

Editorials

The U.S. Bishops, War and Peace

It is not the final product, still the essence of the recently published draft of the U.S. bishops on war and peace is worth considering by all Catholics.

It may or may not be accepted, in whole or in part, by the whole body of bishops who will begin discussing the proposed letter at their meeting later this month.

But one can probably surmise that if the thoughts expressed have reached the second draft, they probably represent the general consensus of thought of the U.S. bishops on the subject, a ticklish one at best.

As the leaders of the Roman Catholic faith in the United States ponder the issues addressed in the pastoral, our readers should simultaneously be giving the life-and-death matters thought — and prayer.

On nuclear warfare, the committee which wrote the pastoral letter said:

"Under no circumstances may nuclear weapons or other instruments of mass slaughter be used for the purpose of destroying population centers or other predominantly civilian targets . . . we feel obliged, as a matter of practical moral guidance, to register our

opposition to a policy of attacking targets (whose destruction) would devastate the nearby population centers. The relevant moral principle in this case is the disproportionate damage which would be done to human life.

"We do not perceive any situation in which the deliberate initiation of nuclear war, on however restricted a scale, can be morally justified. Non-nuclear attacks by another state must be resisted by other than nuclear means . . . We find the moral responsibility of beginning nuclear war not justified by rational policies."

As regards "limited nuclear war," the pastoral said that "the issue at stake is the real as opposed to the theoretical possibility of keeping such a war limited and within the stringent bounds of the requirements for a just war. The range of gravely important questions surrounding these issues makes us skeptical about the real meaning of limited."

As regards nuclear deterrence, the proposed document states:

"1. The intention to use strategic nuclear weapons which would violate the principles of discrimination and proportionality;

"2. The human consequences if deterrence fails;

"3. The political relationship which sustains deterrence, a relationship of radical distrust which John XXIII described in 'Peace on Earth' as root of our international problems;

"4. The threats made or implied by deterrence give no assurance of any limits which would be maintained if deterrence fails, and,

"5. The diversion of vitally needed resources which are consumed by the arms race."

"All of these conditions," the document says, "are the reason we have called the arms race, with deterrence as its key element, a 'sinful situation,' one which must be changed however long and difficult the task."

The document calls for an immediate, verifiable bilateral nuclear freeze, negotiated cuts in current U.S. and Soviet arsenals, a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and the removal of all nuclear weapons from border areas by all parties coupled with increased controls against inadvertent or unauthorized use of tactical nuclear weapons.

A key word in that is "bilateral." While some elements in the United States are calling for a unilateral freeze by this nation, the bishops who prepared the document are clear that they want such a freeze to become policy of both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. and that it be verifiable.

In the coming weeks, much will be published about the bishops' meeting, one of the most important of its kind in years. The general Catholic population would do well to keep abreast of the proceedings. We all are affected.

and Opinions

Stouffer's Position Outlined

Editor:

The information provided by INFAC in relation to the Nestle boycott issue and carried in articles of the Courier-Journal is lacking in confirmation of facts and in cases absolute false statements.

Stouffer's is being attacked over the Nestle issue. It is not in the infant formula business and we do not have any operations in Third World countries. It is true that Stouffer's stock is owned by Nestle but no Stouffer person can make any decisions which will address the critics' demands. A boycott of Stouffer's, if successful, will only cause economic harm or unemployment to 13,495

Stouffer families right here in the United States. A boycott will not improve the nutrition of one child in Africa. A boycott can cause the loss of job opportunities for Rochester people.

