

Editorials

Other Questions

If the federal government cuts off highway funds to states that don't have age 21 drinking laws, will state legislators suddenly see the light concerning the present highway carnage?

Isn't Bishop Matthew H. Clark right on target when he suggests that a consistent pro-life office-seeker -- in favor of nuclear disarmament, against the death penalty and abortion -- would make an attractive candidate, all other factors equal?

And didn't Archbishop John O'Connor make sense when in response to a suggestion that it is political suicide to oppose abortion he said Reagan made it?

Why is that when the Vatican comes out in favor of or opposed to this or that development, those who agree shout, "Magisterium!" but when it takes an unfavorable position, nothing is said?

Would those who suggest that the Church should not change with the times still condemn Galileo for endorsing the Copernican theory that the sun, not the

earth, is the center of the universe? Or burr Giordano Bruno at the stake for professing it is possible that life exists elsewhere in the universe?

What's liberal about abortion?

Was there ever a time when Latin was the universal language of the Mass when a group insisted on attending an Aramaic Mass?

If Ronald Reagan had taken his father's religion (Catholic) instead of his mother's would he be more popular or less with the official church today?

Do those who say abortion is a woman's rights issue see the irony in the fact that in the Far East it is being used as a method of reducing female births and thus building an even more male-oriented future?

Summertime

This really happened and unfortunately not enough years ago: A priest was chaplain for a professional football team (the New York Giants). On the team was a Southerner (no offense intended) who was a graduate of a well-known college. He was afraid of the priest because he thought all Catholics were devils and, naturally, priests particularly

Satanic. The chaplain (luckily he was a sandaled Franciscan) was able to show this young man that he didn't have hooves, thus relieving of him of his anxiety, and the two were able to practice peaceful co-existence, if not friendship.

All of which makes one wonder why do secular sports teams have chaplains, anyway. Too often, it leads fans to believe that God is on one side of a soccer match. What happens when both teams have chaplains; does that mean that the team that prays better wins? And doesn't this also apply to international conflicts, surely Khomeini believes God is on his side.

Does anyone else get uneasy when some athlete or other in victory exclaims, "I owe this all to God," unwittingly implying that his losing adversary somehow was victimized by the Deity? What is the case when such an athlete loses?

And does God really get involved when one team, surely containing good guys and bad in its ranks, plays another with a like makeup? Of course, this conjecture does not apply in the case of the Padres, the Saints and the Angels.

and Opinions

President Criticized

EDITOR:

While in Ireland, President Reagan said, "I can't think of anything more vulgar than Americans providing anyone in Ireland the means of killing his fellow man."

Can he not think of his administration providing the means to Central Americans for killing their fellow man?

Can he not think of his administration providing the means to the Salvadoran government of d'Aubuisson for the killing of over 40,000 civilian men, women and children including nuns,

priests and even an archbishop by death squads?

Can he not think of his "Pearl Harbor like" attack of tiny Granada, and the Nixon administration's complicity in the brutal assassination of the democratically elected president of Chile by the present dictator, Pinochet, and the Republic Party's silence in the face of the kidnappings, tortures and killings by the former Argentine government and the crimes of the Samoza dictatorship, whose guerrillas Reagan now supports?

In a poll released last week, only 27 percent of the Irish people were fooled by Reagan's pre-election peace posturing by supporting his re-election. The 56 percent who judged him by his record were opposed to his re-election.

Walter O'Hagan
7 Sherman St.
Auburn, N.Y.

Llewellyn Mehlomakulu said: "The majority of blacks in South Africa are for continuing U.S. business involvement."

Black American professor Walter Williams says: "Most who might be called black leaders in South Africa are strongly against disinvestment."

According to Llewellyn Mehlomakulu when then NAACP leader Roy Wilkins visited South Africa in 1971, he said that U.S. investment and involvement was desirable.

Black African leader Lucy Moubelo said: "Those in our country who urge a boycott of South African goods and the disinvestment of Western capital are simply a small fringe of desperate revolutionaries . . . Clearly the greatest hardships would fall on my people, the black people."

