliminate moral responsibility. The Commission is absolutely opposed to the notion that homosexuals may live together in a 'faithful union' and instructs confessors to advise penitents that such unions are a grave source of temptation and must be dissolved." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Absolving Homosexuals," 10.

<sup>119</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Why Gays Make Hay," *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 9-10.

<sup>120</sup> For other articles on contraception, see Editors, "Present Imperfect: U.S. v. Babies et al," *Triumph* 2 no. 2 (February, 1967): 7; Editors, "Present Imperfect: McNamara v. People," *Triumph* 3 no. 11 (November, 1968): 7-8; William A. Marra, "Demythologizing Conscience," *Triumph* 3 no. 12 (December, 1968): 11-14; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Machismo," *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 10; Michael Lawrence, "The Pill: An Epidemic for the Healthy," *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 11-16; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Elementary, Dear Watson," *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 7; Maria Isabel De La Vega, "Alianza Para Genocido," *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 24-27; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Strings Attached," *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 9; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Oy, Oy, McHugh," *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 9; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Higher Brass," *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 9-10.

<sup>121</sup> Charles Rice stated that "one crucial thing with contraception is that you are willfully, at your own discretion, separating the unitive and procreative aspects of sex. The more basic thing is that man . . . makes himself arbiter of when life begins. . . . It's no longer the procreation of life according to the plan of the Creator. It's rather the untrammelled decision by human beings about when life should begin." Charles Rice interview by Patrick Allitt.

<sup>122</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Right Place is Dying," *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 8-9.

<sup>123</sup> Editors, "The Time Has Come," *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 27.

<sup>124</sup> Editors, "Alone, If Necessary," *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 38.

<sup>125</sup> Christopher Derrick, "The Rules of the Game," *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 17. Derrick wrote: "The cases are exactly parallel in fact; and on either side you hear the same excuse offered, that the Jew (in those days) and the unborn baby (in these days) is not really human at all. These two versions of the same excuse have exactly the same intellectual standing and value, which is zero. . . . From where he is now, Himmler can smile upon the abortionist and say '*Mon semblable, mon frère.*'" Also, see Editors, "It's a New Game," *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 46.

---

<sup>126</sup> Constantine P. Belisarius, S.J., “Reactions: Dies Irae, Dies Illa,” *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 41.

<sup>127</sup> Robert A. Miller, “The Rule of Demons,” *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 13.

<sup>128</sup> They called the “quality of life” rationale a “Hitlerian euphemism.” Editors, “The Time Has Come,” 27.

<sup>129</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: The Devil’s Legislation,” *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 8. Also, see Editors, “Liberty I,” *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 10.

<sup>130</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: The Devil’s Legislation,” 8.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*, 8-9.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>133</sup> The editors sardonically wrote: “We hereby propose that in every state which allows abortion to prevent the birth of a possibly defective child, the law be amended so that the killing takes place after birth—so that the killers may get a good look at their victim before performing their humane task.” Editors, “Present Imperfect: Let’s Kill a Born Baby,” *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 8.

<sup>134</sup> Diane Moczar, “Why the Pro-Life Battle is a Catholic Thing,” *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 24-25.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, 25. Moczar added that “‘Meaningless suffering’ is a modern cliché—as if any suffering were without meaning.”

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>138</sup> Editors, “Alone, If Necessary,” 38.

<sup>139</sup> Michael Lawrence, “Present Imperfect,” *Triumph* 5, no. 7 (July, 1970): 7-10, 42. Also, see Bozell, *Mustard Seeds A Conservative Becomes a Catholic: Collected Essays* (Manassas, VA: Trinity Communications, 1986), 350-360; and Unsigned, ed., *Frederick Daniel Wilhelmsen (Eminent Professor and Catholic Intellectual): A Tribute from the University of Dallas* (Dallas: University of Dallas, 1998), 63-64. Reader, R.C.F., wrote the following in response to the demonstration: “I pray that our King will form us in His image so that we will bear faithful witness to the truth, and spread the Kingdom that is not of this world, raising the physical sword though it cost us our life. Is there any other way?” R.C.F., “Reactions: June 6 Action for Life,” *Triumph* 5 no. 10 (October, 1970): 3.

<sup>140</sup> Wilhelmsen, “Empty Womb, Empty Altar,” 20.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*

---

<sup>144</sup> Constantine P. Belisarius, "Reactions: Dies Irae, Dies Illa," 41. The editors wrote: "So long as any unborn child can be legally murdered in the United States, not one of us should sleep well at night." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Surviving I" *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 10.

<sup>145</sup> Editors, "It's a New Game," *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 46.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid.

<sup>148</sup> Editors, "Killing Babies Is Legal," *Triumph* 2 no. 7 (July, 1967): 41. The National Conference of Catholic Bishops, the unified and authoritative voice on the Catholic Church in America, issued a number of pastoral letters that condemned abortion. For example, see *Human Life in Our Day* (1968), *Statement on Abortion* (1969), *Statement in Protest of U.S. Government Programs against the Right to Life* (1969), *Statement on Abortion* (1970), *Declaration on Abortion* (1970), *Statement on Abortion* (1973). See Hugh J. Nolan, ed., *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops: Volume II, 1962-1974* (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1983), 164-194, 198-199, 212-213, 254-255, 271, 366. In an editorial addressed to the bishops, in anticipation of their semi-annual meeting in April, 1969, the editors wrote: "We want you to try a little harder than you did last fall to affect the current national craze for baby killing." Editors, "Present Imperfect: A Pastoral," *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 10.

<sup>149</sup> Editors, "The Time Has Come," *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 27.

<sup>150</sup> They were distressed, then, when the bishops, in a statement in 1969, urged the government to forbid abortion on the "grounds that 'the rights of the unborn' are protected by the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment!" Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Bishops Shoot Par," *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 7. The bishops did, however, begin their *Statement in Protest of U.S. Government Programs against the Right to Life* with the teaching that "Every human person is made in the image of God and is called to share in eternal life with God. No price can be set on human life." Nolan, ed., *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, 212.

<sup>151</sup> Editors, "Liberty II," *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 41.

<sup>152</sup> Ibid.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid., 42.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid.

<sup>156</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Quo" *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 8. For the bishops April, 1970 statement, see Nolan, ed., *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, 254-255.

<sup>157</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Quo," 8.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid.

<sup>159</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Prologue," *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 7-10, 42. Also, see Michael Lawrence, "Present Imperfect: Epilogue," *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 42. Michael Lawrence, "The Trial," *Triumph* 5 no. 10 (October, 1970): 11-14.

---

<sup>160</sup> The editors also accused the bishops, in their Campaign for Human Development, which was founded to “to attack the root causes of poverty” in American society, of unwittingly funding organizations “involved in abortion and birth control activities.” Nolan, ed., *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops: Volume III, 1962-1974*, 273; and Editors, “An Inhuman Development,” *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 10, 45-46. Also, see Editors, “Present Imperfect: Come Clean,” *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 8; and William H. Marshner, “The Bishops’ Strange Love,” *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 11-14, 43. The editors were angry at bishops—especially the Church bureaucracy—for not giving its official support to the original National Right to Life Congress. The reason being, according to the editors, was that the bishops did not want to be associated with the militancy displayed by Bozell and others at the June, 1970 pro-life demonstration at the George Washington University Clinic in which five protestors, including Bozell, were arrested. See Editors, “Present Imperfect: “Who Promoted McHugh?”” *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 6; and Editors, “Present Imperfect: A Catholic Abortion: A documentary relating how an ecumenical, national campaign to uphold the dignity of human life was about to be born, and how the pregnancy was terminated by the national bureaucracy of the Catholic Church,” *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 7-12.

<sup>161</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Ben’ Fatto, Paolo,” *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 7.

<sup>162</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Catholics—Act!” *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 7-8. The editors were furious at Rockefeller who not only signed an abortion bill, but vetoed a bill to repeal such a law. They believed that such hatred of life could only have Satan as its source. They wrote: “SATAN SITS in Albany where, twice now, he has guided the hand of Nelson Rockefeller in consigning to death hundreds of thousands of innocent and defenseless human beings.” Editors, “Life in New York,” *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 45. In response to the criticism of Rockefeller, Lee Gilbert wrote: “I can’t help wondering if Rockefeller has persisted in his blindness for so long because of our failure to pray for the man, and I can’t help wondering if St. Paul owes his conversion to the Christians of Jerusalem who heard Jesus’s admonition to pray for those who persecute them. Maybe those hundreds of thousands of infants owe their deaths less to the sins of the Governor than to the fact that the Christians don’t care enough about the welfare of his eternal soul to pray and fast for him. Maybe it would be more to the point to replace those signs saying ‘Abortion is Murder’ with ‘Rosaries for Rockefeller.’” Lee Gilbert, “Reactions: Rosaries for Rockefeller,” *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 3-4.

<sup>163</sup> Editors, “Present Imperfect: Catholics—Act!” 8. The editors used the events in New York to demonstrate that American democracy was inherently immoral. The important point of Rockefeller’s veto of anti-abortion legislation was not, they wrote, that “democratic justice was not done, but that divine justice was not.” “Some Catholic Americans,” they believed, “will now see that the events in New York State last month shed a blood-red glare on the question: Is continued respect for the ideological chimeras of the eighteenth century worth a hundred thousand more lives? Is any political order that puts form before substance worth even one more life?” Editors, “Life in New York,” 45.

<sup>164</sup> Editors, “Liberty II,” 41.

<sup>165</sup> Bozell was furious with Buckley’s decision to print the article and asked him “to leave the Catholic conversation.” L. Brent Bozell, “Buckley and Luce,” *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 9.

<sup>166</sup> Patricia Bozell, “The Wages of Pluralism,” *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 19.

<sup>167</sup> Ibid.

<sup>168</sup> Ibid., 20. The italics are Patricia Bozell’s.

---

<sup>169</sup> Ibid.

<sup>170</sup> Ibid.

<sup>171</sup> Ibid., 19.

<sup>172</sup> Ibid., 20.

<sup>173</sup> Editors, "Liberty II," 41.

<sup>174</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "Near to the Escorial: Stop the Death Merchants I," *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 19.

<sup>175</sup> Ibid.

<sup>176</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: Life in America," *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 5. Also, see Editors, "Life in America," *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April 1971): 1-12.

<sup>177</sup> Bozell, L., "Life in America: Americans United for Life," *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 3, 11.

<sup>178</sup> Editors, ". . . And Its Cure," *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 10.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid.

<sup>180</sup> Charles E. Rice, "New Mandate for the Pro-Life Movement," *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 11-15; and Michael Lawrence, "Arts and the Age: Fifth Column," *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 39-41.

<sup>181</sup> Lawrence, "Arts and the Age: Fifth Column," 41.

<sup>182</sup> Ibid., 39-41.

<sup>183</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "Near to the Escorial: Stop the Death Merchants II," *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 31.

<sup>184</sup> Ibid.

<sup>185</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "Reactions: Near to the Escorial," *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (June, 1973): 4.

<sup>186</sup> Bozell, "Near to the Escorial: Stop the Death Merchants II," 31.

<sup>187</sup> Ibid.

<sup>188</sup> Bozell, "Near to the Escorial: Stop the Death Merchants II," 31. Also, see Solange Hertz, "What's Wrong with Contraception . . . Really . . ." *Triumph* 7 no. 10 (December, 1972): 26. Wilhelmsen objected to Bozell's argument; Bozell was positing "some kind of creation in the Mind of God before He actually creates, makes things be," Wilhelmsen wrote, "There simply is no such child in some imaginary blue print." Such a position would indicate two separate creations: "one within God and one without." "The evil of contraception lies in the frustration of the dynamism of a human act," he concluded, "the evil of abortion, on the contrary, must be sought in the prohibition against taking life once it is in being." The latter was a greater sin. Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Reactions: Near to the Escorial," *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (June, 1973): 3. In response, Bozell denied that that he had suggested that there were two different creations or that such a contention was "*inherent in the position that contraception is a greater affront than abortion.*"

Rather, he argued that his statement that contraception was “a deliberate No-saying to the highest expression of God’s love, His offer of Life in Himself” was “to affirm, not the ‘pre-existence’ of human life, but the existence of a divine love that yearns for an openness to the gift of life.” To reject this was a refusal of God’s love; this was principally what contraception attacked, Bozell argued. A man’s and woman’s mutual and fecund sex act was “saying Yes to God’s love,” while contraceptive sex was “saying No—not so much because they may be ‘denying life’ to a man but because, by refusing to co-create with God, they are certainly rejecting His love.” L. Brent Bozell, “Reactions: Near to the Escorial,” *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (June, 1973): 4. The debate over the severity of contraception continued. David J. Gaetano wrote “Contraception is indeed evil, but it does not prevent the creation of a soul . . . any more than intercourse and conception create a soul. For God alone creates souls. Mankind can cooperate with God in the creation of the soul’s housing, i.e., the body, but no action or inaction of ours can limit the number of souls whom God has conceived in eternity.” David J. Gaetano, “Reactions: Near to the Escorial,” *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 4. Another reader accused Wilhelmsen, a Thomist, of being “anti-Thomistic.” “As far as contraception is concerned,” L. Hemingway wrote, “we may prove St. Thomas’s contention in the following way: Thus, God’s knowledge is infinite, and He knows exactly which acts of sexual intercourse will result in the union of an ovum and a spermatozoon. He knows, therefore, exactly when, where and how often, contraception prevents such a union of gametes. He knows, further, exactly which ovum and which spermatozoon would have united in any particular case, had contraception not been used, and He knows, of course, what chromosomes and genes are carried by the ovum and that spermatozoon. Consequently, God knows the precise characteristics of each and every person robbed of existence by a contraceptive act, and to suggest otherwise is to place limitations on the infinite knowledge of Almighty God.” Dr. L. Hemingway, “Reactions,” *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (August, 1973): 3-4. Christopher Derrick also contributed to the debate: “God *cannot* be said to ‘know’ non-existents. The expression ‘to exist’ and the expression ‘to be an object of the divine knowledge’ are necessarily synonymous. . . . But it’s a real and important point, if only because we need to resist the idea that there’s a great army of unborn and unconceived babies waiting backstage *in potential*, longing for a chance to get conceived and born, suffering injustice when this is denied them by contraception. An idea even remotely of that kind leads to an absurd conclusion. Whenever a healthy man meets a fertile woman, there is (in *that* kind of sense) a potential baby whom they might there and then beget. It would be extravagant in theory, and very exhausting in practice, to say that they always *should* beget him and thus not deprive the poor child of his right to actual existence. This would make today’s ‘permissiveness’ into a universal moral compulsion; and we’d get so *tired*.” Christopher Derrick, “Reactions: Things that Are Not,” *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 6.

<sup>189</sup> Editors, “America’s War on Life: The Decision,” *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 17.

<sup>190</sup> Editors, “The Catholic Obligation,” *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 30.

<sup>191</sup> Editors, “America’s War on Life: The Decision,” 17.

<sup>192</sup> Editors, “A Lenten Meditation,” *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 45.

<sup>193</sup> Editors, “America’s War on Life: The Decision,” 19.

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid.*, 17-19; and Editors, “The Catholic Obligation,” 30-32. The following are other editorial comments on the decision: They noted that it was peculiar that the Court decided that the unborn do not have rights, given that Court has not hesitated—“in, the areas of civil rights, busing, apportionment and any number of others”—“to find ‘rights’ not explicitly mentioned in the Constitution; ‘rights’ consistently abridged by old laws; ‘rights’ never before discovered by any other court.” Editors, “America’s War on Life: The Decision,” 18. They concluded that “the Blackmun opinion’s pretense to constitutional and legal, to say nothing of moral, reasoning is one long, boring and transparently terrible joke.” Editors, “The Catholic Obligation,” 30.

---

<sup>195</sup> Editors, "America's War on Life: The Decision," 19.

<sup>196</sup> Ibid.

<sup>197</sup> Ibid.

<sup>198</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "The Death of the Constitution," *Triumph* 3 no. 2 (February, 1968): 14.

<sup>199</sup> Editors, "America's War on Life: The Decision," 19.

<sup>200</sup> Ibid.

<sup>201</sup> Editors, "The Movement—Staying Together," *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 30.

<sup>202</sup> Ibid.

<sup>203</sup> Ibid.

<sup>204</sup> Editors, "The Catholic Obligation," 30.

<sup>205</sup> Ibid., 31. The editors did not mean that *only* Catholics were required to sever their loyalty to the American government—the teachings of the Catholic Church applied to everyone. They believed, rather, that Catholics—given that the only authentic base from which to oppose America's anti-life movement was the Roman Catholic faith—were required to *teach* the truth and *lead* the way to a new Christian order.

<sup>206</sup> Editors, "The Catholic Obligation," 31.

<sup>207</sup> Ibid.

<sup>208</sup> Ibid.

<sup>209</sup> Ibid., 32.

<sup>210</sup> Ibid.

<sup>211</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: NRLC vs. USCC," *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (1974): 7. The editors hoped that the pro-life movement—the position on life of the National Right to Life Committee, the head of the national pro-life movement—would be Catholic, that is, absolutist in its prohibition of contraception and abortion. Michael Lawrence hoped the committee would adopt the following principals and objectives: "1. We believe that the protection of the law of the land should be extended to every new human life from the time when science has established it comes into being—the moment of conception. 2. We believe that the demand for elimination of unborn innocents through abortion is ultimately rooted in a negative and hostile attitude toward new life. We do not propose to encourage this attitude by promotion of contraception. 3. We specifically oppose any use of government funds for contraception programs, both because such programs increase the demand for abortion and because they force taxpayers to contribute to the support of programs morally repugnant to them. 4. We invite the public endorsement, moral support and financial help of all churches. 5. We welcome the participation of all individuals who share our pro-life purpose and will abide by these principles in its advocacy." Michael Lawrence, "The Pro-Life Movement at the Crossroads," *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (June, 1973): 15. Also, see John Short, "Wanted: A Pro-Life Movement," *Triumph* 8 no. 9 (November, 1973): 16-18; and Editors, "One Year of Slaughter," *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 46. The editors were particularly perturbed by the inadequacy of the pro-life amendment proposals, which, they believed, were too vague on both the issues of when life began and therapeutic abortion and therefore would not effectively

---

ban abortion. See Editors, "The Buckley Compromise," *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 46; William Devlin, "Which Amendment?" *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 12-16, 42.

<sup>212</sup> John Short wrote that "the cause cannot be won, and justice cannot be consistently served, until our movement recognizes the cause and effect relationship between the contraceptive mentality and the baby-killing epidemic. When we match our determination to end government sanction of life destruction with an equal determination to end government sponsorship of life prevention, we will for the first time have drawn up the complete agenda of the pro-life movement." John Short, "The Pro-Life Agenda," *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 19.

<sup>213</sup> Short, "Wanted: A Pro-Life Movement," 17. The editors debated the validity of an amendment giving states the right to develop their own abortion laws. They initially rejected this course because it would have put them in the position "*of defending the constitutional principle of a state's right, over against the federal government, to declare the womb a free-fire zone.*" But later they believed that there were valid reasons to *argue* or at least consider such a strategy. "Shouldn't even half measures be used to save some lives? And maybe the birth of a Catholic politics at the state level portends the chance of its birth at the national level," the editors wondered—"it might *result in a public monstration of Catholic peoplehood that would raise not only the life issue, but Life Himself, in the American political conversation.*" Editors, "Right to Life: Time for a New Strategy," *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 12. Yet, they ultimately rejected such a strategy, answering "No" to such a strategy, noting that the Church had prohibited such a course: "[A] Christian can never conform to a law which is in itself immoral," the editors quoted the Church, "and such is the case of a law which would admit in principle the liceity of abortion. Nor can a Christian take part in a propaganda campaign in favor of such a law, or vote for it. Moreover, he may not collaborate in its application.' Thus did the Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith affirm that a Christian may make no compromise with abortion. In its 'Declaration of Procured Abortion,' released November 25, the Vatican also condemned an 'ethical pluralism' which would modify laws against abortion in the name of 'freedom of opinion,' terming that doctrine 'a pretext for attacking the . . . right to life.' Affirming that 'a way of thinking which considers fertility as an evil cannot be allowed to spread without contradiction.'" Editors, "Whither Right to Life?" *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 46; and Editors, "Life in America," *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 44.

