

* May 13, 2017 Addendum

Additions and Modifications since the Dec. 8, 2016 version

1. pp. 1-2

Summary of Catholic Moral Principles . . .

By adhering to the Catholic principles of morality, teachers can assist students in the formation of their conscience according to the *objective morality* of good and evil, based on Church teaching and divine revelation. This will prevent students from being led astray by the liberal error of *freedom of conscience*, which bases moral judgment on *subjective morality*, i.e., one's personal ideas or feelings about right and wrong, e.g., "How do 'you' feel about this?" or "What do 'you' think about this?" *Subjective morality* is based on *humanist psychology*, which teaches that the most important source of authority is within oneself and one's own conscience, and that a person should appeal solely to his conscience in deciding what is good or evil.

* **Note on Subjectivism:** As Archbishop Lefebvre explains in his book, *They Have Uncrowned Him*, p.15: "In *subjectivism*, it is the reason that constructs the truth: we have the submission of the object to the subject. The subject becomes the center of all things. *Things are no longer what they are, but what I think*. In such a case, man disposes of truth according to his own taste. This error will be called **Idealism** in its philosophical aspect, and **Liberalism** in its moral, social, political and religious aspect."

2. pp. 2-3

B. Qualifications of Teachers in Catholic schools: Pope Pius XI says in his encyclical, *Christian Education of Youth*: "Perfect schools are the result not so much of good methods as of good teachers, teachers who are thoroughly prepared and well-grounded in the matter they have to teach; *who possess the intellectual and moral qualifications required by their important office*; who cherish a pure and holy love for the youths confided to them, *because they love Jesus Christ and His Church*, of which these are the children of predilection; and who have therefore sincerely at heart the true good of family and country" (§88)

"Teachers should keep in mind what Leo XIII says: 'Greater stress must be laid on the employment of apt and solid methods of teaching, and, what is still more important, *on bringing into full conformity with the Catholic faith*, what is taught in literature, in the sciences, and above all in philosophy, on which depends in great part the right orientation of the other branches of knowledge'." (§87)

Literature teachers in particular must possess doctrinal and moral integrity in their personal lives, for one of their main goals is to assist in the formation of the Catholic conscience and moral judgment of the students in their literature

class, where students precisely need to be taught to discern between good and evil according to Catholic moral principles and balanced moral judgment. *Consequently, teachers with immoral conduct or corrupt moral judgment would be unfit and incapable in this important work.*

Canon Law says: “The instruction and education in a Catholic school must be grounded in the principles of Catholic doctrine; teachers are to be *outstanding in correct doctrine and integrity of life*” (1983, c. 803, §2).

In his *Commentary on St. Matthew* (Ch. 5: 5), St. Thomas Aquinas says in reference to preachers—which can also apply to teachers: “If the doctrine is good and the preacher is bad, he is the occasion for blaspheming the doctrine of God” (See *Doctrinal Writings of St. Pius X*, 1988 reprint, p. 417).

C. Intellectual, Moral and Religious Education: Since the Catholic education of youth concerns the spiritual, moral and intellectual formation of the whole person, it follows that *intellectual education must always be ordered to the spiritual and moral good of the person.* Thus, knowledge or information which is harmful to the soul and spiritual life must be avoided. For example, knowledge of those things reserved to adults should not be taught to children, since they do not have the necessary maturity and understanding.

In the *online Catholic Encyclopedia (New Advent)*, on the topic of “Education,” we read: “*Intellectual education must not be separated from moral and religious education.* To impart knowledge or to develop mental efficiency without building up moral character is not only contrary to psychological law, which requires that all the faculties should be trained, but is also fatal both to the individual and to society. *No amount of intellectual attainment or culture can serve as a substitute for virtue; on the contrary, the more thorough intellectual education becomes, the greater is the need for sound moral training.*”

3. p. 4

4. Importance of Adherence to Catholic Moral Principles

Adherence to Catholic moral principles concerning the reading of literature is especially important today when we consider the methods used in schools over the past fifty years to corrupt Christian morals. For decades before Vatican II, Modernists, Freemasons and Communists infiltrated Catholic schools and seminaries, not only as teachers, but also as psychotherapists and psychologists, in their long-term goal to destroy the Catholic Church and corrupt Christians.

