



## The Mass

By REV. LOUIS J. HOHMAN

"In union with the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass throughout the world." Our daily offering of self cannot achieve its full worth and power unless it is united to the Sacrifice of Christ. His death on Calvary was the cause of our salvation and sanctification.

But it is in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the unbloody renewal of the Sacrifice of the Cross, that we come into contact with Calvary and change our lives into a sacrifice offered with Christ and made acceptable to God.

All of us are familiar with the colored photographs which are placed on a screen. Imagine that Christ's sacrifice on Calvary is a colored slide, a single reality.

Project it on the screen of time—the first century, the tenth century, the twentieth. It is still the same single reality, but now present in a different manner in each moment of time through the centuries. God's wisdom decreed that His Son's sacrifice on Calvary should thus be perpetuated and made present to all men of all times down to the end of the world.

It is vitally important that we remember that the Sacrifice of the Mass is not merely an empty commemoration of the death of Jesus Christ, but a true and proper act of sacrifice. Only the manner of offering is different.

It is equally important to remember that no sacrifice we could offer of ourselves alone, no prayer we could say, no act we could perform, would be of any value or merit in the sight of God.

We are finite creatures who have alienated ourselves from the infinite God by sin. Only an infinite Person as Jesus Christ is, could make us acceptable to God. Therefore our prayers, acts, sacrifices, must be joined to Christ to achieve any value.

The Mass is the only perfect form of worship. Worship means giving ourselves back to God who gave us life and everything that we have and are. Logically, then, our relation to the Sacrifice of the Mass is vitally important in our relationship with God.

Many Non-Catholics and many Catholics unfortunately take the position, "I go to church to get a spiritual lift, inspiration." The idea of going to church primarily for God and only secondarily for themselves is something that has never been conceived. The idea of giving themselves to God is even more remote. Only after long study and practice can the liturgy of the Mass as we know it become a source of a deep, recurring inspiration.

And even then, emotions fluctuate from day to day and may not be present at the time. The only essential point in hearing Mass is that we be united to Christ in the offering of ourselves and be willing to live that offering throughout each day.

To think of the Mass as a mere obligation, or even a prayer, or as a source of emotional uplift is to miss the whole point.

A great variety of people stood on Calvary. The Roman



THE CATHOLIC JOURNAL  
OFFICIAL NEWSPAPER OF THE ROCHESTER DIOCESE

Vol. 71 No. 51 Friday, September 16, 1960  
MOST REV. JAMES E. KEARNEY, D.D., President  
BUSINESS OFFICE: 311 Hudson Bldg., Lark St., Rm. 2-111 or Rm. 2-112  
MAIL OFFICE: 311 Hudson Bldg., Lark St., Rm. 2-111 or Rm. 2-112  
Second class postage paid at Rochester, N.Y.  
Single copy 10¢; 1 year subscription in U.S., \$4.00  
Canada \$5.00; Foreign Countries \$6.00  
As required under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

## The America I Believe In

(N.C.W.C. News Service)

Following is the text of the prepared remarks of Senator John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Democratic presidential nominee, delivered Monday, Sept. 12, before the Houston, Texas, Municipal Association.

I am grateful for your generous invitation to state my views.

While the so-called religious issue is necessarily and properly the chief topic here tonight, I want to emphasize from the outset that we have far more critical issues to face in the 1960 election. The spread of communism in this country, until it now festers 90 miles off the coast of Florida—the humiliating treatment of our President and Vice President by those who no longer respect our power—the hungry children I saw in West Virginia, the old people who cannot pay their doctors bills, the families forced to give up their farms—an America with so many problems, with so few solutions and so little to the moon and outer space.

These are the real issues which should decide this campaign. And they are not religious issues—for we need religion and morality and decency to know no religious barriers.

But because I am a Catholic, and no Catholic has ever been elected President, the real issues in this campaign have been obscured—perhaps deliberately, in so many quarters less responsible than this. So it is apparently necessary for me to state once again—not what kind of church I believe in, for I believe in the one true God—but what kind of America I believe in.

I believe in an America where the separation of church and state is absolute—where no Catholic priest would be the President (should he be Catholic) know to act, and no Protestant minister would tell his parishioners for whom to vote—where no church or church school is asked to raise funds or political preference—and where no man is denied public office merely because his religion differs from the President's who might appoint him or the people who might elect him.

For while this is an

be a Catholic against whom the charge of suspicion is pinned, in other years it has been, and may someday be again, a Jew—or a Quaker—or a Unitarian—or a Baptist. It was Virginia's harassment of Baptist preachers, for example, that helped lead to Jefferson's Statute of Religious Freedom. Today I may be the victim—but tomorrow it may be you—until the whole fabric of our harmonious society is ripped at a time of great national peril.

