

Lent Devotions Asked In Sacred Heart Year

My dear People:

On Wednesday we opened the holy season of Lent. When we accept the blessed ashes on our brows, we make an implicit promise to God that the season will be marked by special prayer and self-denial. While the Church has generously mitigated the severity of fast and abstinence, she cannot eliminate that important feature of the holy season.

Lent is not simply a season of prayer. It is a season of penance, self-denial, and sacrifice—a period of atonement for our own sins and for the sins of the world.

During this Lenten season, in a year devoted especially to the Sacred Heart, I would suggest the frequent visits to Christ in the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar for personal conversation with Him in the quiet of your parish church. These heart-to-heart talks can bring rich graces from the Sacred Heart.

Another traditional Lenten devotion is the Way of the Cross. The meditating on the fourteen steps on this cross-bearing journey brings us very close to the Sacred Heart and revives again for us the sense of gratitude for the suffering borne for our salvation. Only in meditation on the suffering and death of Christ can we grasp the significance and necessity for this season of prayer, self-denial, and penance. It has been so for centuries, ever since that afternoon on Mount Calvary. It will be so until the end of time.

In an age which is rapidly losing a sense of sin, the idea of penance may seem ridiculous. However, the words of Christ ring clear through the revelry of our enlightened era. "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, let him take up his cross and follow Me." Where can we follow Him better than retracing His steps on the "Way of the Cross"?

The opening lesson of Lent, on Ash Wednesday, warns us that one day we must meet Him as our Judge. The meeting will be so much easier, if we have walked with Him to Calvary during Lent.

For this special season, I grant permission for an evening Mass in every church on every evening, except Sunday.

May God enrich the souls of all of you with His choicest blessings during this holy season.

With a blessing, I am

Your devoted Shepherd in Christ,

James E. Kearney

Bishop of Rochester

- The annual collection for the Negro and Indian Missions will be taken up on the first Sunday of Lent, Feb. 16.
- A general dispensation from fast and abstinence will be granted on Saturday, Feb. 22 (Washington's Birthday), on Tuesday, March 17 (Feast of St. Patrick), and on March 23 (Holy Saturday).
- All parish celebrations are forbidden during the holy season of Lent.



Patroness of Canada

The good Mother... St. Anne de Beaupre, and St. Joseph are the patrons of our neighbors in the North. Almost since the founding of New France, Canadians have honored and loved St. Anne in a very special way. In 1638, as an act of thanksgiving by the hardy French colonists, a chapel was built in gratitude for the many favors the good Mother of Our Lady had answered on the new settlement of Fort Cap. Just down the St. Lawrence River from Quebec, the cornerstone of the present basilica was blessed in 1823.

Broaden Minds, Hearts On Liturgy Changes

Rome — (RNS) — One of the Catholic Church's foremost liturgical experts stressed here what he said was the need for both clergy and laity to "broaden their minds and hearts" so that they might better understand and appreciate the true importance of the reforms being made in the Church's life of worship.

He was Father Ferdinando Antonelli, O.F.M., who took part with other leading scholars in a conference designed to help acquaint priests more fully with the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy approved by the Second Vatican Council at its second session last year.

It was announced that reports of the conference — the first major project designed to make priests more familiar with the constitution's decrees — would be widely disseminated throughout the Catholic world.

The major purpose of the constitution, Father Antonelli stressed, was to "bring back the faithful to active participation in liturgical ceremonies, especially in the Mass."

Lenten Fast Laws

Abstinence

1. Everyone over seven years of age is bound to observe the law of abstinence.

2. a) Complete abstinence is to be observed on Ash Wednesday and Fridays; b) Partial abstinence is to be observed on the Ember Wednesday and Ember Saturday of Lent. On days of partial abstinence, meat and soup or gravy made from meat may be taken only at the principal meal.

Fast

1. Everyone over 21 and under 59 years of age is bound to observe the law of fasting in addition to the law of abstinence.

