

THE PROGRESS OF PEOPLES

How We Can Help 'New' World

By Barbara Ward

An agricultural revolution is now possible in the developing world, thanks to new hybrid grains and new methods which multiply harvests many times and offer hope that food supplies will increase much more rapidly than the world's growth of population. Without this hope, we might face the grim certainty of famine by the end of the 1970s, of deepening malnutrition, of stunted minds and listless bodies, of children literally starving in Asia and Latin America and parts of Africa.

But it is only a hope. Grain does not harvest itself, fertilizers do not grow out of the ground, water must be conserved and piped and pumped. To achieve this revolution in agriculture, something like \$8 billion to \$7 billion more must be invested each year.

The bulk of it will, of course, be provided by developing peoples themselves—who, today, provide 80 per cent of their own investment. But in the early stages—say, for the next five years—a rather larger share would need to be available in foreign currencies since the developing continents would still lack the means to produce a lot of the needed fertilizers and machines.

We can perhaps guess that a fully financed strategy for ending the risk of famine 10 years from now might add \$3 billion to \$4 billion to the present flow of economic assistance. It would then be, say, \$10 billion instead of the \$8 billion available today.

Let us be clear at this point. At this time there is no chance of securing this increase. The United States,

which accounts for 40 per cent of the combined income of the wealthy North Atlantic states, is cutting back its assistance—which in any case is not more than 1 per cent of American Gross National Product. Other less prosperous nations are likely to follow the lead. Aid is falling in France and Germany; it is static in Britain. And the rich nations' present worries over the working of their international financial system means that almost no attention is available for the desperate needs of the poor.

But can we as Christians accept this dead end? Can we say that far from feeding "the least of these little ones," we really do not care very much if they actually starve? For this is, in essence, what we say when we do not know the facts about the needed scale of investment in world agriculture and do not ask ourselves whether the needed finance can or cannot be provided.

Then let us ask the question: could we, the post-Christian peoples of the Atlantic world, afford an extra \$4 billion a year for investment in the farms of the developing nations?

We must remember, first of all, that we are likely, short of violent economic catastrophe, to go on growing by at least 3 per cent a year. So the increase in our income each year will be not much less than \$60 billion. It is difficult to argue that we could not earmark 2 per cent of this sum to counter the coming risk of starvation.

Or look at the problem from the angle of what we spend our money

on now. The English and French-speaking citizens of the North Atlantic countries spend \$50 billion a year on alcohol and tobacco. If we were ready to pay just 10 cents more with every dollar that goes on drinks and smokes, we could secure more than the whole of the extra sum needed to ward off famine in this generation.

Or consider an expenditure we pretty well take for granted. Each year, the developed nations, including Russia, spend upward of \$150 billion on a defense which seems incidentally to leave us as vulnerable as ever. Can anyone suppose the protagonists would be less secure if, between them, they agreed to reduce this horrific sum by one-third and devoted the saving to food and fertilizer? Such a reduction at this time could, in fact, be part of wider effort to convince the non-nuclear powers that America and Russia have no desire for nuclear monopoly but a serious intent of disarmament behind their recent signing of the treaty restraining nuclear proliferation.

It is no use ignoring all these figures of available and usable resources when, as Christians and citizens, we ponder what should be done to counter the risk of famine, of a new "massacre of the innocents" 10 years from now. When we come, as individuals and nations, before the Judgment Seat and before us rises up, as a symbol of our rejection, the image of Lazarus whom we did not help, shall we cry to the Seraphim that we thought 0.4 per cent of our super-abundant wealth was "generous" enough? And will they listen?



ON THE RIGHT SIDE

Diocese Weak in Radio, TV Work

By Father Paul J. Cuddy

Dear Father Tormey, Editor,
The third part of your editorial, A SLOW BLACKOUT (June 7), was a lamentation on the indifference of the TV and radio media toward religious programs.

