



"I hope you never meet the fellow who writes that column!"

The Church: 1970

Intellectuals Must Bend First

By Fr. Andrew Greeley



A serious danger of the Populist—or Jeffersonian Democratic—philosophy that I have been expounding in the last couple of columns is that it could very easily become anti-intellectual and even paranoid.

The Populist is profoundly suspicious of elites. Whether it was Thomas Jefferson distrusting the aristocratic Federalists or Andrew Jackson, the mercantile East, or Burton Wheeler and Robert La Follette distrusting wall Street bankers, or Franklin Roosevelt warning us about the economic royalists, the Populist is suspicious of small groups of people who seem to have unique access to power—or to knowledge.

The Populist argues that he and his fellow people are as good as any man, whether that man be the Harvard professor or a Wall Street banker, or a senior government bureaucrat, or—to use the classic phrase—a striped-pants diplomat (who later came to be suspected of homosexuality).

Indeed, the Populist can rather easily conclude that there are conspiracies going on: that "they," or "the establishment," or "the system" are conspiring to get him and the rest of the people, take away from him his family, his property, his peace, and his security.

It is probably a rather good thing to be suspicious and skeptical about those who have power and prestige, those who claim a superiority by reason of their knowledge and skills. No society can do without the powerful or the prestigious, or the intelligent and the expert, but it is still a good thing for the members of the society to keep those who govern them either politically or intellectually on their toes.

But it is one thing to be skeptical of elites, and it is quite another to accuse them of conspiracy. It is one thing to be just a bit suspicious of the expert, and it is quite another to deny any worth in his expertise. It is one thing to realize that the professor may take himself and his intellectual skills altogether too seriously, but is quite another to reject those skills as worthless and to despise the professor as not fully human.

There have been Populist intellectuals, but those of us who claim such a dual alliance must not kid ourselves about the strain. We cannot become so enamored of the wisdom of the people to equate inarticulateness with wisdom. Some of the people, alas, are quite dumb, and many others are not very bright. We ought not to be ashamed of our own education or skills at thought and articulation.

The Populist intellectual can ill afford to engage in sentimentality or guilt feelings in the presence of those who are not as sophisticated as he is.

Intellectuals can easily come to think of themselves as distinct from the people and alienated from them. One then either feels guilty about the alienation or contemptuous about those from whom one is alienated. In neither position is the intellectual able to play his proper role, which I take it could be summarized by saying that he is the "idea man" for the rest of society.

While there is a strong tendency for Americans to distrust their professors, there is an even more powerful tendency to respect them. The college professor's social status is one of the highest in the country (just behind the Supreme Court justice and the ambassador and medical doctors and substantially ahead of clergymen). The polarization of the intellectual elite and the people is the result of too much arrogance on one side and too much suspicion on the other; too many feelings of superiority on the one hand and too many feelings of inferiority on the other.

It is a perennial problem in any society, and particularly in one as large and complex and dynamic as our own. In previous columns I have railed against the arrogance and the snobbishness of the intellectuals not because I feel that the people are completely innocent in the present polarization, but I feel because it seems to me that by the very nature of the role they occupy, the intellectuals ought to be the ones who try to initiate dialogue.

As a matter of fact, many of the intellectuals who are becoming involved in plans for the congressional campaign this fall are busy rediscovering the American people precisely by engaging in that most virtuous of actions, trying to understand other people from the "inside" and not from the "outside." One would like to commend such action to the romantic Catholic revolutionaries who are so proud of their ability to be carbon copy imitators of the secular revolutionaries. (Just as some of the Catholic liberal journals are so proud of their ability to be even third-rate imitators of their secular counterparts).

However, one should not be too optimistic about such an event occurring for it seems to be of the essence of American Catholic liberalism (at least official liberalism) to catch up to a fashion just when the fashion is becoming unfashionable.

On The Right Side Sentimental Journey

By Father Paul J. Cuddy



Father Robert Kress and I have been good friends since we served under Father William Byrne in Ithaca thirty years ago. Father K. and I take an annual vacation of a week together. It is rarely according to plan.

At 5 p.m. on August 9, we left his rectory in Montezuma and started off vaguely "to Canada." By 9:30 we had gotten as far as Geneva. Not car trouble. We just stopped off to see a few friends on the way, including Mary and Margaret O'Brien in Geneva. They live right across from the old Redemptorist Retreat House many men in the diocese remember. The O'Brien's pressed us to overnight at their home. However, rectories are a priest's primary home, so we declined gratefully, and landed at the rectories of Phelps and Clifton Springs. Each residence had just one guest room. And each had a cordial welcome. This was the first lap.

About 10 the next morning, having settled the affairs of Church and State with Fathers Roach in Clifton Springs and Turner in Phelps, we started in a general direction "towards Canada." After a short stop on Father McDonnell at Newark, we landed at Marion, 9 miles north, toward Ontario. The pastor is Father Richard Nangle. He served under the late Father Pat Moffitt, who is remembered as a nightly rooster for the Red Wings during baseball season, and a dedicated catechist. Since Father Nangle himself is one of the most practical catechists in the diocese, we discussed

present day catechetics: texts, methods, doctrine, teachers, et al. He seems successful on all counts. Too much catechetical emphasis today is strong on methods and weak in doctrine and morals. This seems to me to be an enthusiasm similar to one which concentrates on the ribbons, decorations and delivery of a package, but has a careless regard for the contents.