Finally, I believe in an America where religious intolerance will some day end—where all men and all churches are treated as equal—where every man has the same right to attend or not attend the church of his choice—where there is no Catholic vote, no anti-Catholic vote, no bloc voting of any kind—and where Catholics, Protestants and Jews, at both the lay and pastoral level, will refrain from those attitudes of disdain and division which have so often marred their works in the past, and promote instead the American ideal of brotherhood.

That is the kind of America in which I believe. And it represents the kind of presidency in which I believe—a great office that must neither be humbled by making it the instrument of any one religious group nor tarnished by arbitrarily withholding its occupancy from the members of any one religious group. I believe in a President whose religious views are his own private affair, neither imposed by him upon the Nation or imposed by the Nation upon him as a condition to holding that office.

I would not look with favor upon a President working to subvert the First Amendment's guarantee of religious liberty. Nor would I support a system of checks and balances permit him to do so—and neither do I look with favor upon those who would work to subvert Article VI of the Constitution by requiring a religious test—even by indirect means—for if they disagree with that safeguard they should be open to removal from office.

I want a Chief Executive whose public acts are responsible to all groups and obligated to none—who can attend to the needs of all groups, Catholic or Protestant, Jew or Gentile, without discrimination.

For while this is an

tend any ceremony, service or dinner his office may appropriately require of him—and whose fulfillment of this presidential oath is not limited or conditioned by any religious oath, ritual or obligation.

This is the kind of America I believe in—and this is the kind I fought for in the South Pacific and the kind my brother died for in Europe.

No one suggested then that we might have a "divided loyalty," that we did "not believe in liberty" or that we belonged to a disloyal group that threatened the "freedom for which our forefathers died."

And in fact this is the kind of America for which our forefathers died—when they fled here to escape religious persecution, when they fought for the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom—and when they fought at the shrine I visited today, the Alamo. For side by side with Bowie and Crockett died McCafferty and Bailey and Carey—but no one knows whether they were Catholics or not. For there was no religious test at the Alamo.

I ask you tonight to follow in that tradition—to judge me on the basis of my record of 14 years in Congress—on my declared stands against an Ambassador to the Vatican, against unconstitutional aid to parochial schools, and against any boycott of the public schools (which I have attended myself)—instead of judging me on the basis of these pamphlets and publications we all have seen that carefully select quotations out of context from the statements of Catholic Church leaders usually in other countries, frequently in other centuries, and always omitting, of course, the statement of the American Bishops in 1948 which strongly endorsed church-state separation, and which more nearly reflect the views of almost every American Catholic.

I do not consider these other quotations binding upon my public acts—why, you may ask, let me say with respect to other countries, that I am wholly opposed to the state being used by any religious group, Catholic or Protestant, to oppress its own people.

But if, on the other hand, I should win this election, then I shall devote every effort of mind and spirit to fulfilling the oath of the President—why, naturally, I might add, to the best of my ability preserve, protect and defend the Constitution . . . so help me God."

The Citizens for Religious Freedom have set up headquarters at the Raleigh Hotel here. According to a report in the Washington Post and Times Herald, the Rev. Gill told the conference that the organization had been given \$5,000 and hoped to obtain another \$20,000 to carry on its work.

The Rev. Gill told the N.C.W.C. News Service that the \$5,000 was raised by individual gifts from a number of people. He said the purpose of the Citizens for Religious Freedom is to "help to articulate Protestant concerns on the religious issue, and that the organization intends to appeal to moderate Protestants, not the authors of 'scandalous attacks' on Catholics."

Dr. Peale said that during the conference the question was raised as to how Senator Kennedy, "as a loyal son of the Church," could be "free" of influence by that Church. "I don't think he can be," Dr. Peale added.

Asked to cite instances in which Senator Kennedy knuckled under to pressure from the hierarchy, Dr. Peale referred to a 1950 incident when the Massachusetts legislator changed his mind about appearing at a fund raising dinner for a memorial chapel in a Baptist church. Senator Kennedy explained last January that he declined to attend because he learned that he had been invited as a "guest" for the Catholic church and felt he had no authority to act in that capacity.

Asked if he was satisfied (Continued on page 5)

## Bishop Appeals For Seminaries

My dear People:

With the opening of our Seminaries, may I ask once again your generous support in the annual Seminary Collection to be taken up on Sunday, September 18, 1960.

