

Editorials

Passing Scene

With apologies and respect to an unknown Courier-Journal editorial writer of June 20, 1930. We hope the writer understands the updating.

The earth was revolving on its axis. The White House clock was ticking. Reggie Jackson was trying to hit a home run in New York City. The Russians were attempting to subdue the Afghans and worrying about the Poles. John Brown's body lay a-molding in his grave. Doomsayers were predicting the end of the world in the 1980s. The Brooks brothers were hospitalized after a long stint of drinking rain water in an effort to reach the spirit of Haile Selassie.

And Madalyn Murray O'Hair and her Society of Separationists, were in Washington asking the court to "declare" the statutes authorizing expenditures for

the Senate and House chaplains, their staffs and expenses unconstitutional."

Mrs. O'Hair, who unwittingly often plays with fire, was taking aim at the two congressional chaplains who open each congressional session with prayer and ask spiritual assistance for requesting members.

Mrs. O'Hair, in case there exists a fuzzy-cheeked child who doesn't know, is an avowed atheist. She is a lady who doth protest long and loud against any official recognition of the deity. She is best remembered for a Supreme Court decision in the early 1960s which prohibited public schools making prescribed prayer mandatory.

"I was a total wreck. I smoked four packs of cigarettes a day and drank a quart of Scotch every night." At the very same time Mrs. O'Hair was tilting with the court, her son was telling of his life with Mom.

William Murray was explaining that he has found

Christ and was apologizing for his part in his mother's earlier Supreme Court suit.

"I began searching for meaning in my life," he said, "thinking surely there has to be something else than this. My self-search for communion brought me to my knees, and since then there have been miracles in life. The alcohol vanished. Four packs of cigarettes a day vanished."

The younger Murray has found his strength on his knees.

As for his mother, perhaps the lines of a song much better known back on June 20, 1930, than now might apply: She is more to be pitied than censured.

So while Reggie continues his quest and the Communists theirs, and while we take time to hope for better things for the Brooks brothers, may we also pause to pray for Madalyn Murray O'Hair to the God who knows her though the acquaintanceship is not at present shared.

and Opinions

Let's Follow Guidelines

Editor: Reading Georgette Ermatinger's letter to the editor of Aug. 27, her admiration of a leader in the prayer community, Klaus Schulz, was evident. However, there is still the problem concerning Rayma, a news publication found in many Catholic church pamphlet racks. Klaus Schulz, as a Christian editor, has a serious obligation to print the truth.

This past year, Klaus has selected two major articles that speak against traditional Catholic belief. Father Cuddy tried to point out in his Courier article (8/3/80) that the "Third Way" is not the way of Jesus because to lead others away from the truth is a most serious error. We should be grateful to Father Cuddy for alerting us to the errors in that Rayma article. Like all priests,

he was anointed at his ordination with the gift of teaching for the faithful.

The Catholic charismatic movement has been blessed with an especially gifted leader in the area of ecumenism: Cardinal Suenens. His guidelines, Malines Documents I and II, were prepared after much prayer and consultation with prayer group leaders from several countries. Klaus Schulz, appointed by Bishop Clark as a leader in the Catholic charismatic community, has a serious responsibility here.

When will the leaders appointed by Bishop Clark settle this issue following the example of the national leaders as reported in New Covenant?

Joan M. Rand
68 Sansharon Drive
Rochester, N.Y. 14617

Forum

The Boycott in Retrospect

By Don McEvoy
Senior Vice President
National Conference of Christians and Jews

When I left for Russia in mid-June I went with mixed feelings about our boycott of the summer Olympics. I came home convinced that America had made the right decision, at the right time, for the right reasons.

I was as disturbed as anyone else about the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, but could not fathom how remaining away from the Olympic games could impact that tragic situation. I am essentially a jock at heart, and it simply did not seem fair that our athletes were to carry the burden of sacrifice to bolster up the sagging political fortunes of a desperate politician.

Two things changed my mind. One was the unanimous approval of the American decision expressed by the dissidents with whom I talked. The other was a variety of things said by local Muscovites, the quintessential man on the street.

The In-Tourist driver who took me from the Moscow airport to my hotel on the evening of my arrival, drove

through the Lenin Hills area and pointed out the stadium and facilities where the Games were to be held less than a month later.

With a shrug of his shoulders he ruefully remarked, "It won't be like we expected it to be. So we beat the Bulgarians. So what?" It was the kind of comment I heard many times during the ensuing days.

But of much more significance was the fact that the boycott forced the Soviet authorities to make some kind of explanation to their own people. The linkage between the absence of Americans, West Germans, et. al. and the invasion of Afghanistan was inescapable.

