

Editorial

Religion of Christ is a Way of Life

Wax Dedicated to the Service of God

Taste and See that the Lord is Sweet

By Miss. William M. Hart

Candles For Catholics

The religion of Jesus Christ is a way of life. It can never be just a dead faith. It can never be separated from the program of daily living of the man who sincerely professes it.

Living the life of faith has its external side as well as its internal side. Sensible signs, in word and action and object, go hand in hand with acts of the will and ideas in the mind that speak constantly of God's presence with us.

Prayer begins with the sign of the cross, and ends with it. Body and mind and will unite in a simple sign that recalls the death of Christ on the cross, that professes publicly our faith in the Unity and Trinity of God, in the Incarnation of the Son of God, in the sacrament of Baptism and the Eucharist.

Retaining the hat or bowing the head at the Name of Jesus, or when passing a church, reflects the bowing down of the soul before the majesty of the Son of God, the full acceptance of His real presence in the Blessed Sacrament. Our rosary registers for us the Pater and Ave's as they will up in our souls and fall from our lips. Scapulars mark us as Mary's own; medals grace the human form as a lasting and constant symbol of the love and reverence we have for God and His saints.

So many helps to devotion, so many different implements of Christian living, so many trills in our kit of tools as journeyers Catholics which bring us to Candles for Catholics.

Blessed Candles

What a perfect sacramental we have in blessed candles! Set aside by the Church for devotional purposes; blessed by the Church to become a sacred thing. To raise up in us religious thoughts, to increase our love of God and His saints. To remind us of Mary and the Purification, the presentation of Christ in the temple.

To arouse memories of the ages past in which candles were the necessary means of lighting the darkness of the catacombs for the masses of the earliest Christians in Rome. To enlist the efforts of the busy bee to gather from flower and blossom the wax for Christ's Holy Mass; for lighting up a supernatural glow the altar-room to welcome Christ as Victim; to honor the visit of Christ's priest; to symbolize the saving grace of Christ ministered in Extreme Unction. To ward off all that can harm Christ's faithful ones in time of spiritual or temporal stress.

The prayer of the Church adding to what may be lacking in the material elements of wax and wick and wavering flame, all the perfection of a blessed candle dedicated to God's service.

Candles For Catholics

Catholics present to Christ on Candlemas Day one or more blessed candles for use on the altar. Catholics also take into their homes one or more blessed candles, to be treasured in a place of honor as a revered sacramental for all days, as a needed part of the preparation for sadder days when sickness or death mark the home for their own.

Keep your candles near you in your home, perhaps in a candelabra rather than hidden away in the darkness of a drawer. Let your eyes fall on them often during the day, to remind you of the long years of history in which your brethren in the faith back to the days of Peter and Paul in Rome were cheered by the glow of the religious candle, were reminded of the abiding presence of God with them.

See in the blessed candle God's constant help to ward off all evil spirits, to remind you of the nearness to you of God's Angels, to keep you conscious of your dignity as a Catholic illuminated with the saving light of the faith of Christ.

The Light Of Christ

Lumen Christi! The Light of Christ! Driving out pagan darkness, bringing in Christian love. Pagan efforts in every age strive to quench its flame, to dim its glow. From those who are professed pagans, and from those who make a false claim to a Christian faith that is alien to their bigotry and lying assaults on Christ and His Church, come violent blasts that would darken the glow of our Catholic candles.

Lumen Christi! The Light of Christ! To enable us in the glow of love to do good to those who hate us, to pray for their conversion, to help them to come to the Light of Christ in His Catholic Church; to taste and see that the Lord is sweet!

The Call Of Christ

Christ came to call all men to salvation. His call concerned this world and the world to come. His call invited men to turn from sin to virtue; to secure pardon from sin and restoration to the friendship of God in sanctifying grace. Men answered this call of Christ when they gave up sin and persevered in the life of grace.

His call concerned also the world to come. Only through death could man answer this call. Man must leave this world to enter into the world beyond. The labor of life, the practice of virtue, the faithful keeping of the commandments, could have no complete reward on earth. God made man for Himself, not for the joys of earth. The call of Christ was a call to eternal life!

