

Today

Today 12,000 people will die of starvation.

"Lord, when did we see thee hungry, and feed thee; or thirsty, and give thee drink? . . . Amen I say to you. As long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me." (Math. 25:34)

A Ruffled Potomac

No Catholic could possibly enjoy the daily news-dosage of the Washington controversy between Cardinal O'Boyle and a small group of his priests. It troubles us all to be involved in family quarrel. But it's even more embarrassing and scandalous when outsiders note our disagreements and subsequent disunity. Last week the CHRISTIAN CENTURY, no gentle observer of things Catholic, said editorially: "For four and a half centuries most Protestants considered it a tragedy that they did not see the breakdown of Roman Catholic authority. During the past couple of months many of them are beginning to experience the opposite tragedy: they are getting to see the breakdown of that authority. Not all of them are sure that they like what they see."

The central issue in the Washington controversy is authority: whether or not the Cardinal is going to regulate the priestly functions of the clergy in the archdiocese where he is the responsible leader of the family of God. The question of the 44 priests' personal opinion about the morality of contraception and about the binding force of the papal encyclical is seriously involved, and so too is the perplexing freedom of the individual conscience of each priest to judge and to act as he believes is right before God.

But the nub of the Cardinal's position is that a diocesan priest is the extension of the Bishop's pastoral arm and that each priest engages in the pastoral works of worship, teaching, sacraments and counseling in virtue of the direct authorization of the Bishop and only within the boundaries that he allows them. The Cardinal has asked his men: "Are you willing to commit yourselves to the priestly ministry as it must be carried out in this archdiocese, according to the teaching of the Church, or do you insist on removing yourselves from the ministry?"

Cardinal O'Boyle has stated firmly and constantly to his priests: "The Encyclical gives us the clear, unequivocal teaching of the Holy Father, speaking to us in virtue of his commission from Christ . . . and I have no authority to empower you to teach or preach or counsel anything else." The suspensions from the use of certain priestly powers, is in line with the principle that the practice, if not the thinking, of each priest under a Bishop's jurisdiction must agree with the Church's doctrine or the doctrine is existentially denied. So preaching, hearing confessions and counseling must conform to the diocesan (the Cardinal's) concepts of the doctrine or the individual priest must relinquish his work. The dissenting priests say that they and all Catholics may dismiss non-infallible teachings of the Church "when sufficient reasons for so doing exist." For the Cardinal, "orthodoxy of doctrine" can never be contradicted: if it is disagreed with in principle that man may not continue the daily practical ministry.

Many questions trouble all of us who watch this conflict with growing apprehension. What new kind of "due process" must quickly be developed which will protect the right and obligation of a Bishop to protect the faithful from error, and still guard the rights of the individual priest to follow his informed conscience? If there be a clearly felt duty to discipline the dissenters, can the holding action be maintained if the revolt grows broader?

— R. T.

Pressing the Grapes

A growing nation-wide boycott of California table grapes arrived in several communities of the diocese this week. But the reason for refusing to buy the fruit and the scope of the desired pressure on the vineyards seems badly misunderstood.

A strike of fruit-pickers in the area of Delano, California, led by Cesar Chavez, national director of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, has for nearly three years been aimed at table-grape vineyard owners because they oppose the efforts of their workers to unionize, refuse to talk with the UFW for bargaining purposes and continue to hire workers from Mexico, thus drawing on an unlimited supply of illegal strike breakers. Because the growers are not required by the National Labor Relations Act to recognize a farm workers' union, the Federal government and the California Department of Employment have not certified the existence of the workers-strike nor accepted the grape-pickers' complaints that imported aliens should not be allowed to take their jobs in the fields. Violence on the picket lines has prompted the UFW to drop their picketing and pledge non-violence. It seems that the strike certainly cannot be won in the fields until the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act are extended to all farm workers. So other pressures have been sought to force the growers to respect the rights of their striking fieldhands.

The Catholic Bishops of California on June 6 signed this resolution: "We cannot in good conscience allow another year to pass without effecting social justice to the farm workers." Since then all the major Catholic, Protestant and Jewish social action organizations in the country have stated their complete agreement that the grape-pickers' demand for recognition is a clear case of social justice.