Even though the explanation of the connection between the two events was very low key, at least both Pravda and the state-controlled television were forced to tell the citizens of Russia that the West did not take lightly their Afghanistan intervention. Without the Olympic boycott it is doubtful that the Russian people would have heard of our outrage at all.

Those courageous people who are putting their lives on the line daily to effect change within the Soviet Union were grateful for our decision. That is good enough for me.

Archbishop Jadot:

Thoughts On the Outgoing Papal Delegate

By William F. Willoughby
Religion Today

Washington — There's a sneaking suspicion in my mind that Archbishop Jean Jadot, the 70-year-old archbishop from Belgium who has been the apostolic delegate to the United States for the last seven years, might not want to leave the United States to take a post in the Vatican.

It is not that he is kicking his heels at an order from the Vatican. He's not that kind of man at all, and he has served the Vatican notably well since he came here.

Many bishops who hold their posts now, for that matter, have to see the hand of Jadot as the hand of power. His recommendations "back" to Rome certainly didn't go unheeded. His hand in reshaping the American Catholic scene will be felt even decades from now.

Jadot, our first non-Italian emissary from the Vatican, has always seemed to me to love the United States and he is one who quite obviously tried to understand the country, its people and its sense of faith. And faith, in his parameters, is not limited to the confines of the Roman Catholic Church.

Why Jadot, a man I've had several delightful chats with, might not want to leave the United States is because of the affluence here and the abject poverty in many other parts of the world.

And if any of you have jumped to the conclusion that he has gotten hooked on the affluent life in the United States, then you've taken the wrong angle in analyzing the man.

He expressed a bit of apprehension about leaving because it is so easy in this country to become inured to the way much of the rest of the world lives. And his

fears are that he might, through all the good times here, have lost some of his sensitivity toward one of the big problems of the world — poverty and its increase of misery year after year.

For one truly committed to the Gospel of Christ, this certainly would be a gnawing feeling for there is a very real sense in which Christ is in the midst of the poor, if ever so faintly.

"You know, when I came here in 1973, I discovered very quickly the level of comfort and wealth in the United States. It hurt me very much to see this," Jadot said.

That seems very strange coming from a man from Belgium, which is anything but a poverty-stricken country.

But one has to realize that Jadot didn't come directly to Washington from Brussels or Antwerp or Bruges, but from a village in Cameroon in West Africa where he was the papal nuncio. And that makes all the difference in this world.

"Two weeks before leaving Cameroon," he said, "I was invited to a feast in a village in the heart of the tropical rain forest. It was a small village of about 5,000 Christian people. Their church was a shack. They asked me to help them raise \$10,000 for what they thought would make a fitting church."

"Five weeks later — three weeks after I came to the United States — I was visiting a parish and the pastor was showing me his renovations, especially his mosaic pictures, which cost \$90,000.

"And so, now, I think sometimes, after seven years here, I have lost the feeling of poverty in the rest of the world."

I like that kind of man. He's concerned that he might no longer be as concerned as he knows he ought to be.

I rather doubt that Jadot was being critical of Americans being well-off. Not at all. After all, there is nothing intrinsically wrong with an industrious and intelligent people making the most out of what they have at hand to work with.

And whether the archbishop would agree with me or not, I do believe there is something about our religious base in this country which has contributed profoundly to the wealth we have developed.

There is something about us as Americans, though, that Jadot puts his finger on that could be one of our faults. We are wealthy, true. We also are generous, and this the man from the Vatican does not for a moment deny. In fact, he is full of praise to us as Americans for it.

And I'm one of the people he's talking about when he says we Americans do get ticked off when the very people we help seem to turn on us. Why shouldn't we expect the decency of some gratitude? I still see nothing wrong with that. It's just fundamental decency.

"There is one thing that is very obvious," Jadot said. "North Americans have a resentment of other countries. They say: 'We are the good guys. After all we've done for you, why don't you love us?'"

"And I understand this, because Americans have done a lot, but Americans must begin to have a broader view. They tend to consider their own problems and their own well-being first and not to be as concerned for the traditions and cultures of those other countries — what's good for people in other countries."

Well, you may agree or not. It won't be the first time the Vatican's top representative in the United States has said things some of us might have trouble agreeing with. That's beside the point.

All I want to say is that if this good man — and he is every bit that — should have his fears about leaving this country for an important post in the Vatican, I, even though I am a Protestant, hate to see him leave. He, in his seven years here, has been a most valuable part of our American spiritual wealth.



Comment