

COURIER-CALENDAR

St. Pius Holy Hour — At 8 tonight, July 17, St. Philip Neri Church, 1780 Clifford.

St. James — Parish picnic, Sycamore Grove in Ellison Park, 1-4:30 p.m. Sunday, July 21, rain or shine. Paul Zielinski, chairman. Tickets from Don and Marge Wafer, 288-6169.

St. Salome — Summer festival, 6 p.m. July 26, 27, school parking lot, 4282 Culver, Irondequoit; fish fry Friday, 5-7 p.m., \$1.90 per plate, take-out service offered.

St. Ambrose — Mrs. Pat Dykstra of Rochester Area Right to Life on women's rights, 7:30 tonight, July 17.

Northwest Area Senior Residents — Monthly get-together, 1-4

p.m. tomorrow, July 18, St. Peter and Paul school hall, Friends welcome.

Eastman Theater — Benny Goodman and his sextet Saturday, July 27, 8-15 p.m. Featuring special guest, dancer Carmen De Lavallade.

Strasburgh Planetarium — "Universe of the Mind" with added feature "The Last Question" through Sept. 2. Weekdays 2 and 8 p.m., Saturday and Sunday, 1:30, 3:30 and 8 p.m.

Bristol Valley Playhouse, Naples — Robb Constantine, folk musician, 5 p.m. Sunday, July 21.

Marine Midland Bank — Exhibit of silver works designed and crafted by Richardo Lopez de Grado of Rochester, Plaza Office, through July 22 during regular banking hours.

Deadline

Calendar items should be mailed to the Courier-Journal Calendar Desk, 67 Chestnut St., Rochester, N.Y. 14604. Deadline is Wednesday noon, one week ahead of the publication date.

RTL Speaker

Abortion Tip of Euthanasia Iceberg

By SHARON DARNIEDER

Describing euthanasia as an iceberg and abortion as the tip that shows, Jeanne Sweeney of the Right to Life Education Fund spoke July 10 at the first session of a Life Issues and Social Action course.

Sponsored by the Diocesan Sisters Council (DSC), the course is one of 19 being offered during July by The Responding Church Institute program at St. Ambrose School, 31 Empire Blvd. Margaret Finucane developed the four-session course.

Mrs. Sweeney, a nurse, told listeners that although the term euthanasia is Greek for "good death," it is a euphemism that covers a complex of ideas and attitudes and has been stretched to encompass three different concepts.

"In death with dignity in the fullest sense of the term, we can all see the reason behind letting the terminally ill die naturally," she said.

However, she stressed that this does not and should not mean abandonment, on the part of hospitals, doctors and families.

"Good medical nursing, spiritual and psychological care should always be given to the

person who's dying naturally," she observed. "They should never simply be left to die alone. We have a responsibility for every human being."

She pointed out that those who push for euthanasia legislation claim that death with dignity is what they want though many bills presented to state legislatures have gone beyond that, some subtly and others bluntly.

"You do not need legislation for death with dignity," she said. "Doctors have been following these procedures for years. We suspect that the whole idea of filing legislation for euthanasia is to get a foot in the door."

According to Mrs. Sweeney, another aspect of euthanasia can be mercy killing. As opposed to death with dignity (permitting the dying to die naturally), mercy killing entails the intentional use of medical technology in such a way as to cause or speed up death.

Advocates of mercy killing, she added, base their case on pity and argue that it's inhuman to prolong the suffering of incurably or painfully ill persons.

Mrs. Sweeney outlined four categories under mercy killing, positive (direct killing on purpose by an overdose, etc).

negative (where treatment is withheld, and not necessarily because the person is terminally ill), voluntary (suicide), and involuntary (murder).

"The thing that makes the categories so difficult to determine is intent," she said. "It's difficult to measure the intent."

"And once the euthanasia laws get on the books," she concluded, "intent cannot be examined."

She warned those in the class to be aware of the semantics involved — "tricky semantics."

A third meaning of euthanasia can be death as a medical management option, she noted.

"Whatever one might believe to be the real motives of the advocates of mercy killing, we must at least accept their concern, distorted as it might be, for the alleviation of individual human suffering," she said.

