

THE PROGRESS OF PEOPLES

Foreign Aid Opposition Baseless

By Barbara Ward

Today, the developed nations—democratic and Communist together—spend \$150 billion of public money each year upon the potentially destructive and infinitely wasteful piling up of armaments. On the works of development and construction, the annual figure is about \$6 billion for the Atlantic nations with perhaps a billion to two billion dollars more from the Soviet bloc.

This contrast between the sums nations will spend upon so-called "security" with all its risk of total destruction and what they invest in lessening that risk is so unbalanced and paradoxical that Pope Paul makes it a central theme of Populorum Progressio.

He urges us to take a fresh look at the policies and expenditures which really bring with them the hope of peace. These are not negative and sterile instruments of defense. On the contrary, "development is the new name for peace" and he urges us to cut back on our unproductive armaments and devote the funds thus saved to world investment in food and health and schools and literacy.

Now, it is true that a nation that is growing and prospering and spreading its benefits to all its people does not have to be peaceful. Rich aggressors are not unknown in history.

But a nation that feels trapped, desperate and bankrupt is usually much readier for aggressive adventures. Hitler, the great aggressor of the 20th century, came to power only after millions of Germans had been made bankrupt first by inflation and then by the Great Depression of 1929.

Since the last war, nine tenths of all the conflicts have been in the still poverty-stricken lands. So the Pope's plea for investment in development and construction is based not only on Christian justice and compassion but also on terms of keeping the peace.

Yet if anyone proposed \$150 billion a year in public programs of development—with \$30 billion supplied by America—many citizens in the Atlantic world, who accept defense "needs," however expensive, almost without question, would be in all probability outraged at the idea. They would suddenly feel the "tax bite." They would insist that the market and the normal processes of private initiative and enterprise could satisfy economic and social needs on such a scale. They would argue that such a program dangerously increased the scope of government action. In short, they would judge it not only visionary but subversive.

Apart from education and road building, many American citizens feel the same about domestic issues. One of the most startling examples of this bias occurred in 1940. Throughout the 1930s, in the wake of the 1929 Depression, America, like Europe, suffered from alarming unemployment. Some governmental "pump priming" was undertaken—a few millions here for WPA, a few millions there. But recovery did not follow.

If anyone had said in 1939: "There is nothing wrong with this economy that \$24 billion of government orders will not cure," he would have been looked up either as a lunatic or a subversive. Yet the arms program for 1941-42 was \$24 billion, with more to

follow. Between 1940 and 1944, war needs took up the whole unemployed slack in the U.S. industrial economy and doubled its size. Growth has continued with few interruptions ever since.

This is a reminder that Western democracies accept large-scale governmental actions for defense—sometimes with remarkable economic consequences. But they shrink away from other public programs as though the consequences would inevitably be dangerous. Yet is this not completely unproven? Take the three supposed risks—heavy taxation, undermining private enterprise and interfering with the market. None would be increased by vigorous international programs of economic development.

The poorer lands could not, before the mid-Seventies, absorb more than, say \$15 billion to \$20 billion a year. Such a sum could either be saved by disarmament or absorbed in the rise of national income.

Private enterprise could cooperate with public development programs as it does, on a huge scale, with the public arms program. Nobody says defense makes industry weaker.

As for lessening the scope of the market, the market does not work well among two thirds of the world's peoples because they are too poor to enter it. Investment in schools, roads, power, communications and the preliminaries of modernization will bring them, for the first time, fully into the market.

No, the prejudice against large development programs is not pragmatic but ideological.



ON THE RIGHT SIDE

'Keep Your Eye on Philip'

By Father Paul J. Cuddy

Recently a school teacher who is active in our Hornell Legion of Mary said: "The Legion Hand Book says that Legionnaires should be informed Catholics. Last Sunday I took a Catholic weekly from our Church rack and it was full of anger against the Holy Father and against the Church. What are we supposed to read?"

Actually she knows her religion well. She has absorbed the much abused Catechism. The ultra-liberals seem to ignore the reality that it is largely incorporated in the Vatican II documents. She has read widely, and she is familiar with the Vatican II documents.

I think if reading people—many good people are not readers, so why should we who love reading force our own "thing" upon those who are so wonderfully good without it?—would soak up the Vatican II documents they would be well-informed, provided they would not selectively omit what they want to reject.

