

LETTERS

REPLY TO MR. ENRIQUE CORDOVA DIAZ' TWELVE QUESTIONS.

Sir:

The actions of the Archbishop of Santiago de Cuba have no bearing whatsoever with actions of our Catholic Bishops here.

On November 8th last our free democratic voice was clearly heard in the polls. Democratically, as it should be in a place where positively liberty reigns, our electorate conclusively answered all your twelve questions.

However as a further answer to Mr. Cordova Diaz' twelve questions it would be very proper to ask him another one: Why has Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, Roman Catholic Primate of Poland, cooperated with a Communist leader in a Communist country?

Carlos F. Mayoral
Ponce, P. R.

* * *

'ABYSMAL NAIVETE'

Sir:

The suggestion contained in your editorials "Sinners Unlimited" and "An Impasse," however well-intentioned, reveals, shall we say, a rather superficial understanding of the inner workings of the Roman Catholic apparatus at the hierarchic level. The hierarchy never acts on impulse. It is cool and deliberate and gears its motions *sub specie aeternitatis*. This is the secret perhaps of its survival throughout two stormy millenia of recorded history. You may rest assured that the "pastoral explosion" of recent weeks and the registration of a theocratic political party were the result of careful cogitation—a movement as precisely planned as a logistic operation.

Historical events preceding and immediately following World War II, put the Roman Catholic Church on the offensive, on a scale unparalleled since the reformation. Confronted, among other crises, with the loss of

Poland and other Catholic strongholds in Europe, the Church resolved to move west, to build up America, north and south, into the strongest bulwark of the Faith in the world.

The Puerto Rican episode is just one episode of the crusade; highly significant; though, if only because of the audacity of the operation and its stateside repercussions during the U.S. presidential campaign. It is here in Puerto Rico that the Church, in an attempt without precedent in any other country of the hemisphere governed by democratic institutions, has tried, by confessional means, to subvert the electoral process while sponsoring the organization of a political party of the faithful. Why?... Why?... Is it because one of the clauses of the platform of the ruling party smacks of moral relativism? Therefore, let the Populares rewrite said clause and proclaim their adherence to the Decalogue, and all's well that ends well?

This, in essence, is what the STAR counsels. I believe that the STAR, in so doing, is acting with abysmal naivete. The hierarchy, my friends is playing for higher stakes. And the highest of them all is none other than the control of the educational process. Bill 84 authorizing release-time for extramural religious instruction was the first step in that direction. It laboriously died in the last legislative session, but served to spark, so the legend goes, the inception of the Christian Action Party.

Prior to Bill 84 we must recall the campaign of vilification against the public school, variously labeled as atheistic, anti-religious, immoral and anti-democratic.

Should the CAP have its way, the next step will be public financing of parochial schools and/or financial aid to families whose children attend parochial insti-

tutions—in short, the defeat of the democratic ideal of a classless society.

So, let's not delude ourselves. Any concession by the Popular Democratic Party in matters of principle—and amending its platform under duress is one—will be construed as a confession of weakness and lack of moral purpose. The Popular Democratic Party, after the overwhelming validation of its mandate on the 8th of November, must deal with the men of the cloth from a position of strength—historically, an idiom they comprehend very well because it's also their own. *Vae victis!*

Mariano Villaronga
Hato Rey, P.R.

* * *

WANTS EXPLANATION

Sir:

The other day I read in your paper in the "Letters" section, a statement made by some Mr. Connolly, from Río Piedras, in which he referred to Puerto Rico as "Operation Flea-speck."

I just want Mr. Connolly to please give an explanation of just what does he mean by this.

Today, November 17, 1960, I have read in your paper an article on page five entitled "Donuts, Not Pies, Fancy P.R." In this article you make reference to the "fact" that donuts have been introduced into Puerto Rico only a relatively short time ago. Now I want to make my comment about this. Donuts have been here many years before you even thought about getting into the newspaper business. I used to buy donuts when I was in the first grade back in 1940. So figure it out. Thank you.

Gregorio Batista Monge
Trujillo Alto, P.R.

P.S. Donuts were sold for one penny each in 1940. Now they cost 5c each.