Religious leaders and the mayors of several cities outside of California have taken public stands that nationwide non-purchase of California grapes is the only practical way of convincing the vineyard owners that they should negotiate with their workers. But this consumer pressure, openly requested by travelling agents of the United Farm Workers, is not supposed to include protest against management of the store where grapes are sold nor a boycott of other merchandise. The grocer or supermarket owner will cut back his orders of California grapes when they can't be sold; no pressure is asked on him to keep all grapes out of his store. Only the pocketbook of the growers is under attack for it is believed that growers' opposition to the workers will continue until the former national grape-market has been closed by customers concerned with social justice. Delano and the Coachella Valley may be far away, but the grapes which do not move from the neighborhood grocery to the American table will shout out a message out to the coastal vineyards.

Father Haring Defends Encyclical Critics

New York—German moral theologian Father Bernard Haring, C.S.S.R., has entered a vigorous defense of Catholic critics of Pope Paul's encyclical Humanae Vitae, saying it is time "for all men in the Church" to speak out against the "reactionary forces" he blames for its issuance.

Father Haring, who was a member of the Pope's Birth Control commission, said the "real issue" involved is "an outmoded understanding of curial power . . . the issue of non-collegial exercise of the teaching office, and the inadequately explored issues of how the Pope teaches."

"What is more important at this time is that the authority of the Church not be destroyed," Father Haring wrote in an article, "The Encyclical Crisis," published in the Sept. 6 issue of Commonweal.

"What must be destroyed is everything which is an obstacle to the reunion of Christians and spiritual leadership. When this situation has arrived, the Church as a whole and especially the Holy Father must find ways out of this impasse. More than that, they must come to a style of authority that can restore creatively, inspire confidence and belief.

"The general direction must be toward collegiality and internationalism. But in this question collegiality must also be a sharing in the whole experience of the laity, especially of married couples and married counselors."

Instead, Father Haring wrote, the reactionary curial group that opposed Pope John XXIII "at the moment is triumphant, a group which, despite the era of internationalization in which we live, was powerfully strengthened at the last consistory by the appointment of 12 Italian cardinals."

"What is needed is an enlightened understanding of the spiritual office of the successor of St. Peter . . ." Father Haring wrote.

"What is needed is the liberation for this ecumenical era of the papacy in the direction in which Pope Paul VI himself has already made such giant strides . . ."

"What is needed now is for all men in the Church to speak out unequivocally and openly against these reactionary forces. This alone can prevent the Pope in the opposite direction back to that worldly narrowness exemplified in the Syllabus (Syllabus of Errors by Pope Pius IX) and the Church prohibition of Italians from voting in their own country which lasted from 1870 to 1929."

Father Haring said it is "no insult to the Holy Spirit" to express doubts about the encyclical because: "If the Holy Spirit gives a very special grace in the composition and promulgation of this document, then one may legitimately expect that this grace will manifest itself in the way the question is handled. That means is the

solid presentation of proofs from human experience and with good arguments"

Father Haring said Humanae Vitae differs from the encyclical Casti Connubii of Pope Pius XI by making no attempt to base the teaching on the Scriptural account of the sin of Onan.

"So the only argument which remains is the fact that the Church has always taught this doctrine . . . The tradition is not so unequivocal as many think," he wrote.

Father Haring provided a four-point answer to the question: "Does the Encyclical bind all Catholics in conscience?" He wrote:

• "Those who can accept the encyclical with an honest conscience must do so, with all the consequences;

• "Those who doubt whether they can must study it thoroughly and also make use of further information in order to form a clear conscience;

• "Those who, with an honest conscience, cannot accept the teaching and requirements of Humanae Vitae, must follow their honest conscience. When married couples, then, for good reasons and with a good conscience use methods of birth regulation which in their minds are most suitable—abortion is obviously excluded—they need not mention it in confession;

• "Priests must instruct the faithful clearly about the Pope's teaching.



FATHER HARING

However, I do not see how they can be denied the right to speak out their own opinion with equal honesty."

