



'Mass' Arrest.

Father Malcom Boyd, Episcopal clergyman and writer, was arrested by a Washington policeman for attempting to hold a "Peace Mass in the Pentagon Building, June 15. Seventeen were charged with making "loud and unusual noise" on federal property. News services reported the bottle contained "Cold Duck".

Keep Out of Abortions Medical Workers Told

Rockville Centre, N.Y. — (RNS) — An unprecedented series of guidelines for medical and paramedical personnel who may be affected by New York State's new abortion law was issued by the Catholic bishop here.

The 10 guidelines, authorized by Bishop Walter P. Kellenberg of Rockville Centre, reaffirm the Catholic Church conviction that direct killing of the innocent, born or unborn, is immoral and that Catholics therefore may not take part in any aspect of an act of abortion.

The recently enacted New York statute on abortion, called one of the most liberal in the U.S., goes into effect July 1.

In effect, urging Catholic hospital personnel to make known their conscientious inability to participate in such operations, the guidelines are being widely distributed among clergy and medical people in Nassau and Suffolk counties of Long Island which the diocese encompasses.

"I am confident that in accordance with the changes in the State Hospital Code," Bishop Kellenberg's letter said, "no physician, staff member, nurse or other employee who objects to abortifacient acts on moral grounds will be penalized in any manner whatsoever for non-participation in these acts."

The text of the Rockville Centre diocesan guideline follows:

"1. This law, which takes effect July 1, 1970, does not impose any obligation on anyone to perform an abortifacient act.

"2. This change in the law of the State of New York does not change the immorality of abortifacient acts. Direct killing

of the innocent, whether born or unborn, is against the law of God.

"3. The Code of Canon Law (Canon 2350) states that those who procure abortion, not excepting the mother, incur, if the effect is produced, an excommunication.

"4. No Catholic medical or paramedical personnel should participate in any capacity in an abortifacient act. Caring for a patient before or after is not regarded as participating in the abortifacient act.

"5. No Catholic medical or paramedical personnel should advise a person to seek an abortifacient procedure.

"6. In a post-abortifacient emergency situation, any morally acceptable, necessary life-saving procedure is allowed.

"7. Since medical and para-

medical personnel are not required either by the law or by the hospital code to act against their conscientious convictions, staff doctors, nurses and others who have moral objections to abortifacient acts should be excused by the hospital authorities from participating in such procedures.

"8. Medical and paramedical personnel who object to participation in abortifacient acts should, in fairness to the hospital, make this fact known to the hospital administration.

"9. No Catholic medical or paramedical personnel should participate in any capacity in the use of an aborted fetus for immoral experimentation. The usual rules for Baptism apply.

"10. If an abortifacient act is productive of a live infant, objective morality requires that every attempt must be made to maintain the infant's life."

K of C Journal Laments Priests' Political Hopes

New Haven, Conn. — (RNS) — The unprecedented emergence of priests into the U.S. political arena prompted a serious, if not scornful, reaction from a national Catholic journal here which questioned the "abandoning of the rectory" and clerical responsibilities to "seek service with Caesar."

Listing five priests who are seeking public office on high state and national levels, an editorial in *Columbia*, official magazine of the Knights of Columbus, said "some Americans may view this phenomenon as another happy 'aggiornamento' in the Church and an opportunity for priests to give fuller expression to their talents.

"However," the editorial continued, "a more far-sighted view will regard this as a precarious experiment fraught with many dangers for the priesthood and the Church."

The editorial, signed by Elmer Von Feldt, *Columbia's* editor, recounted the past general perspective of Catholic Church experience which it said "prompted (the Church) to take a dim view of priests entering political life."

The general outlook on the priesthood, the editorial added, is reinforced by declarations of Vatican II and by a resolution adopted by the U.S. Catholic bishops at their April meeting in San Francisco.

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Court Widens Grounds For War Objectors...

Washington — (NC) — The U.S. Supreme Court has broadened the "conscientious objector" concept by deciding, 5-3, that a draft registrant may claim objector's status even though he is not religious in the generally accepted sense.

Writing the majority decision, Justice Hugo L. Black held for the court that the draft law "exempts from military service all those whose consciences, spurred by deeply held moral, ethical or religious beliefs, would give them no rest or peace if they allowed themselves to become a part of an instrument of war."

Justice Black added that conscientious objector status would be denied to those whose beliefs are not deeply held, and those whose objection to war rests on considerations of policy, pragmatism or expediency.