I must say that I gave up following the National Council of Catholic Men Sunday TV program over a year ago, after watching some of them. The pay off was an attempt to claim James Farrell as a martyr to freedom and a glory to the Church. In a court room, four beefy, effete males depicted with unbelievable impress the prosecutors (the bad men) in a court room trial of Farrell who looked like St. Sebastian without arrows, and was edifying slender (the good man).

I was driven to dismay, and wrote to the NCCM expressing my disgust; and also discontinued an annual contribution to their work which I had supposed was used to spread the Gospel of Our Lord.

Last January a priest friend watched an insipid TV program, and turned angrily toward me and barked, as if it were my fault: "It's a shame. It's a disgrace. Why, if St. Paul were alive he'd be running half the TV stations in the world, and they'd be sending the message of the Gospel to all nations!"

"Well, don't take my head off. I don't see what I can do about the Church and TV programs."

"That's the trouble. No one seems responsible. Well, yes I suppose the bishops are responsible—but they are so involved in other things that they don't seem to consider the air communications media very important."

Since the conversation, I have been thinking of our own diocese. We have the most skilled and famous clerical radio and TV personality in the world in our own Bishop Sheen. But it is one thing to be a TV artist projecting the Word of God and another thing to be an administrative technician, promoting, developing, planning Catholic radio and TV programs.

As far as I know, the sum total of our diocesan radio and TV work consists of Msgr. Cirrincione's Rosary Hour Broadcast and his noon day Angelus. The Rosary program has brought solace and piety to hundreds of people, especially to the sick and the infirm as they pray the rosary together at 7 p.m. I rarely hear it, but six months ago I was going from

Ithaca to Elmira and happened to tune in on the program. Msgr. Cirrincione gave a brief spiritual message after the rosary which moved me enough to send a note of thanks and a token check of \$10 to help continue the cause.

The noon day ANGELUS is a less happy venture. Unfortunately the tape was made with the priest leading the ANGELUS, and the response is made by a small group of shrill voiced children. It would seem better to have the response from the deep resonant voices of sturdy men, proclaiming the faith in the Incarnation of Our Lord.

Our TV efforts are even more puzzling. It must be four or five months ago that I stopped at Avon to visit the redoubtable Father Atwell. He described a series of 5 or 10 tapes he was making for WHEC, narrating Bible stories for "The Pastoral Call."

While some of Father Atwell's ideas sometimes give me the urge to picket in front of the Avon parsonage with a large green sign saying "Unfair to the R. C. Church", I admire his creativity and his enter-

prise, as well as himself. But the few programs I did see were attractively done, instructive and meticulously orthodox. Recently I stopped in on Father William Gordinier at Waterloo. He was slated to go to WHEC to make similar tapes for the same program. As far as I know these are the two Catholic projects of the diocese for TV radio.

But it would seem that in our own diocese, the Courier-Journal itself, with the backing of the Pastoral Office, and perhaps the assistance of the Priests Association and the Priests Council, should take the lead.

Imagine St. Paul with such an opportunity! And behold the lethargy of the priests and the people of God. (I suppose that priests are people of God too, but by their ordination they are very special people. God bless them forever.)

As the late Father John Crowley of St. Aloysius Church, Auburn, used to say in questionable Latin: "Surge et dic." May I respectfully translate to you: "Father Editor, rise and get moving for development of TV and radio communications in the diocese."

Heart Transplants Defended By Anglican Archbishop

London — (RNS) — Transplants of the heart and other organs from the dead are to be welcomed if they make it possible for a man who would otherwise die to have some years of relatively healthy life, according to Archbishop Donald Coggan of York.

He made the point in a special issue of The Practitioner, a leading British medical journal. "To allow a kidney or a cornea transplant but to forbid a heart transplant would seem to adopt a casual-like attitude to the advancing waxes of science," he said.

The Anglican Primate warned, however, that grave moral issues were raised by such developments and scientific knowledge must be accompanied by great care in the field of personal ethics.

