

*Fr. Perozich comments —*

*I am a priest who try to provide leadership of the faithful to the person and teachings of Jesus Christ so that we have life in Him.*

*As a priest I look also to bishops and the Holy Father to guide me to the person and teachings of Jesus Christ so that I have life in Him.*

*In years past, such teachings and leadership were fairly consistent and easy to find.*

*Now many bishops promote a novel vision on faith and morals.*

*When I find a good bishop, I follow him.*

*Here are the first 3 of Bishop Strickland of Tyler Texas' MORALLY COHERENT CITIZENSHIP. It differs greatly from what I hear in San Diego and other dioceses.*

*Bishop Strickland indeed has a morally coherent Catholic message.*

*I won't post more since you can follow him yourself by going to his blog website for future posts: <https://www.bishopstrickland.com/blog/post/morally-coherent-catholic-citizenship>*

***“the Right to Life position is, in one sense, not about an “issue” at all. Nor are those who hold it “single issue voters”. It is the Preeminent moral mandate. The Pro-Life position is also worldview, a lens through which we should view every political, cultural, social, and economic issue. It should inform every aspect of our participation in society, especially the exercise of our citizenship.”***

***anyone who directly promotes abortion is not acceptable for leadership in our society.***

## Bishop's Blog / Morally Coherent Catholic Citizenship



**By Bishop Strickland**

**Tuesday, May 19, 2020**

*Bishop Joseph E. Strickland was named the fourth bishop of Tyler in September of 2012 by Pope Benedict XVI. Prior to*

*being named bishop, he served a number of roles in the diocese, including vicar general, judicial vicar, and pastor of the Cathedral parish. He was ordained to the priesthood in 1985.*



### **Morally Coherent Catholic Citizenship**

As your bishop, I plan to offer a series of brief articles that I pray will be helpful to all of us as we approach the 2020 national, state, and local elections in November. Let me be clear, I have no intention of publicly endorsing any specific party or any candidate.

Rather, I intend to focus on the foundational teachings and principles of our Catholic faith and the importance of moral coherence in our personal exercise of faithful citizenship. That will entail a special emphasis on Authentic Catholic Social Teaching. It is a real tragedy that even the principles of Catholic Social Teaching are often being corrupted and coopted by some whose attitudes and approaches are not Catholic or Christian at all.

Catholics, in their exercise of their citizenship, too often succumb to what the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council warned of in the “Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World” (“*Gaudium et Spes*”). They wrote: **“This split between the faith which many profess, and their daily lives deserves to be counted among the more serious errors of our age”** (Par. 43)

In short, faith and Life must come together for Catholics. The full Deposit of Faith must be guarded - and it must inform every area of our life, including our social and civic participation. That includes our voting. This overriding insight was elaborated upon in 2002 by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in its excellent teaching on the [Participations of Catholics in Political Life](#):

“The social doctrine of the Church is not an intrusion into the government of individual countries. It is a question of the lay Catholic’s duty to be **morally coherent**, found within one’s conscience, which is one and indivisible. There cannot be two parallel lives in their existence: on the one hand, the so-called ‘spiritual life’, with its values and demands; and on the other, the so-called ‘secular’ life, that is, life in a family, at work, in social responsibilities, in the responsibilities of public life and in culture.

The branch, engrafted to the vine, which is Christ, bears its fruit in every sphere of existence and activity.”

We need to fully participate in the election process, as Catholic citizens, in a manner which is morally coherent.

# Bishop's Blog / 2nd Post in the Series...Morally Coherent Catholic Citizenship



**By Bishop Strickland**  
**Thursday, May 21, 2020**

## **The Pre-eminent Moral Mandate: The Right to Life**

The most important foundational teaching and principle of Catholic Social Teaching is that every human life is sacred from conception to natural death, because every man and woman is created in the Image of God. Further, there is a fundamental Right to Life, which is confirmed in the Natural Moral Law, the Sacred Scripture, and the unbroken Tradition of the Catholic Church. Every Civil Law must respect that fundamental Human Right to Life, or such a law is an unjust law.

Every human person is created in the Image of God. Because of that, they have an inherent dignity - at every age and stage of their lives. This truth is what informs our respect for every human life whether that life is found in the first home of the womb, a wheelchair, a jail cell, a hospital room, a hospice, a senior center, a soup kitchen or on a refugee boat. And, in future installments, we will touch on many of these matters.