Next stop was St. Joseph's beautiful church in Penfield. Nobody home, so we borrowed the key to the church from a nice secretary who told us the church is locked after morning Mass. All churches in Penfield are locked during the day because of vandals. Our solicitude for justice is so freighted in behalf of the unjust; vandals, muggers, thieves, the increasing groups who hold good men's rights in contempt that law-abiding and just people are deprived of their rights. So Penfield parishioners are deprived. Happily the convent Superior, an old friend I dubbed The Dutch Cleanser Nun, Sister Agnes Theresa, was at the convent, appropriately cleaning windows. She was soon to return to our mutual love, the people of Clyde-Savannah parishes, so we three praised God over a can of pop.

It was but an hour to supper. We knew there is always a special welcome from Father Newcomb at St. Cecilia's, so we arrived about 5 p.m. Father N. is one of the best pastoral priests I know, and serves his people with the fatherliness of the late Father McGrath, his boyhood pastor in Auburn, and

the fairness of Father Rawlinson of Corning, under whom he first served in the priesthood. The Air Force where he served in WW II, gave him a breadth of experience and pragmatic understanding of reality. He is a good combination of no-nonsense and balanced tolerance. Supper was pleasant, especially for the company of the assistants, Bavarian Fr. Win Kellner and Watkins Glen Fr. Bob Beligotti, with visiting Canadianaigua VA Chaplain, Fr. Jerry Kelly, for dessert.

Said Fr. Kress: "The movie Airport is well recommended. It's playing tonight." The choice was perfect: suspense, humor, and non-pandering to sex.

I phoned Fr. Hester of Spencerport. "We're en route to Canada. Have you room for Fr. Kress and me?" A chuckle chuckled through the phone. "Of course. Sorry Fr. Al Carson won't be here. Glad to have you." "We're going to Airport first, so won't be in until after ten." "I'll be here with a big welcome." And he was.

After Mass on the third day, Chris, a beautiful collegian who combines as secretary, cook, hostess, and from whom emanates the authentic Spirit of faith and graciousness, served breakfast. By 2 p.m. we registered in a motel in Canadiana Niagara Falls. In 45 hours we had traveled an average of four miles an hour. Some men travel with plan and timetable so sacred that any deviation produces an emotional trauma. But as Helen Hayes observed in Airport, the less organized system is more interesting.

The Morriss Plan Brainwashing For Our Times

By Frank Morriss



The euphemism "reeducation" has turned up twice in the news recently. I call it a euphemism because, at least in these two cases, it is simply a cover-up for what is really meant—brain-washing.

First, two Colorado abortionist doctors in a report in the Journal of the American Medical Association, point out that considerable "reeducation" is needed to overcome the repugnance by many on the staffs of hospitals where abortions are concerned. For one thing, Drs. Horace Thompson and David L. Cowen, discovered that nurses—especially younger ones—didn't adequately "appreciate" the psychiatric problems of mothers who were undergoing abortions. These nurses were showing hostility toward the mothers, apparently seeing them perfectly healthy and able, but nevertheless relieving themselves of the human life they had conceived.

Such hostility had to be overcome if the abortion program was not to be threatened. Ninety per cent of the abortions performed at Denver General Hospital where these doctors are involved are performed for psychiatric reasons. This means that in most cases of abortion at this hospital children who were perfectly healthy and would almost certainly have been born perfect were killed in the wombs of women who were also perfectly

healthy, at least physically, but who were able to get psychiatric testimony about the harm that bearing the child would do to them.

So disturbing was this situation to the hospital personnel that they refused to take part. Thus the need for "reeducation."

The second instance of "reeducation" came in the recommendations of the presidential commission on pornography. This commission reportedly is calling for "mass reeducation" about sex for all Americans— young and old.

I can assure you that what "reeducation" in this field means is a destruction of religious values concerning sex and the instilling of a complete naturalism that is nothing but a throwback to the days of paganism.

Therefore I call what is being done and what is proposed "brainwashing," and I insist that it is the most ominous sign when it is suggested in a democracy. Brainwashing is the method of dictators. We all know how the Communists "re-educate" people. We have heard the dull, parrot-like voices of those "reeducated" confessing to guilt and crimes against the people. We know how Hitler "reeducated" scores of Germans into accepting the old Teutonic gods in place of Christ.

Of course, there are always those who are not "reeducable." They are the Mindsentys, the Stepinocs, the Bonhoeffers, the Walshes, and the scores of unknowns who have been imprisoned, starved, tortured, executed wherever the totalitarians gain control.

The American brainwashers do not use the dictatorial decree, but rather the grand legislative or bureaucratic fiat. They say, "Let there be a law," or "Let there be a program." Their followers in the fields of science, communications, politics take the hint and set the wheels going. The opposition is either shouted down or whispered down. It becomes the accepted thing that all enlightened and progressive persons favor such a program.

The pockets of die-hard resistance are turned over to the brainwashers themselves. Do you believe that there is something sacred, and therefore private, about sex? Nonsense, all but the superstitious know that sex is perfectly natural, and that the thing to do is remove all inhibitions, all restraints, all restrictions. Religious attitudes that suggest any natural law or divine decree that curtails sex must be wiped out.

It is all totalitarian and it is nothing but brainwashing. It is simply not the honest brainwashing of the dictators.