

**Editorials**

**Why Do We Endure Insults?**

We wonder how many have noticed that Planned Parenthood is becoming one of the loudest voices in the pro-abortion movement. We wonder how many are aware of its Madison Avenue campaign to sell abortion to the American people.

The campaign would be ludicrous except that so many who should be offended by such manipulation have refused to speak up over past insults.

The president of Planned Parenthood, Fay Wattleton, says the campaign will make abundant use of the American flag, pictures of children and family life and such words as freedom, Apple pie, America and abortion.

Obviously, Ms. Wattleton feels Planned Parenthood can buy this image. Unwittingly, she reveals that she feels that her opposition, the pro-life movement, already possesses them.

According to Religious News Service, she hopes that the advertising campaign will give Planned Parenthood "a pro-child, pro-family, pro-life image." With such muddled thinking at the top, perhaps Planned Parenthood should assume a Pogo-ism as its slogan, "We have met the enemy and he is us."

The whole thing, perhaps, should be treated lightly. But unfortunately it can't because it introduces a new element of divisiveness and disruption to an already scarred issue. Its appeal is to the dark side of the American psyche. No good can come from it.

On the other hand, the campaign may have a reverse effect. It may show alert people to the inconsistency of an organization promoting abortion as a birth control measure and claiming to be pro-life at the same time. It may strike people strange that Planned Parenthood is paying money to wave banners it doesn't possess.

We cannot forget Planned Parenthood's cartoon showing a Catholic bishop carrying a gasoline can at the time abortion clinics were burned by fanatics. In the name of charity, we have tried to forget that bitterly biased and unjust drawing. We did not like to analyze the mentality behind such a cartoon.

But forgetting is hard to do in the face of Ms. Wattleton's gratuitous remark that anti-abortionists "don't believe in separatism of church and state." That's an ugly comment when so many she vilifies have fought and shed blood for the principle of the separation of church and state.

When she couples that observation with another that the pro-life movement is made up of some conservative Republicans, the Roman Catholic hierarchy and fundamentalists and calls them "an increasingly vocal and at times violent minority" the memory of that cartoon flits back.

Ms. Wattleton says that American families will be strong only if its members are free to decide how and when to have children. We agree. Catholics have never tried to make others accept our Church's position on artificial contraception. But when you talk about abortion as a birth control measure, that is quite a different matter.

And Ms. Wattleton and Planned Parenthood seem to have adopted abortion as the principle method of birth control. We wonder why.

We do not like to use labels such as liberal and conservative in connection with abortion. We believe that everyone should see that human life in the womb is not being protected. We commend those who have, from the beginning, worked in this pro-life cause in the face of insults, bigotry and ostracism.

We wonder when the Ms. Wattletons of the world will have the decency to point out that this Catholic hierarchy she demeans so freely also opposes capital punishment and war. That as a body they support increased public assistance, disarmament, adequate health care for all, etc., etc.

We wonder if she realizes that American Catholics have contributed millions, nay, billions, of dollars to help the poor and the stricken.

We are befuddled at how anyone can equate abortion with "pro-child" or "pro-life."

We know excesses in rhetoric and promotion of cause have occurred on both side of this issue but we had hoped that that phase had passed.

This newspaper, for one, has never used photos showing aborted babies in buckets and other available graphic proofs of the violence of abortion.

We, too, sympathize with the frightened, unwed mother-to-be. We support the efforts of such organizations as Birthright to help people in that dire situation. Ms. Wattleton ignores the fact that the "hierarchy" wholeheartedly supports such efforts.

Abortion happens to be the issue here. Regardless, we think it high time that Catholics not accept the insults heaped upon them by people using bias as a ploy to reach their ends. "Enough, enough," we must tell Ms. Wattleton and others of her ilk.

**and Opinions**

**Magisterium  
The Authority**

Editor:

Whether or not Father John Reedy misunderstands "What the Bishops Are Saying" (10-15-80) is speculation. By contrast, his message that the Church Magisterium is legalistic and incompassionate is characteristic of modernist affront which has ruthlessly divided Church bishops as well as the laity. It is no surprise that the division of the Synod bishops can be most simply expressed as modernist and Catholic positions — 180 degrees apart. The clear division of the Synod bishops is given in Cardinal Ratzinger's summarized report of the Synod first-week report, "Instrumentum Laboris."

Cardinal Ratzinger indicates, "There are fathers who have insisted... criteria of doctrines must be the sense of faith of God's people, the experience of couples, the work of theologians and philosophers, the progress of human sciences and evaluations of the Church's Magisterium... pastoral action, in some way must precede the doctrinal judgment, to which it must lead."

The above position contains the essential modernist tenets of faith: the source of supernatural knowledge is peoples' interpretations of experiences and events; their sense of faith, secular disciplines, and theologians as generators of doctrine and morals are placed above the Magisterium. Such beliefs held privately would be considered "subjectively defensible" which is "invincible ignorance." However, some bishops have allowed the scandal of modernist theologians to publicly mislead them as well as priests, religious and laity.

