Courier Journal
THE ROCHESTER DIOCESE
Thursday, JULY 11, 1946
[illegible] EDWARD MEARNEY, S.S., President
[illegible]

[illegible] Cabrini

[illegible] at Mother Cabrini last Sunday has [illegible] the world. Like many years of war [illegible] visited on nations and individuals, [illegible] man whose vocation has been [illegible] lives, it is wholesome and reassuring [illegible] place and honor one whose life [illegible] spent heat on saving lives and re[illegible] whose energies were devoted to [illegible] homes and hospitals. This is what [illegible] the humble Italian nun who [illegible] her life to works of charity with the [illegible] Heart, a congregation which [illegible]

[illegible] given space by the Iowa union, and [illegible] editorials on the dispute [illegible] on the military life of St. [illegible] what we expect the [illegible] would make is Catho[illegible] of members of other faiths every[illegible] Catholics are among the priests that [illegible] the work there was work to be done [illegible] eyes, the sick and the needy for [illegible] the abandoned, the workers down in their [illegible] in the vilest parts of our cities. [illegible] with that heartrending vigor and zeal [illegible] for an early death by fever at [illegible] with Mother Cabrini. God blessed [illegible] and achieving have done much up to [illegible] that he should.

[illegible] in the canonization of St. Frances on [illegible] military personnel has [illegible] and business activities call for proper [illegible] south of the world is to make [illegible] years ago, but this work shall re[illegible] for our salvation life may be to all a long[illegible] and charity. We [illegible] in the fashioning of an era in [illegible] and charity give [illegible] that shall hold all men in [illegible] for all.

[illegible] Law of God

[illegible] accept as his law. No [illegible] Christian if he deliberately sets [illegible] his will observes, and points out [illegible] lower. No man can claim [illegible] specialist of the Church will [illegible] to ceremonial observance [illegible] can not love God and [illegible] claim to love his neigh[illegible] refuse to love God.

[illegible] we all the need of ab[illegible] a perfect example of in[illegible] the Scribes and Pharisees. [illegible] really they were no of [illegible] of the Scribes [illegible] the Kingdom of [illegible]

[illegible] our con[illegible] what we require [illegible] God and loving [illegible] we look into [illegible] are truly [illegible]

[illegible] law of God. All the ten [illegible] these great [illegible] of our neighbor; [illegible] against this [illegible] we may be found [illegible] Christ in [illegible]

Fr. Gillis Says:

Protestants On Our Side!

Bishop Noll and his associates on The Sunday Visitor used to collect statements made by Protestants in praise of Catholicism. Some of the testimonials were published in a big book entitled, "The Fairest Argument." To print all the nice things said about us by persons not of our faith would require a hundred such volumes. It did not surprise us therefore that when Cardinal Spellman commented upon the favorable of certain Protestant ministers that President Truman recall Myron Taylor, His Eminence said that he had received assurances from non-Catholics that they disapproved of what had been done ostensibly in their name.

Father Gillis

* * *

I beg to present a few samples.

In a letter to the New York Times for June 17th, written by R. Gordon Wasson, occurs this paragraph:

"As a Protestant may I dissociate myself from the stand taken by spokesmen for the Federal Council of Churches demanding the severance of diplomatic ties with the Vatican. Everyone who is familiar with the services rendered by the diplomatic office of our Government at the Holy See in recent years knows how valuable that office has been in furthering the cause of right. With Christendom today under mortal attack from within and from without, these Protestant ministers are performing a grave disservice to their own cause by advocating retrogression toward disunity in the Christian fold."

Mr. Watson continues with this significant statement:

"The spokesmen of the Federal Council of Churches and other Protestant churchmen have for years been volunteering advice to states and statesmen about political questions, national and international. It ill becomes them to talk about the separation of church and state."

