

Looking Back . . .

75 Years Ago this week — The paper devoted a full page (broadsheet size) to "News from Ireland — All the Happenings of Interest in the Old Country." It included such items as: "The dead body of Hugh Orr McClurn, auctioneer, who did business at 18 William street, South Arthur square, Belfast, was found in Belfast Harbor New Year's Day. How he got drowned is not known." There were other items from Armagh, Tyrone, Kerry, etc. Another catchy headline was "Wars of the World" with the subhead, "Seldom that this Planet Is Without a Fight." The story: "The Armenians are arrayed against the Turks: Somaliland is angry with England, and is actually fighting Italy. The Germans continue their unsuccessful warfare in Southwest Africa. In Morocco, the Sultan is defending his throne against a pretender and the century-old contest between the Dutch and the natives of Sumatra goes on unabated."

But a saving grace was provided by Sibley, Lindsey and Curr which advertised "Dorothy Dodd" shoes at \$3 a pair. A few \$3.50. And Meng and Shafer of State Street advertised "guaranteed unbreakable Stiff Hats, \$3."

"God grant that in these days of great religious indifference and moral laxity . . . our family life now undermined by strange movements which are a shock to heaven itself." Present day talk? Hardly, it was Cardinal Hayes addressing some 5,000 persons in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City 50 years ago this week.

The same paper included a banner headline on Page 1: "Plans Are Complete for Great National Broadcasting Program for the Church." The subhead added: "Weekly Radio Hour Of Catholic Events To Cover the Nation." The story listed some 20 stations which would carry the initial "Catholic Hour" at 6 p.m., Sunday, March 2, 1930. The closest to Rochester was WGY in Schenectady.

If that Cardinal Hayes 1930 speech sounded like today's material, try this from 1955: "Flight of the Refugees — More than 12 million people were forced to leave their homes when new borders divided India and Pakistan." That is from the Courier-Journal of 25 years ago. It urged readers to support the Bishops Welfare and Emergency Relief Fund collection on Laetare Sunday.

That same edition announced that St. Anne's in Rochester was noting its 25th anniversary with Father William Naughton celebrating the Mass and Auxiliary Bishop Lawrence B. Casey delivering the sermon.

10 Years Ago — "The Speno-Lerner Bill Provides Catholic Schools Best Hope," said the Page 1 lead headline.

Inside was a story that the Rosary Hour was marking 20 years on the radio. "Next Wednesday the Family Rosary for Peace will air its 7:31 3rd broadcast on its 20th birthday." Let's see, that means that the program is now 30.

Forum

Love Is More than Sex

By Lady Mary Ward

Washington (RT) — There recently have been "talk show" dialogues with clergy on certain attitudes toward the divorced. This is a topic that certainly should be discussed and evaluated constantly and heavily by the clergy among themselves, sharing their impressions and experiences.

Then, a dialogue should take place, encounter-style, between groups of clergy and groups of the widowed and divorced. It is sad, but true, that many churches have been so concerned with rites and with their own legalisms that deep dialogue with those scarred from life encounters outside church life is needed. The neglect has been telling.

For example, let us say that divorce is now so widespread a fact of life that an individual church must deal with it in a way that does not make the divorced feel outcast. But is that church realistic about the reasons for divorce? Is there a sort of erosion of responsibility between people in the last 20 years that should be taken into account?

There is a popular psychology front that encourages an act-as-you-feel syndrome.

"That's your problem" is about the most callous phrase to become widespread in all of civilized history.

We do admit there is always a cause to account for an effect, but we deny our behavior as the cause. It's always the other guy.

"What I do is one thing and what you choose to interpret that act as, is another." This is the great 20th Century cop-out. We do not want to admit that if we are cruel the receiver suffers. The new argument is that the receiver is guilty — solo — of his suffering. How foolish! We don't say if someone is crushed by the impact of a Mack truck, that he or she is at fault for cooperating with the truck in having bones and flesh smashed. Psychic blows are much the same as physical ones. Those who give their life in love, either in marriage or in anticipation of marriage, can be damaged for life by the rejection of that love.

The bottom line is always that acts between adults certainly are okay if there is full, informed consent on both sides. Few seducers inform their live-in girlfriends that this is a passing episode only. They may not promise marriage, but usually the woman sees evidence of hope.

So, the place of the clergy is both before and after marriage and before and after divorce, to make it clear that "even as ye do to the least of these, ye do unto me."

What of sex? Why do we talk so glibly about

"human sexuality" instead of love? Why don't we make the gap between love and sex clear? A line of desperate men, lopsely, perhaps career seamen, line up outside a prostitute's room for 15 minutes of her time. That is certainly sex. Maybe sex, plus loneliness and desperation. But is it love? On either side?

If we see clearly that sex is love only if full responsibility for another's life and serenity and security is part of the image, then we are talking about love.

Is it possible that there is a great call and need for the clergy of all faiths to bring this matter as a major theme before their parishioners? They should ask us all if Masters and Johnson are describing love, or rather if the long record of civilization does, as in the words of Elizabeth Browning's poem to Robert "and I shall love thee even more after death." What is missing in our present formula is the study by all of what love means, and what sexuality actually is.