Catholics—and all Christians—should remember that before Vatican II, the entire Catholic Church was *traditional* Catholic. Therefore, it stands to reason that the enemies of Christ, who infiltrated the Church before Vatican II, have still been infiltrating the traditional Catholic Church since Vatican II, continuing their subversive work to destroy the Church and to corrupt the faith and morals of the people. They will be using the same methods that they used before Vatican

II and during the 1960s and 1970s, especially by using the clever tactic of confusing and brainwashing good people to help them in their work.

4. pp. 7-10

1) Modern Error About Literature in Education: Liberal teachers believe that students should read about the moral evils in the world today in order to be better prepared to confront them after high school. They say that it is not good to shelter kids from the evil and corruption they will see in the world when they get out of school.

Consequently, in the education of youth, they think it is important to include in the curriculum literature and poetry with texts that describe indecency and moral depravity, telling parents that if their children are ignorant of the evils and immorality of today's society, they will not be able to resist moral evils when they leave school, and their ignorance and "innocence" will be the cause of their fall into immoral behavior.

However, these liberal teachers are seriously mistaken. For according to basic Christian principles, the teaching of Catholic moral theology, and the common teaching of the Saints and Fathers of the Church, when it concerns sins against the 6th and 9th Commandments, a person must resist and avoid temptations of impurity, not read indecent or impure stories about them.

The reason is because Mankind is a fallen race, and by the wounds of original sin, all people have disordered inclinations towards sensual pleasure. Consequently, the more a person thinks or reads about sensual things, the more he causes temptations of impurity to increase, and the weaker he becomes to resist temptation. It is the error of *Naturalism* to ignore or deny this.

Fr. Robert Schwickerath, S.J., on page 567 in his book, *Jesuit Education* (1904), says that indecent and sensual literature is especially dangerous because "*it stimulates curiosity, sets the mind thinking, and leaves the reader to reflect and dwell on an unsavory and prurient subject.*"

Consequently, exposing students to sensual and indecent literature, plays, movies, etc., will not strengthen them against temptation, but will rather desensitize them to indecency and impurity, dull their consciences into minimizing the seriousness of such sins, and make it more difficult to resist temptations of immoral thoughts and behavior as they get older.

Thus, Pope Pius XI says in his encyclical *Christian Education of Youth*: "Such persons grievously err in refusing to recognize the inborn weakness of human nature, and the law of which the Apostle speaks, fighting against the law of the mind; and also in ignoring the experience of facts, from which it is clear that, particularly in young people, *evil practices are the effect not so much of ignorance of intellect as of weakness of a will exposed to dangerous occasions, and unsupported by the means of grace.*" (¶66)

To heal the wounds of original sin, we must turn to God, Who in His infinite goodness and mercy, will always give us the grace we need to overcome sin and

temptation, *as long as we don't willfully seek temptation* by placing ourselves in the *near occasion of sin*. By the grace of Christ and the supernatural helps of the Church, such as frequent confession and Holy Communion, and by true devotion to Mary—especially by praying the daily rosary, wearing the scapular and making the five First Saturdays, the Catholic family will be protected against the evils of the modern world, and will be a reflection of the love of God.

*** Note on the Error of Socrates:** Even the ancient Greek philosopher *Socrates* erred in thinking that the main cause of sin was ignorance. As St. Thomas Aquinas says in his *Summa Theologica*: “Socrates said ‘every virtue is a kind of prudence.’ Hence, he maintained that as long as man is in possession of knowledge, he cannot sin; and that everyone who sins, does so through ignorance. Now this is based on a false supposition... For a man to do a good deed, it is requisite not only that his reason be well disposed by means of a habit of intellectual virtue, *but also that his will [appetite] be well disposed by means of a habit of moral virtue*” (Ia IIae, Q. 58, A. 2).

2) Sound Catholic Psychology Refutes this Error: In his book, *Good Discipline, Great Teens* (2007), the Catholic psychologist, *Dr. Ray Guarendi*, refutes this false idea in the education of youth. Dr. Guarendi is a father of ten, clinical psychologist, author, professional speaker, and national radio and television host. His radio show, *The Dr. Is In* can be heard on over 440 stations and Sirius XM channel 130. His TV show, *Living Right with Dr. Ray* is aired in 140 countries. He has been heard on *Catholic Family Radio Network* from 1999-2000, and *Ave Maria Radio Network* from 2001-Present.

