

June 2016

Editorial Comment

Rev. William F. Cahill

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/tcl>



Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rev. William F. Cahill (2016) "Editorial Comment," *The Catholic Lawyer*: Vol. 6: No. 2, Article 2.
Available at: <http://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/tcl/vol6/iss2/2>

This Editorial Comment is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at St. John's Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in *The Catholic Lawyer* by an authorized administrator of St. John's Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact cerjanm@stjohns.edu.

Editorial Comment

The clamorous and confused popular discussion of punishment of crime which the *Chessman* case has occasioned in recent months gives to THE CATHOLIC LAWYER'S symposium on punishment a timeliness which was not anticipated when this series of articles was planned last Fall. Perhaps these essays will be of use to attorneys in the discharge of their duty to help their fellow citizens understand and support the rule of reason and charity in our penal law.

The symposium opens in this issue with the 1954 address of our late Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, on crime and punishment. Its riches of wisdom, natural and practical, as well as spiritual and theoretical, are at the disposal of the careful and considerate reader. Father Cutler of Fordham Law School, and Doctor Odenwald have discharged well the difficult task of integrating the special views of the lawyer and the psychiatrist with sound principles of moral and legal philosophy.

In the Summer issue, the symposium will continue with articles by Bishop Riley, Auxiliary of Boston, Mr. Thomas J. McHugh, former New York State Commissioner of Correction, and Mr. Frederick J. Ludwig, for many years a professor of criminal law at St. John's.

Mr. Paul J. Powers, Law Assistant in the Surrogate's Court of New York County and a Professorial Lecturer at St. John's, has made a special contribution to the *Morality in Legal Practice* item offered in this issue. He suggested the practical problems which have been cast into the hypothetical case. He also read and reread drafts of the solution, helping to sharpen our perception of the problems' many facets, and offering invaluable suggestions for a sound and comprehensive resolution. This acknowledgment is made not only to do justice to Mr. Powers, but to encourage other lawyers to think out the moral difficulties that occur in the areas of their special experience, and to contribute to attempts to resolve those difficulties.

William F. Cahill

EDITOR