<sup>214</sup> L. Brent Bozell, "Near to the Escorial: Life Movement: Quo Vade? II," *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1975): 15.

<sup>215</sup> Short, "Wanted: A Pro-Life Movement," 16.

<sup>216</sup> Editors, "Life and the Facts of Life," *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 46.

<sup>217</sup> Ibid.

<sup>218</sup> Editors, "Whither Right to Life?" 46. Also, see Michael Lawrence, "The Impossible Dream," *Triumph* 10 no. 3 (March, 1975): 9-11.

<sup>219</sup> Editors, "Whither Right to Life?" 46.

<sup>220</sup> Ibid.

<sup>221</sup> Editors, "Life and the Facts of Life," 46. The editors continued to criticize the bishops for their lack of militancy. A year after the *Roe v. Wade* decision they wrote: "Is there some explanation which makes forgivable the fact that the unhappy people who live under the reign of the Supreme Court of the United States have not been barraged over the last year with a pro-life media campaign instigated and financed by the Catholic Church?" Editors, "One Year of Slaughter," *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 46. Yet, they praised the bishops for their orthodoxy

---

and clarity on the abortion issue before a congressional hearing in 1974 on the issue of abortion. They wrote: "Although they [the bishops] acknowledged that they were citizens like all the other witnesses, the Cardinals insisted that they were something more than that: they were moral leaders; and something more than that: they were bearers of the official position of the Catholic Church in the United States. For the Cardinals declared: the Catholics of the United States require that the positive law conform to the law of nature and God. That is: no direct abortion at all; no hedging on early abortions; no approval for child murder to protect the mother." Editors, "Pro-Life Movement, Catholic Movement," *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 46.

<sup>222</sup> Editors, "Life and the Facts of Life," 46.

<sup>223</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>224</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>225</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>226</sup> Editors, "Pro-Life Movement, Catholic Movement," 46.

<sup>227</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>228</sup> Michael Lawrence, "The Impossible Dream," *Triumph* 10 no. 3 (March, 1975): 11.

<sup>229</sup> Donald DeMarco, "What Peace Is . . . And Where," *T* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 31.

<sup>230</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>231</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>232</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>233</sup> For other articles on abortion, see Robert M. Byrn, "Up From Abortion," *T* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 20-21; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Education of Dr. Egeberg," *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 7; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Child Removal," *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 9; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Herodians," *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 8; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Madness Upon Us," *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 8; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Barbarism," *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 10; Lorenzo Albacete, "Humanae Mortis," *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 16-19, 44; Germain Grisez, "Arts and the Age: Killing the Inheritance," *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 32-36; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Birthright!" *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 9; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Who Promoted McHugh?" *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 6; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The President on Life," *Triumph* 6 no. 5 (May, 1971): 5; Editors, "Establishing the Resistance," *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 30; Michael Lawrence, "The Vindication of Milan Vuitch," *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 8-11; Charles E. Rice, "Arts and the Age: Re-Simplifying the Issue," *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 19-21; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Surviving I," *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 10; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Travelers Has Everything," *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 9; Unsigned, "Q. What, Doctor, is the difference between you and Adolph Hitler? A: I really don't think that's a relevant question," *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 18-20, 43; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Harrisburg 2," *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 7; Editors, "Present Imperfect: The Abortion Mentality," *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 10; Unsigned, "Q. Doctor, what does the aborted baby feel while it's dying? A. Oh, I think that depends on your philosophy?" *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 20-23, 44; Editors, "Right to Life: New Strategy Needed," *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 46; Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: Business as Usual," *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 15; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Push Comes to Shove," *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 7-8; Kenneth M. Mitzner, "The Abortion Culture," *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March,

1973): 20-24; Editors, "The Movement—Coming Together," *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 25-27; William H. Marshner, "Ecumenism in Crisis: Some Catholic-Political Considerations," *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 18-21; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Suffer the Little Children," *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 8; Michael Lawrence, "Beyond the Crossroads: A Report on the 1973 Convention of the National Right to Life Committee," *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 11-13; Pertinax, "The Catholic Interest," *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 11; Editors, "Present Imperfect: National March for Life," *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 8-9; Editors, "Present Imperfect: See You in Court," *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 8; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Pennsylvania Debacle," *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 7-8; Michael Schwartz, "Showdown in Pennsylvania," *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 16-17; Unsigned, "Life in America," *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 23; Pertinax, "The Catholic Interest," *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 17; Editors, "Abortion: The Divine Law," *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 45; Editors, "Present Imperfect: Deadline," *Triumph* 10 no. 5 (May, 1975): 9; Michael Lawrence, "Pro Multis: Teddy is a Liar," *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 15. Naturally, the editors were opposed to euthanasia, which they viewed as but another predictable extension of the Manichean-contraceptive society. "If society's institutionalized reverence for and protection of human life in any form or stage is scrapped," the editors commented, then "life in all forms and stages will soon be under attack." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Swimming Upstream," *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 7. The logic was "impeccable" that when a society authorizes the killing of the unborn, it "will consider the other end of the spectrum." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Better Old than Dead," *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 10. Euthanasia was made possible "because the secular-liberal criterion for 'meaningful'—socially convenient or useful—has been substituted for the Christian—all persons are meaningful because they have been created by God." Editors, "Present Imperfect: Swimming Upstream," 7. Since the aged were no longer efficient workers (and "very expensive wards" and added to the population problem), secular liberals believed, the editors argued, that they should be disposable. Editors, "Present Imperfect: Better Old than Dead," 10. On another note, Lorenzo Albacete argued that there was no inconsistency between the secular-liberal effort to extend life with technology and the charge that secular-liberal America was Manichean, because, he noted, "death was another affirmation of the simple goodness of mere existence"—and "to the extent that, although unpleasant, death is part of life and thus good—it is no surprise that it too must be controlled, secularized, technologized, stripped of its mystery." Lorenzo Albacete, "Humanae Mortis," 16-19, 44.

<sup>234</sup> Editors, "God and Woman at Catholic U," *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 22.

<sup>235</sup> Judith Martin, "An Attack on Ti-Grace," *Washington Post*, March 11, 1971.

<sup>236</sup> Ibid. For information on this event, see Judith Martin, "No Curtsies, No Kneeling," *Washington Post*, March 12, 1971; James L. Rowe, Jr., "Patricia Bozell to Talk at CU?" *Washington Post*, March 29, 1971; Jeannette Smyth, "Doctrines of Ti-Grace and AnTi-Grace," *Washington Post*, March 12, 1971; and Editors, "God and Woman at Catholic U," *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 21-22.

<sup>237</sup> Atkinson may or may not have blocked the slap. The *Washington Post* reported that the microphone on the podium and Atkinson blocked the slap. Martin, "An Attack on Ti-Grace." The same article in the *Post* provides a picture of the event and it does appear that Atkinson may have blocked it. The April issue of *Triumph* also carried a picture of the event which seems to indicate the same, but Patricia Bozell, in reply to a reader, who lamented that Bozell had missed Atkinson, noted she had in fact struck her. Patricia Bozell, "Reactions: Slap Hear Round the World," *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 4.

<sup>238</sup> Martin, "An Attack on Ti-Grace;" and Editors, "God and Woman at Catholic U," 21. She said this during a lecture at the University of Notre Dame in October, 1970.

<sup>239</sup> Smyth, "Doctrines of Ti-Grace and AnTi-Grace."

---

<sup>240</sup> Ibid.

<sup>241</sup> Ibid.

<sup>242</sup> Ibid. Patricia Bozell suffered no legal consequences for her actions. She later relayed that she felt that she had to act because the administration, the students, the priests, and the nuns did not do anything to impede Atkinson from speaking at the Catholic University of America. Her action might have been immediately motivated by the applause Atkinson was given from a Catholic audience. For her efforts, Bozell was “showered with flowers and cards and presents from all around the country.” Patricia Bozell, interview with Patrick Allitt, 9 March 1991, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA. *Triumph* readers expressed their gratitude, one letter read: “We Salute You Defender of our Lady.” Edward and Patricia Kraus, “Reactions: Slap Heard Round the World,” *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): (4); and Editors, “God and Woman at Catholic U,” 21-22.

<sup>243</sup> Editors, “God and Woman at Catholic U,” 22. The editors wrote: “by her act, to the Catholic universities of the land, to their administrators, their theologians, their students, to all men and women who had hoped the Catholic Church would, at last, surrender; to them all and in the name of God, of His eternal Son Jesus Christ, Our King, and of His Virgin Mother, Mary, the Woman, she said, with the Apostle Paul: Now! Now is the moment to act! ‘Now is the acceptable time! Now is the day of salvation!’”

<sup>244</sup> Anne Westhoff Carroll, “N.A.P.A.L.M.” *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 22-23.

<sup>245</sup> *Triumph's* staff criticized feminism. They would not have made a significant distinction between liberal feminists, who sought political and economic equality, and more radical feminists, who sought to breakdown gender distinctions. An underlying link between the two views was an intention to control fertility, which undermined the women’s role as mother and nurturer. Reader Anne S. Connell wrote of contraception: “I will *never* understand the position called ‘freedom’ that says any woman may be less than all of herself at any time. It sounds like part-time slavery and a demonic delusion which does give temporary escape from responsibility. But, lest you believe me to be an old-fashioned cat’s-paw, I do allow that the devil who dreamed up contraception was very possibly male.” Anne S. Connell, “Reactions: Reactions,” *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 6. The feminist movement of the 1960s and 1970s was triggered by a number of events, including the Civil Rights Movement, many women participated in it and were motivated to activism on their own behalf especially because of the sexist nature of their fellow activists; Betty Friedan’s *The Feminine Mystique* (1963), in which Friedan argued that the notion that women were to find complete fulfillment in the home was a mystery; the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women, which documented the economic discrimination that women faced; and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, specifically Title VII, which barred sexual discrimination in employment. These events in addition to the development of a wider social constituency in favor of such reform—due to the increase in working women, working mothers, and more free time due to the control of fertility—coalesced into a movement. Though the movement was characterized by a plethora of ideological variations and agendas, the mainstream movement was marked by its demand for equal pay, and daycare and abortion rights, and an Equal Rights Amendment, to constitutionally guarantee the equality of the sexes under the law.

<sup>246</sup> Carroll, “N.A.P.A.L.M.,” 22.

<sup>247</sup> Solange Hertz, “The Housewife’s Vocation According to St. Paul,” *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 29.

<sup>248</sup> Ibid. Also, see Carroll, “N.A.P.A.L.M.,” 20-23; and Patricia Bozell, “The Misogyny of it All,” *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 17. Patricia Bozell was angered by an increasing trend in which she received mail addressed to “Ms.” Bozell instead of “Mrs.” Bozell. Marriage, she wrote,

---

makes of the woman “a new and distinct person, called to a new and distinct state of life.” And that “to slur the distinction is not so much to slur semantics as to deprive the woman of what she truly is, and the married state of what it truly is.” The married life, in short, was a sanctified union—sanctified as such, she wrote, because in “the mystery of union, the man gives himself to his wife, as Christ gave Himself to the Church and her mystical family, whereas a woman is drawn into his being, losing her total independence (her maidenhood) to him in order to gain of him.” “By becoming his wife she *is* thereafter ‘wife’: Mrs., *Madame*, *Señora*. In this mysterious way,” Bozell noted, “she reflects the beloved of her Creator.” Patricia Bozell, “The Misogyny of it All,” 17.

<sup>249</sup> Patricia Bozell wrote: “Original sin, the cause of man’s fall from grace, the reason for Christ’s incarnation, a basic tenet of Western civilization held by millions of men *and* women—a marginal creature effected *that?*” Patricia Bozell, “Arts and the Age: The Sexual Dialectic,” *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 37.

<sup>250</sup> Bozell, “Arts and the Age: The Sexual Dialectic,” 36. Patricia Bozell argued that feminists believe that “all the ages of history have been ruled by a patriarchal society, whose sole end is to subjugate women, and toward which myths, fables and religions (synonymous): governments and nations, anthropology, sociology and education; literature and Sigmund Freud, have bent their efforts, ceaselessly, consciously and malevolently.” Patricia Bozell, “Arts and the Age: The Sexual Dialectic,” 36.

<sup>251</sup> Patricia Bozell, interview with Patrick Allitt. Superior, she remarked, “in their intuition, their spirit, their courage, and their faith. Women are more universal than men. Men without women would never amount to much.”

<sup>252</sup> Solange Hertz, “The Housewife as Guerrilla,” *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 26. Feminists confess “before all creation that they have been wrong from the beginning,” Hertz wrote, “that men are more excellent in all departments of life and have been right all along about how to do things. . . . A real woman wants man’s role in society as she wants hair on her face. Never would she admit for a moment that man’s way of doing things is better than hers, or that he’s any smarter. She will only acknowledge, quite happily, that he’s different and that she needs him. She will be tireless, on the other hand, in demonstrating how much he needs her. Without me, dear, she tells Adam, you can do nothing!” Hertz, “The Housewife as Guerrilla,” 26-27.

<sup>253</sup> Solange Hertz, “Among Women,” *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 11.

<sup>254</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>255</sup> *Ibid.* Gender distinction, Solange Hertz was arguing, was divinely ordained. Humankind was made in the image of the Trinitarian God: an image expressed in the world through the love between a man and woman—a union which begets a third member. Like God, the human manifestation of the Trinity must be of the same nature but three distinct persons, and just as the Trinitarian God is more whole through its three distinct persons, so man and woman were made distinct by God to “be more truly one” through their union which completes the trinity. Women, Hertz concluded, must be different from men, if of the same nature, in order to project God’s trinitarian being into the world.

<sup>256</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>257</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

<sup>258</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>259</sup> *Ibid.*

- 
- <sup>260</sup> Ibid., 14.
- <sup>261</sup> Ibid., 44.
- <sup>262</sup> Editors, "Present Imperfect: The First Lady," *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 7-8.
- <sup>263</sup> Ibid., 8. Also, see Editors, "An Idea Whose Time Has Come," *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 45.
- <sup>264</sup> Editors, "Msing Editorial," *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 7.
- <sup>265</sup> Solange Hertz, "The Housewife as Martyr," *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 20.
- <sup>266</sup> Solange Hertz, "The Crack in the Board," *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 23.
- <sup>267</sup> Solange Hertz, "D'abord, the Home: Mama's Manifesto," *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 19; and Solange Hertz, "The Crack in the Board," 23. Anne Westhoff Carroll wrote: "There are three fundamental vocations, and the family is the root from which each of them grows. It is the family which nurtures Christians who will leave everything to follow Christ in the priesthood and the religious life. It is the family which nurtures Christians who will establish new families, dedicated to bringing members of Christ's Body into the world and educating them to the be adult Christians. It is the family which nurtures those laymen who remain single, but still have a vocation—which is *not* merely a last resort for people who can't do anything better. . . . The family's vocation, then, is to provide members for the *whole* Body of Christ and to prepare them for their several apostolates." Carroll, "N.A.P.A.L.M.," 22.
- <sup>268</sup> Solange Hertz, "The Home as Sanctuary," *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 28.
- <sup>269</sup> Solange Hertz, "The Housewife as Guerrilla," *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 27.
- <sup>270</sup> Solange Hertz, "I. The Home As Divine Mystery," *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 23; and Solange Hertz, "The Crack in the Board," 24.
- <sup>271</sup> Hertz, "The Crack in the Board," 24.
- <sup>272</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>273</sup> Solange Hertz, "The Housewife's Vocation According to St. Paul," 30.
- <sup>274</sup> Hertz, "The Home as Sanctuary," 28.
- <sup>275</sup> Solange Hertz, "The Housewife as Martyr," 20.
- <sup>276</sup> Ibid., 21.
- <sup>277</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>278</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>279</sup> Ibid., 22.
- <sup>280</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>281</sup> Ibid.

---

<sup>282</sup> Ibid. The social acceptance of contraception, abortion, and feminism in the 1960s and 1970s were part of what historians call the sexual revolution or the transition from the traditional mores that governed sex—including the pressures for public silence on sexual matters, for pre-marital chastity, and for a monogamous, heterosexual, and supposedly utilitarian, and thus repressive, sex act—to an expressive and unbridled form of sexuality. Included in this so-called revolution was an acceptance of pornography—an expressive and publicized form of sexuality. *Triumph's* editors believed that pornography was “evil” as it was another attack on the sacredness of the sex act. Editors, “Present Imperfect: Of Smut and Men,” *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 8. And thus portended—because it fostered lust—the decay of civilization. Gary K. Potter wrote: “The confirmed lecher in pursuit of his pleasure will risk his reputation, his fortune, his very soul, he will be deaf to every appeal made in the name of decency or honor, for nothing so occupies a man as lust, once he submits to it; it begins and ends with itself; of its nature it isolates the man in its grip, unlike love which binds persons together. No one is so socially unresponsive as the lecher; he is incapable of restraining himself; the only way society can restrain, or discipline, him is with violence. It can be said,” he noted, “that lechery and brutality are inseparable in history. . . . It is bound to happen that wherever there should flourish a large industry that panders to lechery, fosters it, feeds it, profits from it, lechery should itself flourish, but wherever lechery flourishes, society must dissolve, simply because lechers isolate themselves from social bonds. To try to hold together a whole society of lechers requires the universal application of violence. . . . Hence, the only thing a society can do to control the dissolving effects of lechery, attempt to violently restrain it, will itself hasten the society’s dissolution—unless everyone is successfully reduced to the status of a slave, in which case the society will have been so altered as to be effectively dissolved.” Gary K. Potter, “Potter’s Field,” *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 22. John Lukacs argued that the essence of pornography’s evil was in its purpose “to produce excitement in the human mind *not* by the depiction of nudity or even of sexuality but by the depiction of human degradation.” (11-12) And this was the root of its attraction, which stemmed from the masochistic and sadistic tendencies in man. “What happens,” Lukacs asked, “to a society in which large numbers of men and women and adolescents and even children are fascinated by human degradation?” (13) Society will exhibit a “death-wish” or a “desire to be raped and overwhelmed by some brute primitive force from the outside,” which “becomes the goal of the pursuit of pleasure, especially for people who no longer trust, or even know, their own capacity of being able to create their own happiness.” (13) John Lukacs, “Pornography and the Death Wish,” *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 11-13. Also, see Francis Canavan, S.J., “High Road to the Gutter,” *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 15-18; Gary Potter, “Potter’s Field,” *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 29; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Porno-Politics,” *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 7-8; Unsigned, “Mr. Nixon’s Neighborhood,” *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 27-30; Editors, “Present Imperfect: Vile Bodies,” *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 9-10.