And she pointed out that it is this which distinguishes mercy killing from death selection.

"Death selection or managerial euthanasia involves the deliberate termination of lives which are no longer considered socially useful," she said.

Mrs. Sweeney said that the Supreme Court decision on abortion and the recent push toward euthanasia legislation shows that the "Judaic-Christian ethic is being replaced by a utilitarian ethic."

"We've probably always had conflict between the two," she observed, "but the rise in secular humanism makes people more receptive to the utilitarian ethic."

She emphasized the importance of the pro-life movement and noted that all positive helping efforts are pro-life and that "those in the movement are going to have to give more support to those who are handicapped, etc." to counterbalance those who say the solution is euthanasia or abortion.

She added that members of a Christian community could help prevent anti-life activity and laws by "educating themselves to the terminology and vocabulary involved with the issues, so they know what the words mean."

The second session in the Life Issues and Social Action course, which will be held tonight, July 17, features Mr. and Mrs. Alban Reichert who will speak on helping the unwed mother.

The July 24 session will present William Polito, a Rochester lawyer who'll speak on legislative action and the formation of Right to Life groups.

Father Thaddeus Wojcik of St. John's Russian Orthodox Church will speak July 31 about prayer, social action and the anti-life rationale.

Pressure Mounts Against U.S. Aid to Chile Junta

By GARY MACEOIN

New York [RNS] — Pressure is building up in Congress for amendments to the Foreign Aid Bill of 1974 (S.3394) that would cut off military aid to governments in violation of generally accepted international standards in their treatment of their citizens.

Groups concerned for violations of human rights in Chile are leading the movement, gravely embarrassing the Administration which stubbornly identifies the interests of the United States with the Chilean Junta.

Amendments already introduced or being prepared would block aid to Brazil and Bolivia, the two countries scheduled for most military aid in fiscal 1975, as well as to Chile, for which the bill asks \$205 million in military credit sales and \$800,000 in grant military assistance. The Administration wants to increase total military credit sales from \$325 million to \$555 million.

Sen. James Abourezk (South Dakota) has formulated in two amendments the minimum ingredients for a foreign policy that values human rights. They would make military aid contingent on a government's providing access to international humanitarian agencies; and they would end support for foreign police, paramilitary, internal surveillance, and prison systems.

Congressmen Donald Fraser (Minnesota) and Michael Harrington (Massachusetts) are preparing similar amendments in the House, Fraser seeking a general restriction on all violators of human rights, Harrington concentrating on Chile. Sen. Abourezk is also considering an amendment obligating the President to report to Congress on the status of human rights in any country requesting military aid, a report comparable to an "environmental impact statement."

Congressional investigative units have been concerned with human rights in Chile ever since the Junta seized power last September. First was a Senate investigation, headed by Edward Kennedy, of refugee and humanitarian issues. Then came a House study of human rights, under Donald Fraser, which established the fact of "widespread torture" in Chile and found "the response of the U.S. Government to be lacking in view of the magnitude of the violations committed."

More recently, in May and June, an impressive roster of witnesses gave testimony, most of them just back from on-the-spot investigations, and all of them were unanimous in their condemnation of the Junta's continuing violations of human rights.

Several witnesses reported on the "show trials" now being conducted, the first public trials in the military courts since the Junta seized power. They included Charles Porter and Ira Lowe (Fair Trial Committee for Chilean Political Prisoners), Covey T. Oliver, former Asst. Sec. of State for Latin America (International Commission of Jurists), former Attorney General Ramsey Clark and Judge William Booth. The Clark-Booth study was funded by the National Council of Churches.

In other areas, Richard Fagen, incoming president of the Latin America Studies Association, testified on the violations of academic freedom in Chile, and Professor of Law Newman (Berkeley) reported on the efforts of the UN Commission on Human Rights on behalf of refugees and political prisoners in Chile.

Ramsey Clark's testimony on June 11 acquired particular significance the following day when Harry W. Shlaudeman, Deputy Asst. Sec. of State, was

Gary MacEoin is the author of many contemporary studies on Latin America. His latest book, **No Peaceful Way: The Chilean Struggle for Dignity**, was published in June by Sheed and Ward.

examined by Congressman Donald Fraser. Shlaudeman testified that the State Department position is that the Chilean Junta's declaration of a state of siege is in accordance with the Chilean constitution. The Clark statement had clearly established that the state of siege is illegal under the Chilean constitution, as are the measures taken by the Junta under it.