Let's look at the facts. The World Health Organization has enacted a Code of Marketing of Breast Milk Substitutes as a guide to member nations in enacting their local country legislation. Nestle has supported this WHO code from the day it was enacted and on March 16, 1982, announced they have implemented the WHO code in those countries where measures have not yet been taken by the government to apply the WHO recommendations. On May 3, 1982,

Nestle appointed an Infant Formula Audit Commission under the chairmanship of Edmund Muskie and made up of such independent individuals as Dr. Philip Wogaman, dean and professor of Wesley Theological Seminary; Dr. Robert Campbell, general secretary of the American Baptist Churches in the USA; Dr. Omar Fareed, a former assistant to Dr. Albert Schweitzer at the Albert Schweitzer Hospital in Lambarene, Gabon; Dr. Vijaya Melnick, liaison officer to the President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine and Biomedical and Behavior Research, and others to audit Nestle's conformance with the WHO code. This commission made its first quarterly report Oct. 14, 1982. They reported critics groups have not filed any complaints addressed specifically to alleged Nestle

marketing for the commission's consideration and investigation. Further, the commission recommended 10 changes in the Nestle instructions to Nestle managers for implementation of the WHO code. Nestle's executive vice president announced the company accepted the recommendations and "communicated them to our managers and marketing personnel for strict application." The Infant Formula Audit Commission reported they "reviewed the Nestle responses in detail and consulted with WHO and UNICEF as to the acceptability of the instructions and as to any remaining problems . . . On the basis of this review and these consultations, the commission decided, at its meeting in September, to accept the revised Nestle instructions as an adequate response to the commission's recommended

changes and to accept them as the commission's best effort at this time to interpret and to implement the provisions of the WHO Code."

Additional confirmation of Nestle's support of the WHO code came in the action of the United Methodist General Council on Ministries to accept and approve the report of the United Methodist Infant Formula Task Force which included a two-year study of the issue. The Task Force report recommended the United Methodist Church not join the Nestle boycott and further that agencies of the church and annual conferences which currently are taking part in the boycott should re-examine their position and consider ending their participation. In addition to the United Methodist Church, a task force of the Episcopal Church has also recommended their national

church not support the boycott.

Stouffer's asks concerned individuals to listen to the facts from both sides of this issue and insist on critics giving you full facts. Stouffer's would like to be a part of the Rochester community and have a part in upgrading the old Americana Hotel. Stouffer's is a people-oriented organization with a long record of quality operations. We offer the opportunity for Rochester to have a new top quality hotel which will provide jobs for Rochester people and support your efforts to bring convention business to Rochester. Stouffer's asks that you not support any boycott activities.

Edwin T. Frantz
Vice President
The Stouffer Corporation
29800 Bainbridge Road
Solon, Ohio 44139

Further Appeals

Editor:

This letter marks further appeals for 1. Transformation of "Catholic" schools into bulwarks of knowledge and holiness of Catholic faith ("Not Catholic Enough," Courier-Journal, Sept. 1), 2. Elimination of classroom sex education which spiritually seduces and psychologically harms our children ("Sex Education, Cancel It," Ibid.), 3. Primary diocesan efforts and resources to teach "Familiaris Consortio" ("Sex Education Program Hit," Courier-Journal, Oct. 6), and 4. To refute charitably Msgr. William Shannon's defense of his public dissenter image as untenable in Catholic faith.

The sex education guide manual would be objectionable if it were extended to adults only since it contains the same material as the USCC's "Plan of Pastoral Action for Family Ministry" issued in 1978 by the USCC bishops' ghost-writers, contains practically nothing of the content of "Familiaris Consortio" (Family Society). For

document gives 10 suggested readings — six of the authors are public dissenters and only two (Mary and Robert Joyce) are well-known defenders of "Humanae Vitae."

"Familiaris Consortio" was issued following the 1980 Synod of Bishops during which the U.S. Bishop delegates were obliging in conveying the views of "Humanae Vitae" dissenters. "Familiaris Consortio" discusses God's plan for the Christian family in clear, elaborate and intelligent detail, and the Holy Father tells the bishops what they must do and teach to restore the family to Christ.