## CHAPTER VIII

### CONCLUSION

Hail, O Cross, our only hope.  
—Roman Breviary

The editors published the last issue of *Triumph* in January, 1976; although, it carried on for a few months as a newsletter edited by Gary K. Potter. The last issue was a farewell address. Defiant to the end, the editors said farewell in a letter addressed to the “World” in their characteristic, triumphalist tone:

*[We] proceeded to explain with consummate patience exactly what was wrong with you and why; and even told you where you could go (with increasing precision we think) for a cure. All of this was yours, mind you, for a mere ten dollars a year. But far from learning Triumph’s easy lessons, you refused even to read them much: which is why, let’s face it, you are ten times worse off today than you were ten years ago.<sup>1</sup>*

The failure of the journal, they noted, did not entail the failure of their movement. They would continue to be crusaders—intent upon reinstating the Kingship of Christ. Addressing the “World” they noted:

*Our (and your) Pope has just now committed the Catholic Church anew to your evangelization. The apostolic exhortation, *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, which he gave at the close of the Holy Year, becomes automatically our marching orders—and they lead straight to you.<sup>2</sup>*

There were a number of reasons for *Triumph's* collapse. First, the journal, and its parent organization, the Society for the Christian Commonwealth, were in significant financial trouble. Because of its radical views, the journal never developed wide circulation, which hindered its advertising capabilities—limiting investment—which led to a shortage of income. *Triumph's* highest circulation reached 28,000 in 1969, but had fallen to 5,000 by 1975.<sup>3</sup> Periodically, the editors would plea with their readers for donations to keep *Triumph* afloat, and private donations managed to keep the journal financially solvent for a while, but they could not fund *Triumph's* publishing costs indefinitely.<sup>4</sup>

Second, *Triumph's* editorial staff suffered in the mid-1970s from L. Brent Bozell's bi-polar disorder. Bozell was *Triumph's* heart, and his illness hindered the operation of the journal. After the journal's collapse, he spent the next seven years of his life in a state of highs—characterized by a lack of lucidity; in one instance, he was imprisoned in a Belfast jail imagining that he “was both Pope and commander of the IRA [Irish Republican Army]”—and in a state of lows, which left him wanting “to be dead.”<sup>5</sup>

Third, *Triumph* was apocalyptic. Not in a millennial sense; they did not encourage any kind of hasty preparation for the Second Coming, but they did predict an impending collapse of the secular-liberal order—the downfall of the United States government. Yet this collapse did not occur. And because *Triumph* was developed as a doomsday publication, the survival of the United States served to undermine a significant part of the justification for *Triumph's* existence.

Fourth, and most important, *Triumph's* downfall was due to its radicalism. The editors predicted the collapse of the secular-liberal political order; they sought to convert Americans to the Roman Catholic faith and to construct a confessional state. As mentioned, its radicalism hindered the journal financially, but more profoundly, the editors' radicalism left them prone to exhaustion. Michael Lawrence noted that it was "only because the Holy Spirit has not yet had enough of wrestling with him that Brent [Bozell] didn't expire with the magazine, so much of himself did he give away."<sup>6</sup> "A lot of us got exhausted in the mid seventies," he remarked.<sup>7</sup> The editors' radicalism put them against the proverbial stream of convention, and the stance took its toll on them.

The editors' objectives, naturally, would have been very difficult to achieve. They must have met the daunting mission of earning "the triumph of Christianity over secularism" with a heroic amount of faith, hope, and charity—that is, faith in Christ and His vicar as their guide; hope for Christ's triumph over evil; and charity, for their task was for the love of Christ both as king above and as the poor below.<sup>8</sup>

Yet, it must be noted that the editors would not have been demoralized by *Triumph's* inconspicuous existence; this was not a reason for them to doubt their mission. For the editors, who took Mary as a model in their task of "Christianizing America," humble beginnings were not to be fretted.<sup>9</sup> "For the life of Mary," they wrote, "is full of humbling instruction as to what 'success' entails. From an earthly perspective,

History was not being made in that hillside town of Nazareth where a totally unknown maid was receiving her totally unknown visitor. History

was being made in Rome, where Caesar Augustus reigned and men schemed and fought for the spoils of universal empire.<sup>10</sup>

This meant that the mysterious works of the Holy Spirit may indeed be inconspicuous and judged insignificant by secular standards. Their mission, rather, if not to oversee the day when the King's reign was honored in America, might instead be to plant but a seed for such a development—this was not for them to know, but was knowable only to the Lord of history.<sup>11</sup>

And though *Triumph* collapsed, because it was a movement and not merely a journal, it must be concluded that it cannot yet be judged a failure. While only the future will reveal if *Triumph's* existence is to be harked back to by Catholics in the future as a model for political and social action, one thing is for certain—in its time, it was a militant contradiction; it was radical.

The editors sought to lead an exodus of American Catholics from the American state and society and to establish a Catholic ghetto—not for isolation but for confrontation—in order to fortify and order their ranks, from which they could make sallies into American society to convert it to the Roman Catholic faith. The first priority of a Catholicized United States was to overthrow its established, constitutional-democratic order, which rendered all authority unto the people, and to construct a confessional state that rendered all authority unto Christ's vicar, the Bishop of Rome.

Principally, it was their call for a regime change and the type of change they sought that characterized *Triumph's* editors as radical. Even their traditionalist Catholic views could be characterized as radical because of how rigidly these views contrasted the pluralist status quo. In a pluralist society and

increasingly pluralist American Church, they emphasized the absoluteness of Christ's truth—as expressed through the Roman Catholic Church. Furthermore, any classification as reactionary would be to ignore their acceptance of Vatican II—including even the new mass—indeed, they celebrated Vatican II as a mandate to conquer what they viewed as an increasingly pagan world for the Roman Catholic Church. They had no designs to return to a pre-sixteenth-century European political and social order. Their mission was to create a *new* Christian order, so that the eternally true would be re-presented in the late twentieth century and beyond, if in different expressions. As the editors noted, Christ came not to be subject to but rather to transfigure history.

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> The SCC, "A Dedication," *Triumph* 11 no. 1 (January, 1976): 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 3. The masthead for July, 1975 issue, included the following: Michael Lawrence as editor, L. Brent Bozell and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen as senior editors, Patricia Bozell as the managing editor, Bradley Warren Evans as assistant editors, and Lorenzo Albacete, Robert Beum, Cyrus Brewster, Lawrence R. Brown, F. R.(Reid) Buckley, Anne W. Carroll, Warren H. Carroll, Christopher Derrick, William J. Fitzpatrick, Otto von Habsburg, Jeffrey Hart, Robert Herrera, Dietrich von Hildebrand, Laurence M. Janifer, Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddin, W. H. Marshner, William Oliver Martin, Vincent Miceli, S.J., Robert A. Miller, Mark Pilon, John de Rosen, Michael Schwarz, and John Wisner as contributing editors. Nancy Carrodo was listed as the circulation manager.

<sup>3</sup> Patrick Allitt, "Triumph 1966-1976," in *The Conservative Press in Twentieth-Century America*, eds., Ronald Lora and William Henry Longton (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), 208.

<sup>4</sup> For examples of the journal's financial troubles, see L. Brent Bozell, "Life Money? Diaspora?" *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 8; LBB, "Present Imperfect: The SCC Lives," 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 7; L. Brent Bozell, "A Letter You May Have Missed," *Triumph* 10 no. 2 (February, 1975): 9; Editors, "Present Imperfect," *Triumph* 10 no. 3 (March, 1975): 5; The SCC, "A Dedication," *Triumph* 11 no. 1 (January, 1976): 2-3.

<sup>5</sup> L. Brent Bozell, *Mustard Seeds A Conservative Becomes a Catholic: Collected Essays* (Manassas, VA: Trinity Communications, 1986), 17-18. Reflecting on his father's bi-polar disorder in a eulogy, his son remarked that there "were the seemingly endless searches around the country just to locate him; in fact, around the world, as he brought on one crisis after another. There were arrests and forced hospitalizations, escapes and re-arrests and commitments. There was the never-ending parade of lawyers, police, doctors, and, yes, from time to time the State Department was on the line to brief us on yet another prospective international upheaval caused by this very unpredictable man." William F. Buckley, Jr., "L. Brent Bozell, RIP," *National Review* 49 no. 9 (May 19, 1997): 23.

<sup>6</sup> Michael Lawrence, introduction to *Mustard Seeds A Conservative Catholic Becomes a Catholic: Collected Essays*, by L. Brent Bozell (Manassas, VA: Trinity Communications, 1986), 11.

<sup>7</sup> Michael Lawrence, interview by Patrick Allitt, 27 February 1991, interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

<sup>8</sup> Editors, "Future's Triumph," *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 6.

<sup>9</sup> Editors, "Marialis Cultis" *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 46.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### PRIMARY SOURCES

#### INTERVIEWS

Bozell, L. Brent. Interview by Patrick Allitt, 26 February 1991. Interview transcript. In the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

Bozell, Patricia. Interview by Patrick Allitt, 9 March 1991. Interview transcript. In the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

Lawrence, Michael. Interview by Patrick Allitt, 27 February 1991. Interview transcript, in the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA

Potter, Gary. Interview by Patrick Allitt, 4 March 1991, interview transcript. In the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

Rice, Charles. Interview by Patrick Allitt, 3 March 1991. Interview transcript. In the possession of Patrick Allitt, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

#### SPECIAL COLLECTIONS

Francis G. Wilson Papers. Record Series 15/18/24, Box 1, Folder: "Catholic Conservatives (organization; magazine), 1965-1966." University of Illinois Archives.

Russell Kirk Papers. Folder: "Correspondence Between L. Brent Bozell and Kirk." Clarke Historical Library, Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant.

## OTHER PRIMARY SOURCES

- Albacete, Lorenzo M. "Liturgy: Present and Future: A Matter of Culture." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 13.
- "Arts and the Age: Aphrodite and a Roman Prelate." *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 28-30.
- "Creation, Drugs and Politics." *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 15-18.
- "Humanae Mortis." *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 16-19, 44.
- Annabelle Z. Andrade, "Burgos: Black Legend Revisited." *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 12-14.
- Armbruster, Frank. "Defending America: Unthinkable?" *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 16-18.
- Barbarie, Thomas J. "A Christian Manifesto." *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 18-21.
- "Belfast Reports." *Triumph* 10 no. 5 (May, 1975): 15-17.
- "From the Bronx, With Love." *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (June, 1973): 16-17.
- "Papists and Peckerwoods?" *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 16-19, 31.
- "The Crime and Punishment of General Lavelle." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 11-14.
- "The Homelessness of George Meany." *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 21.
- "Tongues, Si! Latin, No!" *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 20-22.
- "Christian Manifesto." *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 18-21.
- Beach, Paul Cole and James Likoudis, "Sex Education: The New Manicheanism." *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 11-19.
- Beach, Paul Cole. "Khrushchev and Stalin's Ghost." *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 22-24.
- "Realities: God and Caesar." *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 29.
- "Soviet Terror." *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 16-18.
- Belisarius, Constantine P. "Reactions: Dies Irae, Dies Illa." *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 41, 43.

- Bozell, L. Brent, and Wilmore Kendall. "From the Democratic Convention." *National Review* 2 (August 25, 1956): 9.
- Bozell, L. Brent. "A Communist View of Soviet Strategy." *National Review* 7 (June 6, 1959): 106.
- "A Letter You May Have Missed." *Triumph* 10 no. 2 (February, 1975): 9.
- "A Special Report: The Mideastern Policy." *National Review* 3 (January 19, 1957): 56-57.
- "Americans United For Life." *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 3, 11.
- "Amnesty: Yes of No? Amnesty: Cui Bono?" *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 13.
- "Buckley and Luce." *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 8-9.
- "Budgetary Elephantiasis." *National Review* 3 (February 2, 1957): 104-105.
- "*Christi Matri Rosarii*." *Triumph* 1 no. 2 (October, 1966): 8-9.
- "Dear Triumph: Do You Really Mean It? True Sin, True Myth." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 15-16.
- "Dialogue in Vermont." *National Review* 17 (December 14, 1965): 1153-1156.
- "Freedom or Virtue?" *National Review* 13 (September, 1962): 181-187, 206.
- "Is Demography a Mortal Sin?" *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 12-13.
- "Legal Libertine." *National Review* 11 (November 18, 1961): 340-341.
- "Letter to Yourselves." *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 11-14.
- "Letters from Yourselves." *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 17-19, 40.
- "Letters." *National Review* 18 (May 3, 1966): 390.
- "Life in America: Americans United for Life." *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 3, 11.
- "Life-Money? Diaspora?" *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 8.
- "Liturgy: Present and Future." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 39.

- "Mr. Burnham's Missing Sanctions." *National Review* 3 (February 9, 1957): 127-128.
- "Nation Trends: The Kremlin's Hawaiian Fief." *National Review* 3 (January 5, 1957): 8, 12.
- "National Trends." 2 (July 11, 1956): 7.
- "National Trends." *National Review* 1 (December 28, 1955): 17.
- "National Trends." *National Review* 1 (December 14, 1955): 12.
- "National Trends." *National Review* 1 (February 29, 1956): 12, 20.
- "National Trends." *National Review* 1 (February 22, 1956): 17.
- "National Trends." *National Review* 1 (March 14, 1956): 10.
- "National Trends." *National Review* 1 (March 7, 1956): 16.
- "National Trends." *National Review* 1 (November 19, 1955): 12.
- "National Trends." *National Review* 11 (July 4, 1956): 7.
- "National Trends." *National Review* 2 (May 30, 1956): 8.
- "National Trends." *National Review* 7 (July 4, 1959): 172.
- "National Trends: A Bill to Curb the Court." *National Review* 5 (March 1, 1958): 200-201.
- "National Trends: Big Labor and the Mundt Bills." *National Review* 5 (February 15, 1958): 152-153.
- "National Trends: Budgetary Elephantiasis." *National Review* 3 (February 2, 1957): 104-105.
- "National Trends: Congress Speaks." *National Review* 6 (August 16, 1958): 128.
- "National Trends: Eisenhower's Premises, Stevenson's Conclusions." *National Review* 2 (October 27, 1956): 8.
- "National Trends: Goldwater on First Ballot." *National Review* 8 (June 18, 1960): 388.
- "National Trends: Mr. Dulles Finds Himself." *National Review* 2 (September 29, 1956): 8.

- "National Trends: Mr. Nixon's Moment of Truth." *National Review* 9 (October 8, 1960): 200.
- "National Trends: Nuclear Tests Hedge Against Disaster." *National Review* 6 (March 14, 1959): 580.
- "National Trends: Repeal of the Constitution." *National Review* 2 (December 29, 1956): 9-10, 23.
- "National Trends: Reuther Schemes for Power." *National Review* 2 (October 20, 1956): 8-9.
- "National Trends: The Challenge to Government Foreign Aid." *National Review* 3 (April 13, 1957): 348, 353.
- "National Trends: The Dangers of Concessionship." *National Review* 8 (April 9, 1960): 227.
- "National Trends: The Great American Slumber." *National Review* 2 (October 6, 1956): 9.
- "National Trends: The New Privileged Class." *National Review* 3 (June 22, 1957): 588.
- "National Trends: The Road Ahead." *National Review* 2 (November 24, 1956): 10, 17.
- "National Trends: The Stevenson Tailspin." *National Review* 2 (November 10, 1956): 8.
- "National Trends: The Symington Hearings on Airpower: A Report." *National Review* 2 (June 20, 1956): 8-9.
- "National Trends: The U.S. Pushes 'National Communism.'" *National Review* 3 (June 1, 1957): 516-517, 530.
- "National Trends: Their Finest Hour?" *National Review* 5 (January 18, 1958): 56.
- "National Trends: They Gave the Orders, II." *National Review* 7 (October 24, 1959): 419.
- "National Trends: They Gave the Orders." *National Review* 7 (October 10, 1959): 387.
- "National Trends: This Was a Man." *National Review* 3 (May 18, 1957): 468.

- "National Trends: Wet Blankets in Foggy Bottom." *National Review* 2 (November 3, 1956): 8, 22.
- "National Trends: Why Mr. Rovere Likes Ike (II)." *National Review* 2 (July 11, 1956): 7.
- "National Trends: Why the Moon is Red (II)." *National Review* 4 (November 2, 1957): 392.
- "National Trends: Why the Moon is Red." *National Review* 4 (October 26, 1957): 368.
- "National Trends: World Approval or National Security?" *National Review* 8 (January 16, 1960): 34-35.
- "National Trends: Why the Moon is Red, II." *National Review* 4 (November 2, 1957): 392.
- "Near the Escorial: Defending America: Impractical?" *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 31.
- "Near the Escorial: Live Politics: Catholic." *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 19.
- "Near to the Escorial." *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 26.
- "Near to the Escorial: A Holy Year Film." *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 31.
- "Near to the Escorial: Doing Populorum Progressio I." *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 31.
- "Near to the Escorial: Doing Populorum Progressio II." *Triumph* 10 no. 2 (February, 1975): 15.
- "Near to the Escorial: Live Politics: Black." *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 19.
- "Near to the Escorial: Live Politics: Catholic." 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 19.
- "Near to the Escorial: On Going to Jail (I)." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 31.
- "Near to the Escorial: On Going to Jail (II)." *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 21.
- "Near to the Escorial: On Going to Jail (III)." *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 19.

- "Near to the Escorial: On Going to Jail (IV)." *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 31.
- "Near to the Escorial: Stop the Death Merchants I." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 19.
- "Near to the Escorial: Stop the Death Merchants II." *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 31.
- "Near to the Escorial: Stop the Death Merchants III." *Triumph* 7 no. 10 (December, 1972): 18.
- "Near to the Escorial: The Heart of the Tribe." *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 20.
- "Near to the Escorial: The JBS and the SCC." *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October 1971): 31.
- "Near to the Escorial: The Life Movement: Quo Vade?"
- "Notes and Asides." *National Review* 13 (August 14, 1962): 93.
- "Nuclear Tests Hedge Against Disaster." *National Review* 6 (March 14, 1959): 579-581.
- "Nuclear War and the Moral Law." *National Review* 11 (September 23, 1961): 197-198.
- "Politics of the Poor (Letter to Yourselves, Part II)." *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 11-13.
- "Present Imperfect: Paul with Leo: A Private Conversation." *Triumph* 2 no. 5 (May, 1967): 7-10, 36.
- "Present Imperfect: The SCC Lives." *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 7.
- "Reactions: Near to the Escorial." *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (June, 1973): 3-4.
- "Retreat in Lebanon: Mr. Hammarskjold Pulls a Fast One." *National Review* 6 (July 19, 1958): 80-81.
- "Saving Our Children from Gold." *National Review* 15 (July 16, 1963): 19-22, 34.
- "Should We Impeach Earl Warren." *National Review* 11 (September 9, 1961): 153-155.
- "The 1958 Elections: Coroner's Report." *National Review* 6 (November 22, 1958): 333-335.

- "The Catholic Issue." *National Review* 9 (September 24, 1960): 171.
- "The Church and the Republic." *Triumph* 8 no. 9 (November, 1973): 9-14.
- "The Confessional Tribe." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (July, 1970): 11-15.
- "The Court Enjoins God." *National Review* 16 (September 8, 1964): 775-776.
- "The Death of the Constitution." *Triumph* 3 no. 2 (February, 1968): 10-14.
- "The Lessons of Cambridge and Salisbury: Was Violence Necessary?" *National Review* 15 (August 27, 1963): 145-147.
- "The Open Question." *National Review* 4 (September 7, 1957): 209.
- "The Open Question: *Mater sí, Magistra, sí!*" *National Review* 17 (September 7, 1965): 772. 786.
- "The Servile State Revisited." *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 20-23.
- "The State of the Tribe." *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 30.
- "The Strange Drift of Liberal Catholicism." *National Review* 11 (August 12, 1961): 81-85.
- "Thou Shalt Live Love." *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 26-27.
- "Thou Shalt Love Life." *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 19-24.
- "To Magnify the West." *National Review* 12 (April 24, 1962): 285-287.
- "To Mend the Tragic Flaw." *National Review* 14 (March 12, 1963): 199-200.
- "Toward a Catholic Realpolitik." *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 9-14.
- "True Sin, True Myth." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 15-16.
- "Who is Accommodating to What?" *National Review* 17 (May 4, 1965): 374, 377.
- *The Warren Revolution: Reflections on a Consensus Society.* New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1966.
- Bozell, Patricia B. "Liturgy: Present and Future: Mystery Rationalized." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 11-12.
- "Realities: Monarchs and Ministers." *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 29.

