

Editorials

A World It Never Made

"Action required" was checked on the memo, presumably meaning the recipient had better drop everything and follow that order.

From the boss? No. That would be understandable. The man signing the paychecks indeed can require the action. But that was not the case.

Was it a Chrysler memo as Lee Iacocca sheds civility to keep the business afloat? No. Most up-to-date businesses have too much savvy regarding employe or corporate relations to employ such non-motivational jargon.

From whence, then, such a memorandum? Why from a Church agency, of course. Every so often someone in the service of the gentle Jesus decides that for the Good News to get through it is necessary to adapt the methods of Caesar. Unfortunately, such

zealots have misguided notions as to the machinations of the secular world.

Variations of this kind of memo exist; and there is good news and bad news about them. The good news is that those using them are few and far between; the bad news is that most of these folks seem to work for the Church. Another version employed by officious Church workers includes a laundry list of directives, such as "follow through" and the more ominous "follow through and report." Appropriate boxes line up and the sender merely checks as many orders as he or she unilaterally deems required of the recipient. This saves the sender oodles of time.

Has it always been so in the Church? Not likely. Can anyone picture Jesus sitting at His desk, a trusty pad of pre-printed notes at hand? Figuring that His "curriculum vitae" may be of use to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, He moves into action. First, He "memos" the secretary: get my bio from the files. Then He checks the appropriate box: "Action required."

When He gets his biographical notes, He attaches them to another memo: "Send these to our writers" and checks the box, "Follow through." She does as

directed and clips to the notes the directive: "Read and pass on." And, if you don't do it, they did.

No. The scenario just doesn't play. The Holy Spirit decided on other means.

True, God did employ memos of sorts when He had a message to send through Moses. But He dropped the idea thereafter! This is true even though the Jesuits claim knowledge of another Divine note. When a Franciscan and Jesuit couldn't agree on which order Christ more favored, they left Him a note overnight in church on the matter and checked the box: "For your comment." The next morning they found that Jesus returned a "For your files" memo, noting that He, of course, had no favorites among the orders and signed it, "Jesus Christ, S.J." But this is pure Jesuit propaganda. It is abundantly clear that the Holy Trinity disavows the use of memo mentality.

N.B.: This editorial requires no action nor any followthrough although the reader may feel an urgent need to act on his or her own, as regards the "round file," a receptacle found to be eminently suitable for many another churchy memo.

and Opinion

Supplement 'Invaluable'

EDITOR:

I thank Bishop Clark. In his "Along the Way", Wednesday, July 4, he encouraged us readers to read the Faith Today. I might have missed an invaluable lesson without his encouragement.

I might have been too busy

with summer activities, or skimmed the article thinking, "Another article on peace...Oh, yes, we have a most morbid situation. Nothing anyone really can do." I'd feel hopeless for a while, say a prayer, then soon forget.

I shall never forget after reading the article that each day I have a responsibility toward peace. Everyone does. Each day I must pray for peace, for the leaders of

nations, and for strength in all of us to live for a peaceful existence.

Every person has a responsibility to live Christ's peace; to show His love and His kingdom in today's world. No matter where we are or what we are doing, this is our Christian obligation to each other.

Barbara A. Malina

Rd. #1

Montour Falls, N.Y. 14865

The Crime Reaches Us

EDITOR:

I have responded to Mrs. Newberry's request (Courier-Journal, 7/18/84) in a written protest of the killing of Rev. Geza Palfi, a Hungarian priest in Transylvania for his outcry against Dec. 25 being declared a working day.

This is indeed a crime against God, Christmas being Christ's birthday celebrated anew annually since his holy birth.

But are we, as a supposedly Christian nation, regressing from his third commandment to "Keep holy the Sabbath," meaning Sunday?

"Business as usual" is the so-called revised, or Liberation version. In other words, the almighty dollar takes precedence over the Almighty God!

This too is a crime against God, as the trend of today so dictates.

I shall obey the Only Dictator in this respect, albeit untold numbers obey the



THERE ARE OTHER WAYS OF USING RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES IN YOUR BUSINESS THAN PRAYING FOR ALL YOUR COMPETITORS TO FOLD.

greedy merchants demanding abandonment of observance of the Lord's Day.

Mrs. Edna C. Faulkner 227 Privet Way Rochester, N.Y. 14624

ANNUAL CATHOLIC Thanks Giving APPEAL. Includes a portrait of a man.

