

EDITOR  
Thomas Fleming

EXECUTIVE EDITOR  
Scott P. Richert

SENIOR EDITOR, BOOKS  
Chilton Williamson, Jr.

ASSISTANT EDITOR  
Aaron D. Wolf

ART DIRECTOR  
H. Ward Sterett

DESIGNER  
Melanie Anderson

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS  
Katherine Dalton, Samuel Francis,  
George Garrett, Paul Gottfried,  
Philip Jenkins, J.O. Tate, Michael  
Washburn, Clyde Wilson

CORRESPONDING EDITORS  
Janet Scott Barlow, Bill Kauffman,  
Donald Livingston, Roger D.  
McGrath, William Mills, William  
Murchison, Andrei Navrozov

FILM EDITOR  
George McCartney

FOREIGN-AFFAIRS EDITOR  
Srdja Trifkovic

LEGAL-AFFAIRS EDITOR  
Stephen B. Presser

RELIGION EDITOR  
Harold O.J. Brown

CIRCULATION MANAGER  
Cindy Link

PUBLISHER  
The Rockford Institute

A publication of The Rockford Institute.  
Editorial and Advertising Offices:  
928 North Main Street, Rockford, IL 61103.  
Website: [www.chroniclesmagazine.org](http://www.chroniclesmagazine.org)  
Editorial Phone: (815) 964-5054.  
Advertising Phone: (815) 964-5813.  
Subscription Department: P.O. Box 800,  
Mount Morris, IL 61054. Call 1-800-877-5459.

Copyright © 2002 by The Rockford Institute.  
All rights reserved.

*Chronicles: A Magazine of American Culture*  
(ISSN 0887-5731) is published monthly for \$39.00  
(foreign subscriptions add \$12 for surface delivery,  
\$48 for Air Mail) per year by The Rockford Institute,  
928 North Main Street, Rockford, IL 61103-7061.  
Preferred periodical postage paid at Rockford, IL  
and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER:  
Send address changes to *Chronicles*, P.O. Box 800,  
Mount Morris, IL 61054.

The views expressed in *Chronicles* are the  
authors' alone and do not necessarily reflect  
the views of The Rockford Institute or of its  
directors. Unsolicited manuscripts cannot be  
returned unless accompanied by a self-addressed  
stamped envelope.

**Chronicles**  
A MAGAZINE OF AMERICAN CULTURE

Vol. 26, No. 9 September 2002  
Printed in the United States of America

## On Consistency

In the April 30 issue of the *Remnant*, Christopher Ferrara cites a priest in New York who claims that the percentage of seminarians within his diocese who are homosexual may be *conservatively* estimated at 60 percent. If this is what Bishop Thomas Doran of Rockford (quoted in "De Profundis," *The Rockford Files*, June) refers to as high scrutiny, I can't even imagine what "relaxed standards" would resemble. Apparently, the post-conciliar standard has been (and will continue to be) that pyromaniacs are O.K., but there must be no evidence of their having set fire to buildings.

Dr. Philip Jenkins' attempts to analyze the sexual scandals ("The Crime of Consistency," *Breaking Glass*, June) seem strangely acontextual as he prescinds them from canon law, the Church's moral teaching, etc.

We are confronting the same old thing: a Vatican that talks sternly and does nothing—at least as long as we're not confronting *really* serious stuff, like "Lefebvrisms," in which case we have to bring the ax down. This is precisely the "laxity" Scott P. Richert mentioned in his June column. However, it's a bit more severe than this. Basically, the Vatican II documents talked about an explicit attempt to reconcile the Church's teaching with science. Fine. But then the Church decided that psychology was science and intimated that the Church's stance on homosexuality could be amended by the "discoveries" of the therapeutic industry. And there we have a postconciliar pose apotheosized: vague, gauzy, and, frankly, asking for trouble. And we've got it, in spades.

