

**Editorials**

**Bishop Clark  
A 'Wild Card'?**

Eavesdropping on other media:

● From Dick Dowd's nationally syndicated column, "Behind the Headlines," concerning the makeup of the bishops committee working on the pastoral on women. Pointing out that all of the bishops on the committee have "official" positions regarding women in the Church, he writes:

"The wild card is Rochester's Bishop Matthew H. Clark who has written his own pastoral on women and will be able to add that special insight from the writing and reception of his own pastoral to the group knowledge."

● The Associated Press reports that a million persons attended a Billy Graham rally in Seoul, Korea.

What makes Graham so successful an international crowd-puller, second only to the pope in the world of religion?

● From the National Catholic News Service, a report that Archbishop Denis Hurley of Durban, South Africa, a longtime critic of apartheid, has sharply criticized his country's recent parliamentary election as "a weak substitute for authentic democratic evolution."

The elections provided the archbishop with more than enough ammunition. First, blacks, who comprise 72 percent of the population, still cannot vote nor are they represented in parliament. In a masterpiece of hypocrisy, "mixed-race" and those of Indian background will now be represented in the parliament, presumably a step forward by the minority, but all powerful, white leadership. However, even this condescending favor is marred by the fact that the mixed-race and Indian people will sit in separate chambers from the whites who will maintain a majority over the other two chambers. Voter turnout was sparse, reportedly as low as 4 percent in some areas.

No wonder the archbishop is concerned. He has called for a "one-man, one-vote" majority rule, including blacks voting. He warns that South Africa faces a "final explosion" unless apartheid is erased.

● And a quick look at the electronic medium, particularly the televising of the Republican convention:

It seemed that Cardinal John Krol of Philadelphia went beyond the usual theme of invocation during the opening prayer Thursday, Aug. 23, when he called for government leaders to protect unborn life.

And shouldn't it bother people to see Rev. Jerry Falwell taking such a prominent position in Republican ranks? And aren't those prominent politicians who hem and haw about not injecting their personal beliefs even into such a life-and-death issue as abortion leaving the field wide open to extreme religious groups, such as the Moral Majority? Isn't the real reason many candidates duck the abortion question that they see an anti-abortion position as a political liability? If so, the national election may prove them wrong -- dead wrong.

**and Opinion**

**Reagan Criticized**

EDITOR:

Is it not ironic to hear these Moral Majority evangelists from the Bible Belt, for many years the home of slavery, lynching, segregation and the Ku Klux Klan, supporting President Reagan in the name of religion?

For them to support the most anti-labor, pro-rich president in our history in the name of religion is to libel religion. Not only his past record but also his future plans make even the worst presidents look good. His policies are in direct opposition to the Papal Encyclicals on social justice for the working man as well as in opposition to the bishops' peace pastoral. His nuclear

arms buildup and his firing of the flight controllers, in spite of the pope's teaching that "strikers must not be penalized," is ample evidence.

Conservatives would have us believe that morality applies only to sex. They want the Church to refrain from injecting morality into foreign policy and from injecting social justice morality into economics.

I believe that Catholics should be consistent and apply the Church's moral teaching to social justice and nuclear war as well as abortion. President Reagan has failed on the first two and has only given lip service to abortion at election time.

Walter O'Hagan  
7 Sherman St.  
Auburn, N.Y. 13021

**Cuomo Criticized**

EDITOR:

I would like to address two issues which presented themselves in the article "The Archbishop vs. the Governor."

First is whether or not a public office holder may inject his moral beliefs into his politics. Governor Cuomo, like so many politicians, supports the idea that his private convictions cannot be intertwined with his political ones. While it is expedient for politicians to promote this philosophy, it amazes me how many people fall victim to this affront to sound logic.

Our forefathers, when founding this great country, drew from their religious beliefs and our laws were formed to reflect them. It was the religious institutions which were to be separate from the state -- not God's basic laws of morality.

Furthermore, all politicians make moral judgments -- many of them unpopular. Governor Cuomo often makes moral decisions when he signs bills into laws. He recently signed a law forcing people to restrain their bodies while riding in a car because "it saves lives." He decided that saving lives was more important than personal choice.

Not only do politicians make moral judgments according to their beliefs, but all of us run most aspects of our lives based on them (whatever religious institution nurtured them). It is foolish to think (contrary to Governor Cuomo) that a politician can divide himself in two. A person who tries because of the temptation of power, money or public pressure will eventually lose those morals he has. And a man who compromises his morals will compromise our best interests and those of our country.

The second issue that surfaced in the article is whether or not a religious leader may influence his congregation as to how they should vote. Black leaders may tell blacks who to vote for; unions may tell their members who to vote for; etc. -- and Governor Cuomo may tell Democrats or other Americans how to vote.