By his statement Archbishop Coggan clashed with a recent assertion

by Malcolm Muggeridge, nationally prominent writer and broadcaster, who was a major critic of the ethics of heart transplantation when South African Dr. Christiaan Barnard, the first man to carry out a heart replacement, visited London in February.

Muggeridge's contention is that a person is indubitably dead, whereas a heart, he maintains, must be living when removed for transplantation.

Dr. Coggan's article was published only a few days after another leading Anglican theologian, Bishop Ian Ramsey of Durham, had called a press conference to advocate his view that a broadly-based, high-powered national body of medical experts, lawyers, and moral philosophers be set up in England to consider issues raised by heart transplants.

A LAYMAN'S VIEW

Rosary Outmoded? Think Again

By Joseph Breig

Whoever asserts that the Rosary is outmoded opens himself, in my view, to a charge of superficiality — and perhaps of laziness. If the statement is not an attempt (conscious or subconscious) to excuse spiritual sloth, it is surely an unwarranted generalization from one's own personal preference.

If you merely say (confining your judgment to your own case) that the Rosary is not the prayer for me, I can only reply, "You may be right—although it is equally likely that you do not sufficiently understand the Rosary, or that you do not care to take the trouble to pray it."

A quite different purpose, however, is indicated when somebody claims that the Rosary is out-of-date; that it does not meet the religious needs of modern man. To any such assertion I would feel compelled by the facts to answer, "You are completely wrong, because in effect you are saying that prayer and meditation are no longer relevant, or meaningful, or rewarding."

Through many centuries, countless men and women and children of all stations in life and of every mental, educational and spiritual level, have found the Rosary to be a highly effective method of worshipping, praising, thanking and petitioning God, and of entering deeply and intimately into the mystery of the redemptive life and death of his only-begotten Son.

This is as true today as it ever has been. It will always be true, because the Rosary is exquisitely suitable to almost everyone's spiritual condition, if only its infinite adaptability is realized and applied.

Do five decades (five Our Fathers, five Glorias, 50 Hail Marys) seem intemperate to you — as sometimes they do to me? Very well—start with one decade a day.

Is meditation difficult? Then begin by thinking about the words of the prayers, and their meanings, and leave the mysteries to one side for the time being. But work your way little by little into the mysteries, because they are the heart of the Rosary.

Jacques Maritain Hails Pope Paul's 'Credo'

Vatican City — (RNS) — Pope Paul VI's new "Credo of the People of God," presented at the ceremonies ending the 1967-68 "Year of Faith" was hailed in a message from French philosopher Jacques Maritain to the Pope.

Mr. Maritain said that the new Credo, which reasserts many traditional Catholic teachings that have been de-emphasized by some modern theologians, was a "grand gesture" which "will give comfort to many disturbed souls."

"Poor philosopher that I am," Mr. Maritain said, "more than ever I think Our Lord and His blessed vicar with all my soul."

Anglican Vicar Becomes Catholic

London — (RNS) — Clement A. Harvey, a former Anglican Vicar, has been received into the Roman Catholic Church. He was ordained in 1955 and served in Northern Ireland until being transferred to Corby, a noted center of ecumenical experiment in England, in 1962. He is married and has a son.

As your capacity for meditation grows, you will find yourself living side by side with the Virgin Mary amid the joys and sorrows, triumphs and setbacks, glories and miseries, agonies and ecstasies, of Jesus her son, in whom it is to be found the ultimate answer to every question about the purpose and meaning of existence.

Does life on occasion mock us with its paradoxes, its contradictions, its mad illogicalities, its senseless cruelties? Does it sometimes strike us as Shakespeare's tale told by an idiot, signifying nothing?

The key to all this mystery is Christ, who is the Paradox of Paradoxes, the Contradiction of Contradictions, because he is at once Creator and creature; all-powerful God and helpless infant; utterly unchangeable, and yet immersing himself in all our sorrows and sufferings.

He is Life Itself and yet dead on a cross; and his death and resurrection are his greatest manifestation of the glory of his holiness. In defeat is his eternal victory.

Of such things does the Rosary speak to us. Outmoded?



