

Courier Journal

Dr. Gillis Says:



Definition: I used that caption over this column on some previous occasion. Probably, in fact, it was the tip of my tongue almost every time I heard a debate, argument or controversy in the newspapers. Always, too, I recall Cardinal Newman's saying that he had listened to hundreds of discussions in the common rooms at Oxford which went on and on with no conclusion and no apparent results because the participants in the argument neglected to define what they were arguing about. This incident was similar to that in a discussion with philosophers trained in the scholastic method. Scholastic disputants are a formidable entity: if an antagonist is arguing loosely, they demand that he put his argument in the form of a syllogism.

The very word "syllogism" infuriates the "modern" philosopher. He says it forces him to be logical and tricky. The real reason he hates the syllogism is that it demands clear thinking. He loathes clear thinking. Likewise we are hating him. The truth is we are trying to save him, his and our own.

Take the most recent example. The opponents of the Bus bill almost invariably say that they don't like it because it would involve the union of church and state.

What they mean by the union of church and state they fail to say. You couldn't extract a definition out of them with a surgeon's probe and scalpel. Since the verdict of the Supreme Court on the Bus Bill, I think I must have seen a hundred letters to editors in which the writers referred to the union of church and state.

In not one of the hundred have I seen any form of words which by the most skillful manipulation could be construed into a definition. As I suppose we give our opponents a little assistance. Let's ask a few questions. When we get (if we get) the answers we may perhaps be in a position to define that elusive something called "union of church and state."

First: If in the public schools there is a Bible reading every morning, and not only Bible reading but a kind of homily on the text once a week in general assembly (you might call it chapel), does that come under the definition of union of church and state? In the public school which I attended, the Boston Latin School, that kind of religious exercise went on from 1835 to at least 1900. Was that exercise unconstitutional at least after the Constitution? Did it involve a union of church and state for over a hundred years? Was the city of Boston and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts breaking the law of the land for all that time?

Second: The Federal Government built a chapel at West Point, at Annapolis and in a thousand camps. In all these chapels religious worship was conducted. Is it still conducted at West Point and Annapolis and in camps. Clergymen who conduct services in these chapels are paid by the government. Is that the union of church and state and therefore unconstitutional?

Third: During the war—every war since 1898—the Federal Government has not only welcomed chaplains into the service but has paid them. Chaplains were given commissions and paid salaries by the government. Is that union of church and state? Some of those chaplains are still receiving salaries. Does that indicate the union of church and state?

Fourth: A large number of GI students are now being educated at the nation's expense in colleges whose constitution provides that the president and a certain number of the board of directors must be Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Dutch Reformed, Catholic or what have you. Uncle Sam is therefore indirectly helping the religious denominations. Does that come under condemnation as a union of church and state? Some of those colleges are periodically given large subsidies with no stipulation that the money must not go to pay the salaries of ordained ministers of religion. Is that another form of violation of the Constitution?

We could go on. In fact we could go on and on. But it would be only more of the same. If those clerical gentlemen who have recently constituted themselves advocates of the separation of church and state will do us the favor of answering these four questions, we may get a little light on what thus far has remained (at least as far as I am concerned) a dark question. If we get the answers, we may be able to place together a definition of the union of church and state. I fear we shall get no definition from the opponents.

What is it that Falstaff said about reasons? "It reasons were as plentiful as blackberries. I would give no reason upon compulsion." If definitions were as plentiful as blackberries our friends on the other side of the Bus Bill argument would give no definitions upon request.

Another Soviet Veto



As We See It

By Dan Patrick

The End Of One World

The rose-colored conception of One World is fading under the grim impact of post-war reality and rivalry.

The split between Soviet Russia on the one hand and France and Britain on the other over the Marshall Plan has served only to dramatize a fact which has been developing ever since the last shot was fired in World War II.

Whether we like it or not, the world is returning to the "balance of power" and "spheres of influence" theory which held sway in the uneasy years between the signing of the Versailles Treaty and Hitler's march into Poland.

Franklin D. Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie indulged in the One World dream which they envisioned as transforming the war-time grand alliance of the victorious allies into a workable peacetime organization.