Far beyond any power of man to merit by his own acts of virtue, is the reward of eternal life. God gives man actual grace to give added value to his acts. God's grace and man's cooperation can win the reward of eternal life. God's giving far exceeds man's meriting.

The great saint does far more than the death-bed convert to serve God; but for the saint who has labored ever many years, there is a reward far exceeding his merits; and for the death-bed convert there is the reward of eternal life far above his deserts. In both the goodness of God is revealed. Many are called; Christ died for the many; for all men Christ calls the many; all men to salvation.

The parable of the Sower, given in Christ's Sermon on the Mount, is to be among the chosen. He wants us all to be among the chosen. He gives us in life; He will exclude us from that number. He will exclude us from that number. He will exclude us from that number. He will exclude us from that number. He will exclude us from that number.

A Layman's View Of The School Controversy

(Continued from Page 1)

ontate one set of tonails from another on the basis of their owner's religion or the school he happens to attend.

The only reason for denying public health services to the pupils at St. Bridget's, while granting the same services to the pupils at Public School 93, would be that Catholic tonails are less important than Protestant or public-school tonails, and that their possessor is somehow a second-class citizen.

Exactly the same principle applies to such items as school lunches. Undoubtedly if little Johnny gets a lunch partly paid for at public expense (whether by direct grant or by operation of a below-cost cafeteria), he will be able to do a better job at his catechism class that afternoon than if he goes there with an empty stomach. But that does not mean that by filling Johnny's stomach the Government is helping to support the Pope.

We have the same problem, as a matter of fact, when it comes to Johnny's shoes. There have been, particularly in bad times, only too many cases where children have been kept home from school because their parents couldn't afford to clothe them adequately. But any local relief official, who operated on the basis of giving shoes to Johnny only if he attended Public School 93 and denying him a pair if he said he was going to St. Bridget's, would, I hope, very soon lose his job.

MISSISSIPPI SUPREME COURT

Even when we get into the field of such things as textbooks, a similar argument can be made. The argument that there is nothing unconstitutional in providing secular textbooks for children attending all schools was put by the Supreme Court of Mississippi much better than I can put it; and Mississippi is not one of the States that is popularly regarded as being under the thumb of the Vatican. The Supreme Court of Mississippi (Chance v. Mississippi State Textbook Rating and Purchasing Board, 200 Southern 706, 709) said:

"Useful citizenship is a product and a servant of both the church and the state, and the citizen's freedom must include the right to acknowledge the rights and benefits of each, and to import into each the ideas and training of the other.

"There is no requirement that the church should be a liability to those of its citizenship who are at the same time citizens of the state, and entitled to privileges and benefits as such. Nor is there any requirement that the state should be godless or should ignore the privileges and benefits of the church. Indeed, the state has made historical acknowledgment and daily legislative admission of a mutual dependence one upon the other.

SEPARATION VS. INCOMPATIBILITY

"It is the control of one over the other that our Constitution forbids. Section 18, 208. The recognition by each of the isolation and influence of the other remains as one of the duties and liberties, respectively of the individual citizen. It is not amiss to observe that by too many of our citizens the political separation of church and state is misconstrued as indicating an incompatibility between their respective manifestations, religion and politics. The state has a duty to respect the independent sovereignty of the church as such; it has also the duty to exercise vigilance to discharge its obligation to those who, although subject to its control, are also objects of its bounty and care, and who regardless of any other affiliation are primarily wards of the state. The constitutional barrier which protects each against invasion by the other must not be so high that the state, in discharging its obligation as patria potestas, cannot surmount distinctions which, viewing the citizens as a component unit of the state, become irrelevant.

"The religion to which children of school age adhere is not subject to control by the state; but the children themselves are subject to its control. If the pupil may fulfill its duty to the state by attending a parochial school it is difficult to see why the state may not fulfill its duty to the pupil by encouraging it by all suitable means. The state is under duty to ignore the child's creed, but not its need."

I have quoted this at length because I think it is a perfectly fair statement of the sound American position in this field. There really is no requirement, whether in the name of separation of Church and State or otherwise, that membership in any particular religious body should be a civil liability. That is the simple proposition for which Catholics contend.