Shlaudeman has a reputation as a hatchet man. He was chief political officer in Santo Domingo from 1962 to 1965, playing a major role in negotiations with Dominicans which led to the ouster of President Juan Bosch, the U.S. invasion and the restoration of the dictatorship. He was deputy chief of mission in Chile from 1969 to 1973; Congressman Fraser questioned him aggressively and extracted some extremely revealing non-answers. The questions were related to an opening statement in which Shlaudeman stated that the U.S. Government had "adhered to a policy of non-intervention in Chile's internal affairs during the Allende period."

Fraser: "If it turned out to be a fact that the U.S. channeled money covertly to opposition political parties, would that be at variance with the policy of non-intervention?"

Shlaudeman: "Well, I am not sure. I am not sure that it would be. I would like to think about that."

Fraser: "Did the U.S. Government covertly supply money to opposition political parties following the 1970 election?"

Shlaudeman: "Well, I would like to postpone that question."

Fraser: "Are you prepared today to deny an assertion that the U.S. funneled money covertly to opposition political parties following the 1970 elections in Chile?"

Shlaudeman: "I am not . . ."

Fraser: "You do agree that you have some knowledge of the facts?"

Shlaudeman: "Of course I do."

Fraser: "You do know the facts?"

Shlaudeman: "Yes."

Fraser: "On the basis of that knowledge you are not prepared to deny that the U.S. funneled money covertly to opposition political parties after the 1970 election in Chile?"

Shlaudeman: "I would like to be careful about what I say . . ."

Fraser: "If money went through other political parties such as in Europe and came back to Chile, you would conclude that is a direct form of aid?"

Shlaudeman: "This is getting in a very complicated situation . . . I would prefer to have the opportunity to make sure that I am precisely correct when I answer."

Fraser: "Would you then be agreeable to returning to the subcommittee after you have rechecked the facts and responding as fully as you can to the question which I have put you?"

Shlaudeman: "I would have to check that, too."

THE OPEN WINDOW

Father Thaddeus Wojcik

Dear Father,

Just recently I saw a picture of a nun — no way could you tell she was a nun! Holding a tennis racket, dressed for the sport. Now I grant you, Father, it is not immoral to play tennis nor to dress comfortably for its rigors, and there certainly is no reason to say a female is wrong to indulge in this wholesome game; but what we are trying to tell you is, "Nuns do not pose for photos if they play tennis!" You — not you, but the Catholic Church p.r. people have destroyed our image of what a nun should be. She is so much like every other female we know that the whole point of her being a nun is lost. So it's not actually that we think there is anything bad about the modern nun, it's just that you have deeply wounded our idealization of a vocation. Perhaps I am wrong but I believe I have read that the only orders which are not hurting badly for recruits are those who still follow the old ways, if somewhat eased, and are engaged in hard missionary labor. These orders represent the only route left for the girl who wants to blend her whole existence into dedication to God's will and works. Short skirts are not a cause, only a symptom.

Disturbed

Dear Friend,

There seems to be some

confusion in your mind about the packaging and the product. Madison Avenue influence, no doubt. I do agree that there are some advantages to having nuns clearly identified for what they are by the "packaging" — the habit. For one thing it calls more easily to the mind of people that the vocation is there and perhaps encourages future vocations. But I also trust the Sisters and the leadership that made the changes. It was not a whim but a carefully considered step and I do feel they knew the reasons pro and con better than you or I could.

I think you object to a nun being photographed in tennis togs simply because it offends a preconception of yours as to how they should look — like someone objecting to some of the new baseball uniforms because they go against tradition. I may be wrong, but I also got the feeling that you somehow think nuns are not what they used to be — not as holy, not as dedicated, not doing as good a job. If you do feel that way, I object strenuously. Nuns of today are doing great work for Christ and His Church. They are in most instances getting to meet more people and are able to do more for them. Please give first consideration to the reality behind the package. God bless our Sisters.