

Courier Journal

THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1948
VOL. 56, No. 17

HONORABLE 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 National Catholic Welfare Conference, National Religious News Service, and National Catholic Welfare Service.
Published every Thursday by the Courier Journal and Journal, Inc.
MAIN OFFICE: 220 E. Main St., Rochester 6, N. Y.
ALBANY OFFICE: 122 Geneva St., Phone 344-W
BUREAU OFFICE: 211 Main St., Phone 2-3443 or 2-3123
RECEIVED AT POST OFFICE IN THE POST OFFICE AT ROCHESTER, N. Y.
As required under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.
Second-class postage paid at Rochester, N. Y.
Postmaster: Please send address changes to the Courier Journal, 220 E. Main St., Rochester 6, N. Y.

An Appeal For Europe



My Dear People:
At the time of the nation-wide collection for the Bishops' Fund for European and Eastern Relief, I felt it unfair to make an appeal here in our diocese. We had just finished our successful College Campaign which had refuted many parish collections at that time. Consequently, we have lost the advantage of much of the national advertising on behalf of this appeal.

However, most of you realize that the Catholic Bishops of America have set up a well-organized program of relief in Europe and the East, which is supervised directly by the Church authorities in these places. In this way the assistance which you give goes only where it should.

We have received a most touching letter from His Holiness, Pope Pius XII expressing his gratitude for this help, and begging that we do not abandon this great work of charity. I was very proud of my people last year when the report of the collection was published. Our diocesan charity placed us very high in the list of contributors, and a great blessing will come to us if we maintain that place.

May I ask therefore, that on next Sunday you bear in mind and heart the millions benefit of Rome, benefit of the necessities of life, many of them actually dying of starvation. The "cup of water" which we give them in the name of Jesus is no figure of speech. Your generosity will mean the difference between life and death for many, between hope and despair for all. Please give generously to this appeal so that our Bishops may meet his responsibility in this great Christian charity.

Your devoted shepherd in Christ,
JAMES E. KEARNEY,
Bishop of Rochester.

Dr. Higgins Says:

A Home Needs A House
"We live in a time when it is harder for a free man to make a home than it was for a medieval ascetic to do without one."

When Chesterton penned this most discerning observation on the manners and morals of the times in which he lived, he wasn't thinking specifically of the housing shortage. He was, thinking presciently, of that widespread breakdown in family morality which is worrying the pastors of souls and of others who, by virtue of their calling, are in a position to observe its unhappy consequences in the fulfillment of their daily round of professional duties—social workers, psychiatrists, etc.

CHESTERTON was thinking, too, of those special obstacles to Christian family which, if not directly caused by the Industrial Revolution, have been occasioned in part by the changeover from the simplicity of rural living to the complexity of modern urbanism. He was suggesting—and those of us who are guilty ought to take his words to heart in all humility—that the married couple of the present day and age, for whatever combination of religious, economic, and sociological reasons, is called upon to practice a degree of personal heroism equal to the twelfth or thirteenth-century monk was seldom called upon to practice.

All of this is by way of leading up, however indirectly, to a discussion of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill which, let us hope and pray, will have been passed by the Senate before this column appears in print.

THE T-REX BILL, in spite of the almost unprecedented measure of bipartisan political support which has rallied behind it in an election year, is being doggedly opposed by important segments of the real estate industry and by certain self-appointed defenders of the faith or the superstition of "free enterprise."

The charge is made that it authorizes the continuation of low-cost public housing for low-income families. Your eighth-grade nephew—at least if he attends a school which follows the curriculum and uses the readers of Catholic University's Commission on American Citizenship—can tell you that such a charge is nonsense. He can probably also tell you why it's nonsense in the light of Christian social teaching.

YOUR NEPHEW knows, if only by the logic of the Faith in which the parochial school instructs him—that the government not only has the right but the inescapable obligation to support the cause of Christian family living to the extent of its legitimate powers.

And how? Among other ways, by encouraging private enterprise, through reasonable incentives, to provide decent housing for our citizens and, if necessary, by actually subsidizing the building of dwellings for those poor unfortunate for whom private enterprise is either unable or unwilling to provide accommodations. If this is "socialism," then the Pope and the Bishops of the United States are socialists—and so are Senators Ellender, Wagner, and Taft.

RIDICULOUS! Of course it's ridiculous. But if the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is defeated, it will be, defeated largely because of such "ridiculous" name-calling.

Some "ridiculous" things can be taken calmly and with an easy-going smile. But those of us who really mean when we say that the family is the basic unit of society, and that marriage is a sacrament instituted by Christ Himself, haven't any right to smile indulgently at the antics of vested interests who would make it even "harder for a free man to make a home"—and to find a house in which to make that home.

WE OWE IT to the Christian family to be "socialists" if that means siding with the Ecclesial on Christian Marriage when it says that legislators "in making the laws and in disposing of public funds must do their utmost to relieve the needs of the poor, considering such a task as one of the most important of their administrative duties."