For example, we read much today of people forming their own consciences. Rightly understood, this is fine. The document, "THE CHURCH TODAY" says:

Conscience is the most secret core and sanctuary of a man. There he is alone with God, whose voice echoes in his depths. . . . The more that a correct conscience holds sway, the more persons and groups turn aside from blind choice and strive to be guided by objective norms of morality. . . . Conscience frequently errs from invincible ignorance without losing its dignity. The same cannot be said of a man who cares little for truth and goodness, or of a conscience which by degrees grows practically sightless as a result of habitual sin. (paragraph 16)

One spring day in 1945 I was listening to a GI under a tree in France. World War II was coming to an end. The soldier was describing to me how he settled his dubious conscience. "I wasn't getting along very well with my wife. So I prayed for about half an hour before a picture of St. Anthony. After praying I heard St. Anthony say to me: 'Go and get a divorce.' So I did."

At the time he held this past August 14, Pope Paul said:

"It is strange to see how many then by the Great Depression of 1929. Christians today have a very argumentative mind in regard to the supernatural condition of our life. On the one hand they seek to minimize the concept of sin. On the other, they attribute to themselves the guidance of the Holy Spirit, conferring on their own thought and conduct a gratuitous and often fallacious power of certainty and infallibility."

I think we cannot hold St. Anthony responsible for the GI's divorce, nor



the Holy Spirit responsible for claims which are aberrations from the rock and foundation of God's truth, the Church.

The prayer of St. Philip Neri is good especially today: "O Lord, keep your eye on Philip, lest he betray you."

Thank God our sufficiency is not from an unwarrantedly confident ego, but from the grace God gives us to preserve the Faith in our souls. (2 Cor. III-4-6)

Cincinnati Bishop Warns Of 'Attack' on Religious

Cincinnati—(NC)—Some popular Protestant theologians have provided valuable "insights into the needs of our times," yet their thought constitutes an "insidious attack" on the religious life, a convocation of nuns was told at profession ceremonies here.

Auxiliary Bishop Edward A. McCarthy called upon the sisters to live as witnesses "to the true, perennial relevance of religion." He addressed women of several communities who had come together for the profession and investiture rites.

"You must be, as Religious have always been, the witness, the sign—to enlighten and encourage all of us," the Bishop said. "You must show the way, give the example, demonstrate to a skeptical age that in serious devotion to a life of prayer, of faith, to the worship of God, to asceticism, is truly to be found the spirit and the grace in which we will also serve and redeem our world."

Bishop McCarthy called the present time "a period when there is a startling tendency to segregate God out of religion."

"In post-conciliar circles one frequently hears quotes of prominent, liberal Protestant theologians like Rudolf Bultmann, Paul Tillich, Dietrich Bonhoeffer and others. We are indebted to these men for insights into the needs of our times—for a more human, personalistic living of the faith," the Bishop said.

"Yet the danger is that even Catholic teachers and writers, in a sort of pell-mell adulation of these theologians, accept fundamental teachings of theirs about God and man's relation to Him that in no way can be reconciled with our Faith," Bishop McCarthy said.

"The attitudes of these influential thinkers who are sometimes followed naively and blindly are an insidious attack on religious life," Bishop McCarthy said.

"Prayer and meditation seem foolish (to them). The three vows no longer have the tremendous value as self-offerings to God that centuries of Christian living have given to them. Poverty is giving up things that could help others. Chastity is damaging to the personality. Everything of the world is important—and sex is the most important of all. Obedience, surrendering personal freedom, is absurd."

"One might ask," the bishop continued, "whether such influences are not already evident in a more subtle form—in neglect of direct worship of God, of meditation, of spiritual exercises; impatience with private thanksgiving after Communion; the tendency to regard Holy Mass less as a sacrifice of worship of God, and more as a meal of communion with men; the emphasis on freedom of conscience, to the neglect of the responsibility to form a right conscience."

A LAYMAN'S VIEW

Encyclical's Message Clear

By Joseph Breig

Jesuit Father Bernard Cooke and 12 other faculty members in the theology department which he heads at Marquette University, Milwaukee, issued an "open letter" to the other members of the department, expressing their type of statement concerning Pope Paul's encyclical on birth control.

I am not deriding the statement; to the contrary, I want to speak seriously about it.