American companies in South Africa have stated that after disinvestment, "Japanese or others will simply buy the businesses. South African whites will not be hurt. But blacks will."

The above opinions have been known for some time. Why then is disinvestment a liberal-radical position if they are sincerely interested in black South African welfare? What is the real reason? Is it the desire to destabilize non-Communist countries?

John S. Starkweather
1840 Middle Road
Rush, N.Y. 14543

Don't End Investments

EDITOR:

Liberals and radicals in and out of the church call for disinvestment of American businesses in South Africa; supposedly this would remove apartheid. These same liberals-radicals ignore far worse conditions in Communist countries.

Black American J. A. Parker says, "I have visited South Africa a number of times during the past decade. On each visit I am impressed by the beneficial impact American business is having on race relations. The vast majority of South African blacks with whom I speak oppose disinvestment."

Black African banker

written by Janis M. Coutu. The paragraph should have read:

"I feel that the entire Christian community should shoulder much more of the responsibility. This might be done via a network of well-publicized shelters and adoption services for mothers with unwanted pregnancies. Apparently abortion has become so accessible and convenient it has become 'the method of choice' for resolving an unwanted pregnancy."

"... The network which I propose should include much more than just church facilities and monies. Church members should be invited to get involved by each family temporarily opening their home to a mother with an unwanted pregnancy. If we turn to ourselves rather than our politicians to eliminate abortion, we will be able to realize many opportunities for charity and grace -- let us work for a Christian solution."

Fr. Louis J. Hohman



The Open Window

Conflicts In Faith, Medicine?

Recently someone approached me with a question about some of my homilies which dealt with the matter of Christian Love as a surrender of self, a giving of self, to God and our fellow human beings.

This particular person was under psychiatric treatment and apparently had been told by her counselor that she was not assertive enough and needed to do things for herself rather than always for someone else. She wondered how this advice could be reconciled with the Christian standpoint or if there was a real conflict here between medical science and Christian faith.

I believe this to be a very important question for two reasons. First, there are many, many people today who suffer from a lack of self-esteem and if they interpret Christian love as a total self-effacement, this obviously could be harmful to them.

The second reason the question is important is because Christian love is so frequently misunderstood from one direction or the other. Sometimes it is seen as a sentimental kind of attachment and at other times a spiritualized masochism. It is neither.

There is however, a paradox in Christian love. On the one hand Scripture tells us that we are precious in God's eyes and his people, tenderly loved, and rescued from our wretchedness through the death and rising of his own son. We are told that we are meant to be his beloved children and to live forever with him. On the other hand, we are told that we must deny ourselves and that whoever saves his life will lose it, while whoever loses it will save it.

These are not irreconcilable. When we lose our lives for Jesus' sake, what we are losing is something lesser, the selfish, animal-like part of us, in favor of something greater, the God-like part of us. So when we love God and our fellow human beings by giving ourselves away, we are achieving our highest possible dignity in becoming like Jesus who is God. He gave himself for the ransom (welfare) of many.

Whatever we give in love we must give it freely. We must give it with reverence for this life of ours which God loves. And we must give it with the dignity of a child of God. If by some emotional twist we are giving ourselves simply in abject surrender, then we are not loving. That is a totally unhealthy situation and is not to be confused with Christian love.



"FATHER MULVANEY CAME OVER LAST NIGHT AND BLESSED OUR HOUSE! HE SAID IT WAS TOO LATE FOR THE FURNITURE, THOUGH."

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.

Correction

In the Courier-Journal of May 30, a typographical error changed the meaning of a sentence in the letter, "Fight Abortion at Church Level,"

ANNUAL CATHOLIC

Thanks Giving

APPEAL

Lawrence
erald W.
ster A.
F. Peer,
Joseph C.
drew J.
Alva E.

McQuaid
t. Morris,
Cipriano,
nd Joseph
m Guilfoil
ath, were
Mel A.
seph P.
Newark
e Anthony R.

McCafferty
Geneva,
tuna and
Assembly
ua, Sam
F. Holtz
Cormick.

nights
ks on,
istrict,
1. The