

# We Can Rely On Ourselves

Msgr. Emmett Murphy's statement in last week's Courier Journal that parents who have the space, resources and skill have a "moral obligation . . . to construct a fallout shelter in their homes" is sure to have a wide impact—far beyond the boundaries of our own Diocese.

Both the National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service of the American Bishops and the Religious News Service of the National Conference of Christians and Jews have carried his statement to both Catholic and Protestant newspapers across the country. The Religious News Service repeated Msgr. Murphy's statement in its special roundup feature "The Week in Religion." Other news agencies also thought the quote worth repeating.

On the heels of last week's edition came the ominous news of the Soviet sealing of East Berlin.

Britain's Foreign Secretary frankly admitted, "Clearly this situation may go very badly wrong in the autumn or some time towards the end of the year."

Nikita Khrushchev, on the eve of sending Hungarian veteran Marshal Ivan Konev to head the 850,000 Russian army in East Germany, threatened, "Hundreds of millions of people will perish" if Berlin erupts into all-out war.

These headlines made many Courier Journal readers take long thought of their "moral obligation" to provide for their family's survival.

But many had a frightening second thought—suppose you build a shelter for your family and then if the day comes when you need it you are faced with a desperate neighbor pleading, "Take my children in with you" or worse than that—forcing his way into your shelter.

Time magazine this week tells of Charles Davis in Austin, Texas, who has armed his home with four rifles, one pistol and a tear-gas gun to be sure his family gets into the shelter he built and everybody else keeps out.

Time asks six clergymen if we can gun our neighbor while keeping the Christian precept to love him. Only the Catholic priest, Jesuit Father Francis Elias of Chicago, admitted Davis has a right to defend his family's right to occupy his shelter alone but even he advised "non-use of violent means."

It is our opinion that two big gaps are revealed in this Time posed problem—first, that Americans are either too ignorant or too lazy to provide themselves with the only available insurance for survival in the event of nuclear war—and second, that Americans as a lot are scavengers who prefer to live on the dead.

We have our share of human acum but it is our opinion it is a minority.

Twenty years ago when the British faced the Nazi horror of sudden death and destruction, they responded in massive mutual aid to make that chapter in their history "their finest hour" as Winston Churchill challenged them to.

Are Americans of less valor than the British?

Two centuries ago and on a different kind of frontier than the one we stand on today, the legendary Daniel Boone was asked if he was ever lost in the forest. He replied: "Well, once I was bewildered for three days."

Each American has a heritage described by Swedish novelist Frederika Bremer. "He is a man who can rely upon himself." English editor Charles Mackay in 1851 said the real motto of America was, "Go ahead," because Americans were not daunted by any danger, distance or obstacle.

Most of us, like Boone, are bewildered by the hazards which confront us but, like him, we can rely on our ingenuity to find the facts we need to know to survive and then to have the "go-ahead" spirit to take care of ourselves on our nuclear age frontier.

In doing that we shall also take care of our nation and our fellow citizens.

## THE CATHOLIC Courier Journal

OFFICIAL NEWSPAPER OF THE ROCHESTER DIOCESE Vol. 72 No. 46 Friday, August 18, 1961

MOST REV. JAMES E. KEANEY, D.D., President MAIN OFFICE 33 So. St.—Bldg. 5-4216—Rochester 4, N. Y. EDITORIAL OFFICE 117 Robinson Bldg., Lake St. Rm. 3-6828 or Rm. 3-2423 AUBURN OFFICE 16 Capitol—AL 3-0433

Second class postage paid at Rochester, N. Y. Single copy 10c. 1 year subscription in U. S. \$4.50 Canada \$5.00 Foreign Countries \$4.25. As required under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

# Facts Can Clarify Federal School Aid Debate

(Following is the second of a series of four articles on the debate over Federal aid to education for parochial and other private schools. The author, whose background includes some 15 books in the fields of philosophy, religion and education, is research professor of theology at the University of Notre Dame.)

By REV. JOHN A. O'BRIEN (N.C.W.C. News Service)

What is the position of Catholics on the need for Federal aid?

Historically, American Catholics have held that education is the concern of the state and of the local community. This position, however, had little or nothing to do with faith and morals.

In terms of belief and discipline, there is no "Catholic" position on Federal aid. There are only positions held by Catholics. That is why the hierarchy advised Catholics to study the facts and reach their own conclusions.

