**Phoenix school forfeits baseball game due to female player**

Prep baseball » Religious school won’t play an opponent with a girl in its lineup.
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Phoenix • Instead of playing in a championship baseball game, Paige Sultzbach and her team won’t even make it to the dugout.

A Phoenix school that was scheduled to play the 15-year-old Mesa girl and her male teammates forfeited the game rather than face a female player.

Our Lady of Sorrows bowed out of Thursday night’s game against Mesa Preparatory Academy in the Arizona Charter Athletic Association championship. The game had been scheduled at Phoenix College.

Paige, who plays second base at Mesa Prep, had to sit out two previous games against Our Lady of Sorrows out of respect for its beliefs. But having her miss the championship was not an option for Mesa Prep.

Paige’s mother, Pamela Sultzbach, told The Arizona Republic, which first reported the story, the team found out about the forfeit Wednesday.

"This is not a contact sport, it shouldn’t be an issue," Pamela Sultzbach said. "It wasn’t that they were afraid they were going to hurt or injure her, it’s that [they believe] a girl’s place is not on a field."

Officials at Our Lady of Sorrows declined comment. In a written statement Thursday, the school said the decision to forfeit was consistent with a policy prohibiting co-ed sports.

The statement also said the school teaches boys respect by not placing girls in athletic competition, where "proper boundaries can only be respected with difficulty."

Our Lady of Sorrows is run by the U.S. branch of the Society of Saint Pius X. The group represents conservative, traditional priests who broke from the Catholic Church in the 1980s.

In junior high, Paige played softball and volleyball. Because Mesa Prep does not have a girls’ softball team, she tried out for the boys’ baseball team and received support from her coach and her teammates.

Lisa Maatz, director of public policy at the American Association of University Women, said the situation is a clear example of why Title IX law, which enforces gender equality in education programs including sports, is needed.

"The very idea that such stereotypes are so strong, they’d actually forfeit a game simply because a girl was on the field. That’s ridiculous," Maatz said. "Does she have cooties?"

Nancy Hogshead-Makar, senior director of advocacy for the Women’s Sports Foundation, said the school’s decision to forfeit doesn’t aid its own students.

"In real life, these boys are going to be competing against the girls for jobs, for positions in graduate programs or in trade schools," Hogshead-Makar said. "In every other area of their life, they are going to be competing side by side."

**FOOD FOR THOUGHT:**

**Well, where to begin? I thought I’d do a little more “learnin’” on the subject, so I went to the ourladyofsorrows.org website and clicked on Catholic FAQs (Frequently Asked Questions). As one example, this is what was indicated for a response to the question “Is it wrong to be an organ donor?”**

*Is it wrong to be an organ donor?*

*There are some occasions in which it is clearly permissible, for example when a person has a pair of organs, only one of which is really necessary. One can be removed to transplant to another person, such as a kidney transplant. There are other cases in which it is permissible, for example when the organ can be taken when the person is clearly already deceased, such as eye corneal transplants.*

*However, it is manifestly immoral to kill a person to take one of their organs, although that person would have died on his own within a short period of time. It is never permissible to kill one person just to help another. Only God has power over life and death.*

*The problem arises because once a person has really died and his cardiac and respiratory functions have ceased for several minutes, then his organs will be damaged in such a way that they cannot be used for organ transplants. Hence the organs must be removed first.*

*The big dispute presently concerns when a person is alive or dead. This involves the concept of brain death. The medical profession generally considers that when a person has been proven to be brain dead, for example by a flat EEG or by the absence of respiration when the respirator has been turned off, then he must be considered to be dead, despite the fact that his cardiac and respiratory functions are being artificially maintained. Consequently, it is permitted, so they say, to remove any or all organs from a person who is still breathing and whose heart is still beating, so long as they are proven to be brain dead. This has actually become big business, and a "living corpse" like this is worth probably more than $80,000 for its internal organs.*

*This practice is not only disgustingly inhuman. It is manifestly anti-God and immoral. Death is the moment at which the soul leaves the body. This is known only to God, the creator of life. While a person is still breathing, even artificially, and while his heart is still beating, he has many signs of life. His body is being maintained in life by the circulation of blood. He is still a human being. It is true that if his brain is dead he will never think again, and he will not have the reflexes and reactions that depend upon brain function. However, this does not mean that he is not alive. It just means that there is a permanent irreparable impairment to his human activities. It is not for man to decide that he is not a man and that he is not alive. Consequently, he must be treated as a living person. Hence no essential organs can be removed until well after all respiration and cardiac action have ceased.  [Answered by Fr. Peter R. Scott]*

There are several other questions that are answered, such as “Does a nurse have the right to give birth control medications”, “Is it wise to give children pocket money”, “Must we always give in to those who ask for money, particularly beggars?”, and “Is slavery evil, and if so, surely the North was right in the American Civil War?”. I’m serious. You can check them out at <http://sspx.org/catholicfaqs.htm>.

**So, back to the Food for Thought…at this point in your lives, do you revile or revere the decisions and beliefs of the Our Lady of Sorrows School? In your view, are they lunatics, or simply traditionalist in their beliefs, trying to bring back old-school Catholicism? Explain your EVALUATION clearly, please.**