However, **the Right to Life position is, in one sense, not about an “issue” at all. Nor are those who hold it “single issue voters”. It is the Preeminent moral mandate. The Pro-Life position is also worldview, a lens through which we should view every political, cultural, social, and economic issue. It should inform every aspect of our participation in society, especially the exercise of our citizenship.**

As we approach this election season, it therefore must inform the way we vote. The Right to Life is the foundation for every human right. The language often used in the political discussion surrounding legal abortion reveals an Orwellian newspeak which is polluting our public discourse. We should never use phrases such as "Abortion rights". Abortions do not have rights; only human persons have rights. The first Right is the Right to Life.

Every procured abortion is the taking of innocent human life and is always and everywhere intrinsically immoral. Without the Right to Life there are no other rights and the infrastructure of rights is thrown into jeopardy. Human rights are goods of human persons. When there is no human person to exercise them, all the rhetoric extolling them is nothing but empty air and sloganeering.

Every procured abortion is intrinsically immoral - always and everywhere wrong. Thus, our absolute opposition to legalized abortion must be the first of the pre-eminent issues we consider in voting. Any candidate or political party which promotes abortion is precluded from any further consideration for a Catholic voter. That individual or party may embrace other policies that seem supportive of other related issues arising out of our respect for the sanctity of life, but if their stance is that abortion is ever acceptable and should be promoted, any other positive life values become moot. If one promotes the idea that an unborn person has no Right to Life, then what other right is of any consequence? That person's life has been terminated.

I urge the faithful in this diocese to realize that **anyone who directly promotes abortion is not acceptable for leadership in our society.** I realize that eliminates a vast number of potential leaders from our consideration as faithful Catholics, but we must hold firm and do all we can to only support political leaders who respect and protect the fundamental Right to life of the unborn. And, they must listen to our voice.

## Bishop's Blog / 3rd Post in the Series...Morally Coherent Catholic Citizenship



By **Bishop Strickland**    **Tuesday, May 26, 2020**

## **The Right to Religious Freedom Should Inform our Voting**

In his World Peace Day message for 1988, Pope St John Paul II said: “Religious freedom, an essential requirement of the dignity of every person, is a cornerstone of the structure of human rights, and for this reason an irreplaceable factor in the good of individuals and of the whole of society, as well as of the personal fulfillment of each individual. It follows that the freedom of individuals and communities to profess and practice their religion is an essential element for peaceful human coexistence. [...] The civil and social right to religious freedom, inasmuch as it touches the most intimate sphere of the spirit, is a point of reference for the other fundamental rights and in some way becomes a measure of them”

This emphasis on religious freedom ran throughout the late Popes teaching magisterium. It was demonstrated early in his service to the Church. For example, then Bishop Karol Wojtyla’s actions at the Second Vatican Council. He made five interventions during the discussions which helped to formulate the final [Declaration on Religious Freedom \(Dignitatis Humane\)](#) which was promulgated by Pope St Paul VI on December 7, 1965.

This is all in keeping with his rich understanding of the essential connection between truth and freedom as discussed throughout “The Splendor of Truth” (Veritatis Splendor) where John Paul warns of the “death of true freedom” (Par 40) . It is also addressed repeatedly in “The Gospel of Life” (Evangelium Vitae) where he writes of freedom’s “...essential link with truth” and “...inherently relational dimension.”(Par. 19)

In his encyclical letter on “Faith and Reason”, *Fides et ratio*, he wrote: "It is not just that freedom is part of the act of faith: it is absolutely required. Indeed, it is faith that allows individuals to give consummate expression to their own freedom. Put differently, freedom is not realized in decisions made against God. For how could it be an exercise of true freedom to refuse to be open to the very reality which enables our self-realization? Men and women can accomplish no more important act in their lives than the act of faith; it is here that freedom reaches the certainty of truth and chooses to live in that truth."(Par. 13)

As the Second Vatican Council affirmed: “This Vatican Council declares that the human person has a right to religious freedom. This freedom means that all men are to be immune from coercion on the part of individuals or of social groups and of any human power, in such wise that no one is to be forced to act in a manner contrary to his own beliefs, whether privately or publicly, whether alone or in association with others, within due limits. “The council further declares that the right to religious freedom has its foundation in the very dignity of the human person as this dignity is known through the revealed word of God and by reason itself. This right of the human person to religious freedom is to be recognized in the constitutional law whereby society is governed and thus it is to become a civil right.” (DH Par. 2)

As we approach the upcoming elections in the United States, the candidates stand on religious freedom must be paramount in our choices in the ballot box. The soft persecution of faithful Christians, across the confessional spectrum, is obvious to anyone who cares about religious freedom. The growing hostility toward the symbols of our religious heritage, the mocking of the values informed by religious faith and the overt and open hostility toward people of faith and religious institutions is increasing.