In his book, *Good Discipline, Great Teens*, pp. 150-151, Dr. Guarendi says: “Yes, you can’t protect [children] forever. Yes, that is a real world out there. And yes, they do have to learn to deal with life. What does any of this have to do with raising your children at your pace and not the world’s?”

“What you are hearing makes my top ten list of *nonsense notions* assaulting good parents today... Let’s go back a couple of generations when protecting kids—socially, morally and emotionally—was considered a very good thing. *Indeed, a prime duty of grown-ups was to shield children from the ugly and immoral stuff of life while morality was being formed.* Keeping kids innocent was a worthy goal, a sign of responsible and wise parenting...”

“In the last generation or two, we’ve taken a step backward toward ‘enlightenment.’ It is now more psychologically savvy to help kids deal with seamy reality as it assails them. In fact, if you put this off too long, when the child finally does confront the ‘real world,’ whatever that means, he will be shell-shocked emotionally and morally. He’ll be overwhelmed or seduced by evil or crushed into despair. His very innocence will be his undoing.”

However, “the opposite of innocence is not maturity; it is worldliness. And worldliness does not equip a child to cope with the world. It just makes him more likely to be comfortable with it...”

“Most parents accused of being overprotective want to shield their kids

from situations and people who could overwhelm their judgment or their young consciences. A good parent's supervision, caution and vigilance are healthy and wise...

"Only when it's too late do many parents realize that they weren't protective enough. Over and over again, my experience with families has taught me a real-life truth: far more children have trouble as adults not because they grew up slowly, but because they saw and learned too much too early."

3) *The Proper Study of Good and Evil is Through Catechism:*

Catholic youth are not sent into the world without the necessary knowledge of good and evil. Rather, it is through good Catholic catechism classes and the study of the Ten Commandments that they are taught about virtue and vice; about sin and temptation; about avoiding the near occasions of sin; and about recognizing the signs and tactics of evil people (e.g., predators) who pose a danger to their faith and morals.

*** *Note on the Catholic Church's Teaching on Sex Education:*** Seeing that liberals and modernists frequently accuse good parents of being puritanical and prudish if they oppose explicit indecency and sexual depravity in literature, it would be good to mention here the Church's teaching on sex education, since the intentional use of literature with sexual themes in the education of youth is actually a veiled form of sex education.

In the article, *Sex Education: The Vatican's Guidelines*, by Kenneth D. Whitehead, *Crisis Magazine*, Vol. 14, May 1996, we read: "The Catholic Church's traditional teaching about sex education, especially as formulated by Popes Pius XI and Pius XII, is that *it should not be primarily a matter of giving explicit information at all, but rather it should be a matter of inculcating modesty, purity, chastity, and morality, a matter of teaching the sixth and ninth commandments.*

"Moreover, *it should also be primarily a matter for the parents to impart privately in the home*, not something to be purveyed and discussed in mixed classrooms of boys and girls at impressionable ages..."

"This should take into strict account the individual stage of development, or *latency period*, of each child being educated, i.e., the time in the young person's development, when the explicit information about the facts of life should precisely not be given.

"Especially in the heart of their own families, *young people should be aptly and seasonably instructed about the dignity, duty, and expression of married love.* Trained thus in the cultivation of chastity, they will be able at a suitable age to enter a marriage of their own after an honorable courtship. Thus, if there is anything than can rightly be called Catholic sex education, *it cannot be anything else but an education in chastity imparted by the parents or in close collaboration with and in support of the parents.*"

Lastly, to emphasize the delicacy and sensitivity of this particular kind of subject matter, *Pope Pius XI* says in *Christian Education of Youth*: "Such is our

misery and inclination to sin, that often in the very things considered to be remedies against sin, we find occasions for and inducements to sin itself. Hence it is of the highest importance that ***a good father, while discussing with his son a matter so delicate, should be well on his guard and not descend to details, nor refer to the various ways in which this infernal hydra destroys with its poison so large a portion of the world; otherwise it may happen that, instead of extinguishing this fire, he unwittingly stirs or kindles it in the simple and tender heart of the child.***” (¶67)

5. pp. 23-25

1. Errors of Modernists and Liberals

Note: Modernists and liberals also use *Sensitivity Training* and *Situation Ethics* in their work to undermine and corrupt Catholic thinking.

See **APPENDIX 3** below for a historical overview of Modernist, Liberal and Marxist methods of subversion in schools since Vatican II, especially in the 1960s and 1970s.