"A Cup in His Name"



As We See It By Dan Patrick

ONE OF the mirages which the presidential campaign will conjure up is a conference between the United States and Soviet Russia for the avowed purpose of settling the problems which now threaten world peace.

It is almost certain that Mr. Wallace will counsel his fellow Americans to talk things over with Josef Stalin on the theory that we most certainly can do business with "the Kremlin."

Some Americans will grasp at this suggestion like men drowning in the stormy sea of a potential atomic war, the draft, an armaments race, higher taxes and all other disagreeable things that go to make up modern "dense and warfare."

THE ASTUTE CHIEF of the Washington Bureau of the New York Times, Arthur Krock, mulled over these possibilities the other day and decided to get an overall answer which would have some ring of authority.

He found his various contacts fairly saturated with a studied pessimism as to the results of such a conference and reported the following summary of responses from those in position to talk policy on a high level:

"The basic difficulty between the United States and Soviet Russia has not arisen because of a failure to confer. The United States has been more than generous in meeting that requirement and, in conference after conference, has made numerous arrangements with Moscow to bring about recovery and enduring peace in the post-war world. But these arrangements agreed on at Yalta, Potsdam, Moscow, London and Berlin—have not been adhered to by the Russian authorities."

"Meanwhile the Soviet Government has proceeded to bring about a wholly new situation and thus has posed the real problem that needs international affairs today. This departure from the normal relationship of governments now constitutes the major threat. It takes form in pro-Soviet fifth columns working ceaselessly in other states to effect Russian control of their foreign policy and minority dictation of their domestic forms according to the Soviet model."

"Unless this ceaseless activity, directed from Moscow, is abated, no Soviet-American conference can come to an agreement covering the general operations of the Cominform and the fifth columns in many countries. Since no such agreements are possible, as the record and

Another Talk With Stalin?

ALL current proofs make abundantly clear, there is nothing to be gained in the terms of peaceful adjustment by such conferences. They would merely distract the non-Soviet conferees from proceeding with other measures to confine and disperse the peril. Also they would tend further to confuse and discourage sincere laborers for peace everywhere and give new opportunities for the fifth columns, assisted both by honest and designing publicists outside Russia, to strengthen the drive for world-Communism."

IN WASHINGTON government officials have prepared a balance sheet of previous agreements reached with the Russians. Against these agreements are the number and detail of violations—on the part of the Reds. The sheet serves a very useful purpose of discouraging those vehement proponents of a "let-sit-down-and-talk-it-over" school.

All the conferences in the world cannot restore peace unless these conferences are backed by a will toward that end. Up to the present time, such a will is either missing or very much curtailed as far as Soviet Russia is concerned. Two Presidents—Roosevelt and Truman—have attempted to play diplomatic poker with Russia at the conference table and the records indicate that both have failed.

The failure cannot entirely be charged to them. A large share of the blame must, of necessity, fall on the shoulders of the Russians. In the past we have taken them at their word and their word proved worthless.

How often have we been told of agreements reached over the conference table and sealed with vodka at a midnight Kremlin dinner only to find those agreements tossed into discard when put to practical use?

IN THE SOVIET dictionary there is one word which carries weight and that word is force.

Nearly every visitor to the Kremlin has come home with a Stalin anecdote which demonstrates the Red's admiration for force of a military rather than a moral nature.

This force permeates every fibre of Russian life. Yet you certainly cannot do business with men who worship force. Lasting peace never can be built on such a foundation.

A diplomatic vacuum results when men of good will try to talk with men of ill will. Even Henry Wallace and his varicolored cohorts must concede that.

Just Between Us

Older Than Royal Houses

THE BOMBING of Monte Cassino gave all of us quite a jolt. We Catholics felt pretty much as a man feels when he has had a tooth pulled. We felt considerable pain; but a parently there was no choice in the matter. According to our military leaders and strategists at the time, it just had to be done.

What must have jolted many a non-Catholic was the realization of how long Monte Cassino had been serving our Church.

We tend to take the Catholic Church for granted, you know. It stands in each community with its Sunday and week-day services, not much different outwardly from all the other churches in town, and then one day we read that a Catholic monastery has been bombed—a monastery founded more than 1400 years ago! Again we've bumped our noses on the fact that the Catholic Church is different. Just when we might have succeeded in convincing ourselves that all churches are pretty much alike.

WE CAN'T call Monte Cassino merely a Christian monastery you see. It was a Catholic monastery, founded by St. Benedict, one of the last Romans of the old Empire. Then, while the Germans were still busy praying to their Nordic gods and the British and Celts were still trimming their idols with mistletoe, the Catholic monks of Monte Cassino began

By Father Ginder

gain arising with each new dawn to sing the praises of God from their Psalters, to consecrate each new day to the service of their Lord in prayer and work.

How do we know it was a Catholic monastery? Because it recognized the Pope as head of the Church and, of course, the Pope has always been a Catholic.

WE WENT to the trouble of looking up who was Pope when St. Benedict founded Monte Cassino, and we found that it was Felix III. He was a saint, and the fifty-fourth Pope to rule the Catholic Church.