Religious freedom is called the first freedom in the American polity for good reason. It ensures that the leavening role of

revealed truth helps us to form our conscience and shape the choices we make as individuals, families and, as a society.

The American founders fled coercive approaches to religion which compelled adherence to a particular sect. An incorrect interpretation of the Establishment Clause in the First Amendment to the Bill of Rights has arisen in our day which promotes a notion of a Church/State separation that is hostile to religious institutions, discriminates against people of faith and seeks to censor religious speech and expression in the public square.

Religious faith should be encouraged and accommodated by the federal and/or state government, not treated with hostility. Rightly understood and applied, religious freedom means a freedom for religious expression, not a removal of such expression in the public square. Religious faith, religious institutions and religious speech are protected by the First Amendment to the Bill of Rights.

The Birth Certificate of our Nation, the Declaration of Independence, affirmed the existence of inalienable rights and self-evident truths. The Rights of Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of happiness were understood to be endowed by our Creator and not conferred by a Federal or State Government. Implicit within the classical understanding of happiness is the pursuit of virtue - and virtue requires religion.

The First Amendment prohibition against the establishment of a National Religion was never meant to be used to justify governmental hostility toward religious faith, religious persons, or religious institutions. It was intended to protect against the establishment of a National Church and a forced adherence to its doctrine. It was more aptly understood as an Anti-Establishment Clause.

The Right to Religious Freedom protects people of all faiths to participate in the public square and to be a part of the daily

social interactions that constitute the very tapestry of our social life. Religious faith is a human and social good.

The drafters of the First Amendment to the Bill of Rights used the phrase "Free exercise of religion" for a good reason. The protection which it guarantees to American citizens goes beyond the freedom to worship within the four walls of our church buildings. Exercise involves action. The First Amendment protects our fundamental right to bring the values informed by our faith into the social, economic, and political arena as good and faithful citizens.

The Free Exercise Clause has been turned on its head. An errant interpretation is increasingly being used to silence the Church and the religious speaker and actor. There is a dangerous trend of labeling anyone who supports the value of the undeniable Jewish and Christian roots of the West as backward, bigoted or, worse yet, trying to impose a theocracy and undermine freedom. The fact is, the Church was and is the guarantor of authentic freedom. Hostility toward the role of faith in our life together and efforts to censor the vital role it has played in our history and founding, is corrosive to true freedom.

The free exercise of religion is not only a constitutional right in the American polity, it is a fundamental human right in Catholic teaching. And, it should inform our choice of who we elect from among the candidates in the upcoming election.

# Series...Morally Coherent Catholic Citizenship



By **Bishop Strickland**  
Friday, June 05, 2020

Share On:



## **Vote for Candidates who Respect and Protect Marriage and the Family**

In our consideration of morally coherent Catholic citizenship we have considered the fundamental Right to Life and the Right to Religious Freedom. Now, we turn to the urgent challenge of defending the first and most vital cell of society, marriage, and the family and social order founded upon it.

In a [2016 interview](#), Cardinal Carlo Caffarra disclosed a letter he had received years earlier from Sr. Lucia, then the last surviving visionary of the apparitions of Our Lady at Fatima. Sr Lucia wrote: “The final battle between the Lord and the kingdom of Satan will be about Marriage and the Family.’ Do not be afraid, she added, because whoever works for the sanctity of Marriage and the Family will always be fought against and opposed in every

way, because this is the decisive issue. Then she concluded: ‘nevertheless, Our Lady has already crushed his head’.”

Pope St John Paul II, the Pope of the Family, wrote and spoke repeatedly about the attacks on Marriage and the Family. He also affirmed their essential and unchangeable nature. Those attacks on marriage and the family have now reached a fever pitch. This is evident particularly in the West, where marriage has been redefined to a point where it is no longer even discernible. And, those who stand in defense of marriage and the family are increasingly being disparaged and confronted with soft persecution.