A. Contrary to the Principle of St. Basil the Great: As we saw above, St. Basil the Great, in his *Address to Young Men*, explains that the benefit of reading classic literature consists in enabling the reader to become *familiar with virtue*, not vice. He says: “It is no small advantage that a certain intimacy and familiarity with virtue should be engendered in the minds of the young... But we shall take rather those passages of theirs in which they have praised virtue or condemned vice... for familiarity with evil words is, as it were, a road leading to evil deeds.”

Modernists and Liberals, however, claim that it is important for students to read literature that portrays indecency, impurity and other moral depravity, for this will give them a more realistic knowledge about the evils in today’s society, and help them to become stronger and better prepared to resist temptation and practice virtue in the modern world. Besides, they say, “It’s wrong to shelter the youth from the evils of the real world they’re going to live in when they leave school.”

Modernist teachers tell parents that if their children do not know about the moral evils in today’s world, they will not be adequately prepared to confront them when they get out of school, and their ignorance and “innocence” will be the cause of future psychological problems or immoral behavior. If parents show opposition, students are told to trust their teachers since “they are more educated” than their parents.

Not infrequently, students are told not to bring their books home from school, thus preventing parents from knowing which books are being used. In some schools, modernist teachers require parents to sign forms consenting to the school literature program *as a condition for enrollment* of children in the school—thus denying their right to object to inappropriate literature.

By means of *Intellectual Intimidation*, Modernists and Liberals sometimes use ridicule, mockery and sarcasm towards Catholics who oppose inappropriate literature. *For example:*

1) *In defense of Evelyn Waugh's book, Black Mischief*, against Ecclesiastical condemnation, a retired modernist professor from Annapolis Naval Academy, who called this book a *great comic satire*, once said:

“Published in 1932, it was the first novel published since he [Waugh] had converted. As a result, many readers, especially Catholics, assumed he would now be writing sweet, pious books in which everyone is lovely, and the nuns sing together, and we all go to Mass, then to a big family dinner where we say grace as grandma sheds a tear, and as the sun comes up the next morning, the children brush their teeth before going to Catholic school where the nuns inspect their teeth, finding them all clean and shining...”

“*What he wrote instead is a novel that is so outrageous that I cannot in public describe what happens at the end.* It reaches points of the gruesome that are unimaginable but raucously funny at the same time. It is quite horrifying, but not nearly as horrifying as life in the modern world would soon actually become...”

“The leading Catholic periodical at the time, *The Tablet*, published an absolutely scathing review of the book. This magazine was under the close supervision of Cardinal Bourne of London. It was clear that the disapproval was coming from the highest reaches of the Church.” (See the SSPX *Angelus Magazine*, May 2011, pp. 28-29).

2) *In a similar way*, modernist teachers often accuse parents of being puritanical and naïve, saying that it is normal for the Church to have literature that portrays moral depravity and explicit sin. They say that students need to read such literature so as to learn how to appreciate its intellectual value and humor, and to be prepared to live side by side with evil in the modern world.

To support their position, they sometimes point out that many Catholic authors have written this kind of literature (e.g., Ernest Hemingway, Evelyn Waugh, Graham Greene, etc.), and that many scholars, and even popes, have praised the nude art of famous Catholic artists and painters, such as Michelangelo and Leonardo da Vinci. Sometimes, when showing the nude art of the Sistine Chapel to students in the classroom, they say: “The human body is beautiful and we should all get used to it because, after all, we won’t have any clothes on when we’re in heaven.”

However, even if some Catholic writers or ecclesiastics defend or promote the use of indecent literature in the education of youth, they are still mistaken, for it is based on the error of *naturalist humanism* and the denial of the wounds of original sin. As Archbishop Lefebvre says on page 4 in his book, *They Have Uncrowned Him*:

“*Naturalism* is found beforehand in the *Renaissance*, which, in its effort to recover the riches of the ancient pagan cultures, and of the Greek culture and art in particular, *came to glorify man, nature and natural forces to an*

exaggerated degree. In exalting the goodness and the power of nature, one devalued and made disappear from the minds of man the necessity of grace; and the fact that humanity is destined for the supernatural order and the light brought in by revelation...