- "Arts and the Age: The Sexual Dialectic." *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 36-37.
- "Reactions: Slap Hear Round the World." *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 4.
- "The Misogyny of it All." *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 17.
- "The Wages of Pluralism." *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 18-20.
- Bradford, Mel. "A Southern Tribune." *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 16-18.
- Bret, Jane. "The Two Liturgies: Liturgy in the Age of McLuhan." *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 16-19.
- Brewster, Cyrus. "Dear Triumph: Do You Really Mean It? The Bounty and Its Source." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 42.
- "The Bounty and Its Source." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 42.
- Briefs, Goetz. "The Sociology of Salvation." *Triumph* 3 no. 8 (October, 1968): 19-20, 22-23, 40.
- Brock, Michael. "Lessons from 'Dagger John.'" *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 18-20.
- Brown, Harold O.J. "A Protestant Case for Co-Belligerency." *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 24-26.
- Brown, Lawrence R. "Reactions: On Vietnam." *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 39-40.
- "The Language of the West." *Triumph* 1 no. 4 (December, 1966): 16-18.
- Brusher, Joseph S. "Clio and the Theologians." *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 26-27.
- Buckley, Jr., William F. "On the Right: The Birth Rate." *National Review* 17 (March 23, 1965): 231.
- "On the Right: The Catholic Church and Abortion." *National Review* 18 (April 5, 1966): 308.
- "Reactions: Death of the Constitution." *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 3-4.
- *God and Man at Yale: The Superstitions of 'Academic Freedom.'* Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1951.
- *Up from Liberalism.* New York: Bantam, 1959.

- Frank S. Meyer, and James Burnham. "The John Birch Society and the Conservative Movement." *National Review* 17 (October 19, 1965): 914-1929.
- and L. Brent Bozell. *McCarthy and His Enemies: The Record and Its Meanings*. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1954.
- Burnham, James. "A Letter of Resignation." *Partisan Review* no. 20 (November-December, 1953): 716.
- "The Protracted Conflict." *National Review* 26 (October 25, 1974): 1223.
- "The Protracted Conflict." *National Review* 27 (January 17, 1975): 27.
- "Third World War." *National Review* 12 (January 6, 1962): 24.
- "Third World War." *National Review* 12 (January 30, 1962): 60.
- "Third World War." *National Review* 13 (August 14, 1962): 97.
- "Third World War." *National Review* 19 (May 16, 1967): 510.
- "Third World War." *National Review* 4 (August 24, 1957): 154.
- *Containment or Liberation?: An Inquiry into the Aims of United States Foreign Policy*. New York: The John Day Company, 1952.
- *Suicide of the West: An Essay on the Meaning and Destiny of Liberalism*. New York: The John Day Company, 1964.
- *The Coming Defeat of Communism*. New York: The John Day Company, 1949.
- *The Machiavellians: Defenders of Freedom*. New York: The John Day Company, 1943.
- *The Managerial Revolution or What is Happening in the World*. London: Wyman and Sons Limited, 1942.
- *The Struggle for the World*. New York: The John Day Company, 1947.
- *The Web of Subversion: Underground Networks in the U.S. Government*. New York: The John Day Company, 1954.
- Burnham, Philip. "Reactions: Catholic Social Doctrine." *Triumph* 3 no. 8 (August, 1968): 4, 6.
- Byrn, Robert M. "Up From Abortion." *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 20-21.

- Calvo-Serer, Rafael. "They Spoke For Christian Europe." *National Review* 4 (July 27, 1957): 109, 112.
- Canavan, Francis. "High Road to the Gutter." *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 15-18.
- "Individualism and the Malaise of Modernity." *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 22-25.
- "Rumors of Disbelief." *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 16-18.
- "The Logic of Contraception." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 26-27, 38.
- Carroll, Anne W. "Dear Triumph: Do You Really Mean It? God and Country." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 18-19.
- "God and Country." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 18-19.
- "The Apostolic School Revisited." *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 24-26.
- "The Apostolic School." *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 12-14.
- "N.A.P.A.L.M." *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 20-23.
- Carroll, Warren H. "A Case for John Schmitz." *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 22-23.
- "Amnesty: Yes or No? The Hard Road Should Be Hard." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 11.
- "The Modern University: Missionary Territory." *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 18-21.
- "The West Come to Judgment." *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 28-30, 43.
- Chambers, Whittaker. "Big Sister is Watching You." *National Review* 4 (December 28, 1957): 594-596.
- *Witness*. New York: Random House, 1952.
- Champlin, Joseph M. "Liturgy: Present and Future: Remarkable, Uneven, Incomplete." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 11.
- Christopher Dawson, "The Christian Church and the Democratic State." *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 21-24.
- Clark, Collin. "Starvation or Plenty?" *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 14-17, 42.

- Clarke, Norris. "Is the West 'God's Civilization'?" *America* 106 no. 25 (March 31, 1962): 853-856.
- Clinton, Farley. "Diabolus est Jesuita . . . ita! Ita!" *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 21-24.
- "The Seeds of Vatican II." *Triumph* 1 no. 3 (November, 1966): 25-28.
- "Very Great Religious Leaders of Modern Times." *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 20-23.
- Colbert, Jr., James G. "Reactions: Dear Triumph." *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 5.
- "Reactions: Tribal Advise." *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 6, 42.
- Connell, Anne S. "Reactions: Reactions." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 6.
- Connolly, Joseph M. "Liturgy: Present and Future: Electric to Soggy." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 15-16.
- Cory, Kenneth A. "Reactions: Dear Triumph." *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 3.
- Costanzo, Joseph F. "Pacifism Is Not Peace." *Triumph* 1 no. 3 (November, 1966): 18-21.
- Crisp, M. "Reactions: The Irish Question." *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 4
- Crosby, John. "The Odd Couple: 'Conservatism' & 'The West.'" *Triumph* 10 no. 4 (April, 1975): 14-17, 23.
- Da Groomes, Thomaz, and Frederick D. Wilhelmsen. *Triumph* 2 no. 10 (November, 1967): 9.
- Davenport, Guy. "The Need to Maintain a Civilization." *National Review* 17 (April 6, 1965).
- Day, Thomas. "Arts and the Age: Must Church Music Be Bad Music." *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 30-33.
- De La Vega, Maria Isabel. "Alianza Para Genocido." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 24-27.
- De Pauw, Gommar A. "Reactions: Fr. De Pauw Objects." *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 6.
- de Rosen, John. "The Altar." *Triumph* 3 no. 11 (November, 1968): 26-29.
- "The New Iconoclasm." *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 26-28.

- de Solenni, Mario. "A Is Not B Is Not C." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 16-17.
- "Baptizing Organiculture." *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 28-29.
- "Dear Triumph: Do You Really Mean It? A Is Not B Is Not C." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 16-17.
- "Usury: The Rise and Fall of a Moral Idea." *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 24-27.
- DeMarco, Donald. "What Peace Is . . . And Where." *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 30-31.
- Derrick, Christopher. "Does Transubstantiation Matter?" *Triumph* 3 no. 7 (July, 1968): 19-22.
- "Fact & Meaning in the Age of Aquarius." *Triumph* 6 no. 5 (May, 1971): 7-10.
- "In Defense of Triumphalism." *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 18-21.
- "Love, Honesty, Babies: A Pagan View of Sex." *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 18-21, 34.
- "Pavane for a Dead Liturgy." *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 16-19.
- "Prophets and Pastors." *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 24-26.
- "Reactions: Things that Are Not." *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 6.
- "The Rules of the Game." *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 14-17.
- "Trimming the Ark." *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 8-10.
- Devlin, William. "Which Amendment?" *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 12-16, 42.
- Dombrowski, John. "A Catholic Continent Awakening." *Triumph* (August 1969): 11-14.
- Domville, Fred. "The Depopulation Bomb." *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 18-20.
- Dooley, D.J. "The Enquiring Mind: Gilson on Evolution." *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 18-19.
- Dunne, George H., and C.J. McNaspy. "How We Look to Others." *America* (May 13, 1961): 272-275.

Dwyer, Robert J. "Ad-Joor-Na-Mint-Ah!" *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 16, 37.

Editor. "Abortion." *National Review* 22 (June 30, 1970): 658-659.

----- "At Last, A Conservative Catholic Magazine." *National Review* 18 (September 6, 1966): 870.

----- "For the Record." *National Review* 11 (August 12, 1961): 77.

----- "Notes and Asides." *National Review* 5 (May 10, 1958): 440.

----- "On Editorial Policy." *National Review* 1 (December 28, 1955): 6-7.

----- "The Week." *National Review* 11 (July 29, 1961): 38.

----- "Why the South Must Prevail." *National Review* 4 (August 24, 1957): 148-149.

Editorial. "'Liberal' vs. 'Conservative.'" *Commonweal* 57 (February 20, 1953): 488.

----- "A venture in Triviality." *Commonweal* 74 (August 25, 1961): 461.

----- "Affront to Conservatives." *America* 105 (August 19, 1961): 622.

----- "Algerian Hopes." *Commonweal* 73 (March 17, 1961): 624.

----- "Birmingham, a City." *Commonweal* 78 (May 17, 1963): 212-213.

----- "Communism and the Pope." *Commonweal* 78 (May 24, 1963): 235-236.

----- "Debate in Moscow." *Commonweal* 75 (November 3, 1961): 139-140.

----- "Defense of Vietnam." *Commonweal* 75 (October 20, 1961): 85.

----- "Ending the War." *Commonweal* 83 (December 10, 1965): 295-296.

----- "Getting Out." *Commonweal* 85 (December 23, 1966): 335-336.

----- "God and Man at *National Review*." *Commonweal* 75 (October 27, 1961): 107-108.

----- "God and the Cold War." *Commonweal* 74 (September 8, 1961): 483-484.

----- "Mr. Khrushchev at the U.N." *Commonweal* 73 (October 14, 1960): 59-60.

----- "Negro Protests." *Commonweal* 72 (April 1, 1960): 4-5.

- "North Vietnam's Bloody Nose." *Commonweal* 80 (August 21, 1964): 559.
- "Polarized Policy, Plural World." *Commonweal* 74 (May 19, 1961): 195-196.
- "Pope John on Communism." *Commonweal* 70 (May 1, 1959): 116-117.
- "Reply." *Commonweal* 75 (October 20, 1961): 97-98.
- "Senator McCarthy's Charges." *America* (April 1, 1950): 737.
- "The Campaign." *Commonweal* 55 (November 30, 1951): 189.
- "The Decline of McCarthy." *Commonweal* 61 (December 24, 1954): 324-325.
- "The Pope's Trip." *Commonweal* 79 (December 20, 1963): 360-361.
- "The Trouble with Crusades." *Commonweal* 56 (August 29, 1952): 499-500.
- "The Watkins Report." *Commonweal* 61 (October 8, 1954): 4.
- "Uncertain Prospect for Vietnam." *Commonweal* 79 (November 15, 1963): 212
- "Vietnam Protests." *Commonweal* 83 (October 29, 1965): 113-114.
- "Washington Report: The Crisis in Birmingham." *Commonweal* 78 (May 24, 1963): 239.
- "Week by Week." *Commonweal* 56 (June 2, 1952): 188.
- Editors. "Present Imperfect: The Emperor's Old Clothes." *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 5.
- "1972: Acceptable Year of the Lord." *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 45-46.
- "60,000,000 x 0 = 0." *Triumph* 3 no. 12 (December, 1968): 41.
- "A Christmas Truce." *Triumph* 8 no. 10 (December, 1973): 46.
- "A Lenten Meditation." *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 46.
- "A Question of Legitimacy." *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 46.
- "A Thousand [Catholic] Flowers" *Triumph* 7 no. 10 (December, 1972): 45.

- "Abortion: The Divine Law." *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 45.
- "Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam." *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 39-41.
- "Adam's Only Sin." *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 37.
- "Aggiornamento . . . Finally." *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 45.
- "Alianza para la Cristiandad." *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 46.
- "Alone, If Necessary." *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 38.
- "America is a Crime Wave" *Triumph* 2 no. 7 (July, 1967): 13-14.
- "America's War on Life: The Decision." *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 17-19.
- "An American Summer." *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 45-46.
- "An Idea Whose Time Has Come." *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 45.
- "An Inhuman Development." *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 10, 45-46.
- "And Its Cure." *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 10.
- "Anti-Semitism in the Vatican?" *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 42.
- "Biafra Lives." *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 41.
- "Birth Control: The Pope Has Spoken." *Triumph* 1 no. 4 (December, 1966): 37.
- "Bishops and Sons." *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 8.
- "Bombs, Bias, and a Bishop's Blessing." *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 45.
- "Brit Flap." *Triumph* 10 no. 9 (October, 1975): 4.
- "Busing: The Real Issue." *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 45.
- "Cardinal O'Boyle." *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (November, 1968): 42.
- "Catechism for a Catholic ADL." *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 45.
- "Chaos in the Church: A Reassurance." *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 42.
- "Chaos in the Schools: A Proposal." *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 41.

- "Collapse at Catholic U., *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 21-28.
- "Correction Notice." *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 10.
- "Czechoslovakia." *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 41.
- "Democracy's Revenge." *Triumph* 2 no. 10 (October, 1967): 41.
- "Doctrine in Dutch." *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 38.
- "Ecology: Whose Rebellion?" *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 41.
- "Ecumenism or Catholicism: Two Politics." *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 46.
- "Ecumenism." *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 8-9.
- "Editorials." *Triumph* 1 no. 2 (October, 1966): 7.
- "Education: The End of the Dreams." *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 46.
- "Election '72: The Morning Line." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 46.
- "Establishing the Resistance." *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 30.
- "Exit Catholic U." *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 42.
- "Exit Holland." *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 42.
- "Felix Aquaporta." *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (June, 1973): 45.
- "For the Mass: Open Season." *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 42.
- "Future's Triumph." *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 6.
- "God and Woman at Catholic U." *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 21-22.
- "Great Day in the Morning!" *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 42.
- "Habemus Papam." *Triumph* 3 no. 8 (August, 1968): 38.
- "Hail, Lady of Victory." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 46.
- "Hippie, Son of WASP." *Triumph* 3 no. 2 (February, 1968): 37.
- "Hungary Remembered." *Triumph* 1 no. 3 (November, 1966): 37.

- "Ireland & Spain: Mirrors of Christendom." *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 45.
- "Ireland: Illusion and Reality." *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 46.
- "It's a New Game." *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 46.
- "Italy is a Modern Country." *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 8.
- "Its About Time." *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 26-28.
- "Jew and Black." *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 41.
- "Judgment Day." *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 45-46.
- "Justice for the People" *Triumph* 7 no. 10 (December, 1972): 46.
- "Killing Babies Is Legal." *Triumph* 2 no. 7 (July, 1967): 41.
- "Leap Into What?" *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 41.
- "Let Them Eat Cake." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 41-42.
- "Let's Found a Catholic University." *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 38-41.
- "Liberal Despair, Christian Hope." *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 45.
- "Liberty I." *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 10.
- "Liberty II." *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 41-42.
- "Life and the Facts of Life." *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 46.
- "Life in America." *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 44.
- "Life in America." *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April 1971): 1-12.
- "Life in New York." *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 45.
- "Life is Not a Bowl of Cherries." *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 46.
- "Lunar Lunacy." *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 37.
- "Make It Bind and Bind Fast." *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 46.
- "Marialis Cultis." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 46.
- "Mater No, Magistra No." *Triumph* 2 no. 19 (October, 1967): 42.
- "McCluskey's Manifesto." *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 37.

- "McNamara's Valedictory." *Triumph* 3 no. 3 (March, 1968): 38.
- "Mindszenty's Triumph." *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 45.
- "Mobilizing for the Mass." *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 42.
- "Mortgaging Souls." *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 10.
- "Mother Seton the Builder." *Triumph* 10 no. 2 (February, 1975): 45.
- "Mr. Johnson Remembers Hungary." *Triumph* 1 no. 3 (November, 1966): 38.
- "Msing Editorial." *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 7.
- "Nixon's Catholic Strategy." *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 45.
- "Nixon's Redeployment." *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 41.
- "Notes on the Tapes Case." *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 9-10.
- "Nuns Are Not Ladies." *Triumph* 3 no. 3 (March, 1968): 37.
- "Ohio Blows Up." *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 9-13.
- "On Impeachment." *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 46.
- "One Year of Slaughter." *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 46.
- "Our Toothless Terror." *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 42.
- "Peace in Palestine: Deus Vult." *Triumph* 8 no. 9 (November, 1973): 45.
- "Pobre Espana." *Triumph* 10 no. 8 (October, 1975): 2-3.
- "Present Imperfect." *Triumph* 10 no. 3 (March, 1975): 5.
- "Present Imperfect." *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 7.
- "Present Imperfect." *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 7.
- "Present Imperfect." *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 7-10, 42.
- "Present Imperfect: A Bishop's Bishop." *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: A Catholic Abortion: A documentary relating how an ecumenical, national campaign to uphold the dignity of human life was

- about to be born, and how the pregnancy was terminated by the national bureaucracy of the Catholic Church." *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 7-12.
- "Present Imperfect: A Gift to All Manner of Folk." *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: A Good Man Down." *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: A Living or a Life?" *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: A Pastoral." *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: A Place in the Sun." *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: A Stitch in Time." *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: A U.S. First Strike?" *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Absolving Homosexuals." *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: ADL's Anti-Semitism." *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Africa—Love It or Leave It." *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Age Two." *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Alexander's Crime and Punishment." *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Ali Stands Up." *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: All the Queen's Men." *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Alliances I." *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Alliances II." *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Alliances III." *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 7-8.

- "Present Imperfect: America and Israel." *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: *America v. Pope.*" *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Amish Fight for Christian Freedom." *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Amish n' Dandy." *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Appalling Responsibility." *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Ay, Ay, Allende." *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Balance of Power, Mid-East." *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Balance of Power, U.S.A.." *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Baptizing the Country." *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Barbarism." *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Bear Market in SALT." *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 5-6.
- "Present Imperfect: Beauty Saves." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Becoming a Pushover." *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Beggars Can't Bargain." *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Ben' Fatto, Paolo." *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Better Old than Dead." *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Biafra Won't Go Away." *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 9.

- "Present Imperfect: Biafra." *Triumph* 3 no. 11 (November, 1968): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Binary Bombs." *Triumph* 10 no. 3 (March, 1975): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Birthright!" *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Bishop in the Dock." *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Bishops and Sons." *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Bishops Set Lines." *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Bishops v. Pope?" *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Black Power." *Triumph* 2 no. 1 (January, 1967): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Blood Money." *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Bloody Ignorance." *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Bloody Lies." *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Boreiganism." *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Build, Baby I." *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Burn Church Burn!" *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Burying Czechoslovakia." *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Business Dropouts." *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Buy Now, Pay Never." *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Caesar Cleans Up." *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Calley Country." *Triumph* 6 no. 5 (May, 1971): 5-6.
- "Present Imperfect: Catholic Politics." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Catholics—Act!" *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 7-8.