Marriage Courts in Need of New Spirit

By MSGR. GERARD KRIGG  
Rochester Marriage Tribunal

It is not often that the thoughts of a canon lawyer make front page news. An exception to the general practice was occasioned by the thoughts of Monsignor Stephen J. Kelleher, the Presiding Judge of the Tribunal of the Archdiocese of New York, as he expressed them in the September 14th issue of America magazine.

As presiding judge of an ecclesiastical tribunal it is one of the tasks of Monsignor Kelleher to pass judgment on the validity of marriages, determining when a person is free to enter a second marriage in the Church.

This is no easy task in this day of changing values when men and women find it increasingly difficult to give themselves to each other in marriage that only death can dissolve.

Like all Tribunal judges, Monsignor Kelleher finds himself faced with his task in a world that tends to give more attention to the means of getting out of a marriage than it does to the far more important task of entering marriage with intelligence, great love and faith.

It is not surprising to discover then, that tribunals across this country (including the diocesan court of Rochester) are approached by a great number of people who seek their freedom from one marriage to be able to enter another.

The secular press recently reported that a priest-judge of a church matrimonial court had made the startling proposal that any person in an unhappy marriage should decide in his own conscience whether he could leave that intolerable partner and enter a second marriage without sin.

This veteran of 25 years in marriage-cases for the Archdiocese of New York said that the Church matrimonial Court should be abolished and that a marriage commission should help an unhappy couple decide for themselves whether they were free to break up and remarry.

The proposal was pure speculation and it drew immediate rejection by the Archbishop of New York. THE COURIER-JOURNAL asked the Presiding Judge of the Tribunal of the Diocese of Rochester to comment on the suggestion and its implications for persons wanting to escape from a marriage bond.

Neither is it surprising to learn that the Church's laws governing the hearing of these cases are complex and demanding in an effort to protect something seen by the Church as sacred and, in the case of baptized persons, sacramental.

The profound desire of every priest engaged in Tribunal work is for a greater regard for marriage by the large number of people entering that state with seemingly so little concern for its worth. Most sincerely do these same priests hope for a simplification in procedure so that each case brought before them can be decided quickly, efficiently and with the greatest charity for all the parties concerned. This hope and desire is shared by Monsignor Kelleher, who sees the need for reform in the laws of the Church regarding the establishment of one's freedom to enter a second marriage.

His solution, however, is one of basic reform when he calls for the abolition of the form of tribunals as we know them and the substitution of a matrimonial commission which would assist the parties in determining whether or not the marriage they are attacking was a true and valid union.

Monsignor Kelleher puts a great emphasis on the individual's own judgment concerning the validity of his marriage—a judgment which unfortunately presupposes a degree of disinterestedness that few people can have in matters that frequently involve no little emotion. In marriage too, there are always two sides of the picture—often representing views whose similarity is purely coincidental.

Objectively in making this judgment regarding validity will be main-

tained by the commission Monsignor Kelleher says should be made up of laymen, as well as clergy, experts in theology and psychology, before whom couples would be obliged to appear.

The recommendations of Monsignor Kelleher came from many years of experience in Tribunal work and from no little anguish that tribunals cannot easily keep up with the demands placed upon them in these days of change.

Whether or not his recommendations take eventually the form of law that will give the Church and Christians themselves a better instrument to judge the validity of marriages, is something only time will tell. His call for improvement in this sensitive area of the Church's concern is heartily approved by priest or layman in church tribunals, although many would call his indictment of the present system of tribunals not a little harsh.

If we read of the call for drastic reform in the Church's means of establishing the validity of marriages, it is important to see in this same call a plea for a greater concern of all of us. Marriage as a reality is too often taken for granted.

Tribunals in whatever form they will be found in future generations can only help to form our conscience in our approach to marriage; to see it as a reality having its origin not in the simple desire of a human being to have a compatible mate but in the creative act of Almighty God.

Letters to the Editor

Editor: I would like to challenge a recent statement by Father Daniel B. Ryan, as superintendent of schools in the Rochester Diocese, (Courier-Journal, 8/23/68) that parents throughout the diocese approve of sex education in the Catholic school system by a 10 to 1 ratio.