“Under a pretext of art, they determined to introduce everywhere, even in the churches, that nudism—we can speak without exaggeration, which triumphs in the Sistine Chapel. Without a doubt, looked at from the point of view of art, those works have their value; *but they have, alas, above all a carnal aspect of exaltation of the flesh that is really opposed to the teaching of the Gospel:* ‘For the flesh covets the spirit,’ says St. Paul, ‘and the spirit militates against the flesh.’ I do not condemn this art if it is kept in secular museums, *but I do not see in it a means of expressing the truth of Redemption, that is to say, the happy submission of restored nature to grace.*”

6. pp. 27-28

4) Vladimir Putin Endorses Communism: In a speech at a meeting with members of the All-Russia People’s Front in Stavropol, Russia, Jan. 25, 2016, Vladimir Putin says: “You know that I, like millions of Soviet citizens, over 20 million, was a member of the Communist Party of the USSR, and not only was I a member of the party, but I worked for almost 20 years for an organization called the Committee for State Security” [KGB]... “I was not, as you know, a party member by necessity. *I liked Communist and socialist ideas very much, and I like them still.*” (See the *Newsweek* article, Sept. 25, 2016: *Russia’s Putin: I’ve Always Liked Communist and Socialist Ideas*).

In his speech, Putin also says that the *Moral Code of the Builder of Communism*, i.e., the set of rules to be followed by all party members, “*resembles the Bible a lot.*” Seeing, therefore, that Putin still endorses the ideas of Socialism and Communism, it stands to reason that recent legislation in Russia against homosexuality, pornography, pedophilia, etc., is due to Putin’s intention to enforce the *Moral Code of Communism*, which “resembles the Bible a lot,” rather than to promote Christian moral values. For the goal of Cultural Marxism is to corrupt and overturn the Christian culture of the Western World, not to cause the ruin of Russia.

Also, according to a July 17, 2016 news report by the *Catholic New Agency* (CNA), titled *New Religious Laws in Russia Not Expected to Hurt Catholic Church*, President Putin approved a new set of laws (effective July 20, 2016) as part of new anti-terrorism legislation. According to these laws, evangelization, missionary activity, as well as faith sharing in private homes (*e.g., private Masses*), are now forbidden except in church buildings and worship areas *officially registered with the Russian government.* (The Russian Orthodox Church has always maintained its ties to the Russian government).

According to the news report, a 24-year missionary priest in Russia relates that these laws are not expected to hurt the Catholic Church, since the Catholic

Church already follows government regulations that require religious organizations to be officially registered with the government. However, he says, Catholic missionaries “do not proselytize on the streets, because *even if it wasn't against the law, it would certainly be very dangerous...* for the religious situation in Russia is very fraught.”

Additionally, according to the report, even though polls relate that 65% of the population in Russia say they believe in God, “the terrors of the Communist regime are still fresh in the collective mind of the country, *leaving the percentage of outwardly practicing Orthodox Christians or Catholic Christians at or below 1% of the population.*”

7. pp. 28-29

D. Moral Compromise and Naturalism: This modernist opinion logically falls into *two errors*:

(1) **The first error** says that it is sometimes permitted to do evil to accomplish good, which was condemned by St. Paul in Romans 3:8. For modernist teachers think the reading of literature with indecency and obscenity will help students learn how to practice virtue and avoid vice.

(2) **The second error is Naturalism**, which, by denying or ignoring the wounds and consequences of original sin, promotes the reading of famous literature and poetry for the sake of its eloquence and style, in spite of descriptions of indecencies and moral depravity in the text.

* **Note: Naturalism** (i.e., *humanism*) **in literature and art** was one of the main tools used by Satan during the *Renaissance* (beginning in the 14th century) to lure Christians into worldliness, sensuality and disordered intellectualism—which led to the decline of holiness and the practice of Christian virtue in society. This ultimately led to *the collapse of the Christian Social Order, and paved the way for the Protestant Revolt, the French Revolution and the subsequent attacks on the social reign of Christ the King.*

E. Method of Lucifer in Tempting Adam and Eve: This modernist opinion on immoral literature is reminiscent of the *method of Lucifer* in tempting Adam and Eve with the knowledge of evil. For in offering them the forbidden fruit, Lucifer said: “Your eyes shall be opened: and you shall be as Gods, knowing good and evil” (Gen. 3:5). Thus, he offered them the knowledge of both good and evil, under the pretext that, **by knowing evil, too, they would be more knowledgeable, more intelligent, superior, and better prepared to live in the world.** This appealed to their intellectual pride, and has caused in mankind a disordered curiosity for the knowledge of evil.

