

COURIER JOURNAL

Dr. Higgins Says:

Take Your Choice

Last week we took issue with the recent writings of the Rev. Edward A. Keller, C.S.C., Director of the Bureau of Economic Research, University of Notre Dame. Father Keller was quoted as expressing strong disapproval—as maintaining that the "encyclicals do not condemn our economic system of free enterprise but instead give a strong moral foundation for such a system."

Since writing our earlier protest against Father Keller's ostensible application of encyclical teaching to American conditions, we have had the pleasure of reading a new book written by one of the most distinguished of American economists. "Alternative to Socialism" by John M. Clark, professor of economics at Columbia University and former president of the American Economic Association.

ALL THE MORE impressive, then, is economist Clark's conclusion (which, it will be noted, directly contradicts Father Keller's central opinion) that our present economic system is anything but moral.

MR. WALLACE to the contrary, the actions of the Soviet Union in its bloodless march of conquest certainly cannot be mistaken for the justifiable aspirations of a peace-loving country. It is time that some counter-measures be instituted by the western democracies and they must be effective — not just futile cries of anguish.

THE FACT that Professor Clark is a highly respected non-Catholic economist, indicates our economic system on charges of immorality or, if you will, of amorality, is indeed significant. Even more significant, however, is the fact that his central complaint against the system is also the central complaint of the social encyclicals — a complaint about which Father Keller, in professing to interpret the encyclicals, is strangely silent.

WHEREAS Father Keller would argue that "free enterprise" is adequate to our needs, Professor Clark maintains that "the market (free competition) has had such marvelous and organizing powers that it has deluded many of us, for some hundred and seventy years, into thinking that it could do all that was needed to organize an economic community on a basis of consent as embodied in the act of free exchange."

ONE NEED NOT concur with all of Professor Clark's applications of his central thesis. I, for one, do not concur with all of them. The fact remains, however, that in his analysis of the central weakness of our economic system, and in his statement of the central weakness of the social encyclicals ever so much more accurately than does Father Keller.

DO YOU REMEMBER? 10 Years Ago—March 31, 1938. Thousands of appeals to Governor Lehman to approve the McNaboe Bill which would have barred Communists and other radicals from public office, the civil service and school positions, failed, when the Governor disapproved the bill.

Supreme Confusion



As We See It By Dan Patrick

We Can Take It

THE STIRRING events of the past fortnight have whipped the people of the United States into a morose, bitter, reminiscent of those fateful days in the spring of 1939 when Hitler's legions sparked World War II by their march into Czechoslovakia.

Through an ironic twist of history the diplomatic seizure of this same Czechoslovakia by Russia in the spring of 1938 has precipitated the present crisis.

MR. WALLACE to the contrary, the actions of the Soviet Union in its bloodless march of conquest certainly cannot be mistaken for the justifiable aspirations of a peace-loving country. It is time that some counter-measures be instituted by the western democracies and they must be effective — not just futile cries of anguish.

HOWEVER, WE would like to take definite exception not to the proposal made but to the manner and methods employed in making them. For some unknown reason, there are key officials in the administration who feel that the only way to get action out of the American people is to drive them into a frenzy of fear and then start sugar-coating the antidotes to be applied for the relief of such fear.

There are some who wonder why a nation possessing the atomic bomb must lean on a large military force. There are others who feel that a program of universal military training is not immediate enough to meet the crisis at hand.

There are some who wonder why a nation possessing the atomic bomb must lean on a large military force. There are others who feel that a program of universal military training is not immediate enough to meet the crisis at hand.

There are some who wonder why a nation possessing the atomic bomb must lean on a large military force. There are others who feel that a program of universal military training is not immediate enough to meet the crisis at hand.

There is a curious passage in the New Testament showing the apostles bickering among themselves on who should have top honors in the new Kingdom. Jesus settles the matter very tactfully and then right away turns to St. Peter, who evidently comes to his mind at once.

Another striking passage in favor of St. Peter shows Jesus choosing him to head the whole Church. It happened by the Sea of Galilee right after the Resurrection.

method of treatment. It not only credits the average American with the kindergarten intellect but it defeats its own purpose by crying emergency too loud and too often.

The current crisis offers some sterling examples of misbehavior in this field. For instance, the administration talks about a "temporary" draft. Why not be realistic and reason that once the immense Selective Service machinery is reestablished, it will continue to function for the duration of the emergency.

Then we have Secretary Marshall and his well-meaning effort to keep the people calm in one breath and, in another, warning them of the crisis at hand. That's something like telling a family that their house is on fire but there's nothing to get excited about.

The inference was plain that the presence of these submarines was a prelude to war. Not until several days later did it develop that some submarines might have been sighted at an unspecified time somewhere outside the three mile limit. And what's more these submarines — even if they happened to be Russian — had a perfect right under international law to cruise in those waters.

JIMMY RESTON, the diplomatic correspondent of the New York Times has pointed out that the Czech crisis should have come to us as no surprise. When the Czechs were forced by the Reds to pass up participation in the Marshall Plan, months ago, that should have been evidence enough as to the real rulers of the Czechs, according to Mr. Reston.

After all the people that fought two wars in a single generation and sent their sons and daughters to battlefronts all over the world don't have to be driven by fear.

They proved themselves under fire. They can take it.