In the dark hours of the late conflict, Roosevelt and Churchill proclaimed to the struggling people of the bomb-blasted world the Atlantic Charter with its guarantees of basic freedoms to everyone. Even Stalin joined in the pious declaration.

A look around the world today is convincing proof that, to all intents and purposes, the Atlantic Charter has become just another diplomatic "scrap of paper." With millions under the heel of Red tyranny, the declarations in the charter sound like hollow mockery.

The same may be said of the United Nations, the organization which was forged in the fires of war to keep the peace for all times in the future. By unbridled use of its veto power, Soviet Russia has delayed, obstructed and scuttled every genuine attempt by the UN to further the cause of peace.

Many competent observers are convinced that the UN, as far as Russia is concerned, has become nothing more or less than a sounding board for Soviet propaganda. It is generally felt that Russia will use the UN forum only as long as it serves Moscow's design and then break away into isolated solitude surrounded by a cordon of subservient satellites.

The inevitable question which follows such observations can be summed up in four words. Does this mean war?

Most careful students of international affairs would reply with either a flat or qualified negative. A rather significant United Press dispatch from Washington this week reported as follows:

"This powerful prayer was found in the Sepulchre of Jesus Christ in 1709, and was sent by the Pope to the Emperor St. Mitchell in France. The person who reads this prayer, or hears it read, or carries it on their body, will not be poisoned, will not fall into the hands of his enemies, will not be vanquished in battle. When a woman will be in confinement and she has this prayer, and she reads it or hears it read by anyone, or carries it on her person, she will be promptly delivered, she will be a good mother, and when the child is born, she will place this prayer on the child's right side and it will protect it from 82 accidents. (We're not making this up. We're still quoting!) The person that writes this prayer for their own benefit, or for the benefit of others, I will beseech with the Lord. The person who will despise this prayer will be punished."

This measurably is obviously the work of an ignorant person. He slanders our faith in saying that any Pope approved it. It has already been roundly condemned by competent Catholic authorities. We beg of you, our friends

These (American) diplomats, aware of the dangers always present in a precarious balance of power and an economic competition between East and West, nevertheless think the world may be in better shape to cope with its problems once the illusion of "one world" is abandoned for the reality of two rival spheres of influence.

American officials are preparing for the UN General Assembly meeting in September and for the later New York and London Council of Foreign Ministers meeting with the conviction that they will mark a vital turning point in post-war history.

Soviet Russia's rejection of the Marshall Plan for European reconstruction has dramatized what men who are responsible for American policy toward Russia have felt for some time—that Germany, Europe and the world are split and that recognition of it will hasten rather than deter a working agreement between America and Russia.

There is nothing novel in that conclusion. To a large degree, it echoes the reaction of the Osservatore Romano, Vatican daily, which remarked several weeks ago that it is possible for governmental nations with two conflicting ideologies to live side by side in peace.

Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson, who served as American prosecutor at the Nuremberg trials and had ample opportunity to study Soviet cooperation or lack of it, is of the same mind. In a little-noticed commencement address which he delivered at Dartmouth, Jackson declared those who see armed conflict as the only alternative to lack of full-scale cooperation between the East and the West.

The idea of one world where all the people would enjoy the freedoms we Americans have come to accept as our rightful heritage, is a splendid dream. Unfortunately it hasn't come true.

It is for us to bow to the inevitable and accept conditions as they are and not as we would like to have them. This is not defeatism. It is reality which we can buoy up with the hope and prayer that at some point in the future Russia, converted through the intercession of Our Lady of Fatima, will embrace the western conception of government where the state is the servant of the individual and not vice versa.

should you ever meet this prayer or any like it, to tear it to a thousand pieces and say a good sincere Our Father, which will benefit all of us more than any other prayer ever written.

U. S. Priest Turns Hermit In Spain

Madrid—(Radio, Noy)—In a move that has caused considerable surprise among scientific circles here, the Rev. Thomas Vermer Moore, 60-year-old professor on leave of absence from the Catholic University of America, has joined the Carthusians near Burgos, Spain, to lead the life of a hermit.

