

Goldwater's Enigmatic Words Do We Again Face A Great Agony?

The Catholic Church is currently under indictment for its alleged silence when Adolf Hitler began his rise to power.

The charge is dramatized in the stage play The Deputy and documented in the just published book "The Catholic Church and Nazi Germany."

Those who make the charge say the Fuehrer gave ample evidence in his early speeches of the whirlwind he intended to unleash if he came to power.

That the Fuehrer's words were clear is true. But who then could believe that such madness would ever become reality?

Hitler's basic doctrine claimed duty to the homeland justified any action — repudiation of treaties, suppression of a free press, muzzling of the pulpits, takeover of other nations, obliteration of individual freedom, massive lies of propaganda, torture, brutal break-up of families, forced labor and the "final solution" to six million people whose only crime was that they were born as Jews.

This mad doctrine for a time dominated Europe from Moscow to Gibraltar and from the polar regions to the Sahara. That it did not prevail was due to the blood, sweat and tears shed by those who believed patriotism was better served in other ways.

But the Hitler madness, it seems, did not completely die with its frightening spokesman.

The world's newspapers, following Senator Barry Goldwater's now famous, and frightening, eighteen words, have poured floods of ink to print their editorial conviction that a Hitler-like warped patriotism is now brewing in the United States.

Delegates at the Republican convention had been asked to condemn the left-wing extremism of Communism and the right-wing extremism of the Ku Klux Klan and the John Birch Society, frequently identified with the fascist or Nazi mentality.

The delegates shouted down the proposal and then later shook their fists and booed newsmen covering the convention.

Then they loudly cheered Goldwater's clearly enunciated statement, "Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice; moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue."

He certainly does not endorse either communism or the Klan but neither has he yet clarified his precise intention in making the statement. Its background, however, is certainly revelatory of a festering jingoism, a nationalism which runs counter to the American tradition and even to Christian faith.

We are to render to Caesar what's his — but nothing more, the Gospels tell us.

Patriotism is best when it keeps the law, not when it takes the law into its own hands, the Constitution tells us.

The Senator's statement will serve the nation, and the world, if it spurs a clarification of what true patriotism should be. And clarification, rather than mutual condemnation, is, we think, sorely needed at this time.

Neither the Catholic Church nor its spokesmen can be expected to take sides on merely political issues — but neither should the Church expose itself to the possibility of facing again in another twenty-five years the charge that it failed to discern a trend, real or imaginary, which if checked at its beginning would save the world a great agony.

When this nation was on the eve of its Civil War agony, the American bishops voiced a plea. We think what they said in 1840 is valid still in 1964 —

"The periods which precede our great elections are usually marked by extraordinary excitement. Associations are formed, committees are appointed, clubs are organized, party spirit is excited, the tongue and the pen are embittered by virulence, truth is disregarded. More melancholy and more censurable still — free men of every religious denomination; electors, upon the proper exercise of whose judgment we receive statesmen who may save our republic from ruin or who may degrade us in the eyes of the world and destroy our peace and our liberty; voters, upon whose virtues and prudence our dearest rights depend — all these are brutalized by pampering their meanest passions . . . and thus what was meant to be a blessing is turned into a curse.

"Beloved brethren flee this contamination, keep aloof from these crimes. Reflect that you are accountable not only to society but to God, for the honest, independent and fearless exercise of your franchise, that it is a trust confided to you not for your private gain but for the public good, and that if yielding to any undue influence you act either through favor, affection, or the motives of dishonest gain against your own deliberate view of what will promote your country's good, you have violated your trust, you have betrayed your conscience and you are a renegade to your country."

—Father Henry Dowell

Boston Prelate OKs Group Despite Vatican Warning

New York — (RNS) — Cardinal Cushing of Boston praised Moral Re-Armament as a "noble cause" in writing a foreword to a new book published by an executive of the movement.

The prelate referred to MRA director Peter Howard, the author, as "a friend of mine and scholarly worker in a noble cause." The book, Design for Dedication, is a compilation of addresses by Mr. Howard on Moral Re-Armament's efforts for world peace.

Moral Re-Armament, founded by the late Frank Buchman, has been criticized in the past by several church bodies, although not so frequently in recent years.

The movement is designed to "improve the world through improving the nature of all men." As recently as 1957, Osservatore Romano, Vatican City newspaper, cautioned Catholics that they could not cooperate with it.

Osservatore then cited a 1955 instruction to bishops from the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office barring lay as well as ecclesiastical participation in Moral Re-Armament.