—Phil Earvolino  
Chicago, IL

## Mr. Richert Replies:

Dr. Jenkins is more than capable of defending himself, and he has done so on numerous occasions, including on *Chronicles*' website (<http://www.chroniclesmagazine.org/News/NewsPJ040602.htm>). I am saddened, however, by the willingness of my good friend Phil Ear-

volino (and many other traditionalist Catholics) to base their arguments on *anecdotal estimates* of the percentage of homosexuals in Catholic seminaries (or in the priesthood) while dismissing Dr. Jenkins' arguments, which are based on *actual studies*. (During a recent interview on a local radio talk show here in Rockford, a well-known writer on Church sexual scandals claimed that homosexuality is a necessary condition for employment in the chancery offices of every diocese in the United States, a ridiculous statement that is easily disproved.) These attitudes simply confirm that far too many Catholics, frustrated (as I am) by the turmoil in the Church over the past 35 years, are willing to believe almost anything, as long as it reflects poorly on those whom they blame for the Church's woes. (That same willingness extends to traditionalist arguments that Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre was not validly excommunicated and that the See of Peter may soon be vacant.)

The disagreement between Mr. Earvolino and myself is not over questions of liturgy (for the past decade, I have attended the Eastern Rite Divine Liturgy and the Tridentine Mass almost exclusively) but over our respective attitudes toward the Church. Like many other traditionalists, he has trouble distinguishing between the statements or actions of certain priests and bishops (and the even the Pope) and Church teaching. This is illustrated by his statement (not backed up by citation) that "the Church decided that psychology was science and intimated that the Church's stance on homosexuality could be amended by the 'discoveries' of the therapeutic industry." But under the heading of "Homosexuality and Chastity," the Catechism of the Catholic Church (paragraph 2357) states that the "psychological genesis [of homosexuality] remains largely unexplained. Basing itself on Sacred Scripture, which presents homosexual acts as acts of grave depravity, tradition has always declared that 'homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered.' They are contrary to the natural law. They close the sexual act to the gift of life. They do not proceed from a genuine affective and sexual complementarity. Under no circumstances can they be approved."

The Catechism goes on to state (in

paragraph 2358) that homosexuals “are called to fulfill God’s will in their lives and, if they are Christians, to unite to the sacrifice of the Lord’s Cross the difficulties they may encounter from their condition” and then explains (in paragraph 2359) how they can fulfill God’s will: “Homosexual persons are called to chastity. By the virtues of self-mastery that teach them inner freedom, at times by the support of disinterested friendship, by prayer and sacramental grace, they can and should gradually and resolutely approach Christian perfection.”

This seems rather straightforward. That certain bishops—for reasons of ideology, bureaucracy, or just plain human sinfulness—have acted in ways that contradict it does not mean that the Church’s teaching has changed.

Finally, Mr. Earvolino is right: We do have trouble, in spades. That is precisely why he and other traditionalists should be engaging more actively in the life of the Church rather than pulling away from it. The Church Herself—with all of Her problems—is the saving remnant, not any one group of Christians.

## On the Ghost of Islam

Tomislav Sunic’s useful reminder of the dark legacy of Islam in the Balkans (“The Ghost of Islam in the Balkans, *Vital Signs*, June) is in need of a few corrections.

While most members of other SS units were volunteers, the Yugoslav “Schwabens” belonging to the Prinz Eugen Division were not. Heinrich Himmler wanted to turn the Balkans into an SS sphere of interest, and this was manifested in his imposition of exclusive authority over the *Volksdeutsche* in the southeast. The fall of Yugoslavia provided an opportunity for unbridled SS recruitment of ethnic Germans, not only in German-occupied Serbia (Banat) but also in the “Independent State of Croatia.” This enlistment was *not* voluntary for the *Volksdeutsche* in the former Yugoslavia: Their leaders made a collective declaration on behalf of the membership that was binding on all.

Dr. Sunic’s speculation about Kemal Atatürk’s Slavic origins is off the mark. Mustafa Kemal was probably of Jewish ancestry. He denied this for reasons easy to understand at the time of his radical onslaught against Islamic traditions in

Turkey, but it appears that his family belonged to the Sabbetaians, Turkish Jews who took Muslim names and outwardly behaved like Muslims but kept carefully guarded prayers and rituals. According to Jewish writer and publisher Itamar Ben-Avi, who met the young Turkish officer at the Kamenitz Hotel in Jerusalem in 1911, Kemal confided in him that he is a descendant of Sabbetai Zevi. As related in the *Jewish Post* (January 28, 1994), during their second meeting, ten days later, after drinking many rounds of *raki*, Mustafa Kemal recalled the following words from his childhood: “*Shema Yisra’el, Adonai Eloheinu, Adonai Ehad!*”

“That’s our most important prayer, Captain,” Ben-Avi said, impressed.

