

VOL. XLIII, NO. 45 TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1964 REV. LLOYD W. TESKE, C.S.C., UNIVERSITY CHAPLAIN - EDITOR

ŧ

OF MANY THINGS

<u>Newsweek</u>, last week, gave what was obviously intended to be a shocking report on sex morality in American colleges; <u>Time</u> published Dutch Father Janssens' opinion that the steroid pill, preventing ovulation in women, is not contrary to Catholic teaching; <u>Saturday Evening Post</u> recently published a Catholic mother's defense of birth control; and every Catholic publication, and some secular, has pounced on Mary Perkins Ryan's book <u>Are Parochial</u> <u>Schools the Answer?</u>. All these articles provide plenty of opportunity for comment and controversy -- fortunately, perhaps, since only the most defensive Catholic publications are still whipping <u>The Deputy</u>.

So onto the bandwagon!

<u>College Sex -- Newsweek's report on college sex can hardly be con-</u> sidered scientific because of the sketchiness of the survey. No doubt some of the situations are factual and hence give cause for alarm. But it would be absurd to conclude that the article portrays the common sex morality of collegians, much less that it portrays the ideal of sex morality for all collegians.

Here at Notre Dame the vast majority of students have high Christian ideals regarding sex. They respect the creative faculty God has given to human beings; they are growing in understanding and appreciation of the fact that sex union between human beings is more than animal mating, that it is the symbol of a far deeper union which joins two persons in a sacramental love. Fail sometimes they might, but there are extremely few who have adopted the base sex attitudes described in <u>Newsweek</u>. At Notre Dame most failures are followed by repentance with a renewal of effort to attain the

high ideal of Christian chastity.

<u>The Pill</u> -- Reputable theologians -- not to exclude Father Janssens from this catagory -- have already pointed out that the opinion of one theologian -- or even of many theologians -- does not overthrow the official teaching of the Church, as promulgated by Popes Pius XI and Pius XII, on the morality of the use of the steroid pill as a means of contraception. They put the pill in the same class as other contraceptive devices.

Catholics should rejoice that in this age theologians are al-

lowed to express their opinions without fear of immediate censure. Only by being unhampered in their pursuit of knowledge can scholars eventually arrive at truth. Catholics, however, must beware of accepting opinion as truch, or of allowing their consciences to be formed by these opinions. Already some Catholics have fallen into this error, but this is the risk the Church is taking in our times rather than stifle freedom of expression.

<u>A Catholic Mother Defends Birth Control</u> -- The subject of freedom of conscience suggests the next provocative article, the one in <u>Saturday Evening Post</u> in which a Catholic mother justifies birth control. Bishop Pursley (<u>Our Sunday Visitor</u>, April 12, 1964) comments that the article should have been entitled "A Catholic Mother Explains How She Justifies Her Rejection of the Teaching Authority of Her Church" and he puts his pen precisely on the point when he writes: "Yes, of course, we must all follow our conscience. The question is: What does our conscience follow?" There is always the danger that we can persuade conscience to follow the way of convenience and ease.

<u>An Aside</u> -- On the subject of conscience and authority, especially as these concepts are considered within the Church, Bishop Wright of Pittsburgh delivered a scholarly paper at the 25th anniversary celebration of the Thomas More Association in Chicago. The treatise is reproduced in its entirety in the April-May issue of <u>The</u> <u>Critic</u>. No one in good conscience can follow his conscience when it conflicts with authority until he has read and studied this article.

The Parochial School Question -- Mary Perkins Ryan was courageous, maybe foolhardy, when she asked the question: Are Parochial Schools the Answer?, the title of her recent book. Perhaps she didn't realize that even to ask the question was tantamount to attacking an institution which, in the minds of many American Catholics, is as sacred as the Church itself. The fact is, of course, that Mrs. Ryan does give an answer, and as far as the future of the Church in America is concerned, that answer is in the negative. More precisely, Mrs. Ryan answersher question by asking another (in response to Father Andrew Greeley's criticism in New City, March 15, 1964): "Can the Church fulfill her main educational mission -- to form a people acceptable to God -- today and continue to provide the ancillary service of a parochial school system?" Not all critics see Mrs. Ryan's point. Father Greeley, in his criticism in New City, mentioned above, finds fault with the book as a collection of "all the cliches about Catholic education that are fashionable in advanced circles." As a sociologist he says that criticisms of parochial schools in the book do not represent sound sociological research. More to the point in their reviews of the book are Gerard S. Sloyan, head of the Department of Religious Education at the Catholic University of America, and Monsignor William E. McManus, superintendent of schools for the Archdiocese of Chicago. Their reviews appear in The Critic (April-May, 1964). Neither agrees with Mrs. Ryan's solution to the problem of Catholic education, but both think much good will come from her having asked the question. For instance, Monsignor McManus concludes his review:

"It is a shame that some of Mrs. Ryan's reckless, negative criticism of Catholic schools the points Father Greeley brought out in his review probably will be exploited by people who have no use for Catholic education in any form.