Vatican Council to Decide Religious Liberty Statement

Very many conciliar Fathers have insistently demanded that this sacred synod clearly explain and proclaim the right of man to religious liberty. Among the reasons given four principal ones should be listed:

1) Truth: The Church must teach and defend the right to religious liberty because there is a question of the truth, the care of which was committed to her by Christ;

2) Defense: The Church cannot remain silent today when almost half of mankind is deprived of religious liberty by atheistic materialism of various kinds;

3) Peaceful Social Life: Today in all nations of the world, men who adhere to different religions of who lack all religious belief, must live together in one and the same human society; in the light of truth, the Church should point the way toward living together peacefully;

4) Ecumenism: Many Non-Catholics harbor an aversion against the Church or at least suspect her of a kind of Machiavellism because we seem to them to demand the free exercise of religion when Catholics are in a minority in any nation and at the same time refuse and deny the same religious liberty when Catholics are in the majority.

Religious liberty is such a grave problem in modern society that it cannot be omitted in a pastoral decree on ecumenism. Therefore, we submit to your deliberations this fifth chapter of our schema on ecumenism. The Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, to the best of its ability, has carefully watched over the preparation of this material.

Since we are treating of a most difficult question and at the same time one of great importance in modern life, the authors of the schema cherish the hope that your attention and pastoral consideration will amend what needs amendment and perfect what is still imperfect in the schema now offered to you.

The term "religious liberty" has a definite meaning in our text. In the forthcoming discussion, great confusion might arise if any of the Fathers give to the expression a meaning that differs from the one intended by the text.

When religious liberty is defended, it is not asserted that it is proper for man to consider the religious problem according to his own whim without any moral obligation and decide for himself according to his own will whether or not to embrace religion (religious indifferentism).

Nor is it affirmed that the human conscience is free in the sense that it is as if it were outside the law, absolved from any obligation toward God (laicism).

Nor is it said that falsehood is to be considered on an equal footing with truth, as though there were no objective norm of truth (doctrinal relativism).

Nor is it admitted that man in any way has a quasi-right to maintain a peaceful complacency in the midst of uncertainty (dilettantistic pessimism).

If anyone were to insist upon giving any of the aforesaid meanings to "religious liberty," he would attribute to our text a meaning which neither the words nor our intention possess.

What therefore is meant in the text by "religious liberty"? Positively, religious liberty is the right of the human person to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of his conscience. Negatively, it is freedom from all external force in his personal relations with God, which the conscience of man vindicates to itself.

Religious liberty implies human autonomy, not from within certainly but from without. From within, man is not freed of the obligations toward the religious problem. From without, his liberty is offended when, obedience to the dictates of his conscience is impeded.

(This is the text of the address made by Bishop Emilio De Smedt of Bruges, Belgium, last autumn as he introduced the draft on religious liberty at the Vatican Council in Rome. Final decision of the bishops is expected at this session of the Council.)

At this point, two questions must be asked: 1) Can each man claim for himself religious liberty as a sacred right given to him by God? 2) Is there, and to what extent is there, a duty on the part of others to recognize the aforesaid religious liberty?

Our decree, since it is pastoral, tries to treat the present matter especially from the practical point of view and, after the manner of John XXIII, will carefully strive to remove the whole question from that world of abstractions which was so dear to the 16th century. The question is put therefore regarding the real man in his real dealings with other men, in contemporary human and civil societies.

Respect and Esteem
The first pastoral problem which must be examined now by this sacred synod is this: How must Catholics because of their Faith conduct themselves toward men who do not belong to the Catholic Faith? We propose the following answer for your deliberations:

1) All Catholics are invited by Christ to strive by prayer, penance, witness and evangelizing in the Holy Spirit to bring our Non-Catholic brothers to the blessing of the evangelical light and of the life of the Church. The sacred, absolute rights of God as well as the evangelical and natural truths must always and everywhere be honored and observed by them.

2) They must abstain from all direct and indirect coercion. Although God wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth, the disciples of Christ may not infringe upon the religious liberty of the individual person. On the contrary, they must respect and esteem the right and duty of Non-Catholics to follow the dictate of their own conscience even when, after sin-

cere and sufficient study, it errs in good faith.

What is the reason of faith why Non-Catholics can be forced by no one to admit the Catholic doctrine against their conscience? This reason is found in the very nature of the act of faith. For this act, on God's part, is a supernatural gift which the Holy Spirit most freely gives to whom and when He wills and, on man's part, it is and must be an assent which man freely gives to God.

3) All Catholics are bound by the command of the Lord to love and to help their Non-Catholic brothers with a sincere and active charity.

