

THE CATHOLIC Courier Journal

THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1945

MOST REVEREND JAMES EDWARD KEARNEY, D.D., President

This newspaper is a member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations and the Catholic Press Association. It subscribes to the full reports of International News Service, National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service, Religious News Service, Catholic Information News.

Published every Thursday by the CATHOLIC COURIER AND JOURNAL, INC.
MAIN OFFICE: 50 Chestnut St.—Phone 1136—Rochester 4, N. Y.
ADVERTISING OFFICE: 15 Clark Street—Phone 636
CIRCULATION OFFICE: 321 Reedy Bldg.—Phone 2-5418 or 2-6757

Entered as second class matter in the Postoffice at Rochester, N. Y. As required under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Rev. Hugh W. H. Hart, V.G., Editor in Chief; Rev. John S. Harbeck, Managing Editor; Rev. Patrick J. Flynn, Associate Editor; Thomas H. O'Connor, News Editor; Harold H. Connor, Advertising Manager; James G. Grassano, Circulation Manager.

The Religious Approach

We must pray that the San Francisco Conference may help all men and nations meet their problems in the post-war world through a religious approach. No solution can come from an anti-religious approach, no true solution can come through an irreligious approach.

The anti-religious approach seemed to be emphasized in the Conference by the Russian delegation. Justice was not appealed to as the foundation for treaty of the Polish problem. No attention was given to the fact that 80,000,000 Catholics live within the territory in Eastern Poland and the Baltic States, which are to fall under Russian domination. Current Russian attacks on the Holy Father seem to go hand in hand with the proceedings of the Russian delegation to San Francisco.

The irreligious approach would be promoted by some, tolerated by other delegations. There was not much of respect for religion or its rights in the Versailles Peace Conference. There seems to be less in the San Francisco Conference. Of 50,000,000 Americans, over one sixth of whom are Catholics, not one Catholic was chosen for our delegation. President Truman included in his opening address over the radio a real prayer for divine guidance and assistance that the Conference might be a success.

May the religious men of all countries unite in a common effort to invite God to have a part in the Conference by His grace and power; and by scrupulous insistence on recognition of God's laws of justice and charity to all men, may our delegates give religion its proper place in planning for world peace.

Just a few years ago at the Eucharistic Congress at New Orleans, President Roosevelt's letter to Archbishop Rummel gave to all the world a message that is most applicable to present conditions: "I doubt if there is any problem in the world today—social, political or economic—that would not find happy solution if approached in the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount."

President Roosevelt closed his message with a prayer that should appeal to all of us right now: "May your prayers hasten the day when both men and nations will bring their lives into conformity with the teaching of Him, Who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life." May our prayers help to obtain for the Conference and its delegates God's blessing on their all-important work that it may mean peace for the world in all the years to come.

Divorces Made Difficult

The decision of the Supreme Court that mismatched couples must be honest in seeking a divorce away from their true domicile, threatens disaster to many a marriage contracted after a Nevada-style divorce. Thus speaks one of our legislators. Justice Murphy insists the decision can bring no harm to those whose divorces have always remained subject to review because of dishonest conditions under which they were obtained.

Where each year has brought new conveniences in the way of multiplied reasons on which divorce may be granted, where states have vied with one another to attract the divorce business, where everything seems to have been done to all in the dissolution of marriages, the new decision does come with something of a shock to those who have more respect for an invalid divorce than they have for a valid marriage.

People remain residents of the State in which they have their home, even though they sojourn six weeks in Nevada. If they settle in Nevada, making their home permanently in that State, they become citizens of it and subject to its laws. When they have no intention of becoming residents of Nevada, when they assume a temporary home there, they do not become bona-fide citizens of that State. Nevada has no jurisdiction over such visitors, and can not grant them a divorce.

Some think the decision makes evident the wisdom of a national divorce law. Just which of the States should be followed in framing such a law, has not been determined. One may be sure it will not be North Carolina, and one can not be too sure it will not be Nevada.