RELIGIOUS TRAINING PROBLEM

At this point, it is well to consider the recent historical changes in the function of the school (both public and private) which have really given rise to the present problem. Catholics, as is well known, have always felt that religious training is of paramount importance, and that it is difficult, if not impossible, to divorce training in religion from training in other subjects. The Puritan founders of Harvard, incidentally, expressed themselves in exactly the same way; and their viewpoint was shared by most Americans until within comparatively recent times.

In line with their belief, Catholics in this country have therefore gone to great trouble and expense in establishing their own educational institutions. They have done this not out of any hatred of American principles, or out of any hatred of American public schools; or because they are a secret cannish group who like to have somewhere to hide their guns. They have done it simply because they believe that a Catholic child will be both a better Catholic and a better American if he is given a thorough religious training along with his training in secular subjects.

To establish their own educational system, Catholics have voluntarily submitted themselves for conscience sake to a double system of taxation.—one set of taxes for public schools and another (by way of voluntary contribution) for Catholic schools.

LITTLE RED SCHOOL HOUSE

Until within recent times, practically until the present generation, the only "competitor" (if you care to call it that) of the Catholic school, and the only recipient of public money in this field was the little red school house.

Certain important points must be noted about the little red school house. In the first place, it had no gymnasium, no basket ball team, no uniformed band, and no swimming pool, erected at the taxpayer's expense. In the second place, it was not a place where Johnny could have his tonsils inspected, or where Susan could get a prescription for her glasses, or where either of them could get a free meal at the taxpayer's expense. It was not a community welfare center; it was a school pure and simple.

Now all that has changed. Catholics are not criticizing the change. On the contrary, they heartily applaud it. But the point is that in our present discussion we must distinguish carefully between the little red school house of 40 years ago and the school-plus-gymnasium-swimming-pool-cafeteria-dental clinic of today. Under the one heading, and often through the one machinery, of "the school system" the State is now giving services to its children which no State thought of giving 40 years ago.

SCHOOL BUS CASE

The reason that the famous school bus case reached the Supreme Court only in 1947 rather than in 1907 is not because Catholics have suddenly become greedy or un-American, but because in 1907 there were no school buses.

No long as the race was between one pair of childish legs on their way to P. S. 93 and another pair on their way to St. Bridget's, we had one situation. But when the race is between a Greyhound bus on its way to P. S. 93, and a pair of childish legs on their way to St. Bridget's, the situation seems a little different.—at least in the eyes of Catholic taxpayers who help pay for the bus. They are inclined to feel the same way when they are told to go ahead and put up Catholic box lunches for their children after helping to pay for the non-sectarian hot dogs supplied by the taxpayers at P. S. 93.

The modern development of extending health and welfare services to children through the school machinery is not without important constitutional implications. When the various States, in the course of the 19th Century, wrote into their constitutions the prohibition against State aid to denominational schools they were thinking in terms of the little red school house.

Neither the State nor the Catholics at that time had any idea of an expansion of State aid into fields of health and welfare which might have some relation to education (as in the case of Johnny's lunch or Susan's glasses), but which were not part of the educational process as then commonly understood.

A great deal of the present confusion comes from overlooking this historical development. This confusion leads to the fallacy and injustice of twisting the argument against State aid to denominational schools into an argument against extending State health and welfare aids to the children who attended those schools.

THE ARGUMENT AGAINST "AIDING" PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS BY GIVING THEIR PUPILS FREE LUNCHES OR BUS TRANSPORTATION, IF PUSHED TO ITS LOGICAL CONCLUSION, WOULD MEAN THAT IT IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL TO "AID" A PAROCHIAL SCHOOL BY BUILDING A SIDEWALK TO IT OR BY STATIONING A POLICEMAN DURING SCHOOL HOURS TO GUARD THE STREET CROSSING IN FRONT OF IT.

At the back of much of the argument against extending welfare services to all children is the feeling — often tacitly held but not often openly avowed — that even though the child who attends a non-public school may not be a second-class or un-American citizen, the school itself is a second-class or un-American school and should therefore be quietly discouraged as such as possible.

OREGON SCHOOL CASE

Stated differently, the feeling is that the public school is the only one which is entitled to be called American, or which is entitled to public recognition or approval. The Supreme Court of the United States knocked that idea on the head 25 years ago in the Oregon School case (Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 U. S. 510).