No Coercion

At this point, the schema takes a step forward and asserts that each and every man, who follows his conscience in religious matters, has a natural right to true and authentic religious liberty. In this second part, it is proposed that the sacred synod solemnly demand religious liberty for the whole human family, for all religious groups, for each human person, whether his conscience be sincere (sincere) and true or sincere and false concerning faith, provided only that he sincerely follow the dictate of conscience. Therefore, a general principle is laid down: No human person can be the object of coercion or intolerance.

What is the reason why observance of religious liberty is demanded of all? The human person, endowed with conscious and free activity, since he can fulfill the will of God only as the divine law is perceived through the dictate of conscience, can obtain his ultimate end only by prudently forming the judgment of conscience and by faithfully carrying out its dictate.

From the nature of things, in forming this judgment, where-

by man tries freely to conform to the absolute demands of God's rights; neither any other man nor any human institution can take the place of the free judgment of man's conscience. Therefore, the man who sincerely obeys his own conscience intends to obey God himself although at times confusedly and unknowingly, and is to be considered worthy of esteem.

When religious liberty is violated, then the very freedom of the human person is violated in its principal matter, in a fundamental demand — in man's relation to the supreme and ultimate end. His greatest injury is to prevent a man from worshiping God and from obeying God according to the dictate of his own conscience.

State Intervention

The schema takes still another step forward and enters upon a most difficult question: Religious liberty would be fruitless and empty if men were not able to carry out the dictate of their conscience in external acts — whether in private life, in social life, or in public life, or if human persons were prevented from forming religious groups whose members could worship the Supreme Deity by common and social acts and lead a religious life.

Hence however, there arises a most difficult problem. For if a human person carries out the dictate of his conscience by external acts, there is danger of violating the rights and duties of another or of others. Since man is a social being and since in the human family men are subject to error and to sin, the conflict of rights and the conflict of duties cannot always be avoided.

From this it is evident that the right and duty to manifest externally the dictate of conscience is not unlimited, but can be and at times must be tempered and regulated for the common good.

This ordering of the common good must be done juridically in human society and belongs to public authority (potestati publicae). "One of the fundamental duties of civil authorities, therefore, we read in Pagan in Tertis (trans. NOWC rev. No. 62), "is to coordinate social relations — in such fashion that the exercise of one man's rights does not threaten others in the exercise of their own rights nor hinder them in the fulfillment of their duties. Finally, the rights of all should be effectively safeguarded and, if they have been violated, completely restored."

How is public authority to carry out this duty? In establishing order for the common good, public authority can never act contrary to the order of justice established by God. As St. Thomas says: "Human law is truly law to the extent that it is in accordance with right reason; and therefore it is evident that it is derived from the eternal law, insofar as it departs from reason, it is a so-called 'wicked law' and therefore is not truly a law but a kind of violence" (II, q. 93, a. 3, ad 2um).

Recent Roman Pontiffs again and again have bewailed the fact that not a few governments have gone too far in this matter, ignoring and violating religious liberty. In our own day,

there are some regions in which tolerance in religious matters has been so little observed that the Supreme Pontiff, Paul VI, in his allocution to the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council on Sept. 23, 1963, said, speaking of the violated right to religious liberty:

"Because of sufferings of this kind, the supreme Pontiffs are affected, and how deeply! We arerieved, when we behold that in some territories religious liberty, together with the other principal rights of man, is suppressed by the principles and acts of those who do not tolerate opinions different from theirs on politics, on rates of men, or on religion of any kind. We are sorrowed also by the many injuries which are done to those who would like to profess their religion honestly and freely."

Rights and Duties

In order that we might clearly understand the doctrine of the Church on the extent and limits of the civil power's duty relating to religious liberty, we must, in a few words, develop the history of this doctrine. Bear with me, Venerable Fathers, if I try to make more than just demands on your patience. But the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity is convinced that many difficulties and confusions can be avoided in the study of the schema if, before the discussion begins, I show very briefly the historical background since the time of Pius IX have taught concerning the duties of public authority in religious matters.

On the question of religious liberty, the principal document is the encyclical Pagan in Tertis, in which Pope John XXIII, especially developed these two points of doctrine: 1) By the law of nature, the human person has the right to the free exercise of religion in society according to the dictate of a sincere conscience (conscientia recta) whether the conscience be true (conscientia vera), or the captive either of error or of inadequate knowledge of truth and of sacred things. 2) This right corresponds to the duty incumbent upon other men and the public authority to recognize and respect that right in such a way that the human person in society is kept

(Continued on Page 5)

COURIER

Thursday, July 23, 1964

Vol. 75 No. 43

MORTY REY,

JAMES E. KEARNEY, D.D.,

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations and the Catholic Press Association, Publisher of National Catholic Welfare Conference.