It should be no strain on the conscience of one who has joined against the unity and sanctity of the marriage bond, to sin again by lying about his or her domicile. Where God's law on marriage is contemned, where vows solemnly pronounced are lightly and permanently violated, where cohabitation with a new partner is undertaken before the ink is dry on the Nevada divorce decree, there can be little hope for the better. The law of religion and true love and morality in our American homes. Thank God for the faithful couples who take and keep each other according to the marital law—"until death do us part."

Special Cards By Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P.

The Courage Of Mr. Churchill

There are many who would say that a characteristic of Winston Churchill even more admirable than his eloquence is his courage. Doubtless it did require heroism to take up the burden of England and the Empire at the moment he accepted the office of Prime Minister. And he did indeed show constancy and a species of faith—in England and perhaps in God—when after Dunkirk things looked very bad for the "fight little island." No one could in fairness deny him praise for his British bulldog pertinacity in the dark difficult days.



But there remains another kind of courage which he seems to lack. Let us call it the courage of consistency, a moral touch more than a physical quality. His recent public castigation of De Valera in contrast with his treachery to Josef Stalin demonstrates the fact that the bluff Britisher is what the Scriptures say no man should be—a "respector of persons."

He speaks out his mind about the little fellow—the man who has no means of getting back at him; but he discerns and indeed, he prevaricates when dealing with one whose vengeance he has reason to fear. In the House of Commons, during the first week of March the Prime Minister declared that "Stalin's word was his bond." That statement was echoed by others in Parliament, notably Mr. Harold Nicholson who "rubbed it in" by declaring (apparently not with tongue in cheek) that Mr. Stalin had "demonstrated that he was about the most reliable man in Europe."

To make the sin the greater those two falsehoods were spoken in defense of the betrayal of Poland (another "little fellow") at Yalta. Mr. Churchill went on to explain that Russia was entitled to what she had taken from Poland because she needed it for her own security! Insincerity is bad enough, but it really was a pity to support it with hypocrisy. The truth is of course, that Churchill fears Stalin and does not fear De Valera. So he praises the one and pillories the other.

Also it is to be noted that in his speech on the fifth Anniversary of his acceptance of the premiership Mr. Churchill understated the case for Eire. He did mention in a hurried way the fact that "thousands of Southern Irishmen hastened to the battlefield"—in defense of the Empire. But he neglected to explain that they could not have done so if De Valera had put through a law to prevent their enlisting.

As for Mr. Churchill's slinky word "thousands"—the fact is (I have it on the authority of the Consul General of Eire in New York) that between 250 and 300 thousand volunteers went into the army, navy and flying force from Eire. No such percentage of non-drafted men offered themselves from any other country in the world.

Add to that fact another: De Valera (or the government of Eire) permitted British agents to recruit men and women for munitions factories and other war works in England. Three hundred thousand responded. To that fact add still another: most of the remainder of the Irish populace raised food for the use of the British forces at the front and the civilians at home in England. Without the Irish the English could hardly have survived. At least their survival would have been immeasurably more difficult.

So Mr. Churchill would have shown courage of a higher kind than he used in condemning De Valera if he had set these facts before the world. Furthermore he might have inserted a sentence or two into that speech to explain what would have happened if Eire had declared war on Germany. Every city, town, village in Ireland might have been blotted out. Ireland had not the equipment with which to defend herself from obliteration bombing, and surely England had enough to do to defend herself. She barely managed to escape annihilation. If Ireland had been destroyed there would have been no crops, no men or women or even children to harvest them. Ireland would have been a burden rather than a support to England.

Statesmen should know these things. Honest men should confess them. But Winston Churchill either ignored them or understated them. De Valera will be recognized, later on, as having done the wise and helpful thing. As for Stalin: the allies are becoming more and more alarmed at his failure to cooperate. Mr. Churchill in that same speech made what seems to be a slanting reference when he said, "there would be little use in punishing the Hitlerites. . . . If totalitarian governments were to take the place of the German invaders." Right! But to which totalitarian governments? Why did he not dare name them (or name it) as he named Ireland and De Valera?

That the Premier of Britain should berate De Valera, and at the same time extol Stalin is, I repeat, sad evidence of the fact that he has a double standard of judgment or of justice in dealing with the little man and the big man. In other words he lacks that kind of courage that one in his high station should possess.

