

Editorial

Horses, Yea! Numbers, Yea! Bingo, Nay!

President Ford has signed legislation enabling newspapers and radio and television media to report the results of state-run lotteries without running afoul of federal laws. Heretofore federal law prohibited broadcast or the use of mails for newspapers carrying lottery information — although big newspapers disregarded the law at will.

So now such information on state gambling is strictly legal. Bingo, however, is still regarded archly by the authorities. Think of it, Bingo.

This newspaper cannot carry information concerning upcoming Bingo games because that would be promoting gambling, the government intones.

So, while the state uses all its resources to squeeze pennies from the populace by touting betting on the horses and by running a numbers game — and while the broadcast media use your air waves secular newspapers, and your mail service to make their hay off the gambling operations, this newspaper cannot announce that a Bingo game is scheduled at St. So-and-So Church next Wednesday night.

Forget that it would be a public service. Forget that Bingo appeals mostly to older citizens who find it an easy and enjoyable leisure-time activity, as well as the opportunity to be with others. Forget that it enables parishes, cut off from the public funds gleaned from the OTB and the lottery, to survive financially to provide the religious needs for their people.

Play the numbers. Good citizen.

Bet the horses. Good citizen!

Play Bingo. Immoral. Un-American.

What politician, pray tell, will step forward and correct this injustice?

Not Now

A chapter of the National Organization for Women, referred to as NOW, has taken action which would classify it as THEN.

A pro-life member who supports equality for women "from conception to natural death" was expelled from the NOW chapter in Columbus, Ohio, because she opposed NOW's fundamental policy that women should be free to choose abortion, according to a Religious News Service report.

The vote to expel her was 32-5. The charge: she "publicly advocated a limitation of a woman's right to choose abortion, a fundamental policy of the National Organization for Women."

Pat Goltz, the member expelled, is president of Feminists for Life and says she supports "the right to choose" to protect life and "not to engage in violence." She said she is opposed to "the right to kill." She feels her position needs no defense but answered NOW's charges "abortion is bad for feminism and because of the urgency of using any opportunity I might have to warn other feminists of the danger to the feminist movement of supporting permissive abortion."

She further feels that NOW is denying her the right of freedom of speech and that the feminist movement in general uses social ostracism on any feminist who disagrees publicly with "house-brand feminism."

It would seem that NOW is practicing some limitations of its own concerning a woman's right to think for herself. We hope that members would work to correct such a basic flaw.

Opinion

Statement Disputed

Editor:

Benedict Stavis' letter praising Communist China's government-directed collective farms (1-8-75) deserves comment. He wrote that "the socialist collectivist system in China... prevented serious food shortages."

To correct this point of view, I would like to quote from the Phyllis Schlafly Report of June 1973:

"Communist China likewise continues to require imports of food commodities, although China was historically agricultural and, with efficient operation, should be an exporter. This year, China will import at least 22 million bushels of wheat and 26 million bushels of corn from the U.S., along with food oils. China, like Russia, is drafting non-farmers into the fields in a desperate effort to produce food and avert famine."

With regard to Communist Russia's program of collective farming the same Schlafly Report informs us that "before 1917, Russia was a grain-exporting nation; today Soviet Russia cannot feed herself." It also mentioned: "the American farmer feeds himself and 58 other people with a high protein diet. The Russian farmer feeds himself and only seven others with a starchy diet."

* Even if the collective farm system did work, would the price of persecution and loss of freedom be worth it?

Nicholas Hober
101 Lapham St.
Rochester, N.Y. 14615.

Sacred Heart The Answer

Editor:

Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus lends itself admirably as a source of personal renewal in the Holy Year. The One salvation of our disturbed times is Jesus Christ, Lord. The need of every member of the human family to be enveloped in the Love which He offers is indicated by the absence of peace in our world. Our yearning for reconciliation with each other and thereby with the Father can be satisfied through, and only through His Person.

The Sacred Heart of Jesus is the summary of all the divine directions for human development, being the sign and symbol.

COURIER-JOURNAL

Bishop Joseph L. Hogan
President

Anthony J. Costello
General Manager

Carmen J. Viglucci
Editor

Rev. Louis J. Hohman
Episcopal Advisor

Vol. 89 No. 37 January 15, 1975
Published weekly by the Rochester Catholic Press Association. Subscription rates: Single copy, 15¢; 1 year subscription in U.S. \$6.00; Canada and Foreign, \$10.00. Offices, Richmond Building, 67 Chestnut St., Rochester, N.Y. 14604, (716) 454-7050. Second class postage paid at Rochester, N.Y.

