



As We See It

By DAN PATRICK

Some Catholics have a pretty confused idea of the proper sphere of activities for their clergymen.

There are some extremists among the laity who would fence their priests within the altar rail. Others would confine them to the parish grounds, contending that the full scope of their ministry lies within such arbitrarily drawn lines.

These Catholics, who should know better, contend that a priest has no business extending his activities into the fields of labor, housing, economics and so on. They seem to forget — these Catholics — that the clergy not only has the right but the duty of inquiring into these matters because they all are related directly or indirectly to the spiritual as well as temporal welfare of the people entrusted to their care.

The subject of clerical participation in labor movements is particularly irksome to some people at this time.

No so long ago the newspapers carried photographs of priests from a mid-western city on the picket lines. We know some Catholics who fairly boiled at the sight.

But — to be logical and reasonable — why shouldn't the clergy interest itself in the labor movement? Isn't a sound family life one of the foundations of a virile and militant church life and isn't a living wage a prime necessity to insure a sound family life?

What happens in the average family when the father's wages can't make ends meet? Invariably, the wife and mother whose place is in the home guarding the children, must pack up and go to work to supplement her husband's relatively meager earnings. And what happens to the children? You'll find the answer inscribed on police and court records.

The average laboring man is fertile material for the prophets of radicalism. You don't have to look far to find the sorry record of some unions in this respect.

Now there must be an antidote for such preachings and it is found in the teachings of the church, especially those expounded so brilliantly by Leo XIII and Pius XI. If the clergy doesn't move into the ranks of labor, preaching the principles contained in the labor encyclicals, who is going to do the job?

Another subject of the moment is housing. Only a few days ago, the President called a group of church leaders of all faiths to the White House to enlist their support in a campaign to lick the current critical shortage.

The voices of priests all over the country are rising to call for positive action in this matter. And some people — including Catholics with no housing worries whatsoever — wonder what connection proper housing has with the salvation of souls.

To answer that question we again revert to the family and the utter necessity of its proper maintenance. You can't have conditions conducive to proper health and morals in improper housing accommodations.

Too many marriages are choked by excessive family entanglements at the very outset and the forced "doubling up" of several families under the same roof is bound to strain the bonds of matrimony to the very breaking point.

That's why priests are concerned about proper housing. There's no tinge of politics in their thinking as some so unjustly suspect. They simply are carrying through to a practical conclusion a few tried and tested theories.

Finally there are those who feel that any clergyman who raises his voice in protest over the conduct of Communistic Russia is "dabbling in politics" and striking a blow at Soviet-American relations.

Political affiliation is traditional with most Americans. Catholics, for instance, who worship side by side in the same church each Sunday, may follow diametrically different political courses depending on whether they happen to be Republicans or Democrats. There is nothing inconsistent in this.

But Communism is something different. It strikes at the very core of Christianity. Its fundamental philosophy is atheistic. As such it differs radically from the political philosophy of Democrats, Republicans and the like and as such it must be opposed.

No Catholic can be a Communist and the recent reported outcropping of "Catholic Communists" in certain parts of Europe is a rank inconsistency. Most certainly clergymen are not "dabbling in politics" when they speak out against Communism. They would be delinquent in their duty as priests if they failed to do so.

And they have a most excellent precedent. For the Magna Charta in this struggle is the encyclical on Atheistic Communism: from the prophetic pen of Pius XI.

No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty; none less inclined to take or touch anything which they had not honestly earned. — Abraham Lincoln.

STRANGE BUT TRUE

Little-Known Facts for Catholics

By M. J. MURRAY



Washington

Leader of Red Movement In Philippines Watched

By Tom Rogers

Washington — EXCLUSIVE — Hitler's Germany. He discharged his direct duties under the name of Rudolf and under the cover of an American counterfeit passport.

Since we started with an item on the Philippines, we might as well continue along that theme for a few lines:

President Truman deserves the highest praise for his stand in favor of the Filipino soldier. Following his approval of H.R. 5158, the Resident Commissioner, General Romulo, called the attention of the Congress to the rider objected to by the President:

"Specifically the Filipino veterans would not be able to enjoy the benefits of the GI Bill of Rights — of the automatic gratuity insurance against death in line of duty in active service between October 9, 1940, and April 19, 1942 . . . of medical and hospital treatment and domiciliary care of the veterans suffering from injuries or disease incurred or aggravated in line of duty."

In view of the fact that the Philippines never hesitated to throw in their lot with us, it seems ironic to even quibble about THEIR small problems while we consider how we can throw away billions in a Europe that has yet to prove grateful.

