

Editorials

U.S. Asked Anew To Aid Hungry

"There is clear, undeniable and authoritative evidence of widespread and increasing hunger in America."

This summation was offered by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts in response to presidential aide Edwin Meese who recently declared that many people go to soup kitchens because the food is free and that there is no evidence of hunger in America.

"Let him go where I went," said Kennedy who had toured soup kitchens in five cities.

Kennedy was not merely indulging in argumentation with Meese; he was trying to get support for his

plan to get the federal government to increase government funds for anti-hunger efforts. In what he described as a "modest proposal," the Massachusetts senator asked the government to support a program which would spend \$2.5 billion annually to combat hunger in this country. The senator's job seems monstrous because he is asking help for hungry Americans from an administration which is reluctant to even admit their existence.

He does have help -- from such groups as the U.S. Catholic Conference and other church agencies. But they are often discounted as "do-gooders" by those cynical enough to ridicule the very kind of work Christ would choose.

The plight of the hungry and the poor in this country is worsening. This is true not only because of the neglect of the central government but because the "do-gooders" to whom President Reagan assigned

the concern for the needy, are themselves running out of resources.

National Catholic Charities said the number of meals it has served has increased from 500,000 in 1981 to 1.8 million in 1982 -- an increase of nearly four-fold. A Charities official said that "while the church will continue to do its utmost . . . we simply do not have the resources to meet the need or fill the gap created by the budget reductions enacted in the federal food programs over the last two years."

"The federal government has an essential role and the capacity to make the necessary resources available to meet this need on a national scale," the Charities spokesman said.

When Kennedy calls \$2.5 million a "modest" sum, he is speaking in relative terms. He points out that it is "only one twentieth of the \$50 billion increase the Defense Department" wants for military spending next year.

and Opinions

Sacred Music Ignored

EDITOR:

It was interesting to read the attempted critic of the clear, logical and focused letter of Judy Echaniz's by Ms. Federowicz in the Nov. 30 Courier-Journal.

Part of Ms. Federowicz's analytical problem might be uncovered by employing the simple semantic test of circling all of the personal pronouns in her letter.

One would have hoped that we have progressed beyond the point of seeking the lowest common denominator in aesthetics in liturgy in order to satisfy personal limitations, real or imagined.

Judy Echaniz did nothing more than point out the Holy Spirit inspired the Fathers of Vatican II to call for the preservation and use of the great treasure of sacred music, and to give pride of place to Gregorian Chant. It would not require a survey by the Roper organization to show that the Catholic Church in America has been remiss in being obedient to the teaching of Vatican II in the area of sacred music. In only few cases have the iconoclasts been successful in destroying or defacing serious physical works of art. It must be admitted, however, that in general, they have quite often been extremely successful in preventing the use of the great treasury of church music, and substituting much weaker and aesthetically inferior musical forms.

All of us in the Catholic Church in America should broaden our hearts and minds and become obedient to all the clearly written directives of the Holy Spirit

in the documents of Vatican II, and this obedience should include the much ignored directives of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy Chapter VI, "Sacred Music."

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

Shakeup In Order

EDITOR:

A new book put out by the U.S. Catholic Conference recommends that Catholics forego "single issue voting and consider the entire spectrum of social issues." A USCC spokesman gave an example saying voting for a pro-abortion/anti-nuke candidate could be acceptable "because you have to vote for the issue that's important to you."

In a nation that kills 3,000 pre-born human beings per day this statement is murderously irresponsible. The book should be withdrawn and strongly suggests a shakeup in the USCC is in order. As Pope John Paul II declared, the right to life of the unborn is a "primordial right." As such it cannot be treated so cavalierly by USCC bureaucrats. In the encyclical "Pascendi", Pope St. Pius X observed, "The partisans of error are to be sought, not only among the church's open enemies. They lie hid, a thing to be deeply deplored and feared, in her very bosom and heart, and are the more mischievous, the less conspicuously they appear."

Louis J. Pasqua 133 Exchange St. Geneva, N.Y. 14456

The Cry For Peace

EDITOR:

"Gentlemen may cry peace! peace! but there is no peace. The war is actually begun. The next gale that sweeps from the North will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms. Our brethren are already in the field", so sayeth one Patrick Henry of Virginia over 200 years ago.

Today some of our brethren cry peace! peace! They are already in the field; the fields around Seneca, Griffith, Greenham Commons and Mautthausen. They are "armed" with signs, tearing down chain link fences, singing spirituals and burning candles.

What is this peace for which they cry? Obviously it is not the current peace achieved by 40 years of mutually assured destruction.

It cannot be the peace enjoyed by those who use overwhelming strength and guile to subjugate their neighbors, for such a peace cannot be achieved by song, signs and flickering candles. Do they cry for the peace of those who live under the heel of the oppressor or for the peace of the grave? Or could it be that the peace our brethren in the field propose is a millenium, brought about by lavishing large doses of brotherly love while conducting continuous, unending meaningful and fruitful negotiations, with all and sundry, under the protection of a mutually verifiable nuclear freeze? The possibility for such a peace assumes that the desire for peace is universal and that reasonable men can achieve peace by reasonable means. To accept this premise, it is necessary to ignore 6,000 years of recorded history. Throughout that history, the universal desire has not been for peace but for power and the fruits of power. Men (and women) and nations have never hesitated to use force and violence to achieve their ends, especially when they were able to achieve them with a minimum risk to themselves.