In other words, the Catholic Church was already ancient in the year 529 A.D.

Our present Holy Father, Pius XII, is the 260th successor of St. Peter in his office of Chief Bishop. The first Pope Pius occupied the Chair of St. Peter for the nine years between 155 and 167.

It's no wonder that the great non-Catholic historian could write, "The proudest royal houses are but of yesterday, when compared with the line of the Supreme Pontiffs."

Fr. Gillis Says:

Questions For Supreme Court
In this space two weeks ago I made some attempt to indicate a few of the practical problems that will confront teachers in public schools if they take the recent Supreme Court decision at its face value. The reader may remember that I asked what would the teacher answer if a pupil, reading the Declaration of Independence, asked, "Who is the 'Creator' mentioned in the text where it says 'Man is endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights'?" The teacher, I took occasion to say, must either confess that she is not permitted to speak of God, or must disobey the ruling of the Supreme Court.



But that is only one example of the fix in which the Court has put the teacher. Let's have a few more:

"Now we shall stand, children, and sing 'My Country 'tis of thee,'" says teacher. So the children go to it with right good will. But what happens when they come to "Our fathers' God, to Thee, Author of Liberty, To Thee I sing. Long may our land be bright With freedom's holy light; Protect us by Thy might, Great God, our King!"

I know, of course, that most children sing without thinking of the words that come out of their mouths. When they utter the ecstatic expression, "My heart with rapture thrills like that above," they don't realize that they are singing about heaven, the Beatific Vision, eternal contemplation of the Face of God. Perhaps the Supreme Court could decide that so long as they don't recognize the religion in the song, they may sing it in the public schools.

BUT WHAT if some bright child among them should say, "Teacher, what does it mean when it says that God is the author of liberty?" The dear good child will not know—and perhaps the dear good teacher also will not realize—that the innocent little question opens up not only a deep question of political philosophy but of theology. But if the teacher happens to be a well-informed Catholic, she will know that the question "whence comes liberty" was threshed out in an epoch-making debate between St. Robert Bellarmine, a Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, and King James of England.

The king held that God gave all powers necessary for the state into the hands of the king, and that the king, in turn, passed on to the people some of the prerogatives he had himself received direct from God. The cardinal opposed that view. He held that God gives power first to the people and that they in turn bestow some of their power upon their king.

IN THE DAYS of James of England such a doctrine was called "papistical," and rejected with scorn by the adherents of the king. It won out nevertheless, and found its way into the Declaration of Independence. And that's what the Rev. Mr. Samuel F. Smith had in mind when he called God "Author of Liberty," and prayed by the way in prayer permissible: "Protect us by Thy might, Great God our King."

By the way, though it may be a "give away" as to my age, I met the Rev. Mr. Smith and have kept the memory of seeing and hearing him as one of the joys of my early childhood. He had no idea, like that of the present day Supreme Court, that the public schoolroom is no place to speak or to sing about God, about Divine Providence, about His intervention in the welfare of a nation about the Divine help and guidance given to "our fathers." Rev. Mr. Smith would have been shocked as would the much-respected Moses Merritt, headmaster of the Boston Latin School, who used to read to us from the Bible and preach a sermon from the text chosen, at least once a week.

AS WITH SINGING "America," so with reading and expounding almost any one of the poets shall we say Lord Tennyson? What will the high school teacher do if he or she cannot explain the religious theme of "In Memoriam" or the constant references to Catholic faith and catholic practice in "The Idylls of the King"?

And what will the teacher do when Shakespeare refers to purgatory or when, as in "Hamlet," he makes a hundred references which mean nothing unless the student is told about the Catholic religion?

MUST THE SCHOOLS leave out all reference to Dante, "The central man of all the ages"? Dante, we are told, is "St. Thomas Aquinas set to verse." Well, then, who was St. Thomas Aquinas? For that matter who was the other Thomas, "the doubting Thomas"? Or the third Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury? And what is an archbishop and what is meant by "Canterbury"? What and why was the Canterbury pilgrimage? If students are not told these things, they are not getting an education.

Or take King David and the Psalms. Or the Golden Rule. Or the Sermon on the Mount. Or the word Calvary. Since the newspapers are now filled with references to Palestine, will the teacher in the classroom make no explanation as to why Jerusalem is called the Holy City?

WHY FILE UP the instances? It makes no difference whether you read or sing or act, you can make no sense of anything unless you bring in religion. To say that religion may be mentioned but not inculcated is bosh. A smart boy or girl can tell in the twinkling of an eye whether the teacher believes or disbelieves what he is explaining. In either case he is inculcating something—faith if he believes, atheism or agnosticism if he doesn't believe. The children will catch on.

So the first objection to the Supreme Court decision in the McCollum case is that it is silly and impossible.

Quotable Quotes

"A happy home can not be established upon the mere sense in man. There must be added a rational plan and the idealism of love."—Rev. Michael J. Miller, O.S.M.
"The people as a whole of a vanquished country should not be made to suffer for the crimes of guilty politicians."—Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, S.J.