To divorce and secure another chance at life worth living is one thing. To engage in free expression of sexual needs in a single life is a "Looking for Mr. Goodbar" syndrome, possibly.

Why not more discussion of love, along with responsibility, along with divorce? The clergy's agenda is filling up.

Where Our Ethics Begin

Consider these bizarre contrasts.

At a time when legal abortions are destroying millions of human lives in the United States, we are about to set up clinics to provide for "in vitro" fertilization (the "test tube" conception highly publicized in England a couple of years ago.)

Now, another example: "The Washington Post" reports that a 20-year-old woman has been artificially

inseminated in order to carry and bear a child for a Delaware couple. The wife was unable to conceive; they were tired of waiting for an adoption. They enter into this startling agreement while thousands of nearby women are going through the trauma of abortion.

These contrasts seem so weird that our minds search for some kind of explanation.

On reflection, I see an explanation for these actions

Fr. John Reedy



Looking for the Lord

— and a number of other conflicts over ethical conduct — in two radically different approaches to ethical behavior.

One approach starts with the specific problem, values, and intentions of the in-

dividuals. Most of us have great respect for the desire of a husband and wife to conceive and raise their own children. We have great sympathy for such a couple when, through no fault of their own, they are unable to do so in a natural way.

For many people, this respect and sympathy is the primary source of their ethical evaluation. If technology offers hope to such a couple, fine. Society should rejoice with them, should put no obstacles in their way.

In another situation: a young unmarried girl or a wife facing severe family problems becomes pregnant unintentionally.

Considering all the emotional, physical and financial consequences for the woman, any compassionate person will feel deep sympathy for the anxiety and difficulties she faces.

In our emotions, none of us wants to make her situation more difficult. So, nine of us (who happen to be on the Supreme Court) rule that if her decision is to have an abortion it is a purely private decision and society can place no obstacle in her way.

Others, especially Catholics, approach ethical choices from a different starting point. It's not that we are devoid of compassion and sympathy, but we begin with a number of basic values which we find in God's will manifested to us in revelation and in nature.

For example, we know that a lot of painful consequences follow if we accept as a basic value: No one has an ethical right to directly destroy innocent human life.

The principle would provide a painful answer to the text-book case of the lifeboat commander who could save the majority only by forcing one or more of the survivors over the side.

If you start with this principle and accept the judgment that the fetus is truly human life, you are led to decisions which might contradict all your feelings of compassion and sympathy.

Another source of tension lies in the fact that many of us see some of these basic values as founded not only in revelation (which is a matter of faith) but also in nature.

I can be a Buddhist or an atheist and still hold that it is always wrong to directly destroy innocent human life. And, as a citizen, I have a right to urge my society to respect this judgment in its laws. In doing so, I am not imposing my faith convictions on those who do not share my faith.

This difference in the source and methodology of ethical thought is at the root of many bitter public debates. It will continue to be a source of conflict in America for a long time to come.

Some of the issues, however, might be clarified — and some of the bitterness might be moderated — if we could recognize how decent, well-intentioned people can defend such contradictory ethical judgments.

Sunday Scripture Quiz

I. Gospel Reading: Luke 9:28-36 — Jesus draws the apostles into transfiguring intimacy.

Below is a key passage from Sunday's Gospel reading. You can determine what this passage is by finding the answers to the questions below the puzzle and then putting the letters in their appropriate box. The first one is done for you.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	14	15	16		19	20	21	22	23		
24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35
	36	37		40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47
48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59
	62	63	64	65	66		70	71	72		

- | | | |
|------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1. Voice came from it: | C L O U D | 49 20 11 22 28 |
| 2. Came from cloud: | | 3 51 32 19 7 |
| 3. Eternal city: | | 10 56 38 16 |
| 4. A rock: | | 42 14 43 57 53 |
| 5. Flexible pipe: | | 63 4 36 58 |
| 6. Girl's name: | | 23 27 54 26 70 |

Based on scripture readings for Sunday, March 2, C Cycle

Following are key passages from Sunday's scripture readings. Fill in the missing words.

II. First Reading: Genesis 15:5-18 — Abraham's intimacy with God, a transforming event.

Phrase: God took _____ outside and said: "_____ up at the _____ and count the _____, if you can. Just so," he added, "shall your _____ be." Abram put his _____ in the _____ who credited it to him as an _____ of righteousness.

III. Second Reading: Philippians 3:17-4:1 — Jesus, in intimacy, gives a "new Form" to our personhood.

Phrase: Be _____ of me, my _____ Take as your _____ those who _____ the example that we set. Unfortunately, many go about in a _____ which shows them to be _____ of the _____ of Christ. I have often said this to _____ before; this time I say it with _____.

Passage I words: Dinah, Rome, host, cloud, Hi, hay, hymn, voice, stone, crisis, Mom, feast.

Passage II words: Look, descendants, act, Abram, faith, sky, Lord, stars.

Passage III words: cross, imitators, guide, you, enemies, brothers, way, follow, tears.

Answer on Page 7