- "Present Imperfect: Chicago." *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Child Removal." *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Chile v. CIA." *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Come Clean." *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Coming Attraction." *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 6.
- "Present Imperfect: Commit Fortas Now!" *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Cost Analysis Saves?" *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Coup d' Ecôle." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Credo In Deum Neutrum." *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Criost Ri Abū!" *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Crucifying the Mass." *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Deadline." *Triumph* 10 no. 5 (May, 1975): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Decimo Anno." *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Democracy in Chicago." *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Democracy: Transitory Meteor." *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Democratic Murder." *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: 'Détente' in Lithuania." *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Dialogue at N(C)R." *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Do You Renounce CBW and All Its Works?" *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Doing One's Job." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 8-9.

- "Present Imperfect: Dr. K's Remedy." *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Dr. Rafferty's Dilemma." *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Dry Rot." *Triumph* 7 no. 10 (December, 1972): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Eastwestestablishment." *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Ecology Wants *You*." *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Economy Si, Economists No." *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Elementary, Dear Watson." *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Endgame." *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Enemy in the Mirror." *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: England Stinks." *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: England vs. Ireland." *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: England's Dirty Little War." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1975): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Erin Goes Blah." *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Faith of Their Fathers." *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Father Nixon, Father McHugh." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Fifth Column in the Senate?" *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Flock, Protect Your Shepherds." *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 9-10

- "Present Imperfect: Fly Me to the Moon." *Triumph* 3 no. 12 (December, 1968): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Free at Last." *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Freedom at Dayton U." *Triumph* 2 no. 1 (January, 1967): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Freedom Now." *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Generally True." *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Grounds for Divorce." *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Guidelines for Scientists." 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Habsburg's Europe." *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: HAK: the Catholic Interest." *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Happy New Year." *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Help for Ireland." *Triumph* 8 no. 10 (December, 1973): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Herod for King." *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: HEW's Counter-church." *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Holy Russia." *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: #!x?\*#!, I." *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: I Am a Man." *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Iberian Imperative." *Triumph* 10 no. 4 (April, 1975): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Ibi Ecclesia. Ubi Kelly?" *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: If the Crown Fits." *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 9.

- "Present Imperfect: In Defense of Heresy." *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: In Restraint of Maude." *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: In Search of Law and Order II." *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 6.
- "Present Imperfect: In the Heart of the World." *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Invitation to Anarchy, I." *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Invitation to Anarchy, II." *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Ireland for the Irish." *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Ireland: The Way to Peace." *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Jerusalem, Jerusalem." *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Jews, Arabs, Christians." *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Justice is Truth." *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Keep on Truckin'." *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Khesanh? What's That?" *Triumph* 3 no. 8 (August, 1968): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: LAD: Ideology over Charity." *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Let's Kill a Born Baby." *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Lie Down, Parents." *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Life in America." *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 5.

- "Present Imperfect: Life is Not a Living." *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Look Up, America." *Triumph* 10 no. 6 (June, 1975): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Look Who's Dead." *Triumph* 6 no. 11 (November, 1971): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Los von Fulda." *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Love's Labor Found." *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Machismo." *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Marching Through Mississippi." *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Mater et Magistra." *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Mayday." *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 5.
- "Present Imperfect: McGovernomics." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: McNamara v. People." *Triumph* 3 no. 11 (November, 1968): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Memo to Good Jesuits." *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Merry Christmas." *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Middle East Linkage." *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Militants, Arise!" *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Mindszenty Holds On." *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Moynihan on Cities." *Triumph* 2 no. 12 (December, 1967): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Muggeridge Comes Home." *Triumph* 3 no. 3 (March, 1968): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Nation Time." *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 8-9.

- "Present Imperfect: National March for Life." *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Nixon v. Jackson." *Triumph* 8 no. 10 (December, 1973): 7-8
- "Present Imperfect: Nixon v. the Media." *Triumph* 8 no. 10 (December, 1973): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: No Peace, No Honor." *Triumph* 10 no. 5 (May, 1975): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Non Sense and Nun Sense." *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1972): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: North Ireland: Why the Violence." *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: NOW Meet a Bishop." *Triumph* 10 no. 6 (June, 1975): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: NRLC vs. USCC." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (1974): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Of Smut and Men." *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Offensive War." *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Oiling the Throttles." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: On the Mass." *Triumph* 10 no. 4 (April, 1975): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: One God, One Vote." *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Our Man in Manila." *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Out Stake in Geneva." *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Outlawing Adam and Eve." *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Oy, Oy, McHugh." *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Palestine: Towards Justice." *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 9.

- "Present Imperfect: Panda to the People." *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Parents v. State." *Triumph* 7 no. 10 (December, 1972): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Pater Si, Mater No." *Triumph* 10 no. 6 (June, 1975): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Peace for What?" *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Pennsylvania Debacle." *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: People Who Need PeopleHood." *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (June, 1973): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Peron's Progress." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Pope without a Sword." *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Porno-Politics." *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Portugal." *Triumph* 3 no. 11 (November, 1968): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Portugal: It Begins." *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Power to the Parents." *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Pray for Cardinal Malula." *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Prayer of the Faithful." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Prayer of the Nation." *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Presbyterian Agony." *Triumph* 2 no. 7 (July, 1967): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Prologue." *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 7-10, 42.
- "Present Imperfect: Push Comes to Shove." *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Quo." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 7-8.

- "Present Imperfect: Race and Creed." *Triumph* 8 no. 10 (December, 1973): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Realism in Macao." *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Reality Now!" *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Reconciling Sinners." *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Red Plot or Red Herring?" *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Render to Cesar." *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Rerum Futurarum." *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 6-7.
- "Present Imperfect: Right Wing Flapping." *Triumph* 10 no. 3 (March, 1975): 5.
- "Present Imperfect: Ring Around Asia." *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: RMN's Inheritance I." *Triumph* 3 no. 12 (December, 1968): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: RMN's Inheritance II." *Triumph* 3 no. 12 (December, 1968): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Robert Strange Mani." *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (November, 1968): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Robert Strange Pill." *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Rocky Road." *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Roma Locuta, Causa Dealbata." *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 5-6.
- "Present Imperfect: Rough Beast." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: S.O.S." *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 5-6.
- "Present Imperfect: Santa for Vice-President." *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Save the Old Mass." *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 7.

- "Present Imperfect: School Rebels Hang Tough." *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Schools Are for Police." *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Science of Racism." *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 6-7.
- "Present Imperfect: See You in Court." *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Senator Stennis's Frolic." *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Setting Up Thieu." *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Seven Points." *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Sex + Education = #!x\*#." *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Sign of the Times." *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Sons of Thunder." *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Spain's Crisis of Love." *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: St. Louis Blues." *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: State in Fide." *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Still Bishop of the Year." *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Still the Pope." *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: S-St-Stop!" *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Stop CBW!" *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Strings Attached." *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Suffer the Little Children." *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Surviving I." *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 10.

- "Present Imperfect: Surviving Il." *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Swimming Upstream." *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Syllabus of Horrors." *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Taking Liberties." *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (June, 1973): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Tannenbaum's Complaint." *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 5.
- "Present Imperfect: Teeter-Totter Bishop." *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: The Abortion Mentality." *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: The Autumn of the Country." *Triumph* 3 no. 6 (June, 1968): 7-9.
- "Present Imperfect: The Bible Truth." *Triumph* 8 no. 9 (November, 1973): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: The Bishops in Charge." *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: The Bishops Shoot Par." *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: The Bishops' Charge." *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: The Bombing Bust." *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: The Captive People." *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: The Catholic Conspiracy." *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: The Conservatives' Pasch." *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: The Crisis of the Regime." *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 7.

- "Present Imperfect: The Collaborators." *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: The Debasers." *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: The Devil's Legislation." *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: The Dry Look." *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: The Education of Dr. Egeberg." *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: The Emperor's New Plan." *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: The Fazed Economy." *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (July, 1973): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: The First Lady." *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: The Flying Plague." *Triumph* 2 no. 12 (December, 1967): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: The Golden Law." *Triumph* 2 no. 8 (August, 1967): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: The Gracey Case." *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: The Greening of Ulster." *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: The Harrisburg 2." *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: The Herodians." *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: The Higher Brass." *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: The Impeachment Scandal." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: The Madness Upon Us." *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: The Magazine's for Burning." *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: The Merciful Penalty." *Triumph* 3 no. 8 (August, 1968): 9-10.

- "Present Imperfect: The Myth of King." *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: The New Paternalism." *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: The Pope and the Mass." *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: The President in Rumania." *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: The President on Life." *Triumph* 6 no. 5 (May, 1971): 5.
- "Present Imperfect: The Provos' Burden." *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: The Reality of King." *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: The Reasonable Pueblo." *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: The Reign in Spain." *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: The Right Place Is Dying." *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: The Right Place to Die." *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: The S.S." *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: The Schoolhouse and the Trough." *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: 'The Second Vietnam War.'" *Triumph* 3 no. 7 (July, 1968): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: The Servile State, Phase II." *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: The Siberian-Fatima Axis." *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: The Sons of Thunder." *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 8.

- "Present Imperfect: The Sounds of the Silent." *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: The Spirit of Mao." *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: The Storm Before the Calm." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970):7.
- "Present Imperfect: The Summit." *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July 1972): 46.
- "Present Imperfect: The Supreme Court on Schools." *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: The Taxing Game." *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: The Unholy Orders." *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: The Yellow Peril." *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Thieu's the One." *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Things You Should Know." *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: To Lose All, to Gain All." *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Travelers Has Everything." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Try It, You'll Like It." *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Two, Three, Many Liturgies." *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: U.S. v. Babies et al." *Triumph* 2 no. 2 (February, 1967): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Ultra." *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Understanding Cambodia: 7 Easy Lessons." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Up Disestablishmentarianists!" *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 10.

- "Present Imperfect: Up from 'Education.'" *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Up the Republic." *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Urban Renewal." *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: Vacancy in Vietnam." *Triumph* 2 no. 8 (August, 1967): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Viet Riddles." *Triumph* 3 no. 2 (February, 1968): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Vietnam." *Triumph* 10 no. 6 (June, 1975): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: Views: Yours and Mines." *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: Vile Bodies." *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Violence, Anyone?" *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Viva Cristo Rey." *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: Voice for the Silent." *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: War for What?" *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Wasting Calley." *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 7-8.
- "Present Imperfect: We Could Be Wrong." *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 8.
- "Present Imperfect: We Like Ikle." *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: What Floats on Top." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: What Price Theology?" *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 6.
- "Present Imperfect: What Prisons Are For." *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 10.
- "Present Imperfect: Where Are All the Catholic People." *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 9-10.

- "Present Imperfect: Who Promoted McHugh?" *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 6.
- "Present Imperfect: Why Do Nations Rage?" *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Why Do the Pundits Rage." *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 7.
- "Present Imperfect: Why Gays Make Hay." *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Why Not Ask the People." *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Why Not?" *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 9.
- "Present Imperfect: With This Loop, I Thee Wed." *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: With This Loop, I Thee Wed." *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 9-10.
- "Present Imperfect: Workfare." *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 8-9.
- "Present Imperfect: 'You Can't Go Home Again.'" *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 7-8.
- "Pro-Life Movement, Catholic Movement." *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 46.
- "Reactions: Triumph in America." *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 5.
- "Red Paper Tiger." *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 38.
- "Report from Spain: New 'States Rights' Challenge to Franco." *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 36.
- "Rhodesia—Tragic Farce." *Triumph* 2 no. 1 (January, 1967): 37.
- "Right On—To Where?" *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 45.
- "Right to Life: New Strategy Needed." *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 46.
- "Right to Life: Time for a New Strategy." *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 11-12.
- "RMN, RIP." *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 46.

- "Rockefeller, Of Course." *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 11-13, 44.
- "Rumbles." *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 46.
- "Saints for Our Season." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 45.
- "Sirhan's Sanctuary." *Triumph* 3 no. 7 (July, 1968): 38.
- "Soul, Brother." *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 9-16.
- "Spain's Fairest Gem." *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 9.
- "Support Your Local Bishop." *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 10.
- "Ten More Years." *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 45.
- "The Autumn of the Church." *Triumph* 3 no. 6 (June, 1968): 10, 37-38.
- "The Autumn of the Country." *Triumph* 3 no. 6 (June, 1968): 7-9.
- "The Battle for the Mass." *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 37-38.
- "The Bishops Take Over." *Triumph* 3 no. 2 (February, 1968): 38.
- "The Buckley Compromise." *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 46.
- "The Capables and the Incapables." *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 42.
- "The Catholic Burden." *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 45.
- "The Catholic Obligation." *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 30-32.
- "The Celibate Priest: A Fuller Man." *Triumph* 1 no. 2 (October, 1966): 38.
- "The Church This Christmas." *Triumph* 3 no. 12 (December, 1968): 42.
- "The Conspiracy Against Justice." *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 41.
- "The Dying of Cardinal Danielou." *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 46.
- "The Election." *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1968), 41.
- "The Elections." *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 45.
- "The End of Catholic Education." *Triumph* 3 no. 7 (July, 1968): 37.
- "The End of the City." *Triumph* 2 no. 12 (December, 1967): 37.
- "The End of the War." *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 41.

- "The English Cannon." *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 37-38.
- "The Future of Portuguese Africa." *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 45.
- "The Future." *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 30-31.
- "The Great Patriotic War." *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 41.
- "The Greek Way." *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1966): 37.
- "The IRA & Ireland's Future." *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 46.
- "The Land of the Sacred." *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 46.
- "The Liberal University Drops Out." *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 42.
- "The Maryland Case." *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 38.
- "The Movement—Coming Together." *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 25-27.
- "The Movement—Staying Together." *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 28-30.
- "The Myth Exploded." *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 45-46.
- "The Negro Revolution." *Triumph* 2 no. 8 (August, 1967): 38.
- "The New Missal." *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 42.
- "The New Missal II." *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 42.
- "The Plot to Take Over Spain." *Triumph* 10 no. 5 (May, 1975): 6-8.
- "The Queen." *Triumph* 6 no. 5 (May, 1971): 22.
- "The Reaction." *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 42.
- "The Renegades." *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 42.
- "The Republic and the Catholics." *Triumph* 8 no. 9 (November, 1973): 46.
- "The Sacrifice." *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 10.
- "The SCC Guild Program: Building the Christian Commonwealth." *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 11-18.
- "The Seminaries." *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 42.

- "The Separatists, Black and White." *Triumph* 3 no. 8 (August, 1968): 37.
- "The Sickness of the West." *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 46.
- "The Silent Church." *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 42.
- "The Solzhenitsyn Witness." *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 46.
- "The Spiritual Man." *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 46.
- "The Synod: Suenens or Danielou." *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 42.
- "The Tapes and the Truth." *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 45.
- "The Time Has Come." *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 27.
- "The Two Synods." *Triumph* 8 no. 10 (December, 1974): 45.
- "The Unassimilable R.C." *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 45.
- "The War Is at Home." *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 41.
- "The War." *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 37.
- "To Be the Christian System." *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 45.
- "Troubled Seas." *Triumph* 1 no. 4 (December, 1966): 7.
- "Up from Pluralism." *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 45.
- "Up From the UN." *Triumph* 1 no. 4 (December, 1966): 38.
- "Vietnam: The Earnest Money." *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 41.
- "Wallace." *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 46.
- "War Catechism." *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 41.
- "War in Our Time." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 45.
- "Wars, Left, Right, Christian." *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1970): 40-41.
- "Whither Anti-Communism?" *Triumph* 2 no. 2 (February, 1967): 37.
- "Whither Right to Life?" *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 46.
- "Whither the Democrats?" *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 45.
- "Yes. Or No." *Triumph* 5 no. 10 (October, 1970): 41.

- . "You'd Better Believe It." *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 45.
- Fauteux, Robert J. "Arts and the Age: The Yellow Submarine." *Triumph* 2 no. 10 (October, 1967): 35-37.
- Fedele, Annette. "The Secularization of St. Thomas School: A Case Study." *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 20-22, 44.
- Fisher, Paul A. "Amnesty: Yes or No? Resist the Law, Resist God." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 12.
- . "The Catholic Vote: A Sleeping Giant." *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 11-15.
- . "The New Hugh Carey." *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 26-27.
- . "Ulster: The Faces of Terror." *Triumph* 8 no. 10 (December, 1973): 15-19.
- Fitch, David. "Two Views of Avery Dulles, S.J.: Dogma, Dulles and Ecumenism." *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 24-27.
- Fitzpatrick, James. "Amnesty: Yes or No? Forgiveness Yes; Capitulation, No." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 43.
- . "Dear Triumph: Do You Really Mean It?" *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 14-15.
- . "Is Conservatism Enough?" *Triumph* 10 no. 3 (March, 1975): 18-21.
- . "Reactions: The Irish American and Sinn Fein." *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 6, 43.
- . "The Irish American and Sinn Fein." *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 13-16.
- Fitzpatrick, William J. "The Pope Speaks." *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 18-20.
- Flannery, Austin., ed. *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents*. Northport, New York: Costello Publishing Company, 1981.
- Flowers, T. Dean. "Reactions: The Confessional Tribe Under Fire." *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 3-4.
- Ford, John C. "Notes on Moral Theology, 1945." *Theological Studies* 6 (December, 1945): 540.
- . "The Morality of Obliteration Bombing." *Theological Studies* 5 (September, 1944): 261-309.

- Fox, Robert W. "Arts and the Age: A Christian Humanism." *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 34-35.
- "Arts and the Age: Beyond Economics." *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 28-30, 32.
- "Arts and the Age: The Importance of Not Being Laddie." *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 32-34.
- "Arts and the Age: Ye Shall Be As Gods." *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 32-34.
- "Catechism V. The Child: What Catechisms Are For." *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 21-23.
- "Is Ecumenism Possible?" *Triumph* 1 no. 11 (November, 1966): 22-24.
- "Public Schools in the Courts: U.S. v. Parents." *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 16-18.
- "The Protestant Burden." *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 36-38.
- "The Student Hang-Up." *Triumph* 3 no. 3 (March, 1968): 14-15, 33.
- Francis, Dale. "Liturgy: Present and Future: Like, No; Love, Yes." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 12-13.
- Fraser, Hamish. "The Triumphalism of Vatican II." *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 18-20, 22.
- Friedenberg, Daniel M. "Harvest in the Congo." *Commonweal* 72 (September 23, 1960): 511-513
- Fuchs, M. Marjorie. "His Mercy Reaches From Age to Age." *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 24-26.
- Gaetano, David J. "Reactions: Near to the Escorial." *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 4-5.
- Gaspar. "Uganda's New Martyrdom." *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (July, 1974): 11-15.
- Giedraitis, Rimvydas. "Lithuania: The Tragedy and the Triumph of the Church of Silence." *Triumph* 9 no. 3 (March, 1974): 11-15, 43.
- Gilbert, Lee. "Dear Triumph: Do You Really Mean It? New Jerusalem and the Word of God." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 19-20.
- "Letters to John and Mary Ann: Preamble to an Exodus." *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 24-26, 44.

