

May 6
In History

1920

Plans were made for the construction of a great Catholic University in Chicago. The cost was estimated to run between \$3-5 million. It was also announced that more than 1000 churches in Belgium needed reconstruction as a result of the German drive through that country. A bill entitled "The Slaccer Amendment" was killed in the NYS Senate. The bill would have forced all children to attend "State Schools". Maude R. Cavanaugh, dean of the Catholic Service School of America, addressed the Rochester Catholic Women's Club.

1945

Germany surrendered unconditionally. The Pope offered prayers for world peace and President Truman and Bishop Kearney dedicated May 13 as a day of prayer for peace. Richard Grace, of Elmira, and Jean Innocenzi, of Rochester, won the Bishop's Oratorical Contest, staged at Aquinas. Father Richard Tormey, assistant at St. Mary's Church, Auburn, addressed the Catholic Action League on the need for Catholics to be "interested, informed and articulate on the philosophy of peace."

1960

St. Charles Borromeo, Elmira, and St. Ambrose, Rochester, opened their doors to worshippers this week. Trujillo was reported "knifing the Church" through the Cuban news media. Ann Conley of Geneva won the Bishop's Oratoricals; and Johnny Umitas, of the Baltimore Colts was slated for St. Mary's, Canandaigua, Sports Dinner.

The Church: 1970

How to Win An Election

By Fr. Andrew M. Greeley



I know how to get elected to public office. Unlike a number of other Catholic clergymen who I think are very unadvisedly trying to seek public office, I don't plan to throw my hat in the ring. It's bad enough to be a priest and a professor without swinging at the third curve ball and becoming a politician.

But I'm willing to offer quite freely to any interested politician the secret of success in American political life right now.

You hear, Mr. Candidate, much about the "white-black backlash" or the "Southern" strategy or the "silent majority," or the "ethnic racist" vote. All these labels describe a very real phenomenon but, like so much of the other liberal rhetoric that's being tossed about today, the labels fail to describe the phenomenon. What we are witnessing in American politics is not something new and it is certainly not fascist (save the mad fascism of the left); it's real name is populism. It's theme is "throw the rascals out" and all you have to do, Mr. Candidate, is find the appropriate set of rascals and you've got yourself a sure-fire campaign.

The secret of the vice president's current popularity is essentially his populist strain: There are powerful people in high places who control things with a complete disregard for the feelings of the rest of the population. The real horror of what the left, new and old, feels for Mr. Agnew is based, I suspect, on the fact that he accuses them of being part of the very "establishment" which they so much enjoy denouncing.

I hold no brief either for the vice president's message or for his tactics, but when he implies that the rich, young radicals are in fact part of the establishment he strikes a responsive cord in the American personality. A Harvard graduate is, after all, a Harvard graduate, no matter how he wears his hair, what kind of clothes he affects, what kind of drugs he ingests into his bloodstream, what kind of slogans he shouts.

The American public perceives, however dimly, that things are not running right. The large corporate structures, government education business — yes, and even the Church — are bogging down in incompetence and inertia, and those who are supposed to be managing those structures have not only lost control of them but do not even understand the problems. Why, for example, was nobody aware of the possibility of a postal strike before it happened. Someone, the peo-

ple argued, was not minding the store.

In other words, there is a strong suspicion that the leadership elites in the country have grown fat and lazy and need to be replaced by a new and more vigorous set of leaders.

The educational bureaucracy has collapsed almost completely and has failed to educate not merely black young people but all young people. The law enforcement bureaucracy cannot police the streets or the parks of the city or, for that matter, even itself.

The governmental bureaucracy is in the hands of the kind of clerks who spend their hours dreaming up such monstrosities as the new tax form 1040.

So, Mr. Candidate, run against the bureaucracies. If you're an irresponsible demagogue pledge that you are going to solve the bureaucratic problems, that you're going to cut down the number of freeloaders and eliminate most bureaucratic regulations. Assert that bureaucracies are mostly unnecessary and that during your term of office you will eliminate all but a few of them.

If you're a responsible candidate tell the public that we're paying the penalty now for the bureaucratic drift of the past, for the refusal to face difficult social and environmental problems when they were small and manageable.

Tell the public that a way has to be found to personalize and humanize the large corporate structures that make up our society. Inform them that nobody is quite sure how this is to be done but that it must be done, that you propose to make a start. Tell them that bureaucrats are not really rascals but human beings caught in an organizational system which denies that man is any more than a clerk.

Tell them, if you're a responsible candidate, that if you're elected, you're going to pour major amounts of intellectual and financial resources into coping with the problems of obsolescent bureaucracy and humanizing a society which must have bureaucracy to survive but which will strangle itself if it cannot transfuse the new blood of responsibility, accountability and human freedom into its bureaucratic structure.

You might not want to use quite that language, however, because then someone might suspect that you're intellectual — or even a Harvard graduate.



"YOU dated GIRLS?"

On The Right Side

Censorship and Editing

By Father Paul J. Cuddy



Who reads your column?