One big question the papers ignored was this: Who is the Soviet envoy to Canada — or rather who WAS the Soviet envoy to Canada? Hold on to your seats!

The Soviet envoy to Canada had about as much diplomatic experience as Babe Ruth had in ice hockey. His name: George Zarubin.

For many years Zarubin was high in the Soviet Secret Police. During the 1930's he was mainly engaged in keeping an eye on the Russian Communists who had broken with their Government and who refused to return to Russia. He watched them personally or through his agents and when they became dangerous . . .

In 1936-1938 Zarubin was a representative of the NKVD in

INFORMATION DISK

Should Priests Defend Strikes?

I was quite scandalized to hear that some Catholic priests are defending these strikes we have been having. I don't see how they can favor the very un-Christian attitude of the strikers who are laying off just at the time when people need money and work and foodstuffs etc., so badly.

Let's look first at all strikes in general. Can they be morally justified? Yes, they can be if three conditions are fulfilled. First, a just cause. Second, the good to be obtained must be proportionate to the evil occasioned by the strike. Third, the means of conducting the strike must be lawful. If one of these conditions is absent, the strike is unjust and immoral.

It is not up to the Church to pass official judgment on any one or on all the strikes now or recently current. In most of these recent cases apparently the first and third conditions have been fulfilled. The cause for the strikes has generally been for a higher wage, and the increase in prices certainly seems to justify that.

The Information Disk is a feature exclusively conducted for the Courier-Journal by the staff of the St. Bernard's Correspondence Column. Address all questions to the Information Desk, c/o Courier-Journal, 90 Chestnut Street, Rochester 3, N. Y. Questions will be answered as soon as possible. Although no names will be printed, questions are asked to sign their names.

ward. The fact that "the laborer is worthy of his hire," and deserves a living wage has been the constant teaching of the Church. Pope Leo XIII defined this living wage as "enough to support the wage-earner in reasonable and wrugal comfort." As for the third condition, the strikes seem with certain exceptions to have been conducted quietly and properly.

You apparently think that the second condition has not been fulfilled. We can admit that real inconvenience has resulted in some strikes, like telephone strikes and electric-works strikes in certain places. However, it does not seem that, all things considered, the strikes have thus far created a stoppage so acute and so enduring as to have produced more evil than good.

If you have found some Catholic priests defending any particular strikers, it is because they have applied these principles and concluded that the strikes were morally justifiable. Thus you have taken scandal too easily.

In "release-time instruction" of children attending public schools a practice suggested by Catholics alone?

No. Almost all religious denominations have promoted and taken part in "release-time" training. According to an article in the Catholic Digest, March 1945, page 60, we read: "One of the main factors in the movement's widespread acceptance has been the cooperation of the three major faiths. Almost without exception, interfaith committees of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews have promoted the project. . . . Some Jewish groups have opposed it as being inadequate for their needs and a violation of separation of Church and State. We must say that the majority of Protestants favor pooling of resources in a common community curriculum and teaching staff."

According to this article "the large majority of places in most places are Protestant." However, last year "OR" of New York City's enrollment (108,000) was Catholic.

The chief opposition to the "release-time" program has come from so-called "Freethinkers" and non-believers, not from sincere believers of non-Catholic faiths.

Who were the parents of St. Joseph? The only reference to the parents of St. Joseph is found in the Gospels, and even then, the reference is only to the father of St. Joseph. Consequently, we know nothing of the mother of St. Joseph.

St. Matthew in the first chapter of his gospel cites the genealogy of Christ, and in that list we have a reference to the father of Joseph, found in the sixteenth verse: "And Jacob begot Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ." (Matt. 1:16) St. Luke also cites the genealogy of Christ in his gospel, and there too is found a reference to the father of Joseph: "And Jesus himself was beginning about the age of thirty years; being (as it was supposed) the son of Joseph, who was of Heli." (Luke 3:23) Thus, St. Matthew tells us that Jacob was the father of Joseph; St. Luke says that Heli was the father of Joseph.

How do we explain this difference? The commonly accepted solution is that Jacob and Heli were half-brothers. Upon Heli's death without issue, Jacob married his widow in accordance with the law of levirate marriage to provide children to Heli. This levirate law was peculiar to the Jews and had been instituted by Moses (Deut. 25:5-6). Thus, Joseph would be the actual son of Jacob, and the legal or adopted son of Heli. In this case, then, since St. Matthew gives the natural genealogy, and St. Luke the legal genealogy, we have two different, yet correct lines of ancestry. Consequently, the common opinion is that Jacob is the natural father of Joseph. We have no reference to the mother of Joseph simply because it was the Jewish custom