- "Reactions: Rosaries for Rockefeller." *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 3-4.
- Goldwater, Barry. *Conscience of a Conservative*. New York: Hillman Books, 1960.
- Graf, Thomas. "Reactions: Black Legend." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 5-6.
- "Reactions: Dear Triumph." *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 3-4.
- Grisez, Germain G. "Arts and the Age: Killing the Inheritance." *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 32-36.
- "Contraception and Reality." *Triumph* 2 no. 2 (February, 1967): 21-24.
- "Contraception and Reality, Part II." *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 18-21.
- "Contraception and Reality, III." *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 27-30.
- "Reactions: Prof. Grisez Replies." *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 5-6.
- Harmon, Julius F. "Nixon's Old Ixonians." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 16-18.
- "In North America Negro Girls Are Not Married for Their Money . . ." *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 24-27.
- Harrington, Michael. "Communism after Hungary: In the United States." *Commonweal* 65 (February 1, 1957): 455-457.
- "New Communist Line." *Commonweal* 64 (July 13, 1956): 363-365.
- Hart, Jeffrey. "Our Prematurely Patriotic Church." *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 24-27.
- Hartl, John J. "Reactions: Stop CBW." *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 4.
- Hathcock, C. Stephen. "Almost Heaven, West Virginia." *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 20-23, 45-46.
- "With the Graceys: Suffer the Littler Children to Come Unto Me." *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 16-19, 44.
- Hayek, Friedrich A. *The Road to Serfdom*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1944; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Hemingway, L. "Reactions." *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (August, 1973): 3-4.

- Hertz, Solange. "Among Women." *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 11-13, 44.
- "D'abord, the Home: Mama's Manifesto." *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 19-21, 44.
- "I. The Home As Divine Mystery." *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 20-23.
- "The Crack in the Board." *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 23-26.
- "The Home as Sanctuary." *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 26-28.
- "The Housewife as Guerrilla." *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 25-27.
- "The Housewife as Martyr." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 20-22.
- "The Housewife's Vocation According to St. Paul." *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 28-31.
- "What's Wrong with Contraception . . . Really." *Triumph* 7 no. 10 (December, 1972): 24-26.
- Higgins, Thomas J. "Why the Death Penalty." *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 20-23.
- Hippolytus. "Durham, Fortas, et al. v. Sirhan, St. Paul, et al." *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 11-14.
- "Is Abe Fortas a Sensible Social Necessity." *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 11-14.
- Hoever, Hugo H., ed. *Saint Joseph Daily Missal: Triumphhe Official Prayers of the Catholic Church for the Celebration of Daily Mass*. Rev. ed. Rochester, MN: Carl B. Noelke Co., 1961.
- Houghton, Bryan. "The Two Liturgies: Why They Are at War." *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 11-14, 36-37.
- Hunt, Peter R. "God's Little Acre-and-a-Half." *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 24-26.
- Imperi, Ann A. "Becoming a What?" *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 12-14.
- Johnston, Ruth. "Reactions: Abortion." *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 3.
- Keating, Karl. "Reactions: The Irish American and Sinn Fein." *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 6.
- Kendall, Willmoore. "The Reasons for War." *Triumph* 1 no. 2 (October, 1966): 30-31.

- Kirby, Rose. "Reactions: Pavane for a Dead Liturgy." *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 4.
- Kirk, Russell. "Arts and the Age: The Myth of Objectivity." *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 35-37.
- "Catholic Yankee: Resuscitating Orestes Brownson." *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 24-26.
- *Confessions of a Bohemian Tory: Episodes and Reflections of a Vagrant Career*. New York: Fleet Publishing Corporation, 1963.
- Foreword to *The Future of Education* by Thomas Molnar, 10-13. New York: Fleet Academic Editions, 1961.
- *The Conservative Mind: From Burke to Santayana*. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1953.
- "You Can't Get to Zion on a School Bus." *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 16-18, 44.
- Kraus, Edward, and Patricia Kraus. "Reactions: Slap Heard Round the World." *Triumph* 6 no. 4 (April, 1971): 4.
- Krebs, Jerry. "Reactions: The Kiss of Death." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 6, 43.
- Kuhlman, Thomas A. "Arts and the Age: The Irrelevant Critic." *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 34-35.
- Lambert, Ronald D. "Liturgy: Present and Future: Disastrous Invitation." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 13, 15.
- "The New Missal: Experiment in Heresy." *Triumph* 3 no. 3 (March, 1968): 17-24.
- "The Threat to the Mass." *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 20-24.
- Lane, Thomas A. "Reactions: Counter-Value." *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 4-5.
- "Why We Lose: America v. Christianity." *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 23-24, 26.
- Larrey, Martin F. "John Courtney Murray: A Reappraisal." *Triumph* 7 no. 10 (December, 1972): 23.
- "The Mediator Church—Can Protestants Accept It?" *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 23-24, 26.

- "The Seamless Robe of Social Justice." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 26-30.
- Lawrence, Michael. "An Inaugural Address." *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 11-15.
- "Arts and the Age: Fifth Column." *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 39-41.
- "Beyond the Crossroads: A Report on the 1973 Convention of the National Right to Life Committee." *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 11-13.
- "Catechism V. The Child: What Parents Are For." *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 23-24.
- "Dirty Books Are as American as Cherry Pie." *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 11-13.
- "Liturgy: Present and Future: Obscure Spirit." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 16.
- "On the Irrelevance of American Foreign Policy." *Triumph* 3 no. 3 (March, 1968): 11-13.
- "Our First Three Years." *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 10-12, 14.
- "Paul Ehrlich: Bombardier." *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 26-28.
- "Present Imperfect." *Triumph* 5, no. 7 (July, 1970): 7-10, 42.
- "Present Imperfect: Prologue." *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 7-10, 42.
- "Pro Multis, Vomitous News." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 15.
- "Pro Multis: 'Our Problem.'" *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 44.
- "Pro Multis: 'Up from Pluralism.'" *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 25.
- "Pro Multis: Business as Usual." *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 15.
- "Pro Multis: Catholics and Their History." *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 27.
- "Pro Multis: Does Politics Matter?" *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 23.
- "Pro Multis: End of the Experiment." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 21.
- "Pro Multis: No Exit." *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 17.
- "Pro Multis: Objective AntiCatholicism." *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 19.

- "Pro Multis: Old Mass, New Mass: Mass." *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 14-15.
- "Pro Multis: Politics of Christmas." *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 21.
- "Pro Multis: Re: 'Up from Pluralism.'" *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 25.
- "Pro Multis: Sillier Yet." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 25.
- "Pro Multis: Straight Talk on Schools." *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 23.
- "Pro Multis: Teddy is a Liar." *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 15.
- "Pro Multis: There Oughta Be A Law." *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 15.
- "Pro Multis: There Oughtn't Be a Law?" *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 21.
- "Pro Multis: Vomitous News." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 15.
- "Pro Multis: What Are Those Dimes For." *Triumph* 5 no. 11 (November, 1970): 31.
- "Pro Multis: Woodstock Notes." *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 15.
- "Reactions: The American Myth." *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 29.
- "The Council's (Unheard) Message to America." *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 17-19.
- "The Impossible Dream." *Triumph* 10 no. 3 (March, 1975): 9-11.
- "The Pill: An Epidemic for the Healthy." *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 11-16.
- "The Pro-Life Movement at the Crossroads." *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (June, 1973): 11-15.
- "The Trial." *Triumph* 5 no. 10 (October, 1970): 11-14.
- "The Vindication of Milan Vuitch." *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 8-11.
- "Up From Americanism." *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 14-18.
- "What's Wrong with the American Myth?" *Triumph* 5 no. 12 (December, 1970): 14-19.

- Introduction to *Mustard Seeds A Conservative Catholic Becomes a Catholic: Collected Essays*, by L. Brent Bozell, 7-12. Manassas, VA: Trinity Communications, 1986.
- Introduction to *The Best of Triumph*, ed., Unsigned, xviii-xix. Front Royal, VA: Christendom Press, 2001.
- Lefebvre, Marcel. "The Case for Authority." *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 13-16.
- Likoudis, James. "Arts and the Age: Power to the Parents." *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 34-35.
- Lopez, Carlos. "Exclusive from Chile." *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 11-12.
- Lukacs, John. "Pornography and the Death Wish." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 11-13.
- Lunn, Arnold. "With No Apologies." *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 18-21.
- March, Ralph S. "Liturgy: Present and Future: Needed: A Choice." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 17.
- Marra, William A. "Demythologizing Conscience." *Triumph* 3 no. 12 (December, 1968): 11-14.
- "The Genesis of Holy Innocents School: A Practical Guide for Parents." *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 16-19.
- Marshner, William H. "A Mass at the Valley of the Fallen." *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 11-13.
- "Contra Gentiles: Anabaptism: Off Limits, Too." *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 27.
- "Contra Gentiles: Archaism: Diaphany of the Sacred." *Triumph* 8 no. 1 (January, 1973): 29.
- "Contra Gentiles: Credo in un Dio Crudel." *Triumph* 8 no. 9 (November, 1972): 27.
- "Contra Gentiles: Hermeneutic's Wonderful World." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 31.
- "Contra Gentiles: Integrism in America I." *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 16.
- "Contra Gentiles: Integrism in America II." *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 14.

- "Contra Gentiles: Integrism-as-Slur." *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 26.
- "Contra Gentiles: Non-Cartesian Sociology." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 31.
- "Contra Gentiles: Revisiting the Liturgy Question." *Triumph* 7 no. 10 (December, 1972): 31.
- "Contra Gentiles: Turning on the Right." *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1973): 31.
- "Dear Triumph: Do You Really Mean It? Effectus Odit Quorum Amat Causas." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 20, 42.
- "Ecumenism in Crisis: Some Catholic-Political Considerations." *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 18-21.
- "Hans Küng: Infallible?: An Inquiry." *Triumph* 6 no. 6 (June, 1971): 8-11.
- "Liberty and the Social Order." *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 23-26.
- "New Mass for Independence Day: The Americanization of J. Christ." *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 26-27.
- "Politique d'Abord." *Triumph* 7 no. 9 (November, 1972): 11-15.
- "Send this Man to School." *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 31.
- "The Bishops' Strange Love." *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 11-14, 43.
- "The Scripture Game." *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 19-21.
- "The Scripture Game II." *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 24-26.
- Trans. "Replacing Christianity: The Teilhard Papers II." *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 28-31, 40-42.
- Martin, William Oliver. "A Christian-Communist Dialogue?" *Triumph* 1 no. 10 (October, 1966): 17-25
- "Death Without Tears." *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 14-17.
- "Mr. Popov Answers Himself." *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 30-32, 34-35.
- McArthur, Ronald P. "Thomas Aquinas College." *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 19-21.

- McCaffrey, Neil. "Amnesty: Yes or No? The Unrepentant Sinner Cannot Be Forgiven." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 11-12.
- "The Last Word: Catholic Mathematics." *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 21.
- "Utopia: Off Limits for Catholics." *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 26.
- McClane, Donald G. "Liturgy: Present and Future: Why Renewal?" *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 17, 39.
- McManemin, John A. "Liturgy: Present and Future: Unsatisfying Compromise." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 15.
- Meyer, Frank S. "Principles and Heresies: Commonwealth Puts the West in Its Place." *National Review* 11 (October 7, 1961): 234.
- "The Twisted Tree of Liberty." *National Review* 12 (January 16, 1962): 25-26.
- ed. *What is Conservatism?* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.
- Meyers, John C. "Columbia's Ruddite Rebellion." *Triumph* 3 no. 7 (July, 1968): 15-18.
- Miceli, Vicent P. "Transubstantiation: Anchor of Orthodoxy." *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 25-28.
- Miller, Robert A. "Arts and the Age: Just War: The IRA's Case." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1975): 36-39.
- "Catholic Politics: Two Views: Forming a People." *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 30, 43.
- "Nation Time." *Triumph* 8 no. 9 (November, 1973): 24-25.
- "The Politics of Mercy." *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 11-15.
- "The Rule of Demons." *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 11-16.
- "What the Communists Are Up to in Chile." *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 20-23, 44.
- Mills IV, Charles G. "Reactions: Dear Triumph." *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 4-5.
- Mirus, Jeffrey A. "Politics and the Dead God." *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 24-26.

- Mitzner, Kenneth M. "The Abortion Culture." *Triumph* 8 no. 3 (March, 1973): 20-24.
- Moczar, Diane. "The Apostolic School Should be a Good School." *Triumph* 10 no. 5 (May, 1975): 22-23.
- "Why the Pro-Life Battle is a Catholic Thing." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 24-25.
- Molnar, Thomas. "Algeria—Integration or Independence?" *Catholic World* 192 (February, 1961): 286-295.
- "All Too Hasty Wisdom." *National Review* 11 (July 15, 1961): 20-21.
- "Disarmament: A Bad Dream." *Triumph* 2 no. 2 (February, 1967): 26-27.
- "France: Paternalism or Civil War?" *National Review* 13 (September 11, 1962): 180.
- "Growing Up in Eastern Europe." *The Human Life Review* 16 (Spring 1990): 63-71.
- "Intellectuals, Experts, and the Classless Society." *Modern Age* (Winter 1957-58): 33-39.
- "Last Days at Dachau." *Commonweal* 65 (March 1, 1957): 169-172.
- "Lessons From Hungary." *Commonweal* 65 (March 1, 1957): 564-566.
- "Letter from Africa: The Truth About Angola." *National Review* 16 (April 7, 1964): 280.
- "Meanwhile, Here on Earth." *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 20.
- "Neo-Colonialism in Africa." *Modern Age* (Spring 1965): 175-186.
- "No New Road." *National Review* 18 (February 8, 1966): 122, 124.
- "Report from Brazil." *Triumph* 1 no. 3 (November, 1966): 36.
- "Retreat in Algeria." *National Review* 10 (February 11, 1961), 84-85.
- "Revolt on Campus." *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 25.
- "Teilhard's Collectivist Salvation." *National Review* 14 (June 4, 1963): 464-465.
- "The American Experiment." *Commonweal* 63 (March, 23 1956): 635-638.

- "The Cold War without Communism." *National Review* 10 (April 22, 1961): 255-257
- "The Terrible Meaning of the Algerian Settlement." *National Review* 12 (May 8, 1962): 321-323.
- *Bernanos: His Political Thought and Prophecy*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960.
- *The Future of Education*. New York: Fleet Academic Editions, 1961.
- *The Two Faces of American Foreign Policy*. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1962.
- "A Critique of Utopian Catholics." *Modern Age* (Spring, 1963): 163-175.
- "Catechism V. The Child: A Political Faith." *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 17-19.
- "Gnosticism: The Perennial Heresy." *Triumph* 3 no. 7 (July, 1968): 23-26.
- "Humane Socialism." *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 28-31.
- "Iglesia Y Revolución." *Triumph* 3 no. 6 (June, 1968): 15-18.
- "Paradox of the Marxist Philosopher." *National Review* 16 (December 15, 1964): 1107-1110.
- "Report from Brazil." *Triumph* 1 no. 3 (November, 1966): 36.
- "South America Updated: The State of the Revolution." *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 28-30, 44.
- "The American Experiment." *Commonweal* 63 (March 23, 1956): 638.
- "The Ideology of Aggiornamento." *National Review* 17 (May 4, 1965): 365.
- "To the Anthill with Love." *National Review* 16 (December 1, 1964): 1073-1074.
- *Utopia: The Perennial Heresy*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967.
- Montejano, Bernardino. "I. The Council Preserves the Tradition." *Triumph* 7 no. 4 (April, 1972): 14-16.
- Montgomery, Thomas A. "Agriculture is not a Plastic Bag." *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 11-14.
- "Agriculture Is Not a Plastic Bag II." *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 15-17.

- Muha, Edward. "Reactions: Apertura a Spirito." *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 6.
- Mullaney, Thomas U. "The Rosary: Sword of Deliverance." *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 11-13.
- Mulloy, John J. "Cleansing the Great Guilty Temple: A Reflection on the Wisdom of Christopher Dawson." *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 22-24.
- "Cleansing the Great Guilty Temple: A Reflection on the Wisdom of Christopher Dawson." *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 22-24.
- Murray, John Courtney. *We Hold These Truths: Catholic Reflections on the American Proposition*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960.
- Nicola, John J. "Satan, Again." *Triumph* 6 no. 10 (December, 1971): 36-38.
- Novak, Emilian E. "Cardinal Mindszenty's Testament." *Triumph* 10 no. 7 (July, 1975): 20-23.
- O'Connell, Marvin R. "Crisis in Confidence." *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 17-19.
- O'Leary, James. "God Save Father Dunne: A Public Confession to Bozell, L. Brent." *America* 105 no. 24 (September 9, 1961): 703
- O'Rourke, Brian D. "Reactions: Counter-Value." *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 4.
- Pearse, Padraic. "The Murder Machine." *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 11-14.
- Pertinax. "The Catholic Interest." *Triumph* 10 no. 1 (January, 1975): 17.
- "The Catholic Interest." *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 31.
- "The Catholic Interest." *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 11.
- "The Catholic Interest." *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 17.
- Pieper, Josef. "The Realm of the Sacred." *Triumph* 6 no. 8 (October, 1971): 11-14.
- "The Realm of the Sacred: In the Presence of God." *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 19-22.
- "What Makes Priests Different?" *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1972): 24-27.
- "What Makes Priests Different? II." *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1972): 28-31.

Pilon, Mark. "Virginity as a Political Problem." *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 26-27.

Pius XII. "On the Sacred Liturgy." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/pius\\_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xii\\_enc\\_20111947\\_mediator-dei\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_20111947_mediator-dei_en.html) (accessed 31 July 2008).

Pope John XXIII. "On Christianity and Social Progress." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/john\\_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_j-xxiii\\_enc\\_15051961\\_mater\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_15051961_mater_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).

----- "On Establishing Universal Peace in Truth, Justice, Charity, and Liberty." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/john\\_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_j-xxiii\\_enc\\_11041963\\_pacem\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_11041963_pacem_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).

Pope Leo XIII. "On Capital and Labor." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/leo\\_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_15051891\\_rerum-novarum\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_15051891_rerum-novarum_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).

----- "On Christian Democracy." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/leo\\_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_18011901\\_graves-de-communi-re\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_18011901_graves-de-communi-re_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).

----- "On the Christian Constitution of States." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/leo\\_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_01111885\\_immortale-dei\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_01111885_immortale-dei_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).

----- "On the Nature of Human Liberty." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/leo\\_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_20061888\\_libertas\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_20061888_libertas_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).

Pope Paul VI. "Credo of the People of God." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/paul\\_vi/motu\\_proprio/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_motu-proprio\\_19680630\\_credito\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/motu_proprio/documents/hf_p-vi_motu-proprio_19680630_credito_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).

----- "For Peace During October." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/paul\\_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_enc\\_15091966\\_christi-matri\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_15091966_christi-matri_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).

----- "On Prayers for Peace During October." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/paul\\_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_enc\\_15091966\\_christi-matri\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_15091966_christi-matri_en.html) (accessed September 6, 2008)

- "On the Celibacy of the Priest." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/paul\\_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_enc\\_24061967\\_sacerdotalis\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_24061967_sacerdotalis_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- "On the Development of Peoples." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/paul\\_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_enc\\_26031967\\_populorum\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_26031967_populorum_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- "On the Regulation of Birth." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/paul\\_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_enc\\_25071968\\_humanae-vitae\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_25071968_humanae-vitae_en.html) (accessed July 9, 2008).
- "On the Holy Eucharist." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/paul\\_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_enc\\_03091965\\_mysterium\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_03091965_mysterium_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- Pope Pius XI. "On Atheistic Communism." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/pius\\_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xi\\_enc\\_19031937\\_divini-redemptoris\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19031937_divini-redemptoris_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- "On Christian Education." *The Holy See*.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/pius\\_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xi\\_enc\\_31121929\\_divini-illius-magistri\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_31121929_divini-illius-magistri_en.html) (accessed September 6, 2008).
- "On Christian Marriage." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/pius\\_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xi\\_enc\\_31121930\\_casti-connubii\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_31121930_casti-connubii_en.html) (accessed July 10, 2008).
- "On Reconstruction of the Social Order." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/pius\\_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xi\\_enc\\_19310515\\_quadragesimo-anno\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19310515_quadragesimo-anno_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- Pope Pius XII. "On the Sacred Liturgy." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/pius\\_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xii\\_enc\\_20111947\\_mediator-dei\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_20111947_mediator-dei_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- Popik, Kristin M. "The Politics of Neuronic Man." *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 34-37.
- Potter, Gary K. "'Counter-Value' America's Pact with Hell." *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 11-17.
- "'Counter-Value,' II." *Triumph* 4 no. 8 (August, 1969): 16-19.
- "'Counter-Value,' III." *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 18-21, 39.