"But parochial schools, and all of Catholic education, will in the long run be better for the challenge Mrs. Ryan has put to them."

<u>Apropos</u> of these journalistic skirmishes, particularly the latter family squabble, are Father Reedy's remarks in "The Editor's Desk" (<u>Ave Maria</u>, April 11, 1964).

"Aside from a few skirmishes over Roch Hochhuth's play, <u>The</u> <u>Deputy</u>, most Catholics seem to be getting along pretty well with most Protestants and Jews. Even the hardened position of <u>Protes</u>-<u>tants</u> and <u>Others</u> <u>United</u> seems to be softening to the point of allowing some conversation.

"Now if Catholics would only start talking civilly to each other we might really enter into the age of religious understanding. It's easy to cite a couple of recent examples of the Catholic-to-Catholic dialogue.

"For example, there was the published criticism by an eminent priest educator of the newly published book, <u>Are Parochial Schools</u> <u>the Answer?</u> The clergyman's judgment: 'an incredibly naive book, a foolish book.' The author is guilty of 'emotionalism.' She 'reveals a complete lack of understanding of education generally, American society and Catholic education.' (That covers a lot of ground for anybody to have a complete lack of understanding of:)...

"A Bishop, who didn't like much of the reporting done at the Council, wrote a satire in which he had a female devil telling her niece of the way in which Satan avoided working too hard to subvert the work of the Council.

"'All you need is a handful of phony Catholic intellectuals who

feel discriminated against...some journalists who are sore because the stuff they peddle isn't worth the paper it's printed on...some busybodies who simply want to mess things up on principle...Leave it to them...'

"(Of course this was presented as satire, but somehow or other I get the feeling the Bishop wasn't smiling when he wrote it.)

"...I begin to wonder if we won't live to see Paul Blanshard editing a Catholic publication... But that's just an idle dream, I suppose. Mr. Blanshard has become too mellow for this league." inspires

"UNFORGETTABLE"

There she is. Her coquettish features dancing through the cold physics' formulas and over the dead records of history. Her lazy lashes, her freckles, her pugnose, her sparkling ivory keymind do somerboard make your saults. But what thoughts does this soft and live-

ly imgirl in your

She is

of her

be with.

age of a churn up head?

reverence.

fun to The sight

To

know her is a real privilege. She has never tarnished my ideal of womanhood. In fact, she has unlocked my mind and opened my eyes to the V goodness, the dignity, and the sacredness of womanhood. Through her I have come in contact with the gentleness and poise that are peculiarly feminine. It makes me feel good just to be near her. Ι don't know, but when I am with her it seems I display many good qualities I never thought I had. It's through her influence that step in the I climbed another ladder of genuine virility. My rough and tough manner seems to dissolve away in her presence. Because of her I have become more of a man -- a gentle-man.

When Miss Fabulous peers at you from a wordy page, smiles at you through a blank wall, or stares at you from a desk blotter, what does she see?

Here's a fellow who is strong, and manly, but who never forgets

that I speam a I am he alme to fine am something cial -- I girl. When with him ways wants display the qualities of

When he looks at a young woman. me, his eyes radiate reverence. Somehow he makes me feel that I am a trust he will always protect. I feel perfectly relaxed while on a date with him because I know he is trying to be virtuous. Besides, I know I can always rely on his good judgment. He never puts me in situations which might compromise ----or embarrass me. I feel

secure in his manliness. Т can always count on his rugged virtue because he isn't any weakkneed follower of the crowd. And he does not think he is less a for being considerate man and courteous to me, a girl. He gets all upset if I forget myself and in any way which would act cheapen me as a Catholic young His reverence for me lady. actually brings out my finer qualities. He makes me want to be the ideal Catholic girl. Most of all, he never forgets that my real attractiveness springs from the fact that I am a temple of God.

Knowing her had made me a better person in every way. She has brought me closer to God.

Why do I love vou? I love you not only for what you are but for what I am when I am with you

I can say truthfully that I am a better person for having known him. He has helped me get closer to God.

--Father Baker, C.S.C.