### **The Attack on Marriage and the Family**

The attack on Marriage and the Family rages all around us. And, it is intensifying. It is a part of a broader cultural struggle, a clash of worldviews, personal and corporate, and competing definitions of human freedom, human dignity, and the path to true happiness and human flourishing. We are involved in a contest over the foundations of what constitutes a truly human and just social order.

As Catholic Christians, we must insist that marriage between one man and one woman, intended for life, and the family founded upon it, has been inscribed by the Divine Architect into the order of the universe. That is because they have. Truth does not change; people and cultures do; sometimes for good and sometimes for bad.

As for the position of the Catholic Church on marriage, it is crystal clear. Marriage between one man and one woman, indissoluble, unitive, and always open to procreation forms the foundation for the family, and the family forms the foundation of both the Church and the civil society. The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith of the Catholic Church [explained it well in 2003](#).

"The Church's teaching on marriage and on the complementarity of the sexes reiterates a truth that is evident to right reason and recognized as such by all the major cultures of the world. Marriage is not just any relationship between human beings. It was established by the Creator with its own nature, essential properties and purpose."

"No ideology can erase from the human spirit the certainty that marriage exists solely between a man and a woman, who by mutual personal gift, proper and exclusive to themselves, tend toward the communion of their persons. In this way, they mutually perfect each other, in order to cooperate with God in the procreation and upbringing of new human lives."

### **Marriage and Family as God's Loving Plan**

Faithful Catholics and other Christians should only support men and women for public office who will respect and protect marriage and the family. For the Jewish and Christian believer, from the first chapter of the first book of the Bible, the Book of Genesis (which means beginning) we discover the loving plan of God for marriage revealed in the context of the creation account. God fashioned man in His own image saying, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness..." (Genesis 1:26)

The early Fathers of the Christian Church noted that the plural language in the creation account points to the Trinitarian nature of God. Though God is One, the Christian faith proclaims that God is a loving Trinity of persons in the perfect unity of perfect love. The Father, Son and Spirit are a gift to one another. The Oneness of God is not solitary, but rather the perfection of Divine Love, being given away to the other, in the reciprocity of the Trinitarian communion.

In the second chapter of Genesis we read, "It is not good for man to be alone" (Genesis 2:18). The two, male and female, coming together in marriage to become one, reflects this unity in communion. We are, by both nature and grace, social. The mutual

expression of love, as gift to the other, lived within marriage, opens the married couple to participation in God's loving plan. If marriage is embraced as a Christian vocation, it also leads them to holiness, includes them in the gift of creation through procreation, and draws them into a partnership of love which births a family.

Marriage is intended to be a lifelong, indissoluble union of the spouses, male and female, always open to life and formative of family. Family, based on marriage between one man and one woman, is not only the first and most vital cell of society, it is the first school, first church, first hospital, first economy, first government and first mediating institution.

### **Marriage is the Future**

Our convictions and claims concerning the nature and ends of marriage are not outdated notions of a past era but provide the path to building a strong future for society. Nor is our position defending marriage as solely possible between one man and one woman simply a religious position. There is a Natural Moral Law which can be known by all men and women through the exercise of reason.

Marriage is not unique to Christianity; it is revealed by that Natural Moral Law as a good for all of humanity. It has been so recognized across cultures for millennia. That Natural Moral Law is the ground upon which every great civilization has been built. It is the source for every great and authentic human and civil rights movement. The Natural Law gives us the moral norms we need to build truly human and just societies and govern ourselves. It should inform our positive or civil law, or we will become lawless and devolve into anarchy.

Civil institutions do not create marriage. Neither can they create some new "right to marry" for those whose relationships are incapable of achieving the ends of marriage. Government has long regulated marriage for the common good. For example, the

ban on polygamy. And, age requirements were enforced to ensure that there was a mature decision as the basis of the Marriage contract.

Marriage is the first society into which children are to be born, learn to be fully human, grow in virtue, flourish, and take their proper role in families and communities. We must not be afraid to make the claim that children have a right to a mother and a father. They do. Of course, we should also care about the single parent family and the many broken homes which characterize this age.

