

K. of C. Gives \$100,000 **To Parents Education Unit**

Washington, D.C. (\overline{RNS}) – A for Nonpublic Education has re-Knights of Columbus, the inter-national fraternal society of Catholic men.

Parents for Nonpublic Education is an association of Catholics formed to lend support to an interreligious organization called Citizens' Relief for Education by Income Tax (CREDIT), according to Robert N. Lynch, executive director of the Catholic group.

Lynch said CREDIT " is composed of Catholic, Protestant and Jewish leaders and representatives of non-public schools who are seeking to obtain relief through income tax credits for parents who are educating their children in non-public schools.

CREDIT, he said, also stresses new organization called Parents the right of parents to educate their children in accord with ceived a \$100,000 grant from the their religious conscience and emphasizes the value of nonpublic schools in a pluralistic society. Rabbi Morris Sherer of Agudath Israel of America is chairman of CREDIT.

> Commenting on the \$100,000 grant, Supreme Knight John W. "Non-public McDevitt said: schools are performing an important service to all Americans. Their contribution is as precious today as it has been in decades past.

"However, rising costs are placing an increasingly intolerable burden on these schools and their supporters," McDevitt said. "The end result of this is that parents are denied their fundamental human rights to educate children in the schools of their choice. It also deprives the nation of the immense benefits which come from diversity of choice in education.

The grant was lauded by Cardinal John Krol of Philadelphia and Cardinal Terence Cooke of New York, both of whom have endorsed Parents for Nonpublic Education.

"For more than a century the Knights of Columbus have been in the forefront of educational, charitable and social welfare activities," Cardinal Cooke said. "It is in keeping with their his-tory that once again they have given outstanding support to a notable effort which only can rebound to the well-being of all Americans of whatever religious persuasion.

Ulster Priest Runs Factory

New York — (RNS) — Father Austin Eustace is a parish priest in Northern Ireland who knows in Northern Ireland who knows latest contribution we have something about glass — enough the socio-economic problems of his area. cut-crystal factory that employs

company underwritten by a cord and violence in Northern Catholic parish that was set up Ireland simply as a "Catholicmainly as a "self-help" project Protestant conflict. to relieve a dire unemployment situation.

is still flourishing in County Ty- the financial backers of the enrone and more recently promoted terprise are local Protestants. a "do-it-yourself" housing proj- "At the first organizational meet-ect which produced 36 badly- ing, I announced that the com-

New York - (RNS) - Father Cardinal William Conway of Ar-

Father Eustace, a native of the 75 persons and make it a success. Irish Republic who has spent all In operation for about a year, 27 years of his priesthood in Ul-Tyrone Crystal, Ltd., in Dungan-non, County Tyrone, is a public which describe the current dis-

The priest remarked that not In 1964, the priest set up an only does his factory hire and agricultural co-operative which train Protestants, but some of needed homes. The glass factory pany was public and that I would undertaken with the approval of not have anything to do with discrimination or segregation." He does not deny that discrim-

ination exists throughout the country but insists it is grounded in socio-economic deficiencies.

Because the manufacture of cut crystal requires an emphasis on men rather than on machines, Father Eustace chose that field. He opened a training school, built the factory, and started production.

Describing Tyrone Crystal as "the most exclusive lead-cut crystal in the world," Father Eustace claimed that U.S. markets are opening up to his table ware products. So far he has designed several "suites" of table glasses, and will soon be moving into the design and production of candle holders, dishes, vases and 'art pieces.

Supreme Court to Get State Abortion Case

the State Court of Appeals against the petition of Fordham Law Professor Robert Byrne to halt abortions as unconstitutional sets the stage for trial in The United States Supreme Court

Even before the case was tried in Albany, it was clear that whether the abortion law was affirmed or struck down a clarifying appeal would be made to the country's highest court.

In their decision, the five judges who voted to permit abor-tions to continue leaned heavily on the position that it was up to the Legislature to determine whether unborn children had legal rights as persons under the state law.

Professor Byrn's argument was based on the unconstitutionality of the liberal abortion law since it deprived the unborn children. of their right to life.