There is no institution in our diocese of such supreme importance as the Seminary. The Church believes that the training of a priest should begin in his early teens, and that these years are spiritually and mentally very important in the development of his priestly knowledge and character. Any program of education which spans twelve years is expensive to maintain on high standards. Only your generosity has made it possible in the past and your generosity alone can maintain it at the present time.

We have been obliged to make very extensive and expensive improvements in St. Bernard's Seminary this year. Our concern for the safety of several hundred students demands careful attention to fire hazards, and as a result we are spending large sums of money this year to insure that safety. This summer has also seen a complete refurbishing of the buildings on Lake Avenue. They were furnished 37 years ago, so you can understand that it is time for the entire equipment to be replaced.

May I ask from every wage earner a gift of \$2.50 for each Seminary, that is, a total donation of \$5.00. Such a gift will make it very easy for your parish to reach the minimum quota which we have asked each parish to accept if these seminaries are to continue.

I asked you to be generous to this cause which is so dear to the heart of Christ, so necessary for the salvation of souls, redeemed by His Precious Blood. Your gift will bring your rich blessings for no work in the diocese is of such importance, and I can conceive of no gift which will bring more grace in return.

I know you will do your share to keep our Seminaries worthy of their great tradition.

With a blessing, I am

Your devoted Shepherd in Christ,

+ James E. Kearney

Bishop of Rochester

## Setting The Clock To 1960

## Basic Issues Spell Survival

The American public is still rubbing the dust from its eyes, flung there by a nationwide squabble challenging the right of a Catholic to be president.

Both candidates, Vice President Richard M. Nixon and Senator John F. Kennedy, were obliged to get on to the issues, they considered far more basic in determining who should take over the White House in January.

One of these issues is how America is to face the advance of Communism.

Dramatic evidence of the threat to our nation's survival in freedom will be the arrival of Nikita Khrushchev of Russia and Fidel Castro of Cuba to the United Nations Assembly in New York City this coming week.

Both men are symbols of a vigorous, growing Communist empire. Also serving to prove that the Kremlin can leap beyond our containing circle of military bases will be the Congo delegation of Patrice Lumumba with its strong leanings toward Moscow.

The Soviet Premier will come posing as an apostle of peace with a plea for world-wide disarmament to impress the still uncommitted nations and to woo them into the Red orbit.

Last year he bolstered his speech with the prestige of landing a Soviet rocket on the moon. This year he might come with the boast that he has a Russian astronaut circling the earth.

Khrushchev's coming certainly is not for the stated purpose of discussing disarmament. Even a casual reading of the long and boring disarmament conferences held in Geneva earlier this year reveals the Soviet Union had no more desire to disarm than the western powers wanted to.

Both sides are realistic enough to know that disarmament at the present time is an idle dream.

But these days it is not so important to want what's right; a nation has to be "thought of" as wanting what's right. If the Soviet chief can get the newly independent nations and the older neutral nations to think he wants world disarmament, then he achieves the goal of his journey—even if he doesn't get out to the Long Island estate where Russian diplomats to this country can relax in "working class simplicity."

Despite the free world's contempt for this crude hoax of Mr. Khrushchev, the fact remains we have to live with him on the face of this earth or war will leave no face of the earth for anyone to live on.

This basic problem of how to co-exist with Russia—to restrain its growth and perhaps to lead it, even if but slowly and slightly, toward the ideal of freedom—will determine the solution of most of our other problems.

Most assuredly we shall have no need to worry for the ailments of the aged, schools for our youngsters or a richer life for ourselves if our next president, whether he be Mr. Nixon or Mr. Kennedy, fails to find the solution to the problem of living with men like Mr. Khrushchev.

If Communism makes the gains in the second half of this century it made in the first half, then the American way of life will be obliterated. If the Communist advance is blocked by an all-out war, then human life itself—at least its civilized version—will be obliterated. That is the blunt warning of all competent experts on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

That then is our problem, how to live with weapons without using them and with the hope that someday we might also live without the weapons.

G. K. Chesterton, one of England's best known authors and lecturers earlier in this century, said he heard it remarked a thousand times, "You can't turn the clock back."

His reply was, "Sometimes you can."

This month, Americans saw the political clock turned back, back to the bigoted outbursts against Alfred E. Smith when he sought the presidency in 1928.

As others have turned it back, it is our task as citizens to set the clock right again, to bring it back to 1960 and clarify the true issues which will determine the survival of our nation.

## Dr. Peale's Press Conference

## Hierarchy's Extreme Pressure

By RUSSELL SHAW

Washington—(CNS)—In the sumptuous lobby of the Mayflower Hotel, one reporter raised his hand in a very salute to another and called: "Papist, go home!"