However, their existence does not change the norm necessary for building a stable and healthy society - two parent, marriage bound families. Intact marriages and families are the glue of a healthy and happy social order. Faithful Catholics and other Christians must become a visible, palpable reflection of this truth about marriage and family in our own lives. To live a faithful marriage is now countercultural.

## **Male and Female**

In the creation account found in the First Chapter of the Book of Genesis we also read these vitally important words, “God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them.” (Genesis 1:27) Our sexual difference as male and female is a gift - and a given. To reject the gift is to reject the Giver.

We do not choose to be male or female. We receive it as a gift, or we reject it. The notion that we can choose our sexual identification as male or female is but one more manifestation of the rebellion that started in the garden with Adam and Eve when they turned away from God’s loving plan.

When our first parents succumbed to the lie that they could determine for themselves what is good and what is evil, the separation from God began. In theological terms, we call that sin.

It is both an offense against God’s loving plan and a wrong exercise of human freedom. Only a Savior could bridge that

separation. Thank God that He sent One. His name is Jesus the Christ.

In His defense of marriage, Jesus referred to this Genesis account in insisting on the indissolubility of marriage: “From the beginning of creation, God made them male and female. For this reason, a man shall leave his father and mother and ... the two shall become one flesh. What therefore God has joined together let not man put asunder” (Mk 10:5-9; cf. Mt 19:4-9; Lk 16:18).

To reject sexual difference is to reject God’s gift. Difference is not inequality of worth. Rather, it enables the gift of self to the other and a reciprocity, an exchange, which elevates us all. To strike against true marriage is to strike against God’s loving plan and design, built into creation from the very beginning, revealed by the Natural Law, and elevated by Jesus Christ to a Sacrament.

### **A New Missionary Age**

The early Christians, with joy and integrity, spoke and lived a different way in a culture which did not accept their message. As a result, they sometimes stirred up hostility. Some of them were martyred in the red martyrdom of shed blood. Countless more joined the train of what used to be called "white martyrdom", by living lives of sacrificial witness and service in their culture, working hard and staying faithful to the end of a long life spent in missionary toil.

Slowly, not only were people converted and baptized, but eventually their leaders and entire Nations followed suit. Resultantly, the Christian worldview began to influence the social order. The cultural climate changed significantly. It was the Christian faith, the lifestyle and the practices of these Christians which began to win the hearts of men and women. As a result, cultures once enshrined to pagan practices, such as plural marriage, homosexuality, infant exposure, and abortion began to change dramatically, and this dynamic continued for centuries.

It was Christianity that taught such novel concepts as the dignity of every person and their equality before the One God. Christians proclaimed the dignity of women, the dignity of chaste marriage and the sanctity of the family. Christianity introduced the understanding of freedom not simply as a freedom from, but as a freedom for, living responsibly and with integrity.

Christians insisted that freedom must be exercised with reference to a moral code, a law higher than the emperor, or the shifting sands of public opinion. Christians understood that choice, rightly exercised, meant always choosing what was right and that the freedom to exercise that choice brought with it an obligation and concern for the other.

The Christian faith presented a coherent and compelling answer to the existential questions that plagued the ancients - such as why we existed and how we got here? What was the purpose of life? Questions like how evil came into the world? And why we could not always make right choices? What force seemed to move us toward evil? And how we could be set free from its power?

Christian philosophy began to flourish, and the arts also flourished under the Christian worldview. Philosophies of government and economic theory began to be influenced by the principles derived from a Christian worldview. This can happen again. We are called to transform our own American and Western culture from within.

We are living in a new missionary age. We must remain faithful as Catholics to the unchangeable truths. The truth about marriage and the family is one of those truths. And, we live our obligations as Catholic citizens in a morally coherent manner. We should Vote for Candidates who Respect and Protect Marriage and the Family.

# Bishop's Blog / 5th Post in the Series...Morally Coherent Catholic Citizenship



By **Bishop Strickland**  
Tuesday, June 09, 2020

Share On:



**Vote for Candidates who Support Parental Choice in  
Education**

One of the experiences which accompanied the COVID 19 Shelter at Home Orders was that all parents became “home school” parents. But, in a sense, all parents already WERE “home school parents”. Some simply choose to share that educational mission with others outside of the home as their children mature. I say that because parents are the “first teachers” of their children. That very phrase is a part of the Baptismal Rite.