The encyclical, it said, "is authoritative and must be taken seriously by Catholics."

However, "it does not preclude their forming their consciences differently."

On the other hand, the encyclical "is authentic teaching."

Still, "it does not make certain what was previously uncertain."

Yet "it cannot be disregarded."

I disagree with Father Cooke's group on two central points.

First: There is no uncertainty about the teaching that artificial means of preventing conception are in violation of God's will. The Church has taught this from the beginning, and in modern times the teaching has been renewed and reinforced by Popes Pius XI, Pius XII, John XXIII, Paul VI, and Vatican II.

Second: This is a teaching of great weight on a matter affecting human beings in their deepest depths—soul and body, mind and emotions, above all in spiritual life. It involves, too, the welfare and the future of the human race and human society. Finally, it goes to the heart of marriage as a vocation—a calling—from God; as a state of life instituted and revealed by God, and as made a sacrament by Christ, a sacrament partaking in the

mystery of the union between Christ and the Church.

It is a teaching, therefore, of the utmost importance, to imagine anything more important for the eternal welfare of human beings is difficult. How can an honest Catholic conscience be formed in opposition?

I recognize that Father Cooke and his group, and some others like them, may be motivated by a desire to ease troubled consciences. But as Pope Paul said in articles 28-29 of the encyclical, it is "an eminent form of charity toward souls to diminish in no way the saving teaching of Christ," and to "expound the Church's teaching on marriage without ambiguity."

This is a teaching which, if one strives honestly to obey it, points the way to high holiness and soaring happiness in marriage.

Let me note another, and a curious, aspect of this matter. The statements of theologians such as Father Cooke's

group turn my thoughts back to the vigorous criticisms, by many Fathers of Vatican II, of legalism, juridicalism, theological technicism, and the like.

These theologians—along with the laity who lionize them and overflow halls to hear them—were the first and the most enthusiastic in hailing Vatican II for turning away from theological hairsplitting and nitpickings ("how much of the Mass might one miss without danger of mortal sin; how much meat eaten on Friday constituted grave matter, etc.) and summoning the people to generous, open-hearted Christianity.

Yet now we see these same theologians and laymen and laywomen trying to balance on the point of a needle rather than accept the Church's teaching on marriage as a way to sainthood—a way which, like all roads to sanctity, unavoidably involves self-mastery, self-sacrifice, putting God first and self second.

Father Martelet Warns of 'Biological Manipulators'

Paris—(RNS)—The reputed author of the original draft of the Pope's encyclical banning contraception said here that if the Church were one day to give her blessing to contraception no one could prevent "biological manipulators" from achieving "abhorrent programs."

Father Gustave Martelet, S.J., in a series of three articles published in *La Croix*, Paris Catholic daily, declared that the encyclical *Of Human Life* had great merit in focusing attention on "the political morality which could result from the justification of contraception motivated by the well-being of families."

Was it right, he asked, in order to

curb dangerously spiraling birth rates in the less developed countries, to deprive their peoples of their sole wealth—that is, their children?

"Paul VI, speaking as he did about contraception," Father Martelet said, "can also begin to appear as a spiritual watch-tower of the world and as a prophetic guardian of the threatened grandeur of love."

Discussing the Pope's statement that "every matrimonial act must remain open to the transmission of life," he said that one cannot at the same time claim to integrate fecundity as an essential part of love and to demolish in this love the powers of life each time it seems opportune.



Pepsi-Cola cold beats any cola cold!

Drink Pepsi cold—the colder the better. Pepsi-Cola's taste was created for the cold. That special Pepsi taste comes alive in the cold. Drenching, quenching taste that never gives out before your thirst gives in. Pepsi pours it on!



Taste that beats the others cold... Pepsi pours it on!

Bottled by Pepsi-Cola Companies of Elmir and Rochester under appointment from PepsiCo, Inc., New York, N.Y.

A 302 PRODUCT

GET A NEW TASTE THRILL FROM YOUR OUTDOOR GRILL!

GRILL POLISH SAUSAGE

HEAT AND EAT
MAPLECREST POLISH SAUSAGE

For a new taste thrill from your outdoor grill, barbeque Maplecrest Polish Sausage. It's pre-cooked and ready in minutes. You just grill it like a hot dog. So, get a new taste thrill... put Maplecrest Polish Sausage on your outdoor grill for a change.