The Bishop's Appointments

- APRIL
10 Saturday—Logan, Utah—Rocky Mountain Regional Convention of Newman Clubs.
11 Sunday—Salt Lake City, Utah—Cathedral of the Madeleine—Sermon at Solemn Pontifical Mass, Diocesan Council of Catholic Men Convention—10:00 A. M.
15 Thursday—Mercy High Auditorium—Christopher Lynch Concert—8:15 P. M.
18 Sunday—St. Bernard's Seminary—Ordinations—9:00 A. M.
19 Monday—Rochester Club, Annual Banquet of the Catholic Women's Club—7:00 P. M.
20 Tuesday—New York City, St. Patrick's Cathedral—Centenary Celebration of the Christian Brothers.
25 Sunday—White Plains, N. Y., Good Counsel College—Sermon at Silver Jubilee Mass for Alumnae.
28 Monday—White Plains, N. Y., Good Counsel College—Silver Jubilee Solemn Pontifical Mass—9:00 A. M.
27 Tuesday—White Plains, N. Y., Good Counsel College—Low Mass and Sermon for Students.
23 Wednesday—Diocesan Building, Priests' Conferences—3:00 P. M.
29 Thursday—Sheraton Hotel—Annual Luncheon of the Mercy Guild of the Little Flower—12:00 Noon.
29 Thursday—St. Stephen's, Geneva—Deanery Conference—2:00 P. M.
Holy Family, Auburn—Deanery Conference—4:00 P. M.

Dr. Gillis Says:

As everyone sees, there is a striking similarity between what is happening now in Europe and what happened in 1939. Nine years ago Hitler was marching on, taking one country after another, making promises and breaking them, keeping the statesmen guessing, and in general upsetting the non-toothless equilibrium of the world.

Not only the pattern but the technique of conquest is the same. The principal instrument employed by Stalin is that which was perfected by Hitler, the Fifth Column, dissension within the state to be invaded, conflict between parties in that state, resultant confusion and a helplessness amounting to paralysis on the part of the people.

Strategy once successful is used again. The tragic question occurs. Will the outcome be the same? Will nothing stop Stalin except what stopped Hitler? Probably. Those who know most about Soviet ambitions are convinced that Stalin will not stop until he is stopped.

HERE IS WHERE America comes into the picture. Are we willing to go to war again for the same purpose as before? Did we really want to go into either the first or the second world war? Are we so well satisfied with the result of those two that we would go into a third?

I could, if I would, at this precise point throw the question into the theological field. St. Thomas lays down as one of the conditions upon which war may be rightly waged, a prudent conviction and expectation that more good than harm will come from the resort to arms. But let us keep that theological question for the moment in the background. We must not put it aside altogether. When all other phases of the problem have been considered, we must bring up the theological question. But for the time being let us stick to our first question.

That first question is: Are we willing to go to war again for substantially the same purpose as before? Are we satisfied with the results previously achieved? To put it in a familiar phrase, "Is the game worth the candle?" To advance a step further and come to what may be considered a more praiseworthy consideration, do we, the American people, think it our duty in conscience to rectify the wrongs being done in Europe, Asia, Africa?

ONE MORE CONSIDERATION: Even if we do think it our duty in honor and conscience to fight for the right and punish the wrong in all the world, can we do it? Is it possible—even probable—that in the attempt to take care of the world we would ruin the great American experiment of democracy?

When Louis Kossuth came to this land to ask America to help the Hungarians in their revolution against Austria, Henry Clay, then Secretary of State, explained to him that the purpose of the existence of the American Republic was not to take part in foreign wars, but to "keep her light brightly shining as a guide to others," and that we could do more good in the world by following that ideal than by resort to arms. Do we now disagree with Henry Clay, as well as with Washington and Jefferson?

The immediate problem is, shall we or shall we not go to war to stop Stalin? Not many, if any of our statesmen help the people to see the issue clearly. We must see for ourselves and decide for ourselves.

Just Between Us

He Alone Has The Key

There is a curious passage in the New Testament showing the apostles bickering among themselves on who should have top honors in the new Kingdom.

Jesus settles the matter very tactfully and then right away turns to St. Peter, who evidently comes to his mind at once. "Simon, Simon," he says impressively, "behold, Satan has desired to have you (that is, all the apostles), that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail; and do thou when thou hast turned again, strengthen thy brethren." (Luke 22, 31-32).

Another striking passage in favor of St. Peter shows Jesus choosing him to head the whole Church. It happened by the Sea of Galilee right after the Resurrection. "When, therefore, they had breakfasted," says St. John, "Jesus said to Simon Peter, 'Simon, son of John, dost thou love me more than these, Lord?' He said to him, 'Yes, Lord, dost thou knowest that I love thee?' He said to him, 'Feed my lambs.' He said to him a second time, 'Simon, son of John, dost thou love me?' He said to him, 'Yes, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee.' He said to him, 'Feed my lambs.' A third time he said to him, 'Simon, son of John, dost thou love me?' Peter was grieved because he said to him for the third time, 'Dost thou love me?' And he said to him, 'Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee.'

By Father Ginder

He said to him, 'Feed my sheep.' (John 21, 15-17).

NOTICE the difference between the lambs and the sheep. Peter is to care not only for the people of the new Church, but for its leaders as well. That responsibility was put on the shoulders of this one man as a public trust. It was meant for all people in all times, just as Jesus meant baptism and the preaching of the word for all people in all times.

As a matter of fact, we have many who baptize and many who preach; but when we look for the man who carries on St. Peter's work of feeding the flock of God, we find that only one man does in fact make that claim. He claims to be the 260th successor of St. Peter in his office as head of the Church; he alone "has the key of David, he who opens one no one shuts, and who shuts and no one opens" (Apocalypse 3, 7).