* * *

In the New York World-Telegram for June 19th, R. E. Chapman wrote:

"These gentlemen, so it is reported, claim to speak for 40,000,000 Protestants. The writer of this letter, as the descendant of three preceding generations of Presbyterian ministers, resents the claim made by these clerical gentlemen that they represent him. This is not the time to sever relations with the head of the greatest single spiritual force in the world arrayed against the ruthless forces of atheistic materialism. This is not the time to break the liaison between the United States Government and the head of the Mother Church of all western Christendom representing a communion of 300,000,000 Christians and carrying aloft the torch, today, in support of the tradition of western Christian civilization. To claim that maintenance of diplomatic relations with the Vatican is in contravention of the principle of separation of church and state seems to me little short of absurd."

* * *

In the New York Sun for June 21st, J. J. May wrote:

"Myron C. Taylor at the Vatican has done a fine job for the United States government; also in helping thousands upon thousands of displaced and persecuted people in Europe. It was an act of wisdom of President Roosevelt to assign him to the post, and President Truman has done the smart thing in following suit. Surely there is no imminent danger of the Catholic Church taking over the United States, and it is high time this hokum stopped. If Dr. Calvert and his brothers of the cloth are so disturbed about the welfare of the United States, let them show their patriotism by blasting away at the Soviet government and the communists, the greatest threat to our country, to religion and to the peace of the world."

* * *

At Grinnell, Iowa, on June 18, Rev. Dr. Ronald Bridges, president of the Pacific School of Religion at Berkley, California, declared to an audience of 2500 persons:

"Protestants and Catholics must live together as neighbors sharing the greatest enterprise on earth. If the kingdom of God is to be advanced, we Protestants must help our Catholic brothers, not hinder them in the great enterprise. The new aggressiveness of the Roman Catholic Church," he said, "was not the beginnings of a campaign to take over America, but a very belated recognition that only in the United States is there a real chance for the healthy growth in the immediate future, only in the United States are there the religious and material resources to keep the Catholic Church a going concern in the years ahead."

Obviously not all that Dr. Bridges says of us can be taken as a compliment. His opinion that the continued existence of the Catholic Church depends upon the United States is in the face of history a bit ridiculous, and his statement that our statistics are "inflated" shows that he has no inside knowledge of our parish records. But let his mistakes pass, and come to what I consider a particularly shrewd description of the difference between the Catholic Church and the Protestant sects. He speaks of us as "the long-range planners, with an eye on eternity," while the projects of Protestants, he says are "often hastily conceived, enthusiastically embraced and impatiently dropped when results didn't appear in a week from Thursday."

* * *

Thanks, therefore, to the Protestant gentlemen, clerics and lay, who took up the cudgels in our defense when the ill-advised Bishop Oxnam and his fellows unwisely made an attempt to deprive our nation of the moral and spiritual advantage of friendly relations with 350 million Catholics.

Wuz I Boined Up!

Labor Leader, the publication of the Catholic Unionists, tells this one about Fr. John Boland, of Buffalo, during the days when the priest was trying to settle strikes as a member of the New York State Labor Relations board — and very often succeeding. A truculent organizer was speaking.

"There we were, at long last, in the Labor Board's meeting room. When I boined up, was I! Wit the guys all there, I feel, maybe, she is do time for the pay-off. 'Boy! Kid I the words on my lips. So I started kind: 'You [illegible] kind sich, the whole [illegible] kind sich. After a few words, the boss Father Boland whispers to me a question. I answer him fast. He whispers another question. Again I swing he. Another guy asks me a question — tough [illegible]. I was boined up, but Father Boland, he was with the answer — whispering. Then I relaxed to and he help me. Next thing I knew I was whispering too. Next thing I knew every body in the whole room, we was all whispering [illegible] Boland, was it [illegible]."

"Ah, Sorum, Will 'Ya, Fellars?"

Copyright 1946 by Courier Journal

As We See It

By Dan Patrick

The mists of war and diplomatic secrecy which shrouded Teheran and Yalta are slowly lifting.