What about those of us who are "not in the field"?

- 1. Do we continue to support our current mutually assured destruction policy?
2. Support a policy for the destruction of our enemies, even at the risk of self-destruction, to achieve the peace which brings power and the fruits of power?
3. Accept defeat and subjugation?
4. Move to the nearest cemetery?
5. Support our brethren in

the field with the hope that the straight line course of human history will make an abrupt 180-degree turn?

Patrick Henry asked, "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery. Forbid it, Almighty God." He then made a choice, "I know not a course others might take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

Patrick was one of the founding fathers of the "movement" which brought us, by the use of force and violence, the liberty we all enjoy. The retention of that liberty requires all of us as individuals to choose and then support one of the policies hidden behind doors 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5, and may the Lord have mercy on us if the one we choose doesn't achieve the end we seek.

John J. Clark III Wayland, N.Y.

Non-Chemical Control Needed

EDITOR:

For as long as man has dwelt on this planet, Spring has been the season of rebirth, and the singing of birds now in some parts of America is strangely silent, for many of the birds are dead -- incidental victims of our reckless attempts to control our environments by the use of chemicals that poison not only the insects against which they are directed but the birds in the air, the fish in the streams, the earth which supplies our food, and, inevitably (to what degree is still unknown), man himself.

Rachel Carson, author of "The Sea Around Us" and "The Edge of the Sea", is a biologist who became so concerned with this situation that she spent four and a half years gathering data from all over America, and from other parts of the world, on the effects of the pesticides and weed killers and fungicides now in general use. The facts, as set forth in "Silent Spring", are appalling.

In terms any layman can understand, Miss Carson explains what is meant by the "balance of nature." She shows how careful we must be, with the great power now at our command, not to disturb this balance in a way that will ultimately do us more harm than good. She describes the lethal chemicals that have been invented in the period since the second world war and are being produced in greater strength and variety every year. And she



"I PUT IT THERE WHEN NEWS AROUND THE WORLD STARTED TO WORSEN."

shows that much of this program is self-deflating. The insects, in fact, have the last laugh. While we have been progressively poisoning our own environment, many types of insects -- including flies and mosquitoes -- have been breeding superior races composed of individuals immune to chemical attack.

But there is a positive side to the picture. We are learning more and more about non-chemical control that in the long run will be both safer and more effective than the deadly chemicals with which we are now poisoning our world.

Mary Rita Crowe 2052 E. Main St. Apt. 74 Rochester, N.Y. 14609

Diocese Asked For Vehicle

EDITOR:

Our concern is the request from the Catholic Family Center for parishes or individuals to donate a van or truck for pickups and deliveries of donations for the diocesan refugee resettlement program.

Since we first became involved with refugee resettlement in our parish in 1980, the Catholic Family Center has had to turn down and do without donated items due to a lack of a transportation vehicle. Now this has been a frustration to us as people with donations to share or a need that cannot be filled. We can imagine the frustrations of the professionals who face this problem day in and day out.

Our question is why can't our diocese with the large resources of our annual

Thanks Giving Appeal apply some of the monies collected to purchasing and maintaining a vehicle for this very program? To be truthful, a program which appears more worthy to us than some of the other areas to which our money is being applied.

Madelyn Teremy Human Development Committee

St. Margaret Mary Parish 401 Rogers Pkwy. Rochester, N.Y. 14617

Editor's Note: The letter included the names of seven other members of the Human Development Committee -- C.J. Sutera, Jerry Dee, Mary Dee, Mary Elizabeth Young, John Horton, Gerry Gessler, Rosemarie Ross.

Disgusted With Bishops

EDITOR:

I cannot express enough disgust concerning the attitude of several bishops on the Sullivan execution, appearing in an article in the Courier-Journal.

Why don't they just propose him for canonization and have it over with?

Here is a heinous criminal who did not hesitate to pump a few bullets into the head of his victim and has dodged execution for ten years through numerous appeals. If anyone ever received "due process of law," he did.

The bishops would be better advised to display their Christian attitude toward the victim's family, rather than toward this criminal.

Robert S. Beer Attorney at Law 32 Old Pond Road Rochester, N.Y. 14625

Guidelines

The Courier-Journal welcomes your opinions. Letters must bear the writer's signature, full address and telephone number. They should be sent to Opinion, Courier-Journal, 114 S. Union St., Rochester, N.Y. 14607.

Opinions should be brief, typed, double-spaced, no longer than 1 1/2 pages.

We routinely condense letters, edit offensive words and libelous statements, and reserve the right to reject letters. Generally speaking, however, only limited grammatical corrections will be made and the letters will reflect the writer's own style.

Because submitted opinions exceed the space for letters, we publish only original letters addressed to us. We will not use poetry, open letters, or copies of letters sent elsewhere. To ensure diversity, we limit each writer to one letter per month.