Further comment was unnecessary in the wake of an all-Protestant "citizens" meeting at which 150 leading ministers and laymen denounced that troubles would descend on the country if a Catholic were elected President.

Following a day of escape-chasing behind closed doors on September 7, the members of 17 religious groups laid down a barrage of challenges to Senator John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, a Catholic who is Democratic presidential nominee.

Among the issues raised in their statement was the Church's stand on federal aid to parochial schools, the rights of other religions, an ambassador to the Vatican—and a wide range of Church-State questions.

The statement implied that as President Senator Kennedy would be under heavy "pressure" from the Catholic hierarchy to promote national policies favoring the Church.

Newsmen were given programs for the day-long conference, billed as the "National Conference of Citizens for Religious Freedom." Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, noted author and pastor of Marble Collegiate Church, New York, presided.

Listed as speakers were: Dr. Daniel Poling, editor of the Christian Herald magazine, who delivered the keynote address; William A. Smith of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission, who spoke on "A Layman Looks at the Pope"; and Dr. Harold John Ockenga, pastor of the First Church

Church, Boston, who spoke on "Religion, Politics and the Presidency."

Also: Dr. L. Nelson Bell, father-in-law of evangelist Billy Graham, who spoke on "Protestant Distinctives and the American Crisis"; the Rev. Fred Nader, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Flushing, N.Y., who spoke on "The Coming Presidential Election"; and the Rev. Donald H. Gill, executive director of Citizens for Religious Freedom who spoke on "Plans and Materials."

The closing address was given by Glenn L. Archer, executive director of the widely known anti-Catholic organization called Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State (POAUS). His talk was called "Clerical Manipulations."

Copies of the talks by Dr. Ockenga and Dr. Bell were given to reporters after the conference. Their addresses were concerned mainly with charges and warnings on the theme that "Roman Catholic domination of America," in Dr. Ockenga's words, is "the greatest threat to the American hierarchy."

In a press conference after the meeting, Dr. Peale insisted that the conference had de-

voted themselves to a "philosophical" discussion of issues—specifically "the nature and character of the Roman Catholic church as it bears on American culture."

Dr. Peale was helped out at the press conference by Dr. Ockenga and the Rev. Donald Gill.

Dr. Peale conceded that although the conference had been devoted to a study of Catholic "philosophy" on Church-State issues, "we invited as Catholics into this meeting" to explain their stand.

Dr. Peale also said that no Jews had been invited, and that liberal Protestant theologians like Reinhold Niebuhr and Dr. John Bennett, were not on the invitation list.

He said that most of those in attendance were members of "evangelical and conservative groups—although none were there as official representatives of their religious bodies."

On the question of who had planned and organized the meeting, Dr. Peale referred reporters to the Rev. Gill, who mentioned only one individual besides himself as an organizer of the gathering—A. J. Allen Wryet of New Hampshire.

The Rev. Gill later declined to give the N.C.W.C. News Service the names of any other organizers of the meeting or of the Citizens for Religious Freedom. He also said the "free" to name the officers of the latter group, because not all had accepted yet.

The Citizens for Religious Freedom have set up headquarters at the Raleigh Hotel here. According to a report in the Washington Post and Times Herald, the Rev. Gill told the conference that the organization had been given \$5,000 and hoped to obtain another \$20,000 to carry on its work.

The Rev. Gill told the N.C.W.C. News Service that the \$5,000 was raised by individual gifts from a number of people. He said the purpose of the Citizens for Religious Freedom is to "help to articulate Protestant concerns on the religious issue, and that the organization intends to appeal to moderate Protestants, not the authors of 'scandalous attacks' on Catholics."

Dr. Peale said that during the conference the question was raised as to how Senator Kennedy, "as a loyal son of the Church," could be "free" of influence by that Church. "I don't think he can be," Dr. Peale added.

Asked to cite instances in which Senator Kennedy knuckled under to pressure from the hierarchy, Dr. Peale referred to a 1950 incident when the Massachusetts legislator changed his mind about appearing at a fund raising dinner for a memorial chapel in a Baptist church. Senator Kennedy explained last January that he declined to attend because he learned that he had been invited as a "guest" for the Catholic church and felt he had no authority to act in that capacity.

Asked if he was satisfied (Continued on page 5)

Here Is What Pope Leo Said

"God has divided the government of the human race between two principalities, the ecclesiastical and the civil; the one being set over the divine, the other over human affairs. Each is supreme in its own sphere; each has fixed limits, within which it governs. Each is restricted to its own orbit, within which it moves and works in its own native right."