In terms of stark realism, it is revealed that Franklin D. Roosevelt gambled all-out war aid for Russia in exchange for a promise of cooperation in the post-war world—and lost.

Just before his death, Roosevelt himself smarted under the sting of Russia's unilateral actions and became very doubtful about the "good intentions" of the Russian rulers.

One administration official quoted Roosevelt as saying:

"The Russians are not playing fair with me. They are ignoring the spirit and the letter of agreements which I made with them."

The "inside" story of what happened at Teheran has emerged from the rumor stage. As a matter of fact it was told to the American public as far back as May, 1944 in two Saturday Evening Post articles written by Forrest Davis.

At that time it could not be revealed that Davis has written the articles on the basis of interviews with President Roosevelt. Subsequent to their publication, Davis received a letter from the President commending the articles as "accurate and fair."

Now what did Roosevelt reveal in these articles? He said he went to Teheran in November, 1943 with a plan for a post-war world and a positive hope to "enroll the Soviet Union as a sincere and willing collaborator in post-war settlements."

Always a political realist, Roosevelt knew he would have to make considerable concessions to Stalin to win a promise of Soviet collaboration.

He also knew that once such a promise was extracted from Stalin, it would be, at best, just that and nothing more. Some of the Roosevelt advisers urged the President to insist upon specific and written pledges from Stalin in exchange for the great contributions the United States was making to the Russian war effort.

But Roosevelt would have none of that. In the Saturday Evening Post article, Davis summarized the President's views as follows: "Mr. Roosevelt, gambling for stakes as enormous as any statesman ever played for has been betting that the Soviet Union needs peace and is willing to pay for it by collaboration with the west."

Of course, Stalin promised post-war cooperation but only in broad, vague terms. He failed to get down to cases. Roosevelt was satisfied but not Churchill who tried unsuccessfully to get some specific pledges from Stalin.

The Churchill procedure led to a series of clashes with the Soviet dictator. Roosevelt tried to mediate the differences but could not wring any specific concession from Mr. Stalin. And there the matter rested.

The whole matter is best summed up by William C. Bullitt, former ambassador to Russia in his forthcoming book, "The Great Globe Itself."

Referring to the Roosevelt plan at Teheran as outlined in the Davis article, Bullitt writes:

"Roosevelt hoped to accomplish his 'grand design' by (1) giving Stalin without limit everything he asked for the prosecution of the war and to ask nothing in return; (2) persuading Stalin to adhere to statements of general aims, like the Atlantic Charter and (3) meeting Stalin face to face and persuading him into an acceptance of Christian ways and democratic principles.

"Critics of this policy asked at the time, 'Suppose that Stalin, in spite of all concessions, should prove unappeasable, determined to pursue his own policy regardless of the West?'

"The answer, said Forrest Davis, was that 'Mr. Roosevelt, gambling for stakes as enormous as any statesman ever played for, has been betting that the Soviet Union needs peace and is willing to pay for it by collaborating with the West.

"President Roosevelt lost his gamble though he died before the actions of the Soviet Government in Poland, Hungary, Austria, Rumania, Bulgaria, Germany, Iran, Manchuria and Korea had made this evident.

"Stalin had remained unconverted. The events of 1945 proved beyond shadow of a doubt that the Atlantic Charter and the Yalta Declaration had been to Stalin merely excellent ready-made suits of sheep's clothing which he could wear until he no longer needed a camouflage.

"The war was over but there was no sign of peace. The President's great design had failed. Stalin had won 'stakes as enormous as any statesman ever played for.'

But the tired President was never forced to admit that he had lost, that not even he with all his genius could appease the unappeasable."

The Secrets Of Teheran

WASHINGTON

Jewish State for Russia

By TOM ROGERS

Washington — The Soviet delegate to the United Nations will soon throw a bombshell that will have political and religious percussions around the world. Reviving the twenty-year old plan for a Jewish state in Soviet Russia, the Russians may soon demand the recognition of that state in the United Nations organization.