- "Amnesty: Yes or No? Is There a Nation to Forgive Them." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 14, 43.
- "Anti-Technology." *Triumph* 3 no. 8 (August, 1968): 19.
- "Arts and the Age: The Electronic Tribe." *Triumph* 6 no. 3 (March, 1971): 30-34.
- "Liturgy: Present and Future: Question Closed." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 12.
- "Potter's Field." *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 38.
- "Potter's Field." *Triumph* 4 no. 11 (November, 1969): 22.
- "Potter's Field." *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 27.
- "Potter's Field." *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 27.
- "Potter's Field." *Triumph* 4 no. 6 (June, 1969): 29.
- "Potter's Field." *Triumph* 4 no. 7 (July, 1969): 37.
- "Potter's Field." *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 39.
- "Potter's Field: Drawing the Sword." *Triumph* 5 no. 5 (May, 1970): 39.
- "Potter's Field: Getting Together." *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 28.
- "Potter's Field: Is the American Dream about to Burst?" *Triumph* 2 no. 8 (August, 1967): 31.
- "Privacy Invasion: Part I." *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 11-16, 44.
- "Privacy Invasion, Part II: Mastering Our Reality." *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 26-30.
- "Reactions: The Reign in Spain." *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 40.
- "The Liturgy Club." *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 10-14, 37.
- "The Non-Trial and Crucifixion of Robert C. Margetts, Major (U.S.A.F.)." *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 11-15, 38-39.
- "Potter's Field." *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 38.
- "Potter's Field: An Open Letter to the American Bishops." *Triumph* 2 no. 6 (June, 1967): 16.

- "Storm Over Dayton." *Triumph* 2 no. 2 (February, 1967): 9-13 .
- "Potter's Field: A Little Quite, Please." *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 30.
- Pournelle, J.E. "Reactions: Patriots? Knaves?" *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 6.
- R.C.F. "Reactions: June 6 Action for Life." *Triumph* 5 no. 10 (October, 1970): 3.
- Rice, Charles E. "'We Hold No Truths?'" *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 11-13, 38.
- "Arts and the Age: Re-Simplifying the Issue." *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 19-21.
- "Government and the Copulation Explosion." *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 16-19.
- "New Mandate for the Pro-Life Movement." *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 11-15
- "Reactions: Death of the Constitution." *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 4.
- "We Hold No Truths?" *Triumph* 3 no. 9 (September, 1968): 11-13.
- Rickenbacker, William F. "The Communion of Economists." *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 11-14.
- Riga, Peter. "Humanae Vitae and the New Sexuality." *Triumph* 8 no. 8 (October, 1973): 18-20.
- Ronald Lamb, "Holy Year 1975." *Triumph* 10 no. 6 (June, 1975): 31.
- Rooney, Keith. "Reactions: The Irish Question." *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 3-4.
- Rooney, Michael J. "Reactions: Eucharistic Euphemy." *Triumph* 7 no. 6 (June, 1972): 5, 42.
- Rough Beast* 1 no. 1 (May, 1970).
- Rovere, Richard. "The Conservative Mindlessness." *Commentary* 39 (March 1965): 38.
- Rushdoomy, Rousas J. "Foundation of Western Liberty." *Triumph* 2 no. 3 (March, 1967): 26-29.

- Schenk, Richard C. "Edmund Burke: Enlightenment Man." *Triumph* 6 no. 7 (July, 1971): 15-18.
- Schlamm, Willi. "Looks Genteel Pogrom." *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 14-15, 17, 34.
- Schmitz, John G. "Up From Politics." *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 24-27.
- Schude, Karl G. "Christian Culture: Blessing or Burden?" *Triumph* 10 no. 4 (April, 1975): 9-12, 22.
- Schuler, Richard J. "Who Killed Sacred Music." *Triumph* 4 no. 3 (March, 1969): 21-23.
- Schwartz, Michael. "Amnesty: Yes or No? To Do Justice and to Heal the Nation." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 13-14.
- "Democracy: For Catholics Only." *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 24-25.
- "Four Post-Moderns: 4 Catholics, II: A Catholic Age Emerging?" *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 26-29.
- "Showdown in Pennsylvania." *Triumph* 9 no. 6 (June, 1974): 16-17.
- Sheffield, John. "Reactions." *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 4.
- Shelton, Charles. "Catholic Politics: Two View: Forming a Bloc." *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 27-30.
- Short, John. "The Pro-Life Agenda." *Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 17-19.
- "Wanted: A Pro-Life Movement." *Triumph* 8 no. 9 (November, 1973): 16-18.
- Simek, Alan. "Amnesty: Yes or No? Resistance to the Law Must Uphold the Law." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 43-44.
- "Dear Triumph: Do You Really Mean It? The Commandment of Love." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 17-18.
- "Neither Either Nor Or." *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 21-25.
- "The Commandment of Love, *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 17-18.
- Smathers, George A. "Business and the Crime Wave." *Triumph* 2 no. 7 (July, 1967): 10-12, 14.
- Society for the Christian Commonwealth. "A Dedication." *Triumph* 11 no. 1 (January, 1976): 2-3.

- “Special Supplement: The Ottaviani Intervention: A Critical Study of the Novus Ordo Missae.” *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 22A-22L.
- Spelta, Victor F. “Reactions: The Non-Trial of Major Magetts.” *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 4-5.
- Steckler, Gerard G. “Christians Must Become Disturbers of the Peace.” *Triumph* 5 no. 7 (July, 1970): 16-18.
- Taylor, Mark. “Arts and the Age: Protecting a Nation’s Soul.” *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 32-35.
- Tonsor, Stephen J. “The Confessional Tribe Under Fire.” *Triumph* 5 no. 9 (October, 1970): 20-23.
- Triumph* 9 no. 1 (January, 1974): 23.
- Unsigned. “Pratically Schismatic.” *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 8.
- . “Report from Chile: ‘Plan Z.’” *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 18-20.
- . ed., *Frederick Daniel Wilhelmsen (Eminent Professor and Catholic Intellectual): A Tribute from the University of Dallas* (Dallas: University of Dallas, 1998).
- . “Catholic Currents.” *Triumph* 9 no. 9 (November, 1974): 47.
- . “Christian Commonwealth Institute.” *Triumph* 6 no. 5 (May, 1971): 23.
- . “How Catholic is the IRA.” *Triumph* 8 no. 7 (July, 1973): 14-15.
- . “Life in America.” *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 23.
- . “Mr. Nixon’s Neighborhood.” *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 27-30.
- . “Q. Doctor, what does the aborted baby feel while it’s dying? A. Oh, I think that depends on your philosophy?” *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 20-23, 44.
- . “Q. What, Doctor, is the difference between you and Adolph Hitler? A: I really don’t think that’s a relevant question.” *Triumph* 7 no. 2 (February, 1972): 18-20, 43.
- . “Report from Ireland: The Anti-Life Movement at the Starting Gate.” *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 29-31.
- . “Report from Ireland: The Anti-Life Movement at the Starting Gate.” *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 29-31.

- "Society for the Christian Commonwealth." *Triumph* 5 no. 1 (January, 1970): 5.
- "Tabling the (Population) Question." *Triumph* 6 no. 2 (February, 1971): 26-27.
- "The Christian Commonwealth Institute." *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 31.
- "The Phenomenon of (Colored) Man: The Teilhard Papers III." *Triumph* 7 no. 1 (January, 1972): 28-30, 43.
- "The Teilhard Papers." *Triumph* 6 no. 9 (November, 1971): 11-14, 43.
- "Triumph on TV." *Triumph* 1 no. 2 (October, 1966): 33-35.
- "Ulster's Strangled Cry for Justice." *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 22-23, 43-44.
- "Ulster's Strangled Cry for Justice." *Triumph* 9 no. 10 22-23, 43-44.

Vatican Council II, "Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decree\\_19651118\\_apostolicam-actuositatem\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651118_apostolicam-actuositatem_en.html) (accessed September 3, 2008).

----- "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_const\\_19631204\\_sacrosanctum-concilium\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19631204_sacrosanctum-concilium_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).

----- "Declaration on Christian Education." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decl\\_19651028\\_gravissimum-educationis\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651028_gravissimum-educationis_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).

----- "Declaration on Religious Freedom." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decl\\_19651207\\_dignitatis-humanae\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651207_dignitatis-humanae_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).

----- "Declaration on the Relation of the Church to non-Christian Religions." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decl\\_19651028\\_nostra-aetate\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651028_nostra-aetate_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).

----- "Declaration on the Relation of the Church to non-Christian Religions." The Holy See.

- [http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decl\\_19651028\\_nostra-aetate\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651028_nostra-aetate_en.html) (accessed 30 July 2008).
- “Decree Concerning the Pastoral Office of Bishops in the Church.” The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decree\\_19651028\\_christus-dominus\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651028_christus-dominus_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- “Decree on Ecumenism.” The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decree\\_19641121\\_unitatis-redintegratio\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19641121_unitatis-redintegratio_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- “Decree on Priestly Training.” The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decree\\_19651028\\_optatam-totius\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651028_optatam-totius_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- “Decree on the Adaptation and Renewal of Religious Life.” The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decree\\_19651028\\_perfectae-caritatis\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651028_perfectae-caritatis_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- “Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity.” The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decree\\_19651118\\_apostolicam-actuositatem\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651118_apostolicam-actuositatem_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- “Decree on the Catholic Churches of the Eastern Rite.” The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decree\\_19641121\\_orientalium-ecclesiarum\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19641121_orientalium-ecclesiarum_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- “Decree on the Media of Social Communications.” The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decree\\_19631204\\_inter-mirifica\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19631204_inter-mirifica_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- “Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests.” The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decree\\_19651207\\_presbyterorum-ordinis\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651207_presbyterorum-ordinis_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- “Decree on the Mission Activity of the Church.” The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decree\\_19651207\\_ad-gentes\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651207_ad-gentes_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).

- "Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_const\\_19651118\\_dei-verbum\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651118_dei-verbum_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_const\\_19641121\\_lumen-gentium\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- "Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_cons\\_19651207\\_gaudium-et-spes\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html) (accessed July 1, 2008).
- "Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World." The Holy See.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_cons\\_19651207\\_gaudium-et-spes\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html) (accessed July 8, 2008).
- Voegelin, Eric. *The New Science of Politics: An Introduction*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952.
- von Habsburg, Otto. "Diplomatic Challenge." *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 18-19.
- "Remnant of Colonialism or Christian Commonwealth." *Triumph* 2 no. 1 (January, 1967): 11-14.
- von Hildebrand, Dietrich. "Belief and Obedience: The Critical Difference." *Triumph* 5 no. 3 (March, 1970): 11-14.
- "Liturgy: Present and Future: Reverence and Recollection." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 16-17.
- "Reactions: Czechoslovakia." *Triumph* 3 no. 11 (November, 1968): 6, 39.
- "The Case for the Latin Mass." *Triumph* 1 no. 2 (October, 1966): 10-13.
- "The Charitable Anathema." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 22-24, 38.
- von Keuhnelt-Leddihn, Erick. "The Philadelphia Society." *National Review* 17 (November 2, 1965): 986.
- "Radical Christianity." *Triumph* 2 no. 2 (February, 1967): 19-20.
- "The Church and Our Age: Sovereignty or Servitude?" *Triumph* 3 no. 12 (December, 1968): 25-27.
- "The Reactionary Vernacular." *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 18-20.

- "The Trouble with Christian Democracy." *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 26-28.
- Wade, David R. "Reactions: The Irish American and Sinn Fein." *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 4, 6.
- Walsh, Albert C., Frederick Gerard, Wm. O. Martin, Eliseo Vivas, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Neil McCaffrey, Stephen J. Tonsor, and Will Herberg. "The Confessional Tribe Under Fire." *Triumph* 5 no. 10 (October, 1970): 20-23.
- Walsh, Albert C. "Reactions: Dear Triumph." *Triumph* 7 no. 3 (March, 1972): 5-6.
- "Toward a Christian Social Order." *Triumph* 8 no. 5 (May, 1973): 15-19.
- Washington, Martha White. "Betrayal in the Schools." *Triumph* 4 no. 1 (January, 1969): 16-19.
- "The Mad Society." *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 16-18.
- Weatherby, Henry. "A Southern Rebuttal." *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 31-33.
- "A Southerner's View: The Church and the South." *Triumph* 2 no. 4 (April, 1967): 19-22.
- Weaver, Richard M. *Ideas Have Consequences*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Welch, Robert. *The Politician*. Belmont, MA: Belmont Publishing Company, 1963.
- Wells, Peter. "Parish Clergy to the Rescue." *Triumph* 2 no. 8 (August, 1967): 11-14.
- Wells, Peter. "The View from the Parish: Catholic Education." *Triumph* 2 no. 10 (October, 1967): 25-26.
- "The View from the Parish: Race Relations." *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 26-27.
- Wessel, Jr., Leonard P. "Are the United Presbyterians Christian?" *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 21-23.
- Wilhelmsen, Frederick D. "A Note Concerning Intellectual Dialogue and Catholic Journals." *The Wanderer* (August 5, 1965): 5.
- "A Parting of Friends." *Triumph* 7 no. 8 (October, 1972): 23-25.

- "Adiós: Francisco Franco—Caudillo de España." *The Wanderer* (December 11, 1975): 85-94.
- "Adiós: Francisco Franco—Caudillo de España." In *Citizen of Rome: Reflections from the Life of a Roman Catholic*, by Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, 222-223. La Salle, IL: Sherwood Sugden and Company, 1980.
- "Are the Great Books Enough?" *Triumph* 5 no. 4 (April, 1970): 24.
- "Arts and the Age: Hapsburg AEIOU." *Triumph* 7 no. 7 (July, 1972): 32-35.
- "Catechism V. The Child: A New Religion." *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 19-21.
- "Catholicism is Right, So Why Change It?" *The Saturday Evening Post* (July 15, 1967): 10-11.
- "Charlie and Legitimacy." *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 20-23.
- "Christmas in Christendom." *Triumph* 2 no. 12 (December, 1967): 10-12.
- "Communications: 'The Conservative Catholic.'" *Commonweal* 57 (April 3, 1953): 650-652.
- "Empty Womb, Empty Altar." *Triumph* 5 no. 6 (June, 1970): 18-21.
- "Frank Meyer, R.I.P." *Triumph* 7 no. 5 (May, 1972): 45.
- "Frederick D. Wilhelmsen." *Commonweal* 65 (February 22, 1957): 550-551.
- "Hallowed Be Thy World." *Triumph* 3 no. 6 (June, 1968): 11-14.
- "Hispanidad." *The Wanderer* (February 8, 1990): 10.
- "History, Toynbee and the Modern Mind: Betrayal of the West." *Modern Age* (Summer 1957): 33-47.
- "Imitations of Walking Death." *National Review* 9 (July 16, 1960): 26-27.
- "In Defense of Princess Irene of Holland and of Spanish Catholicism." *The Wanderer* (August 5, 1965): 3-8.
- "In Defense of Sin." *Triumph* 1 no. 1 (September, 1966): 12-15.
- "In the Name of Sanity." *Social Order* (January, 1955): 21-25.

- "Leslie Dewart: Heretic or Hellene?" *Triumph* 2 no. 1 (January, 1967): 30-34.
- "Letter from Spain: Forces at Work in Today's Spain." *America* (September 21, 1963): 306.
- "Notes Toward a Grammar of the Dialogue." *National Review* 17 (June 1, 1965): 450.
- "Otto von Hapsburg and the Future of Europe." *Modern Age* (Summer 1958): 266-272
- "Pope as Icon." *Triumph* 6 no. 1 (January, 1971): 11-14.
- "Reactions: Near to the Escorial." *Triumph* 8 no. 6 (June, 1973): 3.
- "Reactions: The Lesson of de Gaulle." *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 5-6.
- "Reflections on the Utility of a Disinterested Education." *University Bookman* 3 (1962): 54.
- "Report on Argentina: A New Peron?" *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 19.
- "Respondeo: Dicendum: A Farewell." *Triumph* 9 no. 8 (October, 1974): 31.
- "Respondeo: Dicendum: Family Politics." *Triumph* 10 no. 2 (February, 1975): 43.
- "Respondeo: Dicendum: Introibo as Altare Dei." *Triumph* 9 no. 4 (April, 1974): 30-31.
- "Respondeo: Dicendum: The Form is the Point." *Triumph* 8 no. 9 (November, 1973): 19.
- "Respondeo: Didendum: J.S. Mills v. Popcorn." *Triumph* 9 no. 2 (February, 1974): 16-17.
- "Royalist Revival in Central Europe." *National Review* 5 (January 18, 1958): 61-63.
- "Sacrilege: A Time to Act." *Triumph* 2 no. 11 (November, 1967): 22.
- "Technics and Totalitarianism." *Commonweal* 60 (April 23, 1954): 58-61.
- "Technology: Limited or Unlimited." *America* (October 20, 1956): 66-68.

- "The Bankruptcy of American Optimism." *National Review* 3 (May 11, 1957): 449-451.
- "The Conservative Catholic." *Commonweal* 57 (February 20, 1953): 491-493.
- "The Conservative Vision." *Commonweal* 62 (June 24, 1955): 295-299.
- "The Death of the Age of Analysis." *Triumph* 4 no. 10 (October, 1969): 24-27.
- "The Future of Catholic Spain." *Triumph* 10 no. 6 (June 1975): 11-14, 30.
- "The Good Earth." *Triumph* 4 no. 2 (February, 1969): 11-16.
- "The Sovereignty of Christ—or Chaos." *The Wanderer* (October 26, 1967): 1-12.
- "The Vision of Christopher Dawson." *Commonweal* 67 (January 3, 1958): 355-358.
- "Toward a Theology of Survival." *National Review* 17 (January 12, 1965): 17-19.
- "Toward an Incarnational Politics II: The Hour Is Short; The Hour Is Now." *Triumph* 8 no. 4 (April, 1973): 28-31.
- "Toward an Incarnational Politics." *Triumph* 8 no. 2 (February, 1973): 11-14.
- "Transcending the Dialectic." *Triumph* 4 no. 9 (September, 1969): 16-17.
- "Who Is a Real Conservative?" *The Catholic World* (December, 1956): 197-201.
- "Why I Am a Catholic." In *Born Catholics*, edited by Frank Sheed, 59-72. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1954.
- "With Mindszenty." *Triumph* 9 no. 7 (July, 1974): 31.
- *Citizen of Rome: Reflections from the Life of a Roman Catholic*. La Salle, IL: Sherwood Sugden & Company.
- *Hilaire Belloc: No Alienated Man, A Study in Christian Integration*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1953.
- *Man's Knowledge of Reality: An Introduction to Thomistic Epistemology*. Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1955.