Traditional 'Isms' Seen Too Rigid for World

Uppsala, Sweden — (RNS) — An Indian told the World Council of Churches' Assembly here that both traditional liberalism and traditional Marxism are proving as "rigid and out of date" as traditional Christianity in grappling with the realities of the modern world.

M. M. Thomas, a layman of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church of Malabar and director of the Christian Institute for the Study of Religion and Society in Bangalore, India, said that both liberalism and Marxism were in process of revision "to discover the idea of a new humanism which can provide the framework for a just revolution."

Thomas, chairman of the 1966 Geneva Conference, said that "the pos-

sibility of a revolution for justice betraying the ends of justice from within is a very valid one."

He said that a vigorous transformation of society, "so long as it involves a vigorous transformation of power-structures enabling real and responsible participation of people in the centers of society and state where power is exercised, is the same as revolution." Otherwise, he said, "we make the strategy of violence the essence of revolution."

Although there is always the possibility of violence in revolution, "we have to reject the idea that violence is the essence of the revolution, whether it comes from the side of the establishment or of the revolution," he said.

Expert Has Reservations About Galileo 'Retrial'

Notre Dame, Ind. — (NC) — Father Ernan McMullin, head of the University of Notre Dame's department of philosophy and an expert on Galileo, has voiced reservations about the recently announced plans to "retry" the 17th Century Italian scientist, convicted of heresy for teaching that the earth revolves around the sun.

A suggestion that the Vatican may sponsor a commission to retry the Galileo case was made earlier in July by Franziskus Cardinal Koenig of Vienna in an address to a meeting of Nobel Prize winners at Lindau, Germany. The cardinal expressed hope that clearing Galileo's name would "heal one of the deepest wounds between science and religion."

In a discussion at a lecture on Galileo here, Father McMullin, who is a specialist in the philosophy of science, based his reservations on two grounds: "My main reason is that I am very doubtful as to whether the trial can be shown to have been legally a miscarriage of justice," he said.

He argued that the 1616 decree of the Vatican congregation which declared the Copernican heliocentric theory of the universe to be heretical, was clearly violated by Galileo's "Dialogue on Two Chief World Systems" so that "from the purely legal point of view, there can be little doubt that there was enough evidence to convict Galileo, even though the manner in which the trial was actual-

ly carried on left much to be desired."



Father McMullin's second argument was that reopening the Galileo case in this way would accomplish nothing significant. "Everyone knows that the 1616 decree was erroneous," he said. "Everyone knows that Galileo has been vindicated. Such a declaration would accomplish little, since it is hardly necessary to say in 1968 that the Church does not stand where it did in the time of Galileo. If someone feels a tension or even an incompatibility between religious belief and natural science today, it is not likely that a formal admission on the part of the Church of its ancient error in declaring Copernicanism contrary to Scripture would alter his attitude."

Father McMullin said his reaction was shared by many of the scholars who attended the International Galileo Congress at Notre Dame in 1964 at the time when a petition to the Second Vatican Council to exonerate Galileo had been widely publicized.

Instead of trying to rehabilitate Galileo by reopening his trial, Father McMullin favored a positive approach by which the Church would formally recognize the pioneering importance of Galileo's writings on the nature of Scriptural interpretation. He suggested that this approach might be coupled with an acknowledgment that the 1616 decree was an erroneous one which put Galileo in an untenable position.

the difference is like

DAY & NIGHT


How many times have you used the expression "The difference is like day and night"? Probably every time you described an obvious difference between two subjects. Like the difference between your old water heater and a new Day and Night gas water heater.

What's the difference? Plenty of clean, spark-

ling hot water—all you want—when you want it! And that's quite a difference!

You can buy a Day & Night gas water heater from Rochester Gas & Electric Corp. for as little as \$149.95 for a 30 gallon model. This includes delivery and normal installation. And it's guaranteed against defects for ten years.

Why not discover the difference today?



ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC
89 EAST AVENUE • 546-2700