In that case Justice McReynolds (who could hardly be described as a henchman of the Pope) stated American constitutional principles for a unanimous court in such soundly Catholic language that his words were afterwards quoted with approval in a Papal encyclical. What he said was this (p. 535):

"The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations."

Going back in history, it is interesting to read the arguments unsuccessfully advanced in that case by the Attorney General of Oregon in support of the proposition that the State has a right to monopolize, via the public school, the upbringing of all children. His arguments were exactly the kind that were later advanced by the leaders of the Hitler Youth Movement, and are being advanced in Russia today.

One of the reasons why I emphasize the Oregon case is that it stands as a bulwark for the rights of both parent and child against the claims of a would-be omnipotent State. Catholics are particularly sensitive on this subject at this time.

PARENTS RIGHTS IGNORED

In common with many others, Catholics were considerably alarmed when the Supreme Court in the recent Illinois "Released Time" case had a good deal to say about the rights of the State over compulsory school attendance and the "legal duty" of children to attend, but never once mentioned the Oregon case or the right of religious parents to give their children the kind of education they wanted. Since then, arguments have been publicly advanced in some quarters that the State should have a right to monopolize education through the public schools and that the Oregon case should be overruled.

There is a case now pending in the courts of New York in which some of the same groups who in the past have fought against giving health and welfare aids to children outside the public school system are attacking the constitutionality of the New York statute which permits parents of public school children, on a voluntary basis, to withdraw their children from the public school class rooms for one hour a week to receive religious instruction in their own churches and synagogues.

STATE MONOPOLY FEARED

Catholics are by nature and upbringing suspicious of any State monopoly of education, because they know from long experience that it inevitably precedes or accompanies dictatorship and totalitarianism.

They are afraid that any program which starts by excluding their children from the health and welfare benefits which other children receive may be the opening wedge in a program which will go on to discourage their children from attending Catholic schools, and may end by driving the schools themselves out of existence.

Catholics ask only for an application of the American principles of fair play and no discrimination. As the State and Federal Governments expand the field of Government aid to children, and of providing them with health benefits, we insist that those benefits be made equally available to all children regardless of what schools they attend.

Lift Up Your Hearts

By Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P.



Frank Conniff columnist for the Hearst syndicate, sees "a growing drift toward isolationism." In fact he says that "anyone who cannot see this developing drift has very little perception for the realities of American sentiment."

Our policy-makers, he says, should take note of the trend because "the whole success of the Marshall plan experiment, a rugged gamble at best, has been jeopardized here at home by the swing toward neo-isolationism."

On the fact recorded in Mr. Conniff's recent column (December 28) I agree. There is a revival of isolationism. But unlike Mr. Conniff I don't look upon either the revival or the isolationism with displeasure. Also unlike Mr. Conniff I would stress the need of a definition of isolationism before we think either well or ill of it.

TO JUDGE from the subhead of his brief piece on the subject, "Have We Forgotten Cardinal Mindszenty?" and a reference to "our rights to moral leadership of the world" one might suppose that moral isolationism is the subject under discussion.

That kind of isolationism would be cowardly. Worse still, it would be in contradiction to the spirit of the Gospel. The parable of the Good Samaritan was not spoken and written for Judaea and Samaria. It was meant to be of universal application.

Our Saviour would upbraid us if we were to ignore the Hungarian prelate imprisoned, tortured and perhaps in process of being slowly murdered, as He blamed the priest and the Levite who pretended not to see the robbers' victim, beaten and left half-dead on the road to Jericho.

BUT UNLESS I am mistaken, the trend back to isolationism on the part of Americans is caused by a dread of what may happen to us and to the whole world, if for fear of being damned as isolationists, we swing to interventionism and if our interventionism is not moral but political and military.

It is one thing to demand that the United States, and still more

the United Nations intervene in the Mindszenty case by means of resolutions, diplomatic exchanges and by whatever publicity is achieved by "the Voice of America." But it is quite another matter to threaten or even to hint that we shall go to war with Hungary, and hence with Russia and all her satellites, if Cardinal Mindszenty is not released.

Diplomatic representations are admittedly useless — even silly — when we deal with a government of thugs. But to go beyond such polite measures — as for example to enforce economic sanctions — may be a cause of war.

