



LOOKING THE OTHER WAY

On the Line

A Letter To Bernadette

By Bob Considine



With heavy heart and facile pen, the Dublin columnist of New York's "Irish Echo," John Kelly, addresses an open letter to Bernadette Devlin, M.P. Miss Devlin, who deeply impressed countless Americans with her spirited efforts in behalf of complete Irish independence from Britain, and who went to prison for her courageous activities, has been in the U.S. recently speaking in defense of Angela Davis.

Miss Davis, an avowed Communist, faces trial in connection with the charge of purchasing the guns used in the bloody deaths — including that of a judge — in the San Rafael, Calif., courthouse shootout of last year.

"Dear Bernie," Kelly writes. "The news reports that have been published here in Dublin, concerning your American visit, indicate that you are busily preaching your unique brand of socialism in American universities. In some ways, that seems a little like preaching to the converted. But that is not my main criticism.

"I, for one, would feel very annoyed if some American student, or latter-day 'Savior' like Abbie Hoffman, were to come over to Ireland and tell us what sort of revolution we need here. Abbie did just that. And I was annoyed. And so were a great number of other Irish people.

"One thing the Irish historically were not prepared ever to take was foreign advice, and that is precisely what you are doing out to the Americans.

"Really, Miss Devlin, what exactly do you know about the Black Panthers, or Angela Davis, or that much maligned term, the 'American way of life,' for that matter? If Miss Davis was in any way guilty of being implicated in that terrible murder of a hostage judge, then I believe that she should be punished. That judge, that 'pillar of the system,' as you might term him, was just a

man, after all, Bernie, a man with a family and with his own sacred beliefs. Nobody, not even the Panthers, had a right to take his life for that.

"Bernie, you're not accomplishing anything by telling the Americans what's wrong with America. They already know that. It's what's wrong with Ireland they should be hearing about. Why don't you tell the Americans that the Irish do not want the British Government, or its minions, least of all its army, in this country? Why don't you tell them clearly and firmly that there can never be peace in Ireland until there is unity?

"When you went on your first trip to America, looking for money, you smiled in the right places with the right people, such as that 'Establishment' figure, Mayor Lindsay. You went to as many gatherings of Irish Americans as you could, pleading for money for aid for our civil rights movement. And you got plenty of that. You said so yourself. But almost as soon as you got back to Ireland, you lashed out at the Irish-Americans who helped you, and us, so much. Then, you had the utter gall to send the key to the city of New York, given to you by Mayor Lindsay, to the very people who were doing their utmost to vent anarchy on the United States.

"You went further. You said that they were fighting the same fight as we were. What bloody nonsense! Our people are fighting for six partitioned counties, Bernie. That's what Republicans in Belfast are dying for — not for some pie in the sky such as socialism. They want a united Ireland, now!

Be a socialist if you want. But never forget that the Irish abroad are interested in Ireland first and theories second. You can't really blame them for that, can you?"

Okay, Bernie, baby. Answer that one.

On The Right Side

Dispelling Myths -- II

By Father Paul J. Cuddy



Myth: Then you don't like the new Mass.

Reply: O, come off it! There is nothing I cherish more than the Mass, whether the old Latin Mass, or the present form.

Consider what the Mass is. It is Christ present among His people, gathering His flock together around the altar to form a unity in Himself. The Mass is Christ offering Himself as the Divine Intercessor. The Mass brings the mystical wonder of the Real Presence at the Consecration. Through the Mass Christ continues His Presence as our Food and as our Solace. Recently a non-Catholic friend said wistfully: "It must be a wonderful thing to believe that Christ is really present in the Sacrament." Through the Mass the Church tries to unite her members in love. Thanks to the seven capital sins, complete success is rarely accomplished. But Christ never gives up. Through the Mass we celebrate in communion with the whole Church: with Our Blessed Mother, the angels and saints, with our own dear dead, with the souls in Purgatory as well as with the faithful on earth.

Of course I love the Mass! Cardinal Newman said he never wearied of the Mass; whether celebrated by himself or whether he was assisting at the Mass by his presence. People before the Council had a great love of the Mass. My concern now is the loss of that devotion, thanks to the work of the Confusionists. Many of the older People

are rattled by the too rapid changes. And the youngsters? Do you think they have a better understanding or a greater love for the Mass? Such is not my own observation.

Myth: Why do you keep saying "the Mass," when the modern terms now are: Eucharistic Banquet, Celebration, the Lord's Supper?