2. Every weekday is a day of fast.

On days of fast, only one full meal is allowed. Two other meager meals may be taken to maintain strength, but together they should not equal another full meal. The law of fast permits the use of meat at the principal (full) meal only. Eating between meals is not permitted, but liquids, including milk and fruit juices, are all yed.

Application

Age groups 7-21 and over 59, may have their usual three meals a day even during Lent. They may also eat between meals. These groups must observe complete abstinence from meat at all meals and snacks on Ash Wednesday and Fridays. They must observe partial abstinence on Ember Wednesday and Ember Saturday, when they may eat meat only at the principal meal. On all other days of Lent they may eat meat at all meals and snacks.

Age group 21-59 must combine the laws of abstinence and fast. Thus, on Ash Wednesday and Fridays, they are not permitted meat at all. They may have only one full meal on these days. Eating between meals is not permitted. Liquids may be taken between meals.

On all other days of Lent, including Ember Wednesday and Ember Saturday, they are permitted meat at their principal (full) meal only. The other meals must be meatless. Eating between meals is not permitted. Liquids may be taken between meals.

There is no law of fast and abstinence on the Sundays of Lent.

When health or ability to work would be seriously affected, the law does not oblige. In doubt concerning fast or abstinence, a parish priest or confessor should be consulted.

Courier Journal

OFFICIAL NEWSPAPER OF THE ROCHESTER DIOCESE
Friday, February 13, 1964
Vol. 75 No. 20

MOST REV. JAMES E. KEARNEY, D.D., Bishop

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations and the Catholic Press Association. Published by the National Catholic Welfare Conference. News Service, Religion, News Service, Published Daily, 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Telephone: 442-1111. MAIN OFFICE: 35 N. W. 4th St., Rochester, N. Y. 14602. ELWINE OFFICE: 211 Robinson St., Rochester, N. Y. 14602. AUBURN OFFICE: 11 Capitol Bldg., Auburn, N. Y. 14406.

Printed on second size paper by the Courier-Journal Co., 111 N. W. 4th St., Rochester, N. Y. 14602. Second-class postage paid at Rochester, N. Y. Postmaster: Please send address changes to U. S. 2522, Canada 2522. Foreign: Canada 2522.

'Open Door' in Church-State 'Wall'

(Father Drinan, dean of the Boston College Law School and author of the recently published book "Religion, the Courts, and Public Policy," was designated by the National Catholic Welfare Conference as an official observer of the conference he describes here.)

By FATHER ROBERT F. DRINAN, S.J.

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

Columbus — A new openness toward the challenges of religious pluralism characterized the deliberations and conclusions of the first national study conference on Church and State sponsored here by the National Council of Churches.

Some 450 delegates from 24 Protestant and Orthodox religious bodies affiliated with the National Council came, after four days of remarkably candid and humble deliberations Feb. 1 to 4. Several new initiatives based on the consideration that American Protestants must in fairness and justice recognize and accept the fact that Protestant Christianity is no longer the religion of the vast majority of the American people.

Twelve Catholic and twelve Jewish observers at the NCC conference on Church and State were requested in most instances not just to "observe" but rather to explain to the Protestants in America approval or dissent in the nation's Church-State arrangements.

This unprecedented occasion for dialogue served, in the judgment of Catholic and Jewish observers, to challenge and sharpen some of their own grievances or claims regarding the rights of their co-religionists in American society.

The deepest concern of the preparatory papers and the general addresses at the Columbus conference centered on the question of whether the state would recognize and promote religion and, if so, to what extent.

Protestants from vastly differing traditions replied with vastly different anxieties to that double-barreled question. But there appeared to be a consensus that modern governments, ever more involved in all aspects of the welfare state, must either recognize and even promote religion or constitutionally guaranteed religious freedom is to be preserved.

On a deeper but less easily explainable level, the Protestant dissenters were searching for some way by which the American government could collaborate with the nation's religious bodies to advance those moral standards which are derived from religion and which, in the final analysis, the preservation of law and order depend.