He confronted, however, the Archbishop for advising Catholics that they could not in good conscience vote for a pro-abortion candidate. Contrary to such reasoning, on moral issues, our religious leaders have the right and the

obligation to instruct their congregation on the moral reality -- even to the point of advising them to use their political influence to change immoral, inhuman laws. Personally, I would like to see much more open, unabashed criticism of pro-abortion candidates. It is only those voices who are willing to speak up that will be heard.

Anne Bartholomew  
57 Woodlyn Way  
Penfield, N.Y. 14526

**Moral Hypocrisy**

EDITOR:

As a matter of general policy, I believe that a priest of Christ should be reserved about speaking his mind on the merits or demerits of a political candidate. However, the candidacy of Geraldine Ferraro causes me to throw caution to the winds.

There are virtues higher than merely human prudence and human respect, and the need to speak out in defense of the values of the Gospel outweighs the fear of alienating those who wish the clergy to remain silent. I cannot and will not remain silent in the face of moral hypocrisy and brutal political expediency, and the selection of Mrs. Ferraro as the Democratic candidate for the vice presidency is an outrage that cannot be overlooked.

Though selected as a means of drawing Catholic support at the polls, Mrs. Ferraro's position on abortion is utterly incompatible with Catholic teaching on the sanctity of human life; and I cannot conceive, under any circumstances, of there being a sufficient reason for a conscientious Catholic to lend her support. Some moral issues admit of no vacillation, and abortion is clearly one.

Abortion is a matter that affects the fundamental Judeo-Christian value structure so profoundly as to make it an issue of primary, not secondary, importance. At a time when one and a half million children are being exterminated annually in our own nation, and 50 million worldwide, it cannot be maintained that one's stance on abortion is of only marginal significance. Can those who will not defend the rights of the most innocent be trusted to promote the common good?

Honesty and moral consistency are not optional qualities in public servants. They are of the essence of

what constitutes just government. Those who argue that they are "personally opposed" to abortion, but work incessantly to promote the easy availability of abortion, are engaging in a form of ethical gymnastics that can be summed up aptly in one term: hypocrisy.

Father Gary Sumpter  
W. 3405 Weile Ave.  
Spokane, Wash. 99208

**Can Only Vote Once**

EDITOR:

Paraphrasing Nathan Hale, I regret that I have but one vote to cast in the next election. For if I had two, I could cast one for Ronny Reagan's pro-life position and the other I could cast for Fritz Mondale and all the social, political, economic and military goodies we would get under his administration, "all areas where the present administration could be found wanting," to quote the

Courier-Journal editorial of Aug. 22.

But unless Congress changes the law and lets me have two votes, I must choose either to "end the nuclear arms, race, the need to help the impoverished, strong civil rights legislation, a just policy opposing apartheid in South Africa, responsible energy policies, opposition to U.S. military intervention in Central America at a cost of 1.5 million potential Americans who are currently butchered annually -- or to vote in favor of saving the 1.5 million Americans at the cost of letting the problems of the rest of the world be taken care of by the rest of the world.

In support of the American bishops, there are many other areas of concern, but I would remind the American bishops of the old adages, first things first and charity begins at home.

John J. Clark III  
RD 1, Box 61  
Wayland, N.Y. 14572



"THE WORD IS 'CHARISMA', MEANING A SPECIAL GIFT. IT'S NOT 'CHARB-ISMA', AND IT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH HAMBURGERS."

**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 S., 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.

**Fr. Louis J. Hohman**



The Open Window

**Part II**

Another serious obstacle to a successful marriage is the inability to communicate. By that I don't mean the inability to communicate intellectually (ideas). The word communicate comes from two Latin words meaning to thoroughly join or unite. Therefore communication is not simply at one level, the level of the mind, but rather at every level. Especially must communications be at the level of feelings. How very often marriage counselors have experienced watching a husband and wife talk over one another's heads with intellectual and often very logical statements which mean nothing at all to the other.

For example, the statement, "You have nothing to be jealous about," has no meaning whatsoever in view of the deep-seated feelings on the part of the one who is jealous. Feelings are facts and must be dealt with as such.

That is why Marriage Encounter has become one of the more important movements of our time because it is, in a very real sense, a crash course in communications.

Husband and wife are given a very real and important opportunity to communicate with each other at the level of feelings and so to explore the depths of one another in a way they probably haven't before. It also gradually leads them toward the conclusion that neither one of them is wrong while the other is right.

There is no such thing as one being wrong and the other right except in the most extraordinary of intellectual matters. Being right or wrong may be alright for philosophers but it certainly does not apply to spouses.

**Exploring The Broken Marriage**