The noted American priest, doctor, philosopher and psychologist came to Spain last year to study the Carthusians, a sect of hermits in the mountains of Spain. Moore, who has been in Spain since 1945, is a member of the Carthusians, a sect of hermits in the mountains of Spain. Moore, who has been in Spain since 1945, is a member of the Carthusians, a sect of hermits in the mountains of Spain.

Before coming to Spain, Father Moore, while remaining nominal head of the Catholic University's department of psychology, discontinued his active labors after almost a half century of service.

The Yardstick

By Rev. Geo. Higgins

Mr. Lawrence Objects
David Lawrence, editor of the United States News and a widely syndicated columnist, has been the subject of critical editorials in at least five diocesan newspapers within the past two or three weeks.

And, in all fairness to Mr. Lawrence, it is suggested that he has only himself to blame. The controversy started as follows. On June 12, the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference issued a statement in opposition to the Taft-Hartley Bill. A few days later, Mr. Lawrence, who had been vigorously supporting the measure, Father Higgins in his daily column, criticized the Social Action Department for involving itself in what he referred to as a partisan political issue. He was careful to say that "there is not the slightest objection to the expression of views by individual clergymen on public questions when they are plainly acting as individual citizens."

What Mr. Lawrence objected to was the fact that the Social Action Department, in issuing its statement, was functioning as a "church unit." And "for any church unit, functioning as an institution, to risk in a pressure group on specific laws in the economic or political field," he said, "is to involve America in unfortunate controversies where the influence of the churches will be weakened instead of strengthened."

And then, as if to summarize his theory on the role of the churches in contradistinction to the role of the individual members of the various churches, he argues that "the province of all the churches of all denominations is to exert an influence for individual honesty and self-restraint endeavoring to make laymen responsive to spiritual interest so that they themselves will be fair and objective both in the writing of laws and in taking rightful political action."

On June 30, Mr. Lawrence returned to the subject in his syndicated column and attempted to show that some of his critics in the Senate hadn't taken the trouble to read the original column. Be that as it may, all of the editors of the five diocesan papers referred to above did read the original column. And on the basis of what they read, they found it necessary to register vigorous disagreement with Lawrence's theology.

One or two of the editors—in a special effort to be absolutely fair to Mr. Lawrence—suggested that he probably didn't mean what he seemed to be saying, and that therefore he might be inclined to modify his position after he had given it a second thought. The writer of this column also was inclined to give Mr. Lawrence the benefit of the doubt, but, unfortunately, his second column leaves no doubt about the fact that he most certainly did mean to say that religious groups are stepping out of their province whenever they issue a statement on current legislation. His second article makes this unmistakably clear.

Let it be clearly understood, therefore, that the issue which Lawrence has raised goes far beyond the merits or demerits of the statement of the Social Action Department on the Taft-Hartley Bill. What he is really questioning is the right of any "church unit" (Protestant, Catholic or Jewish) to issue a statement or any piece of current legislation. He simply cannot escape the corollary of his own language, particularly in view of the fact that he has seen fit to reiterate his position in a second and even more forceful column.

Logically, what he is saying is that neither the National Catholic Welfare Conference nor any of its departments (nor the Federal Council of Churches, nor the Synagogue Council of America) has any business issuing a statement on divorce legislation, on educational or labor legislation, on universal military training, or on any one of a dozen other types of legislation which obviously are intertwined with moral and ethical considerations. Whatever ethical statements are made on these and other legislative matters, are to be made exclusively by individuals "plainly acting as individual citizens."

Mr. Lawrence is entitled to his own opinion, of course, but he owes it to his readers to inform them that there are few, if any, theologians who agree with him. One also suspects that there are not very many rank-and-file American citizens who could bring themselves to agree with the obvious corollary of his position on the function of the churches.

By way of a postscript, it may be appropriate to recall that this isn't the first time that Mr. Lawrence has taken one or another of the churches to task. On March 28, for example, he devoted his weekly editorial in the United States News to a criticism of the Pittsburgh "Conference on the Church and Economic Life," sponsored by the Federal Council of Churches.