A NEW ERA in American-State affairs seemed to agree. Protestants and Catholics alike agreed that the fact that they preferred positions for Protestants or any less than equal position for non-Protestants must be courageous and disestablished and disaligned.

The new road that Protestantism must follow it bounded on either side by two traditional threats or perils of Protestant thought—secularism and Roman Catholicism. Holding to either is held to be the most Protestant thinking. But in a post-Protestant religiously pluralistic society, Protestants, it would seem, is being asked — and perhaps will soon be required — to accommodate itself on certain points either to secularism or to Catholicism.

One of the most fundamental Protestant concerns has, of course, been the place of religion and moral teaching in the public schools. Despite official acceptance by the National Council of Churches in June, 1953, the Supreme Court's banning of Bible-reading and other devotional exercises in the public schools, many if not most Protestants still feel that the public school can inculcate spiritual values and even teach about religion.

The enthusiasm of Protestants for "charter schools" of some new kind of "dual school enrollment" was more widespread at the Columbus conference than most observers had

anticipated. It remains to be seen, however, whether Protestant leadership will mount a significant campaign to change those laws and customs which must be modified before pupils in public schools can be enrolled as part-time students in church-related schools for the purpose of taking value-laden subjects.

Not a few persons at the first national Protestant conference on Church-State problems in the nation's history remarked that the central and crucial problem confronting Protestants was the question of federal aid for parochial schools.

As a coincidence, the CBS television special "Catholics and the Schools" was shown nationally on Feb. 3 — at the very midpoint of the discussion in Columbus. Virtually every conference saw the TV presentation and tended to agree that the challenge and the dilemma it presented deserve a reasoned answer which any Protestant has not discovered.

There was, however, little actual retreat at Columbus from previously held positions against federal aid for nonpublic schools. The conferees did not, of course, have the power to make policy for the National Council of Churches but merely to advise the policy-making board of NCC, an organization that represents some 40 million believers.

On the other hand, the atmosphere of receptivity and openness on the part of the delegates at the NCC meeting seemed almost inconsistent with the spirit of a statement adopted by the NCC in 1961 declaring that all public funds should go exclusively to public schools. Concurrent with the new openness, however, were statements about the advisability of tax support for nonpublic schools which, in the words of Martin Marty, associate editor of the Christian Century

magazine, seem to have been made with "calculated blandness."

Although some Catholics doubt that Protestants can or will retreat gracefully to the position that tax support may be granted for the financing of secular subjects in church-related schools.

One of the most intensely discussed issues was the basic question: How much does the Catholic Church want for its schools? As is well known, the basic contention of Catholic leaders with regard to federal aid has been the consistent position that, if federal aid is granted, Catholic schools should receive some share. The question posed, therefore, is whether Catholic leaders should decide on the specific share they request or to continue to assert that the size of this share is a matter for Congress to determine.

Difficult decisions, to be sure, but it may be that the hour has arrived for those devoted to church-related schools to come forward with a viable formula for the allocation of tax money.

Sunday closing legislation also was studied at the Columbus conference. Protestant Councils of Churches have been involved for many years in almost every state in controversies over these laws.

Enacted in the early days of the Republic, the Sabbath laws established not a few of the theological beliefs of Protestants concerning Sunday. Such ordinances have always been a burden on sabbatarians and are increasingly an irritant to the millions for whom Sunday is a day of rest but not of worship.

Protestants have a twofold

anxiety about Sunday laws. They do not desire to have the state aid and abet the Christian religion by enforcing Sunday laws, nor do they want these laws to discriminate against Seventh Day Adventists and Jews whose day of worship is Saturday. Catholics likewise have this double anxiety.

There is some reason to hope that from the deliberation on the Sunday law issue at Columbus there may emerge a set of guidelines by which Catholics and Protestants may more peaceably and profitably collaborate on a problem whose solution requires a delicate balancing of competing interests.