Fr. Louis J. Hohman



The Open Window

English Is Weak On Love

Dear Reader,

This is a continuation of our discussion of the meaning of love as it pertains to marriage. Last week I pointed out that the English word, love, is inadequate to express the many kinds and facets of love.

The first of the Greek words is eros, a word familiar to us through the English erotic. Actually, there was a "men's magazine" by the name of Eros. It refers to desire, but not simply genital desire. It is more akin to the idea of falling in love, of being deeply attracted toward or having chemistry for another person. The desire is extensive and intensive and has to do with wanting to be with the other person as often as possible, as close to the other person as

possible and knowing as much about the other person as possible. It involves the desire for intimacy, even to sexual intercourse which is in a way the culmination of this love but not the only important element. When one is in love one can bear difficult situations more easily in the presence of the loved one and even happy occasions seem less so in the absence of the loved one.

For people who are married, being in love may or may not last. For most people it does not last terribly long, but only by reason of neglect. It takes hard work to stay "in love" through the years of marriage, and yet we see occasionally a man and a woman who have been married for many decades who still love to hold hands, look at each other fondly, and be gently intimate. Obviously, it would be a great boon to a marriage to be

able to stay in love. But it takes hard work in the maintenance of a kind of attentiveness and spirit of romance and adventure which is here involved. People who manage to stay in love throughout their marriages obviously have an advantage.

The second word the Greeks have for love is philos. This kind of love is a deep affection which is not necessarily sexual and therefore not genital. It is more like the relationship of deep friendship. It is a real joy in sharing and giving which is experienced by good friends. Good friends share bad things as well as good things with equal grace. They have a sense of wanting to do things together and share much of themselves in doing. The love which is philos is serene, not passionate, and yet it is deep and abiding. It is my conviction that many marriages involving entertainers do not last because, although they are passionately in love, they are not basically friends. Their careers are on parallel courses and their friends are separate. As a result, they do not have that "togetherness" which is essential for a deep

friendship. Someone once asked his spouse, "When did we stop being friends and become lovers?" The response was, "The secret, my dear, is that we never stopped being friends."

If a relationship is all passion and no serene friendship, it is incomplete.

The third Greek word for love is agape. While this word is not identical with Christian love or covenant love, it is about as close as any single word comes. Jesus gave the command, "Love one another as I have loved you." As I have loved you — here is the crux of the matter. How has Christ loved us?

While we are still sinners, Jesus loves us with an everlasting and unconditional love. He loves us to the point where he gives his life for our well being and our final happy outcome which we call salvation. Jesus sees a goodness in us which enables him to give himself entirely and uncompromisingly forever.

When we speak of Christian marriage, this is the love to which Christian spouses are called. It is sometimes called covenant love because it is a binding relationship whereby two people give themselves totally to one another re-

gardless of their knowledge that the other person is flawed. That of course is the origin of the words "for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, until death do us part."

Jesus most completely signified his covenant love for us in the Holy Eucharist. At the Last Supper, he said, "This is my body which will be given up for you. This is my blood in a new and everlasting covenant which will be shed for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven (so that all may be right with you)." In a very real sense these words could be the marriage vows between a husband and wife. They express most perfectly what Christian love is all about and therefore what Christian marriage is all about.

It should be obvious that this kind of love is literally impossible for ordinary human beings (and we are all ordinary). It requires a God-ordinary which is not ours naturally, but is given to us through the Lord Jesus and his spirit, transmitted to us in the sacraments. By virtue of that capacity we are given the capacity to enter into this kind of covenant love and to live

it through to the end. Archbishop Fulton J. Sheen once said that it took three to get married — a bride, a groom and God. In terms of Christian marriage, that is very true.

One of the most painful experiences for a parish priest is to have a young couple who have no relationship to God whatever in their ordinary lives want to "use the church" for their wedding. They consider it simply to be a romantic setting for their wedding.

The fact is, however, that an outward sign that one wishes to enter a marriage in a way that Christ and the Church understand it. Without that particular desire there is something fraudulent about being married in the church unless, of course, there is a real desire to seek and find that kind of Christian love which we have described above.

That is why priests are not hassling young people when they explore the meaning of marriage with them. They simply want to show them the road to authenticity in their commitment so that it will have the best possible chance of being permanent and happy.