

Editorial

Going, going, gone: Last chance to vote on Faith Today

C'mon folks. More than 75 of you must have some opinion about Faith Today. Yes, that's right, we've received only 75 responses to our survey of June 26, and they're about evenly split. Thirty-two respondents never want to see Faith Today again; they call it a waste of space, a filler, unappealing, etc. Thirty-one respondents said they love Faith Today, calling it the Courier-Journal's best feature, inspirational, refreshing, and praising it for its down-to-earth approach to faith in our daily lives. Four people were lukewarm supporters of the section, ranking it about 2.5 out of five on a scale of importance; eight respondents were equally ambivalent about canceling the supplement, ranking it about 2.4 on the same scale, primarily for its value for children.

What are we to do? The axiom "If you're not with 'em, you're against 'em" could hold true here. If we assume that 48,971 of our 49,046 subscribers were not even interested enough in Faith Today to respond to

the survey, the nays outweigh the yeas by more than 1,400 to 1. On the other hand, we realize that many people — regardless of their feelings on the subject — dislike surveys or are too busy to fill them in.

But Faith Today is a very large investment for the Courier-Journal. To purchase the supplement from National Catholic News Service, produce and print it, we spend the equivalent of more than three reporters' salaries! (Our current staff consists of one editor, one reporter and one photographer.) If Faith Today is really well-read and well-used by our readers, then that's money well-spent. But if the majority of our readers aren't very enthusiastic about the supplement, we can find many other ways to use the money.

So if you haven't submitted your opinion, please do so now. Take this last chance to let your views be known.

We thank you again for your cooperation.

1.) How often do you read Faith Today? Weekly _____ Once or twice a month _____ Once in a great while _____ Seldom _____ Never _____

2.) How often do your children read it? Weekly _____ Once or twice a month _____ Once in a while _____ Seldom _____ Never _____

3.) On a scale of one (1) to five (5) with five being most important, how important do you believe Faith Today is as a supplement to the Courier-Journal? _____

4.) What do you believe to be Faith Today's greatest value? _____

5.) Do you believe the Courier-Journal should continue to carry Faith Today? Yes _____ No _____

6.) If not, what would you prefer to see take its place? _____

7.) Please list the ages of all Courier-Journal readers in your family. _____

8.) To which parish do you belong? _____

And opinions

It was just a mix-up on the menu

To the Editor:

I am truly disappointed, but not surprised, to see the next mind-bobbling feat to be taken on by the Courier-Journal — a Dining Out Around the Diocese monthly special section. You could distribute it to all the hungry, out-of-work people in this diocese who have no idea where their next meal is coming from or if it is coming at all, to let them know where the other half eats and how well they enjoyed it. I personally find the idea of using valuable printing space dedicated to the art of diocesan eating ludicrous. That kind of trivial information can be found in many secular newspapers and penny savers; why waste the space in the Courier-Journal? There are so many issues that are crying out to be addressed, so many worthwhile things that need to be done in this diocese. How timely it would have been to put in the Church's stand on abortion. It's true stand, not some self-appointed moralist's view. What ever happened to the letters from Pope John Paul that used to be published in the Courier-Journal?

It seems to me that we are being fed cake when so many of us want meat. It takes me five to seven minutes to read the Courier-Journal. I would absolutely love to see more instructive articles written about current issues and problems — from the Roman Catholic point of view. I would like to see a monthly update on all the good work