The five judges who voted to continue permitting abortions åre Associate Judge Charles Breitel, who wrote the majority opinion. Chief Judge Stanley H. Fuld, and Associate Judges Francis Bergen, James Gibson and Matthew Jasen.

The two judges who voted to scrap the law are Associate Judges Adrian Burke and John Scileppi.

Breitel's majority opinion said:

Judge Breitel's majority opinion said:

"Whether the law should accord legal personality is a policy question which in most instances devolves on the Legislature, subject again of course, to the constitution as it has been 'legally' rendered.'

Judge Burke, in his dissent, cited among other sources, the recent decision of the Supreme Court which found capital punishment "immoral and therefore unconstitutional" because it involved "The taking of a life."

Since the evidence is clear as "persona non grata."

that the unborn child lives, and has life, it is an "irrational" legpeace of mind" as does our liberal abortion law, Justice Burke argued.

Many Attend Burial of Patriarch

Istanbul (RNS) — In a grave near the tombs of 14 of his predecessors, Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I was buried here following a funeral attended by the great and lowly.

The body of world Ortho-doxy's spiritual leader was buried at Balikli, outside the walls of Old Constantinople, the Greek name for Istanbul. (Balikli continued as a Christian center after the Turks, who are Muslims, conquered the area in the 15th entury.)

The funeral service was held in St. George's church, located within the cramped compound of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the Phanar section of Istanbul.

Among those aftending were Cardinal Jan Willebrands, presi-dent of the Vatican's Secretariat for Christian Unity and the representative of Pope Paul; Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, head of the World Council of Churches; Archbishop Michael Ramsey of Canterbtury, head of the world Anglican Communion, and delegations from most of the world's Orthodox patriarchates and independent Churches.

Many clergy and laity from the Greek-Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America which is directly under the Patriarch's jurisdiction — attended. Archbishop Iakovos, primate of the American Church, could not attend. He was barred by Turkey

St. Paul's Theology in 'Rescue' Movement

A move is underway to reassert the theological importance of St. Paul and to rescue the Apostle's reputation from modern detractors.

The man who wrote a hefty chunk of the New Testament is not, of course, out of vogue in many sectors of the church; no Christian theology can totally circumvent what he said.

But the native of Tarsus has

corrupter of Christianity."

At least three, often interrelated, fronts can be seen in contemporary reassessing of Paul. One is really very old and has to do with Paul as a Jew who became a Christian. A second involves study of the Apostle's attitude towards women; the third with relation of Jesus and Paul.

It is not surprising that Christianity's first major evangelist and theologian has not been a popular figure in Jewish circles. For centuries he stood as a prime apostate from Judaism. More recently he had been considered a non-Palestinian Jew with little understanding of the faith of his fathers.

The author of "My Brother Paul" is no exception, and makes a point stressed by Christians eager to clear the apostle of antifeminist charges. He says Paul's attitude toward women "represented an advance" over previously held ideas.

"How is that true?" ask "women's lib" exponents offended by such passages as I Corinthians 14: 33-36, which prohibits women

Paul without mentioning women. ment of women as "fellow-workers."

> In addition to being accused of relegating women to a secondary human role, Paul has also been faulted for having a negative, puritanical outlook on all sex.

> Rabbi Rubenstein reminds women critics that Paul believed the whole "order of mortality" was coming to an end so that his concern was "with death and res-

Why then are there attempts to drive a wedge between Jesus and Paul? Or to say, as the Rev. Albert Cleage, a black theologian, recently did, "Paul does not follow in the footsteps of Jesus." Mr. Cleage has a special ethnic reason for his declaration. He believes Jesus was black and Paul an "Uncle Tom" who used a "distorted" version of the life and person of Jesus as his ticket into the white Roman world.

fallen on bad times in some cultural streams and among certain highly vocal groups: women's liberationists accuse him of implanting anti-feminism in Christianity; others draw a sharp line between the religion of Jesus and Paul, praising the simplicity of the former and criticizing the abstractness of the latter.

"Paul suffers from a 'bad press' among self-conscious moderns," Prof. Walter Arnold of Fordham University has observed.