Thus Archbishop Karl J. Alter of Cincinnati, chairman of the Administrative Board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, said: "The question of whether or not there ought to be Federal aid is a judgment to be based on objective, economic facts connected with the schools of the country. Consequently, Catholics are free to take a position in accordance with the facts."

Part of the problem, of course, is that the facts themselves are in dispute. Advocates and opponents of Federal aid argue vigorously over state financial capabilities, classroom shortages, and the qualifications and salaries of teachers.

What are the findings of several disinterested research studies?

1. In "Taxes for the Schools," published by the Institute for Social Science Research, Roger A. Freeman reaches the conclusion that all the needs of the elementary and secondary public schools can easily be met from state and local tax resources. He shows that public school enrollment in the last 20 years has gone up 42 per cent while public school expenditures have shot up 567 per cent. Even allowing for inflation these figures show the ability of localities to support increases in school enrollment.

2. The alleged classroom shortage is also questionable. In December, 1959, Louis Conger, chief of the Projection Section in the U. S. Office of Education, estimated that 61,000 new classrooms would be needed annually during the ensuing ten years. But without Federal aid, classroom construction has been actually running at a higher rate than that for more than five years already.

3. The number of teachers and their salaries have also been increasing. Between 1953 and 1959, the certified staff in public schools increased 34 per cent, while the number of pupils grew by only 25 per cent. Teachers' salaries have increased 40 per cent in constant dollars since 1950.

Hence the objective findings of disinterested research show that the need for the Federal government to enter into education on the elementary or secondary school levels is at least open to question and discussion.

WHO ARE the chief proponents of Federal aid?

Public school teachers and administrators, especially through their organizations, the National Education Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers.

What is the position of Catholic Bishops on nonprofit independent schools sharing in any Federal aid program?

leader had informed us that he was building a bigger and better bomb. The "better" here referred to a greater power of obliteration. . . . The Soviet Premier noted 21 nuclear bombs would take care of Britain; six or seven for France, and an equal number for Italy. . . . And Mr. Khrushchev reminded us here in America that we would not be immune to his wrath if we did not go along with his scheme to annex Berlin for the Communist empire.

We've had these threats before. I suppose they should be taken seriously. We have no doubt that Russia has the military capability to destroy Western Europe and to inflict heavy damage on these United States. But the converse is also true.

Mr. Kennedy could have reminded Mr. Khrushchev that America, on its own, has enough military might to destroy the whole of Russia. The number of atomic bombs it would take is beside the point. The fact remains that America has this capability. No one knows this better than Mr. Khrushchev.

There were some, in and out of Congress, who expected Mr. Kennedy to use the Press

Speaking in behalf of the Bishops previously mentioned, Archbishop Alter said: "in the event that there is Federal aid to education, we are deeply convinced that in justice, Catholic school children should be given the right to participate." Similarly, Cardinal Ritter remarked: "If public funds are raised for the educational benefit of the children in America, then all children should share in that benefit."

What is the position of the Catholic laity on nonprofit independent schools sharing in any Federal aid program?

Although there have been a few dissenting voices, the public statements of leading Catholic laymen and laywomen and of their organizations have been in vigorous support of the right of all parents, children, and schools to share in any massive Federal educational program.

Why do Catholics believe that all school children should share in the benefits of any Federal aid program?

"It is unthinkable," declared Cardinal Spellman of New York, "that any American child be denied Federal funds because his parents choose for him a God-centered education." Catholics think it un-American for the Federal government to say: "We will help you educate your child, and help him to become a more useful citizen, but only if you send him to a school in which he will learn nothing about his Catholic faith from the age of six to eighteen."

What is the principal argument used by those who wish to exclude private schools from Federal aid?

The principal argument they use is that including private schools in the Federal program would violate the separation of Church and State, which they say is commanded by the First Amendment.

What does the First Amendment say?

It says: "Congress shall make no law regarding an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." By forbidding the establishment of a national or state church, it safeguards the religious liberty of the individual. But it also does more; it forbids the Federal government to lay burdens on the exercise of religious freedom which are not reasonably necessary to the attainment of important national purposes.

Do the nonprofit schools conducted by Protestants, Jews, and Catholics render a public as well as a private service?

Yes. In addition to teaching religion, these schools teach, with a competence equal to that of the public schools, the secular subjects taught in the latter. They thus render a valuable public service and should be included by the government in any program to achieve educational excellence.