Continuing excerpts from

the cardinal's summary: "The second tendency claims that the main pastoral duty is to propose doctrine of the Church because salvation depends on this, according to Sacred Scripture. The Church must not be overwhelmed by current opinions, as if it were a sociological doctrine, but must prophetically preach the medicine of the Gospel for the ills of the world. The development of doctrine (which is not denied) is actuated only when faith penetrates the life of men and converts them."

Shouldn't the bishops who profess fidelity to the Catholic faith have compassion for the laity, priests and sisters who are oppressed by false diocesan teachers and conspicuously disobedient nuns who place themselves above the authority of the Church? Is compassion to be reserved only for those who insist on subjective establishment of doctrines and moralities?

Joseph J. Murray  
38 Wyndover Road  
Rochester, N.Y. 14616

**Why Not Latin Mass?**

Editor:

I was pleased to read the letter of Robert G.S. Zanche of Sept. 3. It is encouraging to know that he, too, has observed that the desire to celebrate the Traditional Latin Mass is not confined to the old. I am sorry that that impression was given in my letter of Aug. 20 but the issue is not one of numbers. We are supposed to be Christians. We are not utilitarians who run roughshod over the needs of smaller groups to serve our perceptions of the needs of the masses. As Christians, we have obligations to listen to the descriptions of our brothers' and sisters' spiritual needs; to accept those descriptions as seriously as they are shared and to try and answer them. A few months

**Forum  
Political Responsibility**

By Tim McGowan  
Office of  
Human Development  
Department of  
Justice and Peace  
Diocese of Rochester

Sometimes it almost seems so simple. Jesus came "to bring good news to the poor, to proclaim liberty to captives, new sight to the blind and to set the downtrodden free." (Luke 4:18)

As Christians living in the richest country in the world approach the time of choosing someone to lead the United States, we need to examine what this central aspect of Christ's life means in a world where two-thirds of humanity is poor, where 600 million people — 600 million individual human beings —



live in absolute poverty.

In "Populorum Progressio," Pope Paul VI said, "Today the principal fact we must all recognize is that the social question

has become worldwide." Certainly current events in El Salvador, in South Africa and in numerous other parts of the world highlight the international struggle of a people for justice and human dignity. If nothing else, the Iran-Iraq conflict is a clear indicator of how increasingly in the future, the United States is going to be affected by developments in the Third World.

Current debate for the Presidency focuses on war and peace; and attached is a predictable display of charge, counter-charge, innuendo and invective. But how can world peace in the future be spoken of when 600 million people are poor and desperately hungry? It will not be possible until the structural

causes of world poverty are addressed. And how is the wealthiest country on earth going to address that issue, those people? Literally, the future of the world could hinge on such a question. Such is the kind of question we as Christians must be considering when we choose a candidate to lead us into the closing decades of this century.

We join with the bishops of the United States Catholic Conference who conclude in the address on "Political Responsibility Choices for the '80s," "We pray that Christians will provide courageous leadership in promoting a spirit of responsible political involvement. May they follow in the example of Jesus in giving special concern for the poor."

ago, we read on this page an eloquent plea for plurality and tolerance by Msgr. Roche. Surely if plurality is to be taken seriously, it must address the deep, spiritual needs of those who desire to celebrate the Mass in the traditional form.

It has been interesting to watch the progress of the various dissenting groups within the Protestant Episcopal Church of America toward union with the Roman Catholic Church. An article in the Aug. 27 Courier-Journal indicates that this union is about to take place and that the Catholic Church is even going to find some way to accommodate some elements of Anglican Bishop Cranmer's liturgy. If the National Conference of Catholic Bishops can accomplish this, they can undoubtedly obtain the lifting of the ban on the celebration of the Tridentine Roman Catholic Mass.

Mr. Zanche called

traditional Catholics to speak up for their needs and speak up they should. But, more importantly for the spiritual welfare of the Church is the requirement that those who are not attracted by the traditional Mass should speak out in support of those who are.

In Luke 24:35, we read, "Then they recounted what had happened on the road and how they had come to know Him in the breaking of the bread." It is in the "breaking of the bread" that we, like the disciples on the road to Emmaus, come to know HIM! How in the name of charity can we deny this to our brothers and sisters. The ban on the Tridentine Mass must be lifted.

William J. Mooney  
PO Box 11  
Lima, N.Y. 14485

Editor's Note: The Roman Catholic Church bans the Tridentine Mass. The

Rochester Pastoral Office has noted that Catholics who attend the Tridentine Mass fail to fulfill their Sunday obligation.

**Used Material Needed**

Editor:

Readers may like to mail

their used Catholic pamphlets and magazines directly to the Foreign Missions.

If those who wish to do so will please send me self-addressed envelopes, I will give them the addresses of missionary priests and nuns who need Catholic literature.

Mary Conway  
14 Castle St.  
Cork, Ireland

**Thought for Today**

"Trust the Church of God implicitly even when your natural judgment would take a different course from hers and would induce you to question her prudence or correctness. Recollect what a hard task she has; how she is sure to be criticized and spoken against, whatever she does; recollect how much she needs your loyal and tender devotion; recollect, too, how long is the experience gained in 1900 years; and what a right she has to claim your assent to principles which have had so extended and triumphant a trial. Thank her that she has kept the faith safe for so many generations and do your part in helping her to transmit it to generations after you."

—Cardinal John Henry Newman.