An emerging pro-Paul movement is neither organized in any formal way nor blind to problems that Paul does raise for modern people. It is also diverse, at times impressionistic, such as in a British Broadcasting Corporation series in which Malcolm Muggeridge and Alex Vidler literally retraced the missionary journeys of the Apostle.

The variety of reactions to Paul are reflected in a long list of quotes prefacing the printed text of the Muggeridge-Vidler programs. "Envoy Extraordinary" (Harper & Row) notes that Abelard said he did not want to be a philosopher if he had to "rebel against St. Paul," while philoso-pher J. S. Mill said, "I hold St. Paul to have been the first great

Courier-Journal

Now Rabbi Richard Rubenstein, a professor at Florida State University, has challenged traditional Jewish treatments. In his book "My Borther Paul (Harper), the rabbi asserts that Paul can be a reconciling rather than a divise force between Christians and Jews.

While himself stopping far short of Paul's confession of Jesus as Christ, Rabbi Rubenstein sees the Apostle as a "Jewish mystic" who understood but disagreed with the Judaism of his time. He says Paul was a religious genius, giving expression to human yearnings for "a new and flawless beginning that could finally end the human cycle of anxiety, repression, desire and craving.

The rabbi admonishes today's people to go to Paul for instruction on how to make the human pilgrimage, how to tap the 'meaning of the human world."

None today can write about

JANO FER MACH ON 13 WEL

91'ege9

from speaking in churches; I Timothy 2:11-14, which says women may not tell a man what to do, and I Corinthians 8:34, which lectures wives on how to please their husbands.

Two responses are forthcoming. One says to study the particular passages that offend; the other suggests close investigation of the whole of Paul's writing.

Dr. Robin Scroggs, professor of New Testament at Chicago Theological Seminary, proposes that Paul was quite remarkable for his day in seeing men and women as equal. Dr. Scroggs, discussing Paul in a March Christian Century article, hopes moderns will take seriously an affirmation 'in Galatian 3:28; "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus."

Dr. William and Mrs. Marianne Radius, a writer team from Michigan, said recently: "Followers of the women's liberation movement would, we think, if they looked carefully, find more in Paul to encourage than to oppose their movement." They call at-tention to the Apostle's treat-

Wednesday, July 19, 1972

And I want to a second a second s

. Wednesday, July 19 ,972

surrection, not sexuality."

The Paul versus Jesus issue is about a century old and no doubt has been revived, perhaps unintentionally, by the "Jesus revolution.

"What is all the fuss about?" an author in America, the Jesuit weekly, asks. It is about claims that Paul misconstrued the life and teachings of Jesus. This claim goes back to late 19th and early 20th Century scholars.

Philosopher Alfred North Whitehead quipped, "The man who, I suppose, did more than anybody else to distort and subvert Christ's teaching was Paul."

Psychoanalyst C. G. Jung had a similar opinion: "It is frankly disappointing to see how Paul hardly ever allows the real Jesus to get a word in.'

No one denies that Paul did more than any other single individual to spread Christianity to the Gentile world. Although he did not know the historical Jesus, Paul's writings are considered the oldest in the New Testament. His presentation of the faith was authoritative from early Christian times; Pauline themes have been involved in virtually every significant Christian "revival.'

A more general charge is that whereas Jesus preached about God the Father and His kingdom Paul emphasized Christ the Son and took the church in a Christological direction Jesus never intended.

Must Christians, Gerald O'Collins asks in his America Article, choose between "the religion about Jesus and the religion of Jesus?"

O'Collins, reiterating a frequent response of churchmen in past and present, finds the question rather banal and says that 'setting Paul against Jesus if folly."

He states that Paul could not "simply repeat" the preaching of Jesus because in the crucifixion and resurrection a "decisive change took place in the situation of man and his world." O'-Collins continues:

The Apostle rejected as fatal the pretensions of that group of Corinthian Christians who identified themselves as those who 'belonged to Paul.' With passion he asked: 'Was Paul crucified for you?' No question does more to demolish the pretensions of those who seek to construct an opposition between Paul of Tarsus, and Jesus of Nazareth.'

Page 17