The teaching of the Catholic Church on the primacy of parents in the educational mission is clear. After all, the primacy of marriage - and the family founded upon it - as the first cell of society, the first church, first government, first school, first hospital, first economy, and the first mediating institution of the broader society - is at the heart of Catholic Social Teaching.

In his apostolic exhortation on the family entitled “The Role of the Christian family in the Modern World” (*Familiaris Consortio*) Pope St. John Paul II affirmed the social and political role of the family and called for the development of a “family politics”. Catholics should embrace such a “family politics”. A just and efficient philosophy of civil government should recognize the family is the first government and that all other government must first be at its service.

Parents are the first teachers of their children and all education begins in the home. We need to acknowledge in our positive or civil law the right of parents to choose for their own children where they go to school. That choice should include the full array of options, public, private, parochial, charter and home schools, no matter what their economic status. This can be done in constitutionally sound ways. And, the last obstacle, the so-called “Blaine Amendments” are being struck down throughout the country as unconstitutional. And, rightly so.

Education outside of the home is an extension of the parental role and government should recognize and defer to the parent’s primary role in the educational mission. These children are not, in the words of the US Supreme Courts’ *Wisconsin v Yoder* decision

".... mere creatures of the State." The family is the first government and the first schoolhouse. We have forgotten that objective truth as a nation and we are reaping the consequences.

It was the polestar of educational law for many years that teachers act in loco parentis - a Latin phrase meaning in the place of, or on behalf of the parents. Sadly, we have lost our way. In addition, the very origins of what became the "public" school system began with families pooling resources in small community schools. What happened? We need to reconsider our history in order to chart our future.

Some who oppose "school choice" or, more properly "parental choice", are entrenched in the current federalized educational bureaucracy and the culture which fuels it. However, increasingly people of every walk of life will admit the obvious, our current educational system is broken.

The current overly federalized approach to education in the United States is failing. Statistics and experience confirm the obvious. It is time for a change and parental (school) choice is the change that is needed. It means affirming again, as a matter of public policy and legislation, that Parents are the ones who should be able to make the choice of how to best extend their own teaching mission outside of the home. They should be able to choose where to send their children to school from among the full array of options.

The proper role of Federal, State or Local Government is to support, NOT USURP, the first government in the home. Rather than focus on the word "School" - which is then used to arouse a "public" school vs. "private" school debate - we should use the phrase "Parental Choice". After all, it is Parents who are the first teachers of their children and the family is the first school. This is where the policy debate should focus.

Those of us who support this approach must watch our language. We are not against government. We simply maintain that government begins in the family. Good governance recognizes the

first government of the family and follows the social ordering and good governance principle of subsidiarity by deferring to the smallest governing unit; not usurping but empowering and helping families. The current overly federalized approach to education in the United States is failing.

Here is an insight taken from the Apostolic Exhortation "Familiaris Consortio":

**"The right and duty of parents to give education is essential, since it is connected with the transmission of human life; it is original and primary with regard to the educational role of others, on account of the uniqueness of the loving relationship between parents and children; it is irreplaceable and inalienable, and therefore incapable of being entirely delegated to others or usurped by others..."**

In his "Letter to Families" the late Pope wrote

**"Parents are the first and most important educators of their own children, and they also possess a fundamental competence in this area; they are educators because they are parents. They share their educational mission with other individuals or institutions, such as the Church and the State. But the mission of education must always be carried out in accordance with a proper application of the Principle of Subsidiarity."**

**"This implies the legitimacy and indeed the need of giving assistance to the parents but finds its intrinsic and absolute limit in their prevailing right and actual capabilities. The principle of subsidiarity is thus at the service of parental love, meeting the good of the family unit. For parents by themselves are not capable of satisfying every requirement of the whole process of raising children; especially in matters concerning their schooling and the entire gamut of socialization.**

**"Subsidiarity thus complements paternal and maternal love and confirms its fundamental nature, inasmuch as all other participants in the process of education are only able to carry out their responsibilities in the name of the parents, with their consent and, to a certain degree, with their authorization."**

Parental (School) Choice is a matter of genuine social justice, not what is masquerading as social justice in some circles these days. Parental choice in education is right for our children, right for our parents and right for our Nation. As we approach the exercise of our vote in the upcoming elections, we should choose those candidates who support parental (school) choice in education.