It is a thinkable proposition, if not a recognized historical fact, that the attempt by Britain to impose economic sanctions upon Italy was the occasion of Italy's swinging to Hitler; and Italy's swing to Hitler made the Second World War more likely if not inevitable. Yet those sanctions were ostensibly in the name of international morality!

SO BEFORE we decide between isolationism and interventionism in the case of Cardinal Mindszenty or of any other victim of Soviet savagery, we had better stop and ask ourselves if we intend to go through with what we start.

If that be cowardice, it is the sort of cowardice which Hamlet confesses — the cowardice of conscience which prevents his committing suicide. The alternative to that kind of cowardice is bravado, recklessness, the willingness to risk a third World War.

Mr. Conniff expresses the conviction that "it would be a tragic and historic blunder if we ever were to turn our backs on Europe today or in the future." Honestly enough he says that since "our leaders" decided to commit us to intervention in 1940, "it followed inexorably that we would inherit all the headaches and the problems of our stricken globe." But the isolationist (at least as I know him) has no reluctance to inherit "headaches" and "problems" what we don't want to inherit is war.

All who write in opposition to isolationism in America should commence by asking and answering the two crucial questions: "What kind of isolationism?" and "How far interventionism?"

Woman's Viewpoint

By Marie Weidman

Current opinion on the habit of drinking alcoholic beverages is in the same class with modern views on politics, religion and the child.



Each subject is considered strictly subjective, each is calculated, in the always ensuing Marie Weidman frenzy of argument, verily to draw blood. However, since equanimity cannot always be maintained on controversial topics indefinitely, someone is bound to set off the initial spark leading to a really Roman conflagration.

Recent observations by the Yale University Research group on alcoholism that the number of chronic excessive drinkers in this country exceeds four million would naturally make at least some few pause and give thought.

NOW OF COURSE any discussion of this problem always seems to label one as some ancient-vintaged, blue-rosed reactionary inveighing hysterically against demon rum. The grim faced stupidity of Carrie Nation, followed by the faulty reasoning of the Volstead Act, seems to have left all the wrong emphasis in the wrong places.

Although the public is beginning to realize that the fault is with the man rather than with the bottle, the crackling puritanism of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, their stress on reform that they seem not to realize must come from within (with the aid of Grace, about which they know little), sounds like a lot of misguided fervor.

Teaching young people moderation instead of boy-cotting publications which advertise Bopp's Boisterous Brew would seem more positive, to-the-point action.

BUT REGARDLESS of whether or not you pour your drink into the nearest potted plant when your hostess is not looting, it casts unpleasant reflections on the state of our development to learn that alcoholism is the fourth greatest health problem in United States today.

Even though we now are realizing that poor body chemistry is an important factor in causing alcoholism and that

personality patterns is also a cause, the great increase of people needing medical and psychiatric attention for this malady is alarming — and particularly when you note that the number of women chronic alcoholics is increasing.

During the last war a Yale University survey showed there were more than 100,000 internperate women. Their dreary case histories always monotonously the same, broken records of frustration, disappointments, self pity, on every level of society.

IS IT NOT a troubling thought that there seems so little in the modern scheme of life to absorb vital human energy, challenge attention and keep folk on an even, decent keel?

Alcohol therapists will point out that each case is different. True. But even a quick overview of the totality of addictive drinkers together with the large number of neurotics and psychoneurotics waiting about in society today must be due to a few general factors, at least.

Chief of these would seem to be the tendency toward being "I-bound." So utterly concerned with their own egos, this group soon plumbs each his own shallow depths. In despair, the sole remaining comfort seems to be what Miss Host dispenses to the accompaniment of low saxophones.

UNDER the stress of living, (and of course there is a LOT of it), we must teach our young people that the comfort of Joe's Place is pretty transitory, but life still remains to be lived when Joe closes for the night. Our youth should be told that acquiring a higher education does not necessarily mean also acquiring a capacity for alcohol.

The belief that drinking excessively is a vital part of campus life, is one of long standing and is almost universally accepted by students themselves, especially young men. "The tables down at Morey's" and all that connotes may have deep influences on later lives and destinies.

There is a stand to take regarding drinking, and our youth should be given the benefit of all our knowledge to date. The only safe subject to date, but subjective about nowadays, is the old lady and her cow.