“And my secret prayer too, *cher monsieur*,” Mustafa Kemal replied cheerfully.

Finally, Pavelic’s construction of a mosque “in the center of Catholic Zagreb” did not reflect his multicultural liberalism but his sop to the Bosnian Muslims, whom he wanted to woo into accepting his claim that they were really “Croats of Islamic faith,” one of the basic tenets of Ustasa ideology. It was also a prerequisite of practical politics, as only by asserting those Islamized Slavs’ Croatness could Pavelic lay a claim to Bosnia-Herzegovina. The Wehrmacht representative in Zagreb, Gen. Edmund Glaise von Hostenau, knew better when he declared: “Bosnian Muslims would follow the Croats because they have the power . . . but at all times they would certainly seek to protect their special Muslim interests. Any assimilation of Muslims by Croats is out of the question, because a Muslim remains a Muslim. Just as he was not really a Serb when he passed himself for one, he will not become a Croat now.”

Unlike their German-speaking counterparts from northeastern Yugoslavia, the Muslims of Bosnia were true and enthusiastic volunteers for the SS “Hanjar” Division. By creating an SS division composed of Bosnian Muslims Himmler hoped to enhance relations with the Islamic world. One of his closest aides, *Obergruppenfuhrer* Gottlob Berger, said that, with the creation of a Muslim SS division, “a link is created for the first time between Islam and National-Socialism on an open, honest basis. It will be directed in terms of blood and race from the North, and in the ideological-spiritual sphere from the East.”

—Srdja Trifkovic  
Chicago, IL

## On *Chronicles* Among the Ruins

Near the latter part of each month, I anticipate having my day brightened by the delivery of the current issue of *Chronicles*. It isn’t the content that lifts my spirit so much as the unwavering commitment to truth, common sense, morality, and transcendent values.

“Facts are stubborn things; and whatever may be our wishes, our inclinations, or the dictates of our passions, they cannot alter the state of facts and evidence,” John Adams said.

I count on *Chronicles* for hard, unvarnished facts that are seldom, if ever, found in the prattling pages and pictures of our nation’s mainstream media. In the pages of your magazine, thought—based on facts, logic, and a knowledge of history—is evident.

In this post-Christian era, it is refreshing to know that I am not alone in fearfully watching the rapid and seemingly inevitable unraveling of the American experiment.

For that remnant of our society still clinging to the traditional values that once made America the hope of mankind, *Chronicles* offers a respite from the drum-beating, “chicken-in-every-pot,” political finger-pointing jingoism masking America’s loss of community, liberty, and independence.

The consistent content of *Chronicles* serves as a reminder of Whittaker Chambers’ gentle chiding of then-conservative firebrand William F. Buckley, Jr., in a letter nearly 50 years ago. The beaten Chambers told Buckley not to be concerned about the wreck of Western civilization because “It is already a wreck from within.”

Chambers suggested that little could be accomplished except to nurture truth and preserve its flame until a day “ages hence, when a few men begin again to dare to believe there was once something else, that something else is thinkable, and need some evidence of what it was, and the fortifying knowledge that there were those who, at the great nightfall, took loving thought to preserve the tokens of hope and truth.”

Thank you for your continuing and tireless efforts.

—Jim Panyard  
Palmyra, PA



**THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT** is the only industry in which employees get more money—and raises and bonuses—for doing absolutely terrible jobs.

The American people have spent several hundreds of billions of dollars on our intelligence agencies over the last ten years, yet none of them ever hinted at, much less warned us, about the attacks of September 11.

We receive more accurate information from the television newscasts than we do from the CIA and other intelligence agencies. In fact, intelligence expert and author James Bamford said that the National Security Agency “found out about the attack by watching CNN!” (The NSA is the same agency for which we built a plush, \$320-million state-of-the-art building a few years ago—at a cost of \$320 per square foot. Then, again, *Congressional Quarterly* recently reported that we are giving the CIA a multi-billion-dollar increase—somewhere between \$35 and \$40 billion—for the new fiscal year.)

Our intelligence agencies have too many “experts” who want to stay in their vice-offices and write reports that almost no one sees and that do no good whatsoever. Late last year, *Insight Magazine* quoted one CIA veteran as saying that agents “don’t live in the grungy, smelly fly-infested environments of the locals; they don’t go to mosques and smoke-filled mud houses where the populations live; and almost no one in the CIA has language fluency, cultural experience and ethnic background allowing them to blend in.”