Three kinds of people read it, and a fourth flee it. They are: 1) the enthusiastic who agree; 2) the group who usually agree, but sometimes do not; 3) the hostile who read it with irritated pre-judgmentalism. These are more open-minded than a fourth group, namely their cousins who will not read it at all. They enjoy a concretized mentality which is so common among those who blether about open-mindedness. They're a deadly serious lot who rarely see the humor in their own contradictions.

I was tickled by a remark of an OTRS fan who said: "I work at Kodak and read your article enroute to work. One of the riders in our pool hates your column and said: 'I wouldn't read him if he was the last piece of print in the country!'" Highly-strung people frequently identify ideas with persons.

Your OTRS titles are often dull.

Amen! And the title is important. It frequently gives the key to the idea projected. For example, the April 15, 1970 article was entitled by me: "Tears for Ann Landers." Now that title indicated admiration for a wise, witty woman; and sorrow that she twisted wisdom in her abortion opinion. Do you know how they (I never know who "they" are; but I mean the people at the CJ who edit manuscripts) mutilated that title? To a flaccid: "Ann Landers Lets Us Down." No wonder men take to drink!

Does the C-J edit you very much?

A little. But that's usually by reason of lack of space. It's a pity, because sometimes what is edited, i.e., omitted, is the main reason for the article. For example, the April 22, 1970 article was a skit which foretold the developing encroachment of government powers. It predicted the logical extension of the government abortion law, to permit the death of the unborn child at the mother's request, to the destroying of the born child at the mother's request. If a reader wasn't familiar with George Orwell's book, entitled: "1984", he missed the point of the OTRS article which was entitled: "1980".

The special purpose of the article was to familiarize readers with three important manuscripts, with the hope some would read them. It was shortened because of lack of space. This is what should have concluded the skit:

"If this seems far-fetched, do read 'The Lord of the World,' by Robert Hugh Benson, a prophetic book written in 1906; 'Nineteen Eighty-Four,' by George Orwell, a prophetic book written in 1949; and the prophetic 'Abortion Legislation of the State of New York,' written in April 1970... And please write to your legislators who are elected to safeguard life, liberty and property, expressing your wonderment at the legislation."

The Morriss Plan

How About 'Heaven Day'?

By Frank Morriss



We have Earth Day. What we really need, of course, is Heaven Day. Tidying up one's conscience and saving one's soul is far more important than tidying up and saving one's planet; but it is also more demanding, even, I might say, embarrassing, and that is why not even today's gentlemen of the cloth are likely to suggest a Heaven Day.

I know my regular critics are immediately going to insist that in true Medieval fashion Morriss is being contemptuous of the material realities and exigencies. If I may be so unkind as to attempt to forestall such criticism, may I point out that some years ago my little book, "The Forgotten Revelation," met with overwhelming unresponse. Like the revelation of nature which it discussed, the book was forgotten from almost the moment it appeared in print, published only, apparently, thanks to an editorial lapse by the too charitable friars of the Franciscan Herald-Press, Chicago.

There is a very legitimate concern we should have for our material welfare. It would be utterly sinful for a man to exert no effort to sustain himself.

But essentially and ultimately, a concern for material well-being without the proper why and wherefore of such concern being linked to the spiritual becomes nothing but hedonism. It is after such a materialistic well-

being that the Gentiles seek. If there is any lesson at all in the parable of the lilies of the field and the birds of the air, it is that Man must turn his eyes first to heaven before his efforts in his own behalf can be blessed.

Heaven Day, to the contrary, would be a concern for welcoming from the womb the huddled masses of future generations. Earth Day for the vast majority was an attempt to establish a quota system — and a most miserly one — from these immigrants whom God has destined to be the visitors upon the shores of our once hospitable planet. Heaven Day would insist that such a quota system be scrapped as an insult to the Creator and His Providence.

Having suggested such a day, I have some obligation to suggest an agenda for it. I do so full well realizing that my suggestions will seem hopelessly simplistic to the new sophists, who are not so much concerned about how many angels may stand on a pin, as how many disobediences to God and the Church can be balanced on the point of conscience.

One highlight would be a bestowal of a Heaven Day award upon the Methodist governor of Alaska, who not only showed himself appreciative of the priority of life, but had the courage to defend and assert that priority against the advocates of turning this planet into a

refuse heap for the unwanted.

Such an award might encourage others of fainter heart to insist that unborn children are not going to become simple litter to be hygienically disposed of — that while people in fact may pollute their environment, people themselves can never properly be considered pollutants.

Heaven Day would be one on which there could be lectures on the historical filth and degeneracy of ancient paganism compared to the filth and degeneracy of modern paganism. This filth and degeneracy defiles our art and entertainment, dirties our understanding of physical love, brutalizes, in the exact sense of that term, our once religious understanding of the sacredness of our own bodies.

It would be a day for a return to innocence; an insistence that wisdom is not related in any sense to sophistication, or knowledge in any sense to mere sense data.

In a word, on Heaven Day we would proclaim that without God there cannot be cleanliness of heart, mind or soul. It would be the day we would come to realize that purity is not the same as sterility. Heaven Day takes a great deal more courage than Earth Day — but then the rewards of Heaven Day are eternal, whereas those of Earth Day must certainly pass away.