Reply: I wonder if the Confusionists don't have a terrible inferiority complex. They are like a few of the Irish or Poles or Italians who came to this country, and whose children thought becoming Americanized was to ape the WASPS. I do not find a thing the Reformation an improvement on my own Catholic heritage. Do you recall the word "Mass" was anathema to the Reformers? Furthermore, "Mass" is the term used by Vatican Council II.

Myth: The vernacular has made the Mass more meaningful.

Reply: The vernacular is not new. Catholics commonly used vernacular Missals which were happier in translation than many of our present translations. Have you noticed the beautiful word "grace" is suppressed whenever the Confusionists get hold of the printing press? Is that progress? Many new translations of the Mass are aesthetically inferior as well as theologically less precise. A simple illustration is the greeting, "The Lord be with you," "And also with you." The person who perpetrated that bit

of rhetorical inferiority must surely have a tin ear. That's retrogression.

Non-myth: Then you think the People understood the Mass before the Council.

Reply: I think the People better understood the sacrificial aspect of the Mass, and their personal union with Our Lord in Holy Communion. I think that The People did not realize the community and family aspects of the Mass... nor do I think that many have gotten the idea now, despite great efforts to instruct them. However, the purpose of the Council was to develop our understanding, and this comes gradually, not in some instant illumination. The Dutch New Catechism does a good job explaining the community aspect of the Mass. But this good explanation did not come from nowhere, but rather from previous ideas. They are found in such spiritual classics as Sheeben's Mysteries of Christianity, and Vonier's Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist or Marmion's Christ, the Ideal of the Monk. Development in understanding of the Mass has brought a lot of understandable foot-dragging, but I am hopeful. There's a cheerful rhyme which goes:

"From the time that you're born till you ride in a hearse
Things are never so bad that they couldn't be worse."

I am optimistic about the future, but it will take time, perseverance and patience.

The Church: 1971

Casting Stones In Detroit

By Fr. Andrew Greeley



In one of the Lenten Sunday Gospels Jesus tells a crowd that is eager to dispatch a sinner, "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone."

There are a number of other places in Scripture where Jesus has harsh words to say about moralistic denunciations. We are told that we ought not to judge lest we ourselves be judged, and that we should get the two by four out of our own eye before we criticize the speck in the eye of another. But there are lots of people who seem not at all afraid of the prospect of judgment and who are quite convinced that there is no two by four in their eye.

There are, for example, the nine nuns from Detroit who have quit teaching in a school because it is "racist." Why is it racist? Because many of the parents had attitudes which hindered the teaching of justice, because there is disagreement over the religious education program, because there were "clashes during parent conferences, poor attendance at meetings," and because the parish council arrives at decisions regarding the school which are "inadequate" and "stem from racist attitudes."

To quote from their charge against the parish, as newspapers carried it: "The fact that the teaching of Christian principles was not considered by council members as the main reason for maintaining St. Raymond's school and the fact that concern for our disadvantaged

brothers in the church of Detroit was almost totally disregarded at the council meeting led us to conclude that for us to staff the school would signify acceptance if not approval of this mentality."

One scarcely knows how to begin. Teaching at the school would endorse the values of the parish council? Why would it? Could it not just as easily endorse the values of the Gospel? Is it the attitude of the parish council or the attitude of the teachers which determines what is taught in the school?

Even if the adults of the parish were racist — and not coming to meetings scarcely makes a parish racist — who is going to win the children away from such attitudes? The heavenly Father is willing to let His sun shine and His rain fall on both the just and the unjust, but the Detroit sisters are apparently willing to teach only the children of just parents — and justice will be measured by not making trouble at conferences, by coming to meetings, and by repeating all the appropriate liberal clichés when discussing the purpose of Catholic education.

The truth of the matter is that bigotry is to be found everywhere. It is to be found among liberal university professors who stereotype white ethnics as hard hats, it is to be found among feminists who class all men as sexist; it is to be found among blacks who condemn all whites, it is to be found among romantic revolu-

tionaries who denounce an entire society, and it is to be found among self-righteous nuns who write off their ethnic parishioners without trying to understand what the social, economic, and historical problems are that make white ethnics afraid of racial change.

If the nuns wish to work only with children whose parents do not have traces of bigotry, then they had better work with the children of angels.

I do not contend that the Detroit nuns should stay in a school where they do not want to be. But I do question whether they ought to justify their walkout by writing off a whole community with the cheap and easy label "racist."

They may argue that Jesus condemned people. Indeed he did, though only rarely. As I remember the Gospel, most of his condemnations were aimed at a group who thought they were morally superior to others — the Pharisees by name.

Your Views Important

Our readers want to know what other readers think of the multitude of happenings in our fast-paced world. We invite letters to the editor.

They should be typewritten, double-spaced and no longer than one page. They must be signed by the contributor.