My daughter took the course last year and I do not remember such a survey of parents. I was not aware to what extent my rights as a parent were going to be confiscated. I also believe many parents are unaware of the de-emphasis on morality in this course.

Parents are naturally confused by the many scientific terms which are used and believe that this knowledge is essential to the moral growth of their child. I say it is a camouflage in doing it. Many parents seem to be unaware or forget that sex education is a grace given only to parents by God and not transferable to educators who would have all children learn the same thing at the same time. By these frank and brutal discussions they are trying to strip away the sacredness and mystery of sex, statement from the school office: "If

I will not be placated with the they're not ready for this information, it will go over their heads". How do they know this if they are still experimenting? After the damage is done it cannot be undone. I want to be responsible for my own rights as a parent and I want to keep these rights.

I would like to hear a priest respond to defend these rights which the school, office wants to take away from us.

—Mrs. Mary Kelly  
7 Harwood Lane, East Rochester

Editor: Mayor Daley chose to bludgeon bodies, Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle chose to bludgeon minds. They are both losers in their "cause-militant" crusades to enforce respect for positions or personal authority. This is what Father Torrey's editorials "Leaders at Bay" and "Excessive Authority" are all about. This is the central issue. It is not about whether Chicago cops "are the kind of men we need for the priesthood", or the one-upmanship statement that someone requires a night time ride in a police prowl car as handed down from the corner of the Commentary Page by Father Paul Cuddy (9/20/68).

The folly of men in high places who attempt making all disputes un-arguable is on display in the "walk-out" of Catholic men and women during Cardinal O'Boyle's sermon.

leaving a nation and the Church in shambles.  
—Leslie Delmege,  
Lehigh Avenue, Rochester

Editor: While reading Father Robert McNamara's excellent article on the Bishops of the Diocese, a thought which has been in my mind for some time prompted this letter:

Although he lives in the grateful memory of all who knew him, there is nowhere in this Diocese any tangible memorial to the late Bishop John Francis O'Hern (1928-33). Soon we shall be gone and future generations will have no reminder of the man who as priest and bishop served so well here.

—Rosemary W. White,  
161 Child Ave., Rochester

Word for Sunday

Angels... Take Them Seriously

By Father Albert Shamon

Sunday is the feast of St. Michael the Archangel. As my thoughts drifted to the angels, the many legends about St. Michael came to mind: the one that put his statue above Castel San Angelo, the one that caused Mont-St-Michel, the paragon of medieval architecture, to be flung up. I thought of St. Michael, the soldiers' saint, calling Joan of Arc to arms for France. And then I saw an article in The Catechist titled "The Trouble with Angels." When I read it, I got the impression that the author, Father Grisipino, felt the trouble with angels was that people took them too seriously. He almost seemed to want to reduce angels to nothing more than symbols of God's providence.

Father Grisipino wrote: "Angels are a problem in the same way that Santa Claus is a problem. Santa is delightful, an amusing figure who characterizes the spirit of joy and generosity during the Christmas season. But given too much emphasis, allowed to be too strong an image, he can obscure and distract from the real source of Christmas joy: Christ Himself. In much the same manner, angels can be stressed to excess, obscuring the reality they are meant to communicate: God's love and care in dealing with His children."

But is excessive stress on angels the trouble today? Rather is not the very opposite true? The one criticism I leveled at the first-grade text of

Com-to-the-Father was that it said nothing about angels. The trouble with angels seems rather to be a too hush-hush attitude toward them; as if in this age of sophistication they ought to be relegated to the realm of Santa Claus or fairy godmothers or witches—the fantasies of childhood.

Yet Christ took angels seriously. He said angels (guarding little children, that is, all Christians) are standing before God's throne as advocates and defenders (Mt. 18:10). In His agony "an angel from heaven" strengthened Him (Lk. 22:43).

The Church, too, takes angels seriously. A good third of the baptismal

ceremony is devoted to exorcisms. In the Mass angels are present in the Confiteor, the Gloria, and the Sanctus.