Courier-Journal

of the One in Whom the invisible God is made manifest and Who is the ultimate perfection of creation.

It is to be hoped that there will be a re-presentation of the Mystery of Christ as revealed in His Sacred Heart so that everywhere there may return that fervent relationship with the Person of Jesus so necessary to make us personally holy. We can find ourselves and each other in His Heart. Let's look.

Daniel J. McCarty, SS.CC.
Ss. Peter and Paul
720 W. Main St.
Rochester, N.Y. 14611

To Make It Better: 5%

Editor:

Perhaps we have accepted too readily the notion that achieving a better society is like "The Impossible Dream." Perhaps we should focus instead on the theme that, with God, nothing is impossible. We will be realistic in accepting this theme only if we acknowledge OUR responsibilities and OUR duties as members of one interdependent human community. And with God's help, we can make it better.

The Lord is most pleased when we are obedient to Him and willing to share with one another; in short, when we give evidence of loving Him and neighbor. What does this delicate concept of love-of-neighbor mean in a rough and tumble world? A little thought should tell us that we give love to our neighbors, most of whom are strangers, principally through a desire and an effort to be just and merciful toward them in concrete ways, even at cost to ourselves.

We believe that today's severe problems cry out for everyday people to stand up and be counted more on the side of serving others and less on the side of self-serving. To get things started, we will offer five percent of our net income in addition to our normal contributions. Half will go to the poor and half into efforts to get others to make sacrifices of their own choosing and to get our legislators to do their part as well.

We sincerely hope that you the reader will not be apathetic but will write us about the different things people can do to make this good world work better. We trust you will think beyond purely financial sacrifices to what people can and ought to do to become better neighbors, citizens, employees, businessmen, political, and religious leaders. Then adopt one for yourself and go public with YOUR decision. The spreading example might just be contagious and effective enough to worry the prophets of gloom and doom! If you can, won't you join us in a campaign to spread whatever constructive ideas come in? Perhaps someday, someone will challenge our mood with a song, "The Possible Dream," so that people will begin to believe in and use the latent power they possess even now.

Mr. & Mrs. William Folger
764 Newberry Lane
Webster, N.Y. 14580
Jan. 3, 1975

Letters intended for publication must be addressed to Opinion, Courier-Journal, 67 Chestnut St., Rochester, N.Y. 14604.

They should be no longer than 1 1/2 pages, typed double-spaced, with names and addresses. The paper reserves the right to edit all letters.

common sense, I sincerely hope that our bishops have not taken steps to remove the Stations of the Cross from our churches or have played down this religious service.

Sincerely,
D. J. O.

Dear D. J. O.,

I have checked around the diocese and have not found any pastors who have taken down the Stations of the Cross. (It was not an "across the board" check; there still may be some.) Vatican II did not specifically mention the stations but did approve highly such devotions, as would build up the spiritual life of the people; also, the Enchiridion (List) of indulgenced practices issued since Vatican II does list the making of the stations as a practice which merits an indulgence. I am not at all certain that pastors are required to have the stations in their churches.

Some remarks of my own: The Stations of the Cross is one of my favorites. The steps Jesus took to Calvary are a daily reminder of the important steps in my life — bearing daily burdens (II), falling under them (III) meeting people along the way who need help (V & VI); quality of interpersonal relationships (VII); spirit of detachment (X) and commitment (XI), quality of my love (XII & XIII) and my Baptismal Commitment (XIV).

Some of the problems with stations have been the very poor quality of the artistic rendition of them, and the fact that they are used as mere historical sentimental memories of what Christ went through.

I would hate to think a pastor or parish council would remove them because of lack of personal taste for them; to me that would be unwise as well as uncharitable. The Stations of the Cross are very valuable to many people; encourage them, or at least let them be!

THE OPEN WINDOW



Fr.
Louis Hohman

Dear Sir:

I have heard recently that a number of pastors in our diocese have taken down the Stations of the Cross which had adorned the walls of their church for many years. The explanation I have been given is that since Vatican II emphasis on the stations has decreased, and the services are not really important, so why have them! Before I accept this premise, I think there are a number of questions that have to be answered:

1. What exactly was the official position taken by Vatican II on the Stations of the Cross?

2. Have the Stations of the Cross really been taken down in churches of the diocese?

3. If so, who gave the respective pastors the authority to do so?

I know that there are other ways to contemplate and to meditate on the passion and death of Christ, but how easy it is before and after Mass and confession to kneel in church and just reflect on the stations. How very important it is not just for adults but for our young children to learn and be reminded of what Christ went through to save mankind.

In this day and age where change sometimes seems to be the banner [standard] rather than