Adam and Eve already understood the difference between good and evil by the voice of God in their conscience. What, then, was Lucifer trying to offer them? He was telling them that that they would be like God **by deciding and determining for themselves what is good and evil**, thus becoming *independent and free* from the objective morality of God’s laws.

This sin of Adam and Eve is the basis for the errors of *subjective morality* and *humanist psychology*, which teach that the most important source of authority is within oneself and one's own conscience, and that a person should appeal solely to his conscience in deciding what is good or evil.

In his *Address to Newly Married Couples* on Aug. 7, 1940, *Pope Pius XII*, gave this example: "I am no longer a child,' a young lady will explain, 'and I know life, and have therefore the wish and the right to know it still better.' *But does not the poor girl realize that her talk is like that of Eve when confronted with the forbidden fruit?* And does she think that to know, love, and enjoy life it is necessary to investigate all its abuses and ugliness? 'I am no longer a child,' a young man also will say, 'and at my age, sensual descriptions and voluptuous scenes have no effect.' Is he sure? If it should be true, it would be an indication of *an unconscious perversion*, the result of bad reading already indulged . . . *The danger of bad reading is, under some aspects even worse than that of evil companions, because it can make itself more treacherously familiar.*"

8. pp. 29-32

F. Negative Emphasis on the Corruption of Mankind

1) *The Use of Negative Literature*: Negative literature, which places an exaggerated emphasis on the corruption and wickedness of man's fallen nature, tends to promote a spirit of *pessimism* and *despair*. This negativism is promoted not only by authors of impure and indecent literature, but also by authors who choose to write stories that are strangely depressing, violently morbid, grotesque, senseless, shocking and weird, etc., because they think it's important to give the reader a true picture of the moral corruption and nihilism of the modern world. These authors tend to display crudeness and a lack of art in their style, and feel the need to use sensational violence, depression, and fear in writing stories to make their point.

For example, in his article, *A Caution on the Writings of Flannery O'Connor*, July 31, 2014 (see *Crisis Magazine* online), James P. Bernens writes: "It is not the purpose of her writing, but the vehicle she chooses, that is disfigured and distracted. In this sense, O'Connor displays something of a likeness to a James Joyce or a Truman Capote; there is a deep sorrow, and almost an imbalance, which cannot help but break forth in the substance of her craft. Too often, for no reason but the author's imaginative will, *a story veers towards a prolonged contemplation of disorder, or even deliberate, manifest evil.*"

Flannery O'Connor was influenced by several modernist priests, such as Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, S.J., Yves Congar, O.P., Jean Daniélou, S.J. and Henri DeLubac, S.J. (See *Jesuit Influence in the Life and Works of Flannery O'Connor*, by Patrick Samway, S.J., Hopkins Lectures 2004).

O'Connor had a special admiration for Teilhard de Chardin and his "Cosmic Christ" and "Omega Point." The title of her work, "*Everything That Rises Must Converge*," is an allusion to de Chardin, and in her work, *The Presence of*

Grace, she says: “It is doubtful if any Christian of this century can be fully aware of his religion until he has seen it in the cosmic light which Teilhard has cast upon it.”

Archbishop Lefebvre, in his book, *They Have Uncrowned Him*, page 16, says: “Fr. Teilhard the Chardin affirms, in the name of pseudo-science and a pseudo-mysticism, that matter becomes spirit, that nature becomes the supernatural, that humanity becomes Christ: *a triple confusion of an evolutionist monism irreconcilable with the Catholic Faith.*”

a) *Literary Converts:* Even though there have been many good literary converts to the Catholic Faith, such as Cardinal John Henry Newman, Fr. Robert Hugh Benson, G. K. Chesterton, Malcolm Muggeridge, Edith Stein, etc., there have also been those who portray indecency and moral depravity in their writings or in their art. ***For example:***

(i) *Ernest Hemingway*, who converted to Catholicism in 1927, experienced perhaps the greatest range of censoring among American writers, for political, religious, sexual and social reasons: *The Sun Also Rises*, 1926 (banned for sex, alcohol, decadence); *A Farewell to Arms*, 1929 (banned for politics, sex, language); *To Have and Have Not*, 1937 (banned in 1938 for immoralities); *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, 1941 (denied the Pulitzer Prize for political, sexual, and language issues).