Some will see contradictions and inconsistencies in the final conclusions and recommendations of the study conference on the Church and State.

But the spirit and intent of the several findings can be summarized, in this observer's judgment, by saying that the NCC conference set aside the concept of the "wall of separation" or the "absolute separation" of Church and State and adopted a tentative but reasonably firm position that there can and should be a functional interaction between government and religion in the areas of health, education and welfare.

The profound graciousness of the Protestant hosts to their non-Protestant guest-observers at the history-making Columbus conference set aside the concept of the "wall of separation" or the "absolute separation" of Church and State and adopted a tentative but reasonably firm position that there can and should be a functional interaction between government and religion in the areas of health, education and welfare.

Pope John and President John Kennedy touched the heart of every man by their Catholicism. Every non-Protestant at the nation's first national conference on Church and State felt profoundly that all the world was profoundly indebted to two men named John who came to power for a brief time in the 1960's.

'Neutral' Vietnam

Step to Red Take-over

(The author of the following assessment of the impact of French recognition of Red China in east Asia is a veteran Far East correspondent. He reported from China in the years preceding the Communist take-over there, covered the Korean War, the Red victory in North Vietnam in 1954, and has been in Saigon since the past two and a half years. He has covered events in virtually all the countries of the Far East.)

By FATHER PATRICK O'CONNOR, Society of St. Columban

Saigon — (NC) — The Chinese Communists gained ground last month. General de Gaulle gave it to them by agreeing to give them diplomatic recognition. They surely hope to gain more by it — including some in Vietnam.

The announcement undoubtedly increased the Chinese Communist prestige in Asia and Africa; where it had been working hardest to win influence. It meant that the West had yielded, something to Peking. To many a nervous politician and businessman it suggested that the time to climb aboard Mao Tse-tung's Red bandwagon might be at hand.

Though it had been expected for weeks, the French decision jolted Vietnamese and other South Asians in whom the Chinese Communist regime is a near and present threat. They all seem to feel that the Chinese Communist will inevitably get the better of the deal, and largely at their expense.

The most important event in 1954, that is, the end of World War II, is now one Saigon newspaper described the French decision. This is an exaggeration, but it indicates the

impact the news had on some people here.

The Vietnamese have always feared their far more numerous Chinese neighbors. For one thousand years the Chinese occupied and ruled North Vietnam. Today Chinese who are also Communists are feared all the more. The North Vietnamese Communists probably fear their Chinese "comrades" in spite of their dependence on Chinese aid — perhaps because of it.

Vietnamese suspected that French recognition of the Peking government would be linked to a plan for a "neutralized" South Vietnam.

The neutralization that many Vietnamese, especially Catholics, fear is what the Communist-controlled National Liberation Front for South Vietnam proposes for South Vietnam only. That would certainly be just a stage on the way to Communist domination. The "neutralized" fertile south would be an easy prey for a militant, rich, hungry, China-backed Communist regime in the north.

So far General de Gaulle has not spelled out what he means by neutrality for the states of South-East Asia. It is meant to include Communist-ruled North Vietnam, his proposal would be reasonable in itself, though most unlikely to be accepted by Hanoi and Peking.

As long as North Vietnam is not neutralized, any proposal to neutralize South Vietnam is simply a proposal for its surrender by degrees to Communist rule.

Many of the effects of an all-around neutrality could be attained, however, if the Geneva cease-fire agreement of July, 1954, were honestly kept.

Article 18 of that agreement, says: "The two parties shall en-

sure that the zones assigned to them do not adhere to any military alliance and are not used for the resumption of hostilities or to further an aggressive policy." Article 24 says: "The armed forces of each party shall respect the demilitarized zone and the territory under the control of the other party, and shall commit no act and undertake no operation against the other party..."

The present warfare in South Vietnam was begun and is continued by the North Vietnam government in direct violation of the Geneva agreement. After prolonged investigation and discussion, the International Commission for Supervision and Control pronounced on June 2, 1962, that the northern government was guilty of these violations. The decision was reached by a vote of ten India and Canada to a predictable one (Poland).