To refuse to make public benefits available through these schools is to discriminate against them in favor of a religiously neutral school system. Many of the Founding Fathers of the Republic would be shocked at such discrimination. More importantly, such discrimination will frustrate the achievement of the proclaimed objective of Federal aid, "The maximum development of every young American's capacity."

HOW MANY students are enrolled in Catholic schools? A total of 5,863,648 students in 13,961 schools, according to the 1961 Official Catholic Directory. Of these, 321,000 are in 267 colleges and universities, 41,871 in 537 seminaries, 886,295 in 2,433 high schools, and 4,114,482 in 10,724 elementary schools. They are taught by 168,877

full-time teachers, and the operating costs per year amount to about \$2.3 billion.

Approximately the same number of Catholic students are also enrolled in public schools. In many large cities a substantial percentage of the total public and private school enrollment is in Catholic schools: for example, Chicago 34 per cent; Philadelphia 39 per cent; and Pittsburgh 42 per cent.

What is the enrollment in other church-supported schools?

About 400,000 students, Lutherans have 180,000 students in approximately 1,500 schools, including 30 high schools. Episcopalians have 480 schools with a total enrollment of 37,000. Other denominations have about 200,000 students in their schools.

How many are enrolled in other private schools?

About 900,000 students. This makes a total of about 6.8 million students in private schools, about one-fifth the number in public schools.

DO THESE private schools greatly reduce school taxes?

Yes. The average annual

cost for the education of a pupil in a public elementary and secondary school is \$496, and for a college or university student is \$1,414.05. This means that Catholics alone, by bearing the whole cost of educating 5,300,777 elementary and high school pupils and 321,000 college and university students, reduce the public school tax by \$3,063,095,442.

If we add the savings effected by the education of the 400,000 students in other church-related schools and 900,000 in nondenominational schools, the educational tax bill of the general public is reduced more than another billion—a total savings well in excess of \$4 billion.

Do parents who send their own children to private nonprofit schools pay additional funds for the education of other children?

Yes. After paying for the education of their own children, parents are taxed for the education of their neighbors' children in the public schools. This means that they carry double their share of the educational burden. But that is not all. On the \$4 billion they pay for the educa-

tion of their children in private nonprofit schools, parents are subjected to still another financial outlay, the income tax exacted by the Federal and state governments.

Incredible as it seems, the payments made for the education of their children in independent nonprofit schools, though they save other parents more than \$4 billion, are not deductible. This means that these parents bear a triple financial burden for the education of the nation's youth.

Is this fact generally known?

No. Comparatively few people are aware of the staggering financial burden placed upon parents who send their children to any private nonprofit school, church-related or nondenominational.

Is this triple burden fair?

No. It is discriminatory, unfair, unjust, and inequitable. It can be reconciled only with the greatest difficulty to the constitutional guarantee of equal protection of the laws.

What would the proposed Federal aid to elementary

and high schools mean tax-wise to millions of parents?

It would mean that the parents who send their children to private nonprofit schools are to be subject to still another heavy financial burden—a fourth—from which their children would derive no assistance. They are expressly excluded from sharing in any of the benefits—a direct contradiction of the announced purpose of the bill: "The maximum development of every young American's capacity."

Isn't it true, though, that everyone pays public school taxes, whether he has children in the public schools or not, and that everyone benefits from the education given to children in public schools?

Yes. But people who are both taxpayers and parents do not benefit equally from taxes and the public school system. Those who send their children to public schools do not have any additional educational expense; those who send their children to private nonprofit schools must shell out considerable extra money for the education of their children.

# Free in New Congo Regime

By REV. JOSEPH CEUPPENS C.I.C.M.

Leopoldville—(NC)—Much Congolese—including Catholics—breathed easier at the nation's return to political normality with the formation of a government apparently acceptable to most political factions.

Despite the Marxist tendencies of Lumumbist members and other ministers of the government of Premier Cyrille Adoula, Catholic observers are in high hopes that the government will respect the liberties of the church, society and individuals.

Some observers are convinced that the government will be careful to respect such liberties. Africans fundamentally dislike political sectarianism of the European fashion and will strive to avoid reviving it unless pushed.

The Congolese know—partly from the disintegration of the country's fine medical service with the disruption of mission life—that the

Church works for the interest of the nation. Education, which the Congolese leaders regard as a major means of elevating the country's economic and social life, would be virtually impossible without the missionaries.