(ii) *Evelyn Waugh*, who converted to Catholicism in Sept., 1930, wrote a book called *Black Mischief*, 1932, which was condemned by the Catholic Church in England (as mentioned above).

(iii) *Graham Greene* converted to Catholicism in 1926. His books, *The Power and the Glory*, 1940 and *The End of the Affair*, 1951—which is basically about his affair with a married woman, Catherine Walston—were both condemned by the Catholic Church.

Greene’s novel, *The Power and the Glory*, 1940 was condemned by the Holy Office in 1953 in letter to Cardinal Griffin, Archbishop of Westminster. The same Cardinal condemned it indirectly in his *Pastoral Letter of Advent* that same year (see *below*), in which he condemned all indecent literature.

* ***Note:*** It is interesting to note that, in 1965, *Graham Greene met Pope Paul VI*, who told him: “Mr. Greene, some aspects of your books are certain to offend some Catholics, but you should pay no attention to that’.” (See: *Wikipedia: Graham Greene*; and the article: *Graham Greene’s Vatican Dossier* from the *Atlantic Magazine*, July-Aug. 2001).

(iv) *Eric Gill*, who converted to Catholicism on Feb. 22, 1913, produced very impure and blasphemous art concerning Christ, the Blessed Virgin Mary and various saints.

b) *Incomplete Conversion:* Sadly, it appears that such literary converts may have had an *incomplete conversion* to the Catholic Faith, due to a kind of *disordered intellectualism*. For true conversion is *not only intellectual*, by which a person believes the truths of faith, *but also moral and spiritual*, by which he

also conforms to Christian moral behavior and spirituality.

As St. Paul says in *Eph. 4:23-24, 29*: “Be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man, who according to God is created in justice and holiness of truth... *Let no evil speech proceed from your mouth; but that which is good, to the edification of faith, that it may administer grace to the hearers.*” And in *Col. 3:1-8*: “Put you also all away: anger, indignation, malice, blasphemy, filthy speech out of your mouth.”

Unfortunately, we can see in the literature of these literary converts the misguided attempt “to teach truth” by means of stories portraying explicit impurity, indecency, the weird, vulgar, shocking and grotesque, etc. These authors fail to see that, by their defective moral judgment, and imprudent, disordered focus on evil, *they actually offend or harm souls* by the very evils from which they claim to be protecting them.

Also, since the writing of literature involves much thought, reflection and deliberation, only with difficulty can these literary converts be excused by reason of ignorance or weakness. For, as Catholic converts, *they voluntarily obliged themselves to study and conform to the Church’s teachings on faith and morals*—which especially applies to their writings, since they are in the public domain.

2) Negative / Pessimist Spirit of Protestantism and Manichaeism: This negative spirit in literature also seems to be influenced by Protestantism, which in effect revived the pessimism and despair found in the ancient doctrines of Gnosticism and neo-Manichaeism (e.g., the French Cathars and Albigensians). For, according to Martin Luther, man’s fallen nature has been completely corrupted by Original Sin (not *gravely wounded*, as in Catholic doctrine), and it remains completely corrupt even after the grace of Baptism.

As *Archbishop Lefebvre* says in his book, *They Have Uncrowned Him*, pp. 5-6: “For the Protestants, grace does not operate a true interior renewal; baptism is not the restoring of a habitual supernatural state; it is only an act of faith in Jesus Christ Who justifies and saves. Nature is not restored by grace, it remains intrinsically corrupt, and faith obtains from God nothing more than this: He throws over our sins the modest cloak of Noah...”

“And if a certain **Puritanism** comes to exercise an *exterior supervision* over public morality, it will not impregnate men’s hearts with the truly Christian spirit, which is a supernatural spirit, called *the primacy of the spiritual.*” (*Note: Puritanism focuses on the external appearance of holiness while neglecting interior sanctity and moral virtue.*)

Thus, in *Protestantism*, even with the redemptive grace of Christ Our Lord and Savior, man is still unable to avoid sin and attain true *interior* sanctity and virtue; grace simply covers up his sinfulness. In a similar way, *Gnosticism* and *Manichaeism* teach that man’s corporeal nature, and matter itself, is intrinsically evil and, therefore, everything in the material world is evil, including marriage and having children.