Instead of confining his criticism to specific details of the Pittsburgh report, he concentrated on the central theory of its more recent columns, namely, that "the influence of the church must be wholly individual and not institutional."

Mr. Lawrence repeatedly makes the point that the churches ought to keep out of partisan politics. The point is well taken. But Mr. Lawrence's highly personalized definition of partisan politics is ambiguous at best. For example, if the churches advocate the extension of the cooperative movement, or if they debate the ethics of the draft motive, or mention only two of the specifics to which Lawrence himself refers, they are becoming involved in partisan politics—according to Lawrence's definition of the term.

Undoubtedly Mr. Lawrence's intentions are of the best; but one cannot but feel that he is advocating, perhaps unwittingly, a type of extreme individualism which, in turn, could only result in a kind of secularism, the fruits of which Mr. Lawrence himself would be the first to abhor.

Calendar of Saints

SUNDAY, JULY 14—St. Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea. Refused to obey the order of King Himerius that he exclude the Vandals, some of whom were Catholics, from the church. This led to a persecution of the Catholics.

MONDAY, JULY 14—St. Bonaventura, known as the "Seraphic Doctor." When asked by Thomas Aquinas whence he drew his great learning, replied by pointing to the Crucifix.

TUESDAY, JULY 15—St. Henry, emperor, moved by a vision, prepared for death at the age of six years. When that period had elapsed, Henry, Duke of Bavaria, was elected emperor. He devoted the resources of his empire to the honor of God.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 16—Feast of Our Lady of Mount Carmel. Also the Feast of St. Simon Stock, who was born in the County of Kent, England.

THURSDAY, JULY 17—St. Anthony, son of noble Roman parents, lived as a hermit in his father's house for 12 years, having returned home as a beggar unrecognized by relatives or friends.

FRIDAY, JULY 18—St. Camillus of Lellis, at the age of 15 took service with his father, an Italian noble, against the Turks, and after four years campaigning found himself in straightened circumstances. A few words from a Capuchin friar brought about his conversion and he decided to enter religious life.

SATURDAY, JULY 19—St. Vincent de Paul, who was born in 1580, devoted his life to the care of the poor and the instruction of the rich in the ways of charity.

Just Between Us

Please, Tear It Up

By Father Ginder

Yes, indeed! The devil can use even prayer to trick us, making all kinds of extravagant promises in return for reciting some little formula—which may be perfectly innocent in itself.

How can the Catholic tell a false promise from a superstitious play on words? He looks for the Nihil Obstat, or censor, then for the Imprimatur, or license of the Bishop. These are required by Church Law on any printed thing about Religion.

Perhaps these may have been forged—which is hardly likely. Even so, the Catholic uses ordinary common sense. Superstition promises an effect all out of proportion with its cause, and it promises that the desired effect will come without any real cause of the cause. And, frankly, there is something odd about the cause or conditions laid down.

Here is the writing preceding such a prayer. It came in the mail printed, but without Nihil Obstat or Imprimatur. It



Follows, spelling mistakes and all.

"This powerful prayer was found in the Sepulchre of Jesus Christ in 1709, and was sent by the Pope to the Emperor St. Mitchell in France. The person who reads this prayer, or hears it read, or carries it on their body, will not be poisoned, will not fall into the hands of his enemies, will not be vanquished in battle. When a woman will be in confinement and she has this prayer, and she reads it or hears it read by anyone, or carries it on her person, she will be promptly delivered, she will be a good mother, and when the child is born, she will place this prayer on the child's right side and it will protect it from 82 accidents. (We're not making this up. We're still quoting!) The person that writes this prayer for their own benefit, or for the benefit of others, I will beseech with the Lord. The person who will despise this prayer will be punished."

We beg of you, our friends



should you ever meet this prayer or any like it, to tear it to a thousand pieces and say a good sincere Our Father, which will benefit all of us more than any other prayer ever written.

should you ever meet this prayer or any like it, to tear it to a thousand pieces and say a good sincere Our Father, which will benefit all of us more than any other prayer ever written.