Some observers also hold that the Marxism of Lumumbists and anti-Lumumbists alike is really a mild African socialism, based on the teaching of the Senegalese leader Leopold Senghor. This socialism is far from being materialistic. On the contrary it extolls a high spirituality, recognizes human rights of men and essential liberties.

What it retains of socialism is a strong notion of the community, which moreover is the foundation of Bantu society.

Lumumbists as well as anti-Lumumbists backed Adoula at the 13-day session of parliament which elected him (Aug. 2). President Joseph Kasavubu, Lumumba's arch-rival, supported Adoula's candidacy.

The new premier is re-

garded as a staunch anticommunist. He announced he would begin an ambitious program of public works and would try to attract investment in the Congo.

Adoula, 39, was a bank clerk until he, like Lumumba, got into politics through the union movement.

Twelve of the 28 ministers

in the new government were members of the government of Patrice Lumumba, who became premier when the Congo received independence in July of 1960. Eleven of the 28 ministers are considered to be Lumumbists. In view of Lumumba's links with communist countries and the violence that broke upon his misdoings when news of his death was spread, such Lumumbist strength seems ominous.

But Lumumbists represent roughly one-third of the population. Furthermore, observers point out that the national elections which paved the way of independence were not fought on ideological grounds but for a large part of the electorate centered on tribal and economic considerations. Many of the leaders, however, were influenced by leftist ideologies, and Lumumba's Congolese National Movement (MNC party) received financial and technical aid from communist countries.

Adoula himself was a founding member of Lumumba's MNC party but later broke away with a segment under the leadership of Albert Kalonji of Kasai province. Kalonji went on to found his own "Mining State" in South Kasai, of which he became "king." Adoula remained with the cabinet government here and was interior minister under the provisional government of Joseph Ileo until his own election as premier.

The Lumumbist bloc includes four parties besides that faction of the MNC that remained faithful to Lumumba. They are the African Solidarity Party (PSA), strong among the inhabitants of Kwilu, the eastern part of Leopoldville province, the African Regroupment Center (CEPRA) of Kivu province, the Kasai Coalition (COAKA), a small grouping of some tribes in Kasai; and the Balu-

bakal, the Association of the Baluba tribesmen of Katanga province.

These parties represent some 3,500,000 of the Congo's 14,000,000 people. They all have been under some communist influence.

The second bloc includes 14 political parties, including Kalonji's wing of the MNC, the party of National Unity (PUNA), the Alliance of the Bakongo (ABAKO), and the National Progress Party (PNP). This bloc is entirely anti-Lumumbist, but otherwise is strongly divided ethnically and politically. On the ethnic plane it is composed of tribes who often wrangle over tribal territories. On the political plane some want a united Congo, others a federal Congo.

Out of both blocs only two parties are "national-political": the MNC and the PNP. The others are tribal.

The future role of Antoine Gizenga, Lumumba's vice-premier who declared himself premier after Lumumba's murder, was not immediately clear. He remained in his stronghold of Stanleyville during the session of parliament at Lovanium University near here, but sent his deputies to the session. His lieutenant, Christophe Gbenya, accepted the post of interior minister in the Adoula government. Gizenga dissolved his own regime in favor of the Adoula government.

The role of Premier Moise Tshombe of secessionist Katanga province was also in doubt. He boycotted the parliament that elected Adoula. But after Adoula's election he said he would send deputies to the parliament as a gesture of reconciliation.

Adoula declared that one of his first objectives was to bring Katanga back into the Congo. He said he would recognize the special needs of Katanga if that province proved itself willing to reunite with the rest of the country.

## Time Makes The Difference

Puno, Peru—A missionary here, unlike many priests in the U.S., has no difficulty recruiting altar boys to serve the 6:30 a.m. Mass. In fact, the boys in Maryknoll's San Juan parish vie for it.

"THE REASON," explains Father Robert V. Tobin, M.M., of Marion, Ohio, "is that with the honor of serving early Masses for a week goes my new, shiny alarm clock with illuminated hands. And since few families here have clocks, the boys consider it a mark of prestige to have my Baby Ben around the house for a week."

## Pressing Business

Hokkaido, Japan—The battered Jeep Father Christopher K. Maino, M.M., of Detroit, Mich., drives around his remote mission here formerly belonged to an American news correspondent and still bears a large, red PRESS sticker on the windshield.

But the sticker is presenting complications for the motorized missionary. The few Japanese here who can read English often mistake the Maryknoll for a laundry operator. Now the young padre is in a dilemma over whether to remove the misleading sticker or take advantage of the unexpected notoriety.