The pre-Vatican II confidence in a bishop's imprimatur and nihil obstat has been destroyed by the failure of some bishops to present and defend Church teachings from the onslaughts of dissenters and opinion molders. Msgr. Shannon's "The Lively Debate" by coincidence contains the same imprimatur as the "Familiaris Consortio" publication, the Holy See assigned a commission of cardinals to correct and incorporate a number of Church teachings (i.e. Mass is a continuation of the holy sacrifice of the cross; original sin, rather than polygenesis which monsignor advanced recently in the Courier-Journal).

The Vatican excerpt which Msgr. Shannon selected in defense against mockery of "freedom of conscience" and his public dissenter image is irrelevant. If continued, "Conscience frequently errs from invincible ignorance . . . Why omit 'religious submission of the will and of the mind must be shown in a special way to the authentic teaching authority of the Roman pontiff, even when he is not speaking ex Cathedra' (Vatican II, the Church, 25)?"

Walter M. Abbott, general editor of "The Documents of Vatican II," emphasizes that the phrase "freedom of conscience" does not appear in the documents; that one cannot use such subjectivism, which is a basis for moral anarchy.

Msgr. Shannon can obliterate his public dissenter image and serve the diocese fruitfully by faithfully teaching "Humanae Vitae" and "Familiaris Consortio."

38 Wyndover Road
Rochester, N.Y. 14616

Supreme Court Erred Before

Editor:

It was a sad day in 1973 when the Supreme Court

ruled in favor of abortion, which created the fallacy that it was granting woman the liberal position of choosing between life or death for their unborn child.

This was the second most devastating decision in the history of the Supreme Court when it failed to recognize the fact that all people are created equal.

At the time our country was founded, a person's position in life was almost preordained by his birth and in that period, equality among people existed only at the time of death.

This is why the first American proposition was and is the most daring of all, because it finally made all people equal in the eyes of the law, from conception to the grave.

The first time the Supreme Court denied this right was in 1857 in the Dred Scott decision. The Court had a chance to declare slavery

The court then did to all black Americans what it is now doing to unborn children: refusing to recognize that they are human beings.

The 1973 Supreme Court decision on abortion was in itself unconstitutional. In order to render its decision,

the court had to usurp legislative powers and it also violated the 10th amendment which gives the states whatever powers are not directly vested in the Constitution.

I pray that every woman faced with such a major decision will seek guidance and wisdom from our Lord. I hope that she will seriously consider the baby that she is carrying as a human being and, most of all, as a part of her life.

Anthony Liccione
77c342 Box 149
Attica, N.Y. 14011

Why Start Worrying Now?

Editor:

The concept of churches becoming involved with nuclear freeze and becoming revolutionary troubles me. I question their sudden interest over these age-old problems. Have Christian communities suddenly realized these problems exist? Where have

or so since the birth of the atomic bomb? Certainly not praying with me, or our children would not have to suffer the horrors of a nuclear war!

The freeze movement is commendable. One cannot disagree with it. You protesters have grown up in the nuclear age. I have a

legitimate question: Where are the demonstrations in foreign countries where democracy and religious freedom is suppressed? We have aggressive revolutionary movements buying bullets instead of bread to feed their fellow man. Must he submit his list of visitors to the world before talking to them? The debacle of the Iranian revolution is evident. Everywhere you look there are attempts to control peoples' minds with different forms of terrorism. Would we not be susceptible to terrorism if we unilaterally stopped?

People protesting hope our antagonists would receive a message by these demonstrations. Our antagonists' interpretation of these actions is questionable. Would they assume weakness on our part, or a sincere desire for peace and a better life? Must we have this nuclear sword of Damocles hanging over our heads for eternity? That is what our antagonists would do, would they not? The analysis is the method of controlling

acceptable to them. The concept of beating swords into plowshares is fine. I would like to check the keenness of the edge our enemies placed on the plowshare.

Our only recourse is prayer.

Robert L. Landschoot
10 Sharon Street
Geneva, N.Y. 14456