The high court finding eliminates belief in a supreme being as a criterion for conscientious objection. Justices William O. Douglas, William J. Brennan

Jr., and Thurgood Marshall joined in Justice Black's opinion. Dissenters in the decision were Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, and Justices Byron R. White and Potter Stewart. Newly seated Justice Harry A. Blackmun did not take part in the decision.

The court was able to avoid a tie vote in the case because Justice John M. Harlan dug deeper into the legal problems presented and found the draft law's conscientious objector exemption an unconstitutional abridgement of the first amendment's freedom of religion guarantees.

Contrary to Justice Black, he read the law as exempting only those with "theistic beliefs," but found this discrimination wrong.

Harlan, who voted against a similar 1965 decision, said in a separate opinion today that he was wrong then and that the whole attempt by Congress to grant draft exemptions on religious grounds runs afoul of

the 1st amendment to the Constitution.

The decision came in the case of Elliott Ashton Welsh II of Los Angeles, sentenced to three years in jail for refusing to submit to induction.

The 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals held that Welsh's draft board properly denied his application on the ground that his beliefs stemmed from sociological, economic, historical and philosophical — rather than religious — considerations.

Welsh, a computer engineer, had checked the "no" square opposite the question "Do you believe in a supreme being?" on his conscientious objector form. At hearings he said he does not believe in a life after death or in what might be called a human soul. Taking a human life he described as a social "error."

Later he explained his belief that "both ethical and religious values usually arise from the same source: the individual's concern for other individuals."

... But Real Test Still to Come

entious objector is one whose religious training and belief prevents him from taking part in any war in any form. It does not provide, however, exemptions for those who object for "political, sociological or philosophical views, or merely a personal code."

The majority opinion in the recent 5-3 decision says Congress meant to include moral and ethical beliefs as a basis for objection, if they are so "deeply held" that the objector's conscience would know "no rest or peace" if he went to war.

There were quick assertions that the decision only increased the dilemmas of draft boards and of young men who objected to participation in specific wars; that it could lead to the end of all exemptions for reason of conscience, and even to the termination of the draft itself.

Perhaps the most widely ex-

pressed opinion was that the Supreme Court has yet to make its most important decision in this area. It may come soon in its review of a Massachusetts case, in which a young man was excused from military service because of non-religious objection to fighting in a specific war — Vietnam. Selective Service officials are watching closely to see what the court says in this instance.

While national Selective Service officials were grinding out guidelines for local boards to use in interpreting the June 15 decision, a Church official here said the decision's value was mainly psychological.

Msgr. Marvin Bordelon, director of the USCC's department of international affairs declared: "Some local draft boards are still refusing to grant conscientious objector status to Catholics... this decision will, no doubt, aid those Catholics whose local boards are reluctant to grant C.O. status to anyone not affiliated with a traditional peace church."

Catholic leaders, including the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, have urged the law's widening to include those who object to a particular war on the grounds that it is unjust according to traditional Catholic principles.

The June 15 decision, Msgr. Bordelon pointed out, is a reaffirmation of a 1965 finding that "upheld the right of religious objection for individuals not associated with traditional peace churches."

It also widened the 1965 finding by excluding belief in a supreme being as a criterion for conscientious objection and allowed ethical and moral opinions the same value as religious beliefs in establishing conscientious objector status.

Selective Service director Curtis Tarr predicted that the finding would not seriously affect the total number of conscientious objectors in the nation.

But he added that establishment of non-religious moral and ethical beliefs as grounds for allowing conscientious objection makes it harder to establish the sincerity of applicants for conscientious objector status.

TAXPAYERS NEED SCHOOL AID BILL, K. OF C. WARNS

Moorestown, N.J. — (NC) — The statewide Knights of Columbus council, supporting a state funded nonpublic school aid program, has warned that New Jersey taxpayers may be burdened with an additional \$250 million tax bill unless the aid is forthcoming.

The K. of C. council represents some 55,000 members who support a measure approved by the legislature which would provide \$9.5 million in aid to nonpublic schools.

The council charged the N.J. Education Association's opposition to the measure, on which public hearings are slated during the summer months, is a "callous disregard for the problems of taxpayers."

"Without some support from the state, our nonpublic schools may indeed have to close their doors. As a result, the taxpayers of this state will have to accommodate approximately 300,000 additional students in our public school system at a cost of \$200 million per year for operating costs alone."