Saints of Unity

St. Photina—According to a story popular in the East was the Samaritan woman with whom Our Lord talked at the well, being afterwards martyred with others at Rome. Her feastday is March 20.

## Daily Mass Calendar

Sunday, August 20—Thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost (green). Gloria, Creed, Trinity Preface.

Monday, August 21—St. Jane Frances de Chantal (white). Gloria, 1941—Rev. Paul Gaffney.

Tuesday, August 22—Immaculate Heart of Mary (white). Gloria, 2nd prayer of St. Timothy and companions. Creed, Preface of our Lady, 1948—Rev. Edward McKay.

Wednesday, August 23—St. Philip Benizi (white). Gloria.

Thursday, August 24—St. Bartholomew, a postle (red). Gloria, Creed, Preface of Apostles, 1958—Rev. Edward Waters.

Friday, August 25—St. Louis (white). Gloria.

Saturday, August 26—Saturday Mass in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary (white). Gloria, 2nd prayer of St. Zephyrinus.

Priests listed above died on the date indicated. Please pray for them.

## Reapings at Random

# Confidence in Face of Soviet Threats

By GERARD E. SHERRY

Editor, Central California Register

Whatever one's political point of view it was heartening to watch President Kennedy perform a national service at his press conference last week.

Some 450 newspaper reporters from all over the world attended the conference and expected startling statements in answer to the recent bluster and threats of Nikita Khrushchev over Berlin.

These reporters, instead, witnessed the great game of diplomacy played at its best. Mr. Kennedy spurned Mr. K.'s ranting and raving and, instead, reiterated the desires of the U.S. Government to seek every peaceful means to a solution of the Berlin question. The President pledged that the United States would go "to the brink" in the search for peace and justice.

Whereas Mr. Khrushchev was taking an exercise in military mathematics, Mr. Kennedy took the road of calm reasoning. The Russian

leader had informed us that he was building a bigger and better bomb. The "better" here referred to a greater power of obliteration. . . . The Soviet Premier noted 21 nuclear bombs would take care of Britain; six or seven for France, and an equal number for Italy. . . . And Mr. Khrushchev reminded us here in America that we would not be immune to his wrath if we did not go along with his scheme to annex Berlin for the Communist empire.

We've had these threats before. I suppose they should be taken seriously. We have no doubt that Russia has the military capability to destroy Western Europe and to inflict heavy damage on these United States. But the converse is also true.

Mr. Kennedy could have reminded Mr. Khrushchev that America, on its own, has enough military might to destroy the whole of Russia. The number of atomic bombs it would take is beside the point. The fact remains that America has this capability. No one knows this better than Mr. Khrushchev.

There were some, in and out of Congress, who expected Mr. Kennedy to use the Press

Conference to answer Khrushchev in violent terms. Yet, our President chose the better way. He spoke of peace with the confidence of a leader who had the strength to face the issue of war if need be. Our President rattled no sabers; made no threats; nor gave any ultimatums. He spoke of our desire for peace.

But behind this peaceful facade the preparations for the ultimate showdown were going on. Mr. Kennedy was speaking, and all the time was making sure that the big stick would be available as and when it is needed. Some people saw his failure to reply to Mr. Khrushchev's threats with counter threats as a sign of weakness. To me, however, this is a sign of the President's strength.

Mr. Kennedy was not panicked by Russian bluster. He does not want a war hysteria creeping over these United States. He would much prefer to see our people engaged in peaceful pursuits, and production for peace and security. Hence, even though the war shadows loom across our horizon, the United States continues to promote other projects.

The Peace Corps program is under way;

aid for Latin America is becoming a reality; aid for the rest of the world's needy is under way. And most important, we pursue with patience for a controlled world disarmament plan.

To me, our President has given an example of constructive leadership, which has been missing in high places in Government for many a year. It can't help but impress not only our own people but the peoples of all the world.

Mr. Khrushchev's methods are aimed at instilling fear in the free people of Western Europe, and in this country. His bluster is meant to cover us in surrender before a shot is fired. He can succeed only if we lose faith in our leaders and the high ideals of this democracy.

If we panic into the fear of saber-rattling there may be no other way but the sword. However, if we speak softly, facing the enemy with courage and resolution the battle will be won. There will be time to let the enemy see that in the holocaust of modern war that nobody wins; least of all Mr. Khrushchev.