One morning, a national TV program reported that the CIA would be on the “hot seat” in front of the Intelligence Committee that day. As a congressman, however, I know that no critics of the CIA are allowed by the leadership of either party to sit on that committee.

The cover of the June 10 *Newsweek* proclaimed, “Exclusive—The 9/11 Terrorists The CIA Should Have Caught,” and the accompanying article claimed that the FBI was guilty of “clear failure to connect various vague clues that might have put them on the trail of the terrorists.”

*U.S. News & World Report* highlighted “FBI Foul-Ups.” Then the House passed a supplemental bill giving the Bureau \$112 million more than the \$4.27

billion already budgeted for 2002.

Ronald Kessler, who recently published a book about the FBI, wrote a column for the *Washington Post* on June 15, arguing that we should double the size of the Bureau, which already has 27,000 employees. Our Founding Fathers would be shocked by the magnitude of this federal police force—and even more so by the fact that, in addition to the FBI, almost every agency and department of the federal government now has its own police force. Joseph Califano, a Cabinet member and top advisor to the last three Democratic presidents, wrote in the *Post* last December that, because of our concerns about terrorism, we “are missing an even more troubling danger: the extraordinary increase in federal police personnel and power.” He was referring to the federalizing of screeners at airports, something that he said goes very much against our tradition of leaving most law enforcement to local authorities.

I am in my 14th year in Congress. I have seen some pretty surprising things in that time, but even I could not believe the shocking rate of expansion of the new Transportation Security Administration (TSA). There were fewer than 28,000 screeners at U.S. airports before September 11. TSA officials told us before the passage of the Aviation Security Bill that they would need 33,000. Immediately after passage, they upped the figure to 40,000. Then, only seven months later, the TSA decided that it would need 72,000 employees, including approximately 3,500 “shoe bin runners.”

Secretary John Magaw, according to one senior appropriator, has already hired 140 of his old buddies from the Secret Service for the TSA at salaries of up to \$150,000—and they are allowed to continue drawing their full government pensions.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service recently sent visas to two of the dead September 11 hijackers. To excuse this embarrassment, they claimed that the INS is underfunded and needs better computers. (This is an agency to which Congress has given a 250-percent budget increase in the last eight years, about ten times the rate of inflation.) I am a low-tech person living in a high-tech world, but I am told that, since the technology is moving so fast, new computers are obso-

lete the day they are taken out of the box. I can tell you with certainty that, thanks to the deep pockets of the federal government, federal employees have better, more expensive technologies than almost any private businesses. Still, it is impossible to satisfy the government’s appetite for money or land.

Sadly, almost every department or agency of the federal government is attempting to profit from the tragedies of September 11 by increasing its size, its power, and, especially, its funding.

—Rep. John J. Duncan, Jr.

**ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY**, for all their essential powerlessness in worldly terms, are never as inconsequential as might be supposed. How about those great English accents, for instance? How elegantly the archbishop of the hour undertakes to speak for and to an Anglican Communion increasingly disunited in theological outlook, joined by habit and custom as much as anything else: not fully Protestant; not popish enough to become Roman (especially in the sex-scandal era); tolerant; tasteful; influential out of proportion to actual numbers. And how assiduously an archbishop’s words get reported, not least in an almost-faithless England. It matters—up to a point, at least—who holds the job.

The man who will hold the job for possibly the next 18 years (until age 70) is Rowan Douglas Williams, shaggy, white-bearded archbishop of Wales, scholar, author, left-wing commentator on public affairs. Williams received the nod from Prime Minister Tony Blair in July. A tide of speculation instantly engulfed the event. Might Williams split the communion? Would he, please, finally split the rotten thing in order that serious Anglicans could get on to serious religion?

There is, naturally, no knowing in matters touching the divine. It would be silly to project the outcome of a Williams archbishopric, though, Heaven help us, many are projecting it now. All one knows is what one knows. And what is that in Williams’ case?

His left-wing politics stand out most flagrantly. Let’s just say that Williams would never have been Maggie Thatcher’s choice. (As it happened, Thatcher’s pick for archbishop, a brow ex-tank com-