

Who
Will
Prove
Right?



THE VIRGIN OF FATIMA
GAVE THE ANSWER
WITH A QUESTION:
WOULD WE PRAY...
SACRIFICE...
MEND OUR LIVES...?

Khrushchev or Kennedy? by John M. Haffert

The memoirs of Khrushchev, published at the end of 1970, are remarkably frank.

Those trying to sell the Communist line in America have long been advocating "coexistence" but Khrushchev openly and frankly agrees with the Pope: Coexistence between Communism and Democracy is impossible.

However, Khrushchev does not call the American form of government "Democracy" but "Capitalism", as opposed to the Russian form of government: "Socialism". And with even greater frankness he admits that in Russia, "under the dictatorship of the working class, there can be no such thing as absolute freedom."

In 1960, I wrote to President Kennedy and asked if I could use a highly controversial interview which I had with him just before his election.

The President's answer was brief and to the point. I could quote what he said, and I could quote it as coming from the President of the United States.

I had been doing a series of interviews for two years on Channel 13 in New York and asked all of my guests the same question: "Do you think there will be another — an atomic war?" And this was one of the questions I put to President Kennedy,

after having asked him about problems of integration, racial riots in America, rising crime rate, the fall of Cuba, and the increasing tensions of the cold war.

With an almost unbelievable amount of reassurance, Kennedy replied:

"Time is on our side."

He felt this so strongly that he repeated that his policy would be to coexist not because he believed coexistence possible, but because the longer we could live side by side with Russia we would allow time for the basic freedom which is instinctive in every man to assert itself.

How Explain Differences?

Since we can now see from Khrushchev's memoirs that the former head of the Communist Dictatorship has an equally strong belief that time is rather on the side of Communism, how can we explain equal self-assurance in such intelligent, well-informed leaders on diametrically opposite points of view? The answer is not hard to find.

Khrushchev Disturbed

In his memoirs, we can see how deeply disturbed Khrushchev is by the idea of religion. He says that he can

hardly think of Stalin's daughter without tears coming to his eyes because he felt like a parent toward her and he thinks that there is something "odd and even sick" about her book because she says that she used to cross herself and that she was very religious and he asked: "How could a Soviet citizen grow up in our society and write this kind of stuff?"

But Stalin's daughter, because of the belief which grew within her that there is a personal God, wrote that *she could no longer believe in any* of the principles of Communism.

And what must have disturbed Khrushchev is that Stalin's daughter is not isolated and unique.

If there is no God, godless-oriented society MUST prevail. And Kennedy was sure that freedom would prevail because he believed there IS a God...Who endowed man with personal freedom.

His Angry Moment

One of the great advantages of doing a series of television interviews over a period of time is that one comes in contact with great minds and very different points of view.

One of the interviews I remember

SOUL MAGAZINE VOLUME XXII NUMBER 2

March-April 1971

Official publication of the Blue Army of Our Lady of Fatima in the U.S. and Canada. Published bi-monthly by Ave Maria Institute, Washington, N.J., 07882.

Executive Editors: Rt. Rev. Harold Colgan, John M. Haffert

Entered as second class matter at the U.S. Post Office Asbury (Warren County), N.J., 08802.

Imprimatur: Most Rev. George W. Ahr, Bishop of Trenton N. B. The imprimatur implies nothing more than that the material contained in this magazine has been examined by diocesan censors and that nothing contrary to faith or morals has been found therein.



Jim Bishop

best was done together with Jim Bishop. We were interviewing Dr. Charles Malik when the latter was President of the General Assembly of the United Nations. And very indirectly Jim Bishop proposed the question as to whether there would be a Third World War.

Mr. Malik faced him squarely and took us both by surprise by re-phrasing the question in its bold, almost terrible directness: "Are you asking me if I think there will be another war, an atomic war?"

Jim lost his almost perpetual "cool" when he acknowledged that this was exactly what he was asking.

And Mr. Malik answered that in his opinion perhaps the world at this moment, in its crisis between the opposite ideologies of atheistic Communism and the ideas of freedom which America proclaimed in its Declaration of Independence based upon acknowledgment of God, was probably the hour of the world's greatest progress.

Himself a doctor of philosophy, and professor of philosophy at the American University in Beirut, Dr. Malik said that perhaps so much of the world has come to take God for granted that it needed the challenge of those who claim there is no God to advance to that degree of responsibility and freedom which belief in God rightfully demands.



Dr. Malik

Indeed, all the men of letters and politics with whom we spoke in those two years of television agreed that the fundamental crisis of the world was a crisis of conscience, a crisis of religion.

March-April 1971

Bob Considine and Frank Conniff had recently come back from Russia where they had a very rare personal interview with Khrushchev. For more than an hour they discussed many questions which Khrushchev answered easily, often smiling, invariably at ease.



Considine and Conniff

"But," said Bob Considine "when we got to the subject of religion he went into a purple rage." And Frank Conniff interrupted vehemently that it was the only time in that long interview when Khrushchev seemed anything but an affable, normal, self-assured man.

Will There be War?

In my book RUSSIA WILL BE CONVERTED, which I wrote in 1948, I wrote in detail about the dichotomy between men like Castro and men like Kennedy.

The question is not patriotism, and not sincere desire for the welfare of man.

The question is one of the most basic of all: whether man is merely a super animal, or whether man is a child of God, created in the image of God, and commanded to love his fellow man as himself, and to love God with his whole heart and soul and mind.

And seen in this basic, bare and ultimate definition, the outcome of the so-called "East-West" struggle becomes clear.

There will not be a war if we can deepen religious faith across the world in time to prevent it. There will be a war if we do not. But in the end, whether there is a war or not, time is on the side of the principles which govern the Declaration of Independence of the United States: the principle that man is created, and endowed by His Creator with certain inalienable rights.

Race to the Moon

How did you see the race to the moon?

Was it a race of Russia against the United States, or was it a race between atheism against theism? Was it a race between those who say that science doesn't need God, and those who say that science is meaningless without Him?

Anyone who travels and reads newspapers of other countries would realize that this race to the moon was far more important *ideologically* than as the race of two political giants for superiority in space.

When the Russians launched the first Sputnik, and showed a superiority in space to the United States, they gave out the grand statement: "We looked all around in space, and we did not see God."

And when the Americans landed on the moon, before doing so they read from Genesis: They read about the creation of the world, the creation of man, the creation of the earth and the moon. And all over the world, and particularly behind the Iron Curtain, *millions of human beings got the message.*

My mind flashes back to some of the "greats" of our time to whom I spoke personally on television. One of them was Willie Ley, author of many books on space and spokesman for Doctor Werner von Braun, the genius who was the principal force behind the American moon-landing. And Dr. von Braun had said that he could no longer

Continued on page 22.

Dr. Von Braun and, below, Willie Ley.

