**ATHOLIC** 

1150 Buffalo Road Rochester, NY 14624 716/328-4340

President

s year. ne dis-

inistry

arish's

ked to

st few

recom-

ouncils

at the

to ask

vered

t is in

n and

sterial

for the

ly, the

vhere

s top-

atican

c that

" but

pport

gized

r sug-

ict on

ld me

shop

ade a

r my

p nor

ected 1. But

y led

cesan

they

and

: old

the

ibly

hate

law.

om-

and

the

peo-

me.

his

nds

30d

oes

rise

ises

ust.

? of

ı of

ıll.

out

purier

own

Bishop Matthew H. Clark

General Manager Bishop Dennis W. Hickey

Editor/Asst. Gen. Mgr. Karen M. Franz

#### **Editorial Department**

**Managing Editor** Richard A. Kiley

Senior Staff Writer Lee Strong Finger Lakes

Staff Writers **Rob Cullivan** Monroe County Mike Latona Southern Tier

**Photo Editor** Babette G. Augustin

Photo Intern S. John Wilkin

### **Business Department**

Circulation Manager Jeanne A. Morin

Office Manager Amy D'Accursio

Receptionist **Lenna Hurley** 

### **Advertising Department**

Advertising Manager **Bernie Puglisi** 

Advertising Account Exec. **Kathy Welsh** 

## **Production Department**

Graphics Manager **Lorraine Hennessey** 

**Graphic Artist** Kim Parks

# **Letters Policy**

The Catholic Courier wishes to provide space for readers throughout the diocese to express opinions on all sides of the issues. We welcome all signed, original letters about current issues affecting church life.

Although we cannot publish every letter we receive, we seek, insofar ås possible, to provide a balanced representation of expressed opinions and a variety of reflections on life in the church. We will choose letters for publication based on likely reader interest, timeliness and a sense of fair play. Our discerning readers may determine whether to agree or disagree with the opinions of the letter

We reserve the right to edit all letters. Mail them to: Catholic Courier, 1150 Buffalo Road, Rochester, New York 14624. Please include your full name as well as telephone number and complete address for verification purposes.

Gays in military means worries for soldiers

To the editors:

The front page article, "Gays in the Military" (Catholic Courier, Jan. 21) asked with its subtitle "Is ban necessary or rooted in fear?"

I believe that question can best be answered by stating the basic function of the military is to ensure the nation's survival.

By lifting the military ban on homosexuals, the other people in the military will have an additional worry.

Not only will they have to fight enemy soldiers, they will also have to endure lustful glances — and worse from gay soldiers.

As a Catholic I feel that removal of the ban will in effect say that homosexual acts are not really sinful.

This kind of thinking not only jeopardizes the eternal salvation of the homosexual orientated but also the survival of our nation.

How many servicemen and women will be deferred from seeking a military career if the ban is lifted?

In addition, it is well known that sexually active homosexuals are far more promiscuous than sexually active heterosexuals.

Consequently the homosexuals are at a higher risk for contracting sexual diseases such

as AIDS When Magic Johnson retired the second time from professional basketball the reason he gave was that his teammates were worried about contracting his HIV virus (believed to cause AIDS).

Service men and women living in closer proximity than even those in sports activities should not have that /worry.

**Robert Bart** 



# Bishop should take a stand on United Way

To the editors:

I have to disagree with the Leadership Teams of the Sisters of Mercy and the Sisters of St. Joseph of Rochester in their joint letter-to-the editor supporting Bishop Clark's decision to remain with United Way (Catholic Courier, Jan. 14: "Sisters praise bishop for remaining with the United Way").

As part of their argument, the Sisters point out that Jesus associated with "those whose lifestyle and values differed from his."

I'm curious to know if any of these Sisters are members of the pro-life group Operation Rescue - even though they might they disagree with the organization's tactics — in order to "give witness by their presence." I sincerely doubt it; and, if not, is it because they don't want to be associated with "the wrong kind of people," or because they don't want to give credence to the tac-

It is one thing to say we must be prepared to associate, informally, with people whose behavior we reject — as Jesus associated with tax collectors in His day. It is quite another to say that Jesus would have served on the board of some Tax Collector's Association, part of whose activities unjustly oppressed the poor. ...

... We do well to remember that St. Thomas More was perfectly willing to continue his friendship with King Henry — "My house is at your disposal" - even after Henry severed the Church of England's ties with Rome. But, More chose to resign as Chancellor of England — and ultimately paid with his life — rather than appear to sanction Henry's illicit marriage to Anne Boleyn by giving public witness attending the wedding.

By all means Bishop Clark ought to maintain his friendships, informally, with all those with whom he now associates on the board of United Way. But, he should not give even the appearance of lending respectability to an organization, Planned Parenthood, whose babykilling activities are every bit as monstrous as anything the Nazis did. Nor should he lend respectability to United Way, so long as it continues to fund a Planned Parenthood determined to bring one of its abortion factories to

Rochester. He ought to announce, publicly, that, in good faith, he can no longer serve on the board of United Way until it decides to yield on so important an issue. Then,

he should announce that anyone opposed to abortion ought, for the time being, direct any contributions they would have sent to the United Way, instead, to the Thanksgiving Appeal Fund. Let that fund henceforth make up for any deficiencies among those agencies affected by the loss to United Way.

If Bishop Clark won't take a, perhaps heroic, stand in favor of the most innocent and defenseless among us all unborn babies — for whom will he be a

> Michael L. DeLorme Park Aver ue, Rochester

EDITORS' NOTE: This letter has been edited to comply with space imitations.

# Affiliates of parish recognize bishop for his leadership regarding women

To the editors:

We are a community of women and men who at one time ministered, worshipped and served in the Roman Catholic Parish of St.



Monica's in Rochester, N.Y.

We wanted to publicly recognize our Bishop, Matthew Clark, for his courage, sensitivity and commitment to the issues surrounding the role of women within our tradition. We fully recognize the effort, energy and time he put into the draft of the pastoral on women as a member of the original committee. We commend his decision to vote against a weakened and sadly changed docu-

His honesty, his willingness to be open to the movement of God's Spirit and his ability to listen to sincere and divergent points of view surrounding this issue of justice and inclusiveness, are a model for all of us within our tradition.

We offer these words of prayerful support to him as he continues to respond to the challenges of this issue and the action of God's Spirit in his life.

This letter was signed by (in alphabetical order): Eugene Clifford; Joyce Clifford; Dennis Conheady; Sharon Conheady; Margo A. Connelly; Michael Connelly; Gerard Farrell; Jacqueline M. Farrell; Mary R. Knapp; Richard Knapp; Christopher Langton; Kathy Langton; Anne Malloy, RSM; Barbara Moore, RSM; Father Ron Stacy; Barbara S. Trudeau; John S. Trudeau; Sheila Walsh, SSJ; and Father **Edward Zimmer** 

# Enjoys paper, finds letters to editor disturbing

To the editors:

I enjoy reading the Catholic Courier. The messages from our Bishop Matthew Clark are always uplifting and filled with a loving spirit. Your articles are informative and columnists interesting.

Then I get to the letters to the editor and I am shocked. The vitriolic feelings that people express in these letters is unbelievable. I find them offensive especially Jan. 28.

I also found it difficult to believe one priest could compare another priest to Rush Limbaugh favorably Jan. 28.

I hope I am not alone in feeling this

**Evelyn Lutz** Genesee Street, Mt. Morris