(Copyright, 1945, NC)

In the Name of

To teach the word of God and to baptize, this was the mission of the Apostles. They were to make disciples of all nations. These disciples were to continue as members of the Church during life, as children of heaven after death. Their was to be a high dignity, a dignity that called for a definite and proper preparation. The Apostles were to teach them, to send into their minds and hearts a knowledge of the teachings of Christ and a holy respect for that knowledge. But all the teaching of the Apostles would be as naught without the grace of Baptism. Each new disciple was to be made a partaker of the merits of Jesus, a sharer in His death and resurrection through the Sacrament of Baptism. The merits of Jesus Christ, the power of the Father, the grace of the Holy Spirit, were to be invoked with the pouring of the water, in the words Christ Himself gave us: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

In Baptism then as in all the Sacraments, the power of the Holy Trinity was to be invoked. To know God and to love God and to serve God, is our mission. Our knowledge of God becomes more perfect when we know the great mystery of the Trinity. One God in three Divine Persons. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost we have been baptized. In the name of the three Divine Persons, we shall live the life of grace here on earth, the life of glory in the Kingdom of Heaven.

Russia's Stock Takes a Drop

By J. J. GILBERT

Washington — (NC) — Many explanations have been offered for Russia's puzzling methods and behavior during recent weeks. If, and to what extent, these explanations are acceptable remains an open question, but there is remarkable agreement that Russia's attitude, whatever its motives may be, has caused a slump of Moscow's stock in American public opinion.

Even those who are fully convinced that the pending issues between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers cannot, and should not, be interpreted as controversies where black is all on one side and white on the other, confess themselves as bewildered and find themselves, much against their will, driven into a strange partnership with those who have always adhered to the opinion that "you can't do business with Stalin."

Whatever the Russians may say in justification of their unilateral decisions in eastern Europe — and some of their arguments, observers feel, cannot be peremptorily dismissed — Russia's methods have contributed a great deal towards undermining her position. The procedure of Russia has, in the view of the objective observers, contributed to obscuring the international atmosphere, and cast a cloud of suspicion that paralyzes the efforts of those who are anxious to understand Russia's problem as one of the world's leading powers and are ready to give her the fullest benefit of the doubt.

"Russia is losing good will here in Government and in Congress among people who hitherto have been sympathetic," writes Thomas L. Stokes in his column for the Scripps-Howard newspapers. His statement is representative of many others in similar vein. "This reaction expresses itself voluntarily, which makes it impressive," Mr. Stokes continues. "It is impressive, too, because it comes from a middle-ground, liberal and progressive stratum which, since the last war, has been separate from the anti-Russian group that never has changed and from the Communist element that accepts everything Russian blindly, is constantly worshipful and has not changed either."

There is, of course, the possibility, observers suggest, that the statesmen in Russia are not in the least interested in promoting the indefinable quality that goes under the name of "good will," but it is hard to believe that Russia, even in the flush of victory, should completely disregard the unfavorable reaction caused by her methods among representatives of all the nations gathered for the Conference at San Francisco.

Observers at the Golden Gate unanimously declare that the delegates will return to their home countries with acute concern as to the attitude of Soviet Russia. For many delegates it has been their first direct contact with Soviet diplomacy, and the tactics employed by Soviet Foreign Commissar V. M. Molotov have been far from reassuring.

Not alone has Mr. Molotov's fight against the admission of the Argentine to the Conference been particularly displeasing to the Latin-Americans; his intransigent stand on the Polish Question has also affronted the United States and Great Britain and, in a sense, put them "on the spot."

If the Russians came to San Francisco with the intention and hope of removing some of the open and latent antagonism towards her that still exists in spite of Russia's tremendous contributions to winning the war militarily, then the Soviets must look San Francisco as a failure. There is more antagonism today than before the Conference.

More and more persons ask themselves, as Mr. Stokes points out, whether it is not time to call a halt to this country's Russian policy of conciliation and concessions "before this policy develops into appeasement."