Never has the Bulletin kidded itself or you. But, to put it mildly, IT WOULD SEEM that many of YOU are kidding YOURSELVES—DEFINITELY. One fellow, for example, writes in: "My, doesn't the Bulletin stop beating around the bush and answer our moral questions directly?"

If you are that man, here is your answer: You are a typical kidder—cf-self. Not a man on this campus is moronic enough not to know by his own conscience, by the signs of concupiscence and by the very insistent, CONTRARY pressure of fallen nature against his better sense and ideals what is right and what is wrong.

You should all know better than to expect the Bulletin ever to write more plainly than it wrote yesterday and is writing tonight. But if you are TRULY PERPLEXED by an HONEST PROBLEM OR CURSE you know you can have the right answer by approaching the Prefect of Religion or his assistants or any one of the other priests you may prefer.

Instead you usually make the fatal mistake of college men everywhere. You talk endlessly in your bull-sessions about sex, marriage, birth-control and (not rarely) sin. And YOU GET NOWHERE for the simple reason that you're never satisfied and you waste another night, and another week, and another year re-hashings these things that you like to talk about. The trouble is you never arrive at authoritative, apodictic conclusions. YOU ARE THE ONES WHO ARE CONSTANTLY BEATING AROUND THE BUSH.

It is surprising and even disheartening to hear that some of you waste your time arguing sympathetically the case, so-called, for birth-control. EVEN ACADEMICALLY this is a sheer waste of time because it is a closed case, CLOSED BY GOD, CLOSED BY THE NATURE OF THINGS, AND REFUGIANT TO THE CULTURE OF ANYONE WHO BELIEVES IN THE DIGNITY OF CHRISTIANS AS TEMPLES OF GOD.

Now and then you hear this stupid question, "How far can you go with a girl without committing a mortal sin?" The direct answer is "not very far." But the question is stupid because it shows that whoever asks it hasn't even an APPROXIMATE IDEA of the tremendous insult to God inherent in every DELIBERATE VENIAL SIN; because it shows how little such a Christian, such a supposedly Catholic, college gentleman, thinks of the dignity of his soul and THE SOUL OF THE GIRL HE GOES WITH.

If LOVE OF GOD is not enough as a motive to influence you to do the right thing—surely the more selfish motive of protecting yourselves against an unhappy marriage should keep you from DOING HARM TO ONE ANOTHER IN COURTSHIP. Every KISS, POUNCE OR ENCIRCE AGAINST REASON undermines the sanctity, the stability, the happiness of your future marriage and opens both you and your girl to the suspicion that you may not be trust-ed. EXCESSES IN COURTSHIP WILL FILL YOUR MARRIED LIFE WITH REGRETS.

Particularly the question of courting a non-Catholic girl is important for you to consider. So many pooh-pooh the Church's idea on this subject as narrow and bigoted. But NOW IS THE TIME to think the thing out to the last possibility. No one is blaming you if your girl is not of your holy Faith. It is not your fault, nor hers. At least it is not your fault UNLESS YOU WANT OUT OF YOUR WAY TO COURT A NON-CATHOLIC GIRL WHEN A CATHOLIC GIRL WAS AVAILABLE. But the tragedies to forese and forestall are THE DIFFERENCES THAT TO OFTEN SUCCEED IN BREAKING UP THE UNITY OF MARRIAGE and the unhappiness that outweighs the joy of having persisted after that one girl. Suppose she says CHRIST IS NOT IN THE TABERNACLE and you say He is; suppose she insists BIRTH-CONTROL IS OKAY and you say it isn't; WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO AFTER THE IN-DIS-CULABLE KNOT HAS BEEN TIED? ***** What you need is an intellectual showdown. May God bless you all! and may the Mother of God—sweet, immaculate, pure—help you!
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