- . *The Metaphysics of Love*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1962.
- , and Jane Bret. "Work and Leisure II." *Triumph* 5 no. 2 (February, 1970): 24-27.
- , and Jane Bret. "Work and Leisure." *Triumph* 4 no. 12 (December, 1969): 11-15.
- Wills, Gary. "An Exchange of Views: 'God and the Cold War.'" *Commonweal* 75 (October 20, 1961): 95-97.
- . "But is Ayn Rand Conservative." *National Review* (February 27, 1960): 139.
- . "Catholics and Population." *National Review* 17 (September 7, 1965): 643-648.
- . *Politics and Catholic Freedom*. Chicago, Henry Regnery, 1962.
- Wilson, Francis G. "Catholics and the New Conservatism." *Social Order* (June, 1956): 247-252.
- Wisner, John. "A Fault in the Democratic System." *Triumph* 2 no. 5 (May, 1967): 20-23.
- . "Amnesty: Yes or No? War, Sacrifice, Brotherhood." *Triumph* 9 no. 5 (May, 1974): 12.
- . "Atmospheric Stinks." *Triumph* 2 no. 1 (January, 1967): 20-22.
- . "Political Aspects of Solzhenitsyn's Exile." *Triumph* 10 no. 5 (May, 1975): 11-14.
- . "Reactions: 'War is hell.'" *Triumph* 2 no. 10 (October, 1967): 6.
- . "The End of Abolition." *Triumph* 3 no. 5 (May, 1968): 15-17, 38.
- . "The Fall of the Liberal Republic." *Triumph* 3 no. 8 (August, 1968): 11-14.
- . "Up From Economics" *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 26-29, 34.
- . "Vietnam Imbroglio." *Triumph* 1 no. 2 (October, 1966): 27-29.
- . "What Happened to the Church." *Triumph* 3 no. 2 (February, 1968): 21-24.
- . "Wisner's World: A Secular-Liberal Failure." *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 21.

- "Wisner's World: Boiling One's Brains." *Triumph* 3 no. 3 (March, 1968): 27.
- "Wisner's World: Leisure and Slums." *Triumph* 3 no. 10 (October, 1968): 24.
- "Wisner's World: Maintaining Order." *Triumph* 3 no. 1 (January, 1968): 24.
- "Wisner's World: The Causes of Defeat." *Triumph* 3 no. 4 (April, 1968): 15.
- "Wisner's World: The Ideal Man." *Triumph* 2 no. 10 (October, 1967): 27.
- "Wisner's World: The Negro Plaint." *Triumph* 4 no. 4 (April, 1969): 27.
- "Wisner's World: The Power of the Press." *Triumph* 4 no. 5 (May, 1969): 17.
- "Wisner's World: The Reverend M.L. King." *Triumph* 3 no. 6 (June, 1968): 34.
- "Wisner's World: The Transfer." *Triumph* 3 no. 7 (July, 1968): 34.
- "Wisner's World" Our Moral Imbecility." *Triumph* 2 no. 7 (July, 1967): 25.
- "Wisner's World: Priestly Celibacy." *Triumph* 2 no. 8 (August, 1967): 20.
- Yearly, Jr., C.K. "Self-Interest and the United Nations." *Commonweal* 75 (March 23, 1962).
- Zola, Joan. "Big Brother's Baby." *Triumph* 2 no. 9 (September, 1967): 18-20.
- "The New Catechisms: Towards Empty-Headed Catholics." *Triumph* 2 no. 7 (July, 1967): 22-24, 39.
- Zucchi, Philip F. "South Boston: What Hath Busing Wrought?" *Triumph* 9 no. 10 (December, 1974): 10-14.
- "Boston Busing Update." *Triumph* 10 no. 2 (February, 1975): 30-31.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

- Allitt, Patrick. "Triumph 1966-1976." In *The Conservative Press in Twentieth-Century America*, eds. Ronald Lora and William Henry Longton, 201-208. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999.

- . *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America, 1950-1985*. Ithaca: Cornell University, 1993.
- Au, William A. *The Cross, The Flag, and The Bomb: American Catholics Debate War and Peace, 1960-1983*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985.
- Balfour, Sebastian. "Spain from 1931 to the Present." In *Spain: A History*, edited by Raymond Carr, 243-282. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Bell, J. Bowyer Bell. *The IRA 1969-2000: Analysis of a Secret Army*. London: Frank Cass, 2000.
- Blinkhorn, Martin. *Carlism and Crisis in Spain, 1931-1939*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Bokenkotter, Thomas. *A Concise History of the Catholic Church*. Rev. ed. New York: Doubleday, 1990.
- Bozell, L. Brent. *Mustard Seeds A Conservative Becomes a Catholic: Collected Essays*. Manassas, VA: Trinity Communications, 1986.
- Buckley, Jr., William F. "James Burnham 1905-1987." *National Review* 39 (September 11, 1987): 31.
- . "L. Brent Bozell, RIP." *National Review* 49 (May 19, 1997): 22-23.
- Buckley, Priscilla. "Medal of Freedom." *National Review* 35 (April 1, 1983): 378.
- Carr, Raymond. *Modern Spain 1875-1980*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Carroll, Warren H. "Carlism in the Spanish Rising of 1936." In *Saints, Sovereigns, and Scholars*, edited by R.A. Herrera, James Lehrberger, and M.E. Bradford, 377-388. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.
- . "In Memoriam: Frederick D. Wilhelmsen (1923-1996)." *Faith and Reason* 22 no. 4 (Winter, 1996): 239-246.
- Ceplecha, Maria S. "Remembrances of a Philosopher-Sailor." *Faith and Reason* 22 no. 4 (Winter, 1996): 263-267.
- Cheek, H. Lee, Jr., M. Susan Powers, and Kathy B. Cheek, eds. *Political Philosophy and Cultural Renewal: Collected Essays*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transactions Publishers, 2001.
- Cooney, John. *The American Pope: The Life and Times of Francis Cardinal Spellman*. New York: Times Books, 1984.

- Crosby, Donald. *God, Church, and Flag: Senator Joseph McCarthy and the Catholic Church*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978.
- Cuneo, Michael W. *The Smoke of Satan: Conservative and Traditionalist Dissent in Contemporary American Catholicism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997; Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Davis, Cyprian. *The History of Black Catholics in the United States*. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1990.
- D'Andrea, Thomas D. "Frederick D. Wilhelmsen: An Appreciation and Memoir." *Faith and Reason* 22 no. 4 (Winter, 1996): 253-267.
- Diggins, John P. *Up From Communism: Conservative Intellectual Odysseys In American Intellectual History*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1975.
- Dolan, Jay P. *In Search of an American Catholicism: A History of Religion and Culture in Tension*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- *The American Catholic Experience: A History From Colonial Times to the Present*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- Edwards, Lee. *Educating for Liberty: The First Half-Century of Intercollegiate Studies Institute*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2003.
- *The Conservative Revolution: The Movement that Remade America*. New York: The Free Press, 1999.
- Ellis, John Tracy. *American Catholicism*. Rev. ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- Ewbank, Michael B. "Dr. Fredrick Daniel Wilhelmsen: 1923-1996." *The Wanderer* (June 20, 1996): 12.
- "In Memoriam: Frederick D. Wilhelmsen (1923-1996)." *Review of Metaphysics* (September, 1996): 262.
- Ferriter, Diarmaid. *The Transformation of Ireland: 1900-2000*. London: Profile Books, 2004.
- Filler, Louis. *Dictionary of American Conservatism*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1987.
- Fisher, James T. *Communion of Immigrants: A History of Catholics in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- Flackes, Sydney, and W.D. Flackes. *Conflict in Northern Ireland: An Encyclopedia*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 1999.
- Foley, Patrick. "Frederick D. Wilhelmsen." *The Catholic Social Science Review* 1 (1996): 281.
- . "In Memoriam Frederick D. Wilhelmsen: One Year Later." *The Catholic Social Science Review* 2 (1997): 329.
- Francis, Samuel. *Thinkers of Our Time: James Burnham*. London: The Claridge Press, 1999.
- Frohnen, Bruce, Jeremy Beer, and Jeffrey O. Nelson, eds. *American Conservatism: An Encyclopedia*. Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2006.
- Gaddis, John Lewis. *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Gillis, Chester. *Roman Catholicism in America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
- Glazier, Michael, and Monika K. Hellwig, eds., *The Modern Catholic Encyclopedia*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1994.
- Glazier, Michael, and Thomas J. Shelley, eds. *The Encyclopedia of American Catholic History*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997.
- Gleason, Philip. *Contending with Modernity: Catholic Higher Education in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Gottfried, Paul. *The Conservative Movement*. Rev. ed. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1993.
- Griffin, Edward G. *The Life and Words of Robert Welch: Founder of the John Birch Society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: American Media, 1975.
- Hardon, John A. *Pocket Catholic Catechism*. New York: Doubleday, 1989.
- . *The Catholic Catechism*. New York: Doubleday, 1981.
- Hart, Jeffrey. "Frederick Wilhelmsen, RIP." *National Review* (July 1, 1996): 17.
- . *The Making of the American Conservative Mind: National Review and Its Times*. Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 2005.
- Haynes, John Earl, and Harvey Klehr. *Venona: Decoding Soviet Espionage in America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

- Henneseey, James. *American Catholics: A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Herr, Richard. *The Eighteenth-Century Revolution in Spain*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1958; Reprint, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Herrera, Robert A. "Frederick D. Wilhelmsen." *The Catholic Social Science Review* 1 (1996): 283-284.
- Hill, Kenneth L. *Cold War Chronology Soviet-American Relations: 1945-1991*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1993.
- Himmelstein, Jerome L. *To the Right: The Transformation of American Conservatism*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990.
- Hodgson, Godfrey. *The World Turned Right Side Up: The History of The Conservative Ascendancy in America*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1996.
- Holt, Edgar. *The Carlist Wars in Spain*. London: Putnam, 1967.
- Janaro, John. "Editorial." *Faith and Reason* 22 no. 4 (Winter, 1996): 233-235.
- Judis, John B. *William F. Buckley, Jr.: Patron Saint of the Conservatives*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988.
- Kelly, Daniel. *James Burnham and the Struggle for the World: A Life*. Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2002.
- Kelly, John L. *Bringing the Market Back In: The Political Revitalization of Market Liberalism*. New York: New York University Press, 1997.
- Kenneally, James J. *The History of American Catholic Women*. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1990.
- Kennelly, Karen. Ed. *American Catholic Women: A Historical Explanation*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989.
- Kovrig, Bennett. *Communism in Hungary: From Kun to Kadar*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1979.
- Lehrberger, James J. "Christendom's Troubador: Frederick D. Wilhelmsen." *The Intercollegiate Review* (Spring, 1997): 52-55.
- , "In Memoriam: Frederick D. Wilhelmsen (1923-1996)." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* (Summer, 1996): 458.

- Lynch, Kevin. "Mission of Mercy." *National Review* (June 5, 1987): 45-46.
- MacClancy, Jeremy. *The Decline of Carlism*. Reno: University of Nevada Press, 2000.
- Marshner, William H. "Don Federico: Presente!" *Faith and Reason* 22 no. 4 (Winter, 1996): 247-252.
- McAvoy, Thomas T. *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.
- McGirr, Lisa. *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- McGreevy, John T. *Catholicism and American Freedom: A History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2003.
- Meconis, Charles A. *With Clumsy Grace: The American Catholic Left, 1961-1975*. New York: Seabury, 1979.
- Molnar, Thomas. "Frederick Wilhelmsen, R.I.P." *Chronicles* (June, 1997): 48.
- Morris, Charles R. *American Catholic: The Saints and Sinners Who Built America's Most Powerful Church*. New York: Random House, 1997.
- Murphy, Paul V. *The Rebuke of History: The Southern Agrarians and American Conservative Thought*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- Nash, George H. *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America: Since 1945*. New York: Basic Books, 1976; Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 1998.
- Neuhas, Richard John. "While We're At It." *First Things* (August-September, 1997): 86-87.
- Nolan, Hugh J., ed. *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops: Volume II, 1962-1974*. Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1983.
- O'Brien, David J. "American Catholics and the Vietnam War." In *War or Peace? The Search for New Answers*, edited by Thomas Shannon, 119-150. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1981.
- Payne, Stanley G. "Spanish Conservatism, 1834-1923." *Journal of Contemporary History* 13 no. 4 (October, 1978): 765-789.

- . *Fascism in Spain, 1923-1977*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1999
- . *Franco's Spain*. New York: Cromwell, 1967.
- Pope John Paul II. "Catechism of the Catholic Church." The Holy See. [http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/\\_INDEX.HTM](http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/_INDEX.HTM) (accessed September 5, 2008).
- Power, M. Susan. "A Forgotten Conservative: Francis Graham Wilson." *Modern Age* (Winter 1999): 55-62.
- Powers, Richard Gid. *Not Without Honor: the History of American Anticommunism*. New York: The Free Press, 1995.
- Rusher, William A. *The Rise of the Right*. New York: William Morrow & Company, 1984.
- Schaefer, Thomas. "Frederick D. Wilhelmsen: Requiescat in Pace." *The University Bookman* 36 (Fall 1996): 18-21.
- Schiller, Craig. *The (Guilty) Conscience of a Conservative*. New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1978.
- Schneider, Gregory L. *Cadres for Conservatism: Young Americans for Freedom and the Rise of the Contemporary Right*. New York: New York University Press, 1999.
- . ed. *Conservatism in America Since 1930: A Reader*. New York: New York University Press, 2003.
- . ed. *Equality, Decadence, and Modernity: The Collected Essays of Stephen J. Tonsor*. Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2005.
- Schoenwald, Jonathan M. *A Time for Choosing: The Rise of Modern American Conservatism*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2001.
- Silk, Mark. *Spiritual Politics: Religion and America Since World War II*. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1988.
- Smant, Kevin J. *How Great the Triumph: James Burnham, Anticommunism and the Conservative Movement*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1999.
- Tentler, Leslie Woodcock. *Catholics and Contraception: An American History*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004.

- The Holy See. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Trans. by the United States Catholic Conference. Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference—Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1994.
- Thomas, Hugh. *The Spanish Civil War*. 3rd ed. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1986.
- Thorne, Melvin. *American Conservative Thought since World War II: The Core Ideas*. New York: Greenwood, 1990.
- Unsigned. Ed. *The Best of Triumph*. Front Royal, VA: Christendom Press, 2001.
- Unsigned. Ed., *Frederick Daniel Wilhelmsen (Eminent Professor and Catholic Intellectual): A Tribute from the University of Dallas*. Dallas: University of Dallas, 1998.
- Van Allen, Roger. *Commonweal and American Catholicism: The Magazine, The Movement, the Meaning*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- Walch, Timothy. *Parish School: American Catholic Parochial Education from Colonial Times to the Present*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1996.
- Warner, Michael. *Changing Witness: Catholic Bishops and Public Policy, 1917-1994*. Washington, D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1995.
- Weaver, Mary Jo, and R. Scott Appleby, eds., *Being Right: Conservative Catholics in America*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1995.
- Wilhelmsen, Alexandra. "Antonio Aparisi y Guijarro: A Nineteenth-Century Carlist Apologist for a Sacral Society in Spain." In *Saints, Sovereigns, and Scholars*, edited by R.A. Herrera, James Lehrberger, and M.E. Bradford, 365-376. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.
- "Carlism: From Reaction to Counterrevolution, 1833- 1876." In *Spanish Carlism and Polish Nationalism: The Borderlands of Europe in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries*, edited by Marek Jan Chodakiewicz and John Radilowski, 9-23. Charlottesville, VA: Leopolis Press, 2003.
- "Carlism's Defense of the Church in Spain, 1933-1936." *Faith and Reason* 14 (Winter, 1990): 355-370.
- "Carlos VII or an Introduction to Carlism." *Iberian Studies* 8 no. 1 (Spring 1979): 29-41.

- . "The Carlist Motto, *Dios, Patria, Fueros, Rey* in the Late Nineteenth Century." *Society for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies Bulletin* 6 (September, 1979): 250-253.
- . "The Conspiracy of La Rápita and the Theory of the Two Legitimacies." *Society for Spanish and Portuguese Studies Bulletin* 11 (October, 1986): 16-18.
- . "The Theory of Spanish Political Traditionalism (1810- 1875): Realism and Carlism." In *Identidad y nacionalismo en la España contemporánea: El Carlismo (1833-1975) Jornadas organizadas por la Universidad de Wisconsin-Madison y la Fundación Hernando de Larramendi*, edited by S. G. Payne, 44-54. Madrid: Actas, 1996.
- Wuthnow, Robert. *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith since World War II*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.

## VITA

Mark David Popowski

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctorate of Philosophy

Dissertation: ROMAN CATHOLIC CRUSADING IN TEN YEARS OF *TRIUMPH*, 1966-1976: A HISTORY OF A LAY-DIRECTED, RADICAL CATHOLIC JOURNAL

Major Field: History

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Mankato, Minnesota, June 21, 1977, the son of David and Sharon Popowski. Married in Lincoln, Nebraska, on June 29, 2002, to Amber Marie Fairbanks.

Education: Graduated from Loyola High School, Mankato, Minnesota, in June, 1996; received the Bachelor of Science degree in History from Minnesota State University, Mankato, in May, 2001; received the Master of Arts degree in History from Emporia State University, Emporia, Kansas, in December, 2003; completed the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in History at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in December, 2008.

Experience: Graduate Teaching Assistant, History Department, Emporia State University, 2001-2003; Adjunct Instructor, Butler County Community College, El Dorado, Kansas, 2003; Graduate Teaching Associate, History Department, Oklahoma State University, 2004-present.

Professional Memberships: American Catholic Historical Association.

Name: Mark David Popowski

Date of Degree: December, 2008

Institution: Oklahoma State University

Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: ROMAN CATHOLIC CRUSADING IN TEN YEARS OF *TRIUMPH*,  
1966-1976: A HISTORY OF A LAY-DIRECTED, RADICAL  
CATHOLIC JOURNAL

Pages in Study: 524

Candidate for the Degree of Doctorate of Philosophy

Major Field: History

Scope and Method of Study: The purpose of this study was to explicate the Roman Catholic views of *Triumph*, a lay-directed Catholic journal. The principal source was the journal. In addition, the research was dependent upon interviews, books published by the editors, papal encyclicals, Vatican Council II documents, and two special collections. The primary research was complimented by extensive secondary research.

Findings and Conclusions: The purpose of *Triumph's* editors was to convert America to the Roman Catholic faith and construct a confessional state. That is, they wanted to subject the public order to the authority of Christ's vicar, the pope. They believed that the American political order—because it gave authority to the people, rather than Christ, and separated Church and state—was an inherently secular and relativist order, and thus, was an obstacle to virtue. The confessional state, in contrast, aided virtue and thereby promoted the salvation of its members. The confessional state, they noted, was an act of love. The thesis of this dissertation is that *Triumph's* editors were radical. Their views—essentially calling for a regime change—were militant and extraordinary in the context of late twentieth-century America. Two sub-theses of this dissertation are that the editors did more than sustain a journal, but actually founded a movement dedicated to their radical goals, and that the journal, despite its sectarian views, was important. Their views and actions exhibited the tension that is to exist, supposedly, between the Roman Catholic Church and the modern pluralist and secular state. Catholics have dual citizenship, to the Church of Rome and to their country. The obligations to the former, the Church teaches, supersede the latter when their interests conflict. A Catholic revival in America, rooted in such a tension, could rightly be traced to *Triumph*.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL: Dr. Ronald A. Petrin