New Service: Religious News Service. Published every Tuesday by the Rochester Catholic Press Association. MAIN OFFICE — 15 Reia — Baker St. 1119, Rochester, N.Y. 14614

ELMIRA OFFICE — 317 Robinson Bldg., East St. N.E. 14433 or 1-3111.

ATLANTA OFFICE — AL 3-1111, 145 East Georgia Street.

Entered as second class matter in the Post Office at Rochester, N.Y., on October 10, 1933. Post Office of Publication of March 4, 1939.

Single copy price, 15¢. Postage and handling charges extra.



Patron of Wales

Waterman's Saint, St. David, Dewi Sant, the patron saint of Wales lived in the sixth Century. He founded a monastery at Mynyw in the Far West of Pembrokeshire, and is venerated as the first Bishop in those parts, now called after him St. David's. The monks followed the extremely austere rule which included total abstinence from wine, whence they were called "The Watermen"; this led to controversy between St. David and St. Gildas who said the Mynyw monks were more ascetic than Christian. St. David's feast is kept in Wales and in the English dioceses of Westminster and Portsmouth.

Father Hall to Speak At Interracial Meeting

Father Charles Hall, a Negro native of Rochester who is a parish priest in Louisiana, will speak at tonight's meeting of the Catholic Interracial Council at St. Michael's parish hall, Rochester, at 8 p.m.

Douglas Hoffman, a seminarian who is scheduled to begin his theological studies for the priesthood in Rome this autumn, will also speak, describing a week he spent at Friendship House, an interracial center in Chicago.

Mrs. Alma K. Greene, Council president, said the Council program for the coming months will be outlined. All Council meetings are open to the public, she said.

New Look At Church's Role In Education

BY GARY McEON

It is not only in the United States that the great debate on the future of education under Catholic auspices is taking place. In many parts of the world, Catholics are asking if it is necessary and proper to continue today to give general education as activities as had been customary in recent high a priority among Catholic institutional activities.

The issue was keenly debated, for example, at a recent national meeting of the association of Catholic colleges of Columbia. The meeting agreed that a program to streamline Catholic educational activities in the country, with a view to their gradual reduction, should be prepared for submission to a later meeting.

The practical reason advanced for this re-evaluation is substantially the same as that which underlay the decision of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati to suppress the five lowest grades in its schools and transfer the children to the public schools. It is that education is threatening to absorb

too high a proportion of the resources available for the apostolate.

Allied to this is the fear, more valid in Colombia than in the United States, that the Catholic schools tend to become the preserve of the children of the well-to-do, thus constituting a scandal and a stumbling block rather than a pastoral aid.

Even more noteworthy was a theoretical argument put forward in a Bogota Catholic newspaper in the eve of the meeting and taken up by various speakers. In a striking departure from the traditional Catholic position, it was argued that society today is more conscious of its obligation to educate all its members, that it is more adequately equipped through the facilities provided by the state to give them a human formation, and that consequently the Church is free to withdraw progressively from this area of service and concentrate on its primary mission of preaching the gospel.

In many of the newly independent states of Africa the same debate is going on in very different context. Education has de-

veloped only very recently, mostly during the present century, in that part of the world. The first schools of Africans were built and staffed by missionaries from Europe, with the Catholics generally playing a preponderant part.

Gradually a system of subsidization by the colonial governments was developed to encourage the expansion of education. The schools continued to be built, owned, staffed and administered by the mission authorities, but the major part of their revenue came from government grants.

For a variety of reasons the new independent governments are reluctant to continue this system. Some of them feel that the mentality of the missionaries reflected too closely that of the colonial powers, leading to exalt European cultural values and attitudes to the neglect of those of Africa.

Such an allegation is far from universally founded, but it contains enough truth in certain cases to make it embarrassing. Besides, many point out that in practice the mission schools have served primarily

the children of Christians and catechumens. In an area in which only a small percentage of the children can get education, this constitutes a discriminatory application of state funds.

The Catholic authorities have shown an admirable readiness to meet their critics more than half way. In Tanganyika, for example, they recently stated that the Church recognizes that education is a social service and that accordingly its schools are equally open to all without religious test. They added that the Church would open further schools in any district in which schools guaranteeing freedom of conscience already exist.

Both in Tanganyika and elsewhere the bishops realize that education is going to become more and more a state function.

They believe the cause of religion will best be served by accepting the inevitable gracefully, cooperating in the transfer, and developing new social activities calculated to benefit the entire community and to further the national objectives as established by the people through their own representative institutions.