We should take angels seriously. Never should we think of them as mere ciphers for God's providence or that the Devil and his angels are only personifications for all the evil persons, actions, and movements in the world. The angels are pure spirits and personal beings. They do intervene in the life of men: good angels, to help men; and bad angels, to harm them. We shall live with them for all eternity. Can we afford to neglect them—especially St. Michael who battled victoriously the dragon, Satan (Apoc. 12:7)?



Expe

By PINCER LEAVEY

A school which originated renovated stable and for had been the diocese's ministry, was given a new title new future on June 2, 1967. drew's Seminary became Kiparatory for boys and girls a religious vocation education.

Deliberately deciding not to emphasize the vocation to the hood, in high school year Prep on Buffalo Road was by Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, er, to be the first school of in the United States when men and women will unite one another solve their personal commitment to God a kind."

It was to be a bold experiment "school for the spiritually of Bishop Sheen, requiring faculty teachers "to train the next generation either in a relationship to God in the religious life, or the horizon to humanity."

Shortly after his arrival in case in December, 1966, Bishop began an intensive review then, St. Andrew's Seminary jority of priests of the diocese advised him to close the school.

Established by Bishop B. McQuaid at the old St. Cathedral in 1870, to provide training of young men who ed to the priesthood, St. operated exclusively to provide for St. Bernard's, coming its academic program disciplines expected of candid Holy Orders.

St. Andrew's then fitted first of the 4-4 program of education leading to ordin. Andrew's offered 4 years school, Becket Hall the coll and St. Bernard's Seminary ing the last four years of th

After 5 months the bishop nated his research with a d establish in its stead a co-e college preparatory school, to stress specialized training

Seminar On Race

A seven-week dialog series for Sunday evenings starting will offer fresh insights many observers judge the greatest internal problem—

Questioned by the Catholic racial Council (CRC), the be "keyed" to short films, discussion led by a know leader. The seminar will John the Evangelist Church Humboldt Street.

A special feature, according president Paul Brayer, will sis on indicating avenues ment.

"We hope to provide no latest information on the ture, but acquaint partici groups and programs which a good job in this area."

PAT

Do you have questions bug you? The famous PAT ANSWERS! . . . write in your concerns . . . Address: PAT ANSWERS will not necess— or of the Diocese.

Q. The only church coun see cited in my reading, two Vatican Councils, is th of Trent. When was that, it so often referred to? —N. M.,

A. The 19th ecumenical the Church began in the Trent, in the Tyrol section ern Italy, in December, 18 pontificate of Pope Paul II 18 years later, in Decem after 25 sessions. Its main to define Catholic doctrine the heresies of the Protesta began around 1517) and about reform within the checking the abuses widele ed within the structure ar sons of the Church. Dec passed concerning the original sin, grace, the the seven sacraments and Reforms concerned the bis ditions, clergy morals and education. It is referred most productive council until Vatican II of the 196

Q. We have been invited a nuptial Mass and recee casual acquaintance of my We can't make the recepti planning to be at the Mas hand says that the Nuptia on and should not be app Mass they invite you to them.

A. Have you checked, Vanderbilt? It seems that gift" is required accordi degree of friendship or one has with the couple, whether you attend the vice and/or the party after tainly sending a gift in ter the couple back is p (tion and should not be app Mass they invite you to them.

Q. On Sept. 8 the Mass litur the feast of the Nativi Blessed Virgin". How ma

COURIER-JOURNAL  
BISHOP FULTON J. SHEEN  
President  
MSGR. JOHN S. RANDALL  
Managing Editor  
CARMEN J. VIGLUCCI  
Associate Editor  
REV. RICHARD TORRMEY  
Editor  
ANTHONY J. COSTELLO  
Advertising Director  
MAIN OFFICE . . . . . 35 Sco St. — 454-750 — Rochester, N. Y. 14609  
ELMIRA OFFICE 317 Robinson Bldg., Lake St. — RE 2-548 or RE 2-343  
AUBURN OFFICE 114 E. Genesee St. — 252-1446