China was one of the principal negotiating parties in the Geneva agreement. And that resulted in the cease-fire agreement. Instead of using its powerful influence to make the North Vietnam regime keep its word and the peace, it has supplied weapons for the subversive war now being waged under Hanoi direction by the Vietcong in the south.

French recognition of the Chinese Communist government may only stimulate the sending of more Chinese aid for the Vietcong guerrillas in order to produce more war-weariness in Vietnam and abroad. Then the trick "neutralization" for south Vietnam alone may be accepted. The Geneva cease-fire agreement of 1954 will have been successfully circumvented. And the Communist half-Vietcong, won with Red Chinese aid at Geneva ten years ago will have become a full one.

Refugees and Water, Two-edged Sword of Damocles

By DR. GARY MACDON

The fact that Pope Paul had to insist so emphatically that his pilgrims to the Holy Places had no political implications was itself an indication of the delicate of the political balance in the area he visited. Jordan and Israel, the two states in which partitioned Palestine lies, formally respected the Pope's wishes in their arrangements to welcome him.

The leaders of both states, nevertheless, selected each word and planned each ceremony to highlight the unresolved conflict and present their respective positions in the most favorable light.

At a distance, it is easy to overlook the fact that Israel and her neighbors have been at war for more than 15 years, and that the present border is simply an armistice line patrolled by UN forces to maintain an uneasy truce.

Not only is such the case, but the passage of time is increasing rather than diminishing the tension.

The 400,000 Arabs who fled their homes

in Israel during the open warfare in the late 1940s still live in the main refugee camps near the borders, their numbers greater today through natural increase than at the outset. No formula has been found to absorb them in the countries around, nor is any likely.

The Arab leaders deliberately hold them together, a human pawn in the struggle. Without them, the tension would be less and their case against Israel weaker.

No issue arouses more feeling in this area of the world than water. The original partition plan called for a sharing of the waters of the Jordan, the major available source of fresh water.

The Arab states have, however, put reparations of the refugees as a condition preceding any kind of discussion. Israel is absolutely opposed to any mass return of Arabs to the territory it controls. But it has not brought the water issue to a head by the construction of pumping stations and pipe lines to carry water from the Jordan (at the northern end of the Sea of Galilee) to irrigate the Negev desert

in the south of the state. These works are now almost complete.

Arab states at this unilateral action has been such as to bring together the many Arab states, one of whose weaknesses is internal dissension, for a summit conference. But fiery resolutions alone will not stop the Israeli, and there are two reasons to believe that the Arab States will not attempt the major military action which would be the logical next step.

One is that they probably realize that they would suffer a defeat similar to that of 1948, a defeat possibly involving a further loss of territory.

The other reason is more complicated but also more basic. It is that there is an unresolved conflict in the Arab world itself. The Arab intelligentsia see the region as involved in a process of emancipating itself from feudal backwardness and apathy. They regard the kings and sheiks as part of the feudal and colonialistic system, and they will not take action to strengthen any part of them. A successful war on Israel, however, would benefit

Jordan's king more than any other Arab ruler, almost completely.

It is worthy of note that this attitude is shared by Christian Arabs no less than Moslems. In spite of the fact that the "progressive" Arab intelligentsia many times treated Christianity as an ally of colonialism and an alien element, the Christian Arabs identify themselves with the Arab world and believe that the emergence of modern states will ultimately be to their advantage, as well as to that of the community as a whole.

For the outsider, what is perhaps the most sinister aspect of the Palestine situation is that none of the principals is concerned about the nuclear war which could grow out of border raids. They are willing to play with fire. It is not merely that they believe that the nuclear warheads would seek more important targets, it is that they see the alternative as such as to blind the judgment.

In these terms, Palestine is a sword of Damocles over all our heads. No price would be too great to pay for the true peace for which Pope Paul has so insistently at his every address during his pilgrimage.