Exactly what effect this propaganda will have on the displaced persons in chaotic Europe who are being barred from Palestine by the British can not yet be determined. It is thought that the attraction will be strong however, for a national homeland and world recognition as a promise is better than continued existence in a former prison camp.

The terrorists operating in the Holy Land can be expected to capitalize on this, pointing out that Russia is far more friendly to the Jews than is Britain. The Arab League likewise will feel well-disposed towards the Russians for offering to solve their problem.

Actually, there is little new or sensational news connected with this state. It was once known as the district of Biro-Bidjhan, named for two rivers in Siberia where it is located just west of Khabarovsk, the capital of Siberia. It was set aside by the Soviet Government as a self-governing "colony" for the resettlement of the Russian Jews. Most of the Jews in the district had been transported there from the towns and the villages of the Ukraine and White Russia.

They fared better than the labor gangs that were sent to toil and die along the highways and in the swamps of Siberia. They retained their political rights and enjoyed autonomy in the direction of the local administration of the district. The editor of the party newspapers in Khabarovsk told one American newspaperman some years ago that the Jewish colony "was similar to the Palestine colony which Great Britain had fostered" and that the chief object of the Soviet Government in establishing the district was to divert the attention of Russian Jews from the British-fostered Zionist movement in Palestine, which had profoundly impressed the millions of Russian Jews.

The area itself is in great need of development. Iron and coal must be mined if industry is to be started. Farming techniques must be expanded and improved. Communications are poor. The winter temperature drops to 30 degrees below zero; the summer's hottest day averages in the area of 68 degrees.

According to some Soviet sources, the chief objective in founding the Biro-Bidjhan colony was strategic . . . years ago. Due to its location directly west of Khabarovsk, capital of Siberia, the district was intended to provide an important agricultural and industrial base for the support of the Far Eastern Army of Russia.

Today that area is still hidden from the world. But in view of the increasingly grave crisis in middle Europe and the Middle East, you can soon expect to see the Russians bring it to light again, offer it to the homeless and harried Jew, profit by the propaganda, and place additional weight for an additional U. N. vote by asking for recognition in the General Council. It will be a complex problem to handle — and top sources say it will be sprung soon.

Know It?

(Answers on page 5)

If you answer all five, you're perfect; three or four, good; if only one or two, not so good.

1. Is some one being married or buried at church when at the offertory of the Mass are read these words:

"Let Michael, the only standard-bearer, bring them into the holy light which Thou didst promise to Abraham and his seed."

2. The dalmatic is worn at solemn High Mass by the
   celebrant
   deacon
   master of ceremonies

3. In Prague, Bohemia, is kept the tongue of a saint which since the 14th century is still as fresh as a living tongue. What is the name of this martyred priest who was confessor to Queen Jane Sophie, and whom King Wenceslaus IV had thrown into the Moldau River because he would not reveal to him what the Queen had confessed?

4. The first "priest of the Most High" to offer the sacrifice of bread and wine to God was
   Aaron
   Samuel
   Melchisedech

5. Mention one important incident associated with the following mountains (hills) mentioned in the Bible:
   Mt. Sinai
   Mt. Olivet
   Mt. Thabor
   Mt. Calgotha
   Mt. Nebo
   Mt. Sion

Yardstick

Competition Cooperation

By Rev. Geo. Higgins

One of the Federal agencies which somehow manages to stay out of trouble, and out of the limelight as well, is the Federal Trade Commission. Presumably the multitudinous taxi drivers in Washington can tell you where the agency is located, but the average Washingtonian would probably be stumped if you asked him for directions to the Commission's headquarters.

Father Higgins

He knows where the Department of Labor is located, because — well, because labor is in the news. Or hadn't you noticed? He knows his way to the National Art Gallery, even though he courteously stifles his cultural instincts and stays away from the Gallery to leave room for the tourists. If he put his mind to it, he could probably even direct you with reasonable accuracy to the Social Security Board, but as for the Federal Trade Commission — well, frankly, he has never heard of it.

* * *

The writer's current interest in the FTC—an interest which sent him back to the books for a brief refresher course — was occasioned by a recent newspaper story which indicated that the agency is taking on new life. The 32-year-old Commission is overhauling its procedures with the aim of improving its role as the so-called "businessman's court."

* * *

The present Congress, before it adjourns, is expected to vote the FTC the additional funds required for dealing with unfair trade practices on a wholesale scale. "This the Commission hopes to accomplish," the story continues, "through a series of new industry-wide codes setting forth the rules to which members must adhere."

* * *

The substantive power of the Commission was derived from Section Five of the Act under which it was originally established, which section states: "That unfair methods of competition in commerce are hereby declared unlawful." Hitherto the Commission has usually exercised its statutory powers in piece-meal fashion by taking action against individual firms accused of unfair competitive practices—a procedure which was painfully tedious and time-consuming and which frequently left competitors free to practice the same abuses until the Commission could get around to their cases. Under its proposed reorganization the Commission would draw up codes acceptable to a given business or industry and then proceed simultaneously against all members failing to comply with its rules and regulations.

* * *

Officials of the FTC are said to believe that a wider and more effective use of fair practice codes would encourage industries and trade associations to regulate themselves voluntarily, "thereby reducing the need for Government intervention."

* * *

"Thereby reducing the need for government intervention. . . ." A very significant paradox: More government intervention in the short run equals less government intervention in the long run — provided that industry is sensible enough to know what's best for it. It comes down to this in effect, that the officials of the Federal Trade Commission are aiming to be so successful that their own services can gradually be dispensed with.

* * *

Their altruism is to be admired, but it remains to be proved that even the most efficient type of reorganization will enable the FTC to do an effective job of regulating competitive practices in American industry. The job is just too big and too complicated for a government agency to handle. Which brings us back, however circuitously, to the social encyclicals.

* * *

The encyclicals are not opposed to government intervention in economic life, but they do maintain that government intervention is at best an emergency substitute for self-regulation — self-regulation through the joint cooperation of organized business and organized labor, with the assistance and encouragement of the government. If the Federal Trade Commission can help to educate American industry to an acceptance of this principle, more power to it! That's the most that it can hope to accomplish. It cannot effectively regulate competition. That job can be done only by industry itself in organized cooperation with labor and the government.

* * *

The foregoing discussion is inadequate in this regard among others, that it dodges the very fundamental question of the role of competition in economic life. Is it enough merely to "regulate" competition, or will it be necessary to substitute something else as the normal guiding or directing principle in economic life? Commentators on the encyclicals are still undecided among themselves on the specific role of competition under the so-called occupational group system of Pope Pius XI, but it sometimes seems that their disagreement is largely one of emphasis. Certainly this much is true, that competition cannot be the normal means of bringing order and harmony into economic life.

* * *

Quadragesimo Anno hardly admits of exegesis on this point. Its wording is unmistakably clear and specific. "But free competition, while justified and certainly useful provided it is kept within certain limits, clearly cannot direct economic life — a truth which the outcome of the application in practice of the tenets of this evil individualistic spirit has more than sufficiently demonstrated."

* * *

What the Federal Trade Commission is attempting to do is to regulate competition—certainly not to displace it as the normal directing principle in economic life. It is suggested that American industry, if it decides to take up the job where the FTC leaves off, will need to go beyond the realm of negative regulation and move into the field of organized cooperation as a substitute for competition. The two are not the same.

One Man's Opinion

By Walter Kiernan

(Distributed by International News Service)

Byrnes and Bevin really scored at Paris. They got Molotov to agree to accept 100 million dollars from busted Italy.

It is triumphs like this that restore men's faith in International diplomacy.

It is obvious that the Russians are easing up on their demands. Previously they got two islands and everything they could lug out of Manchuria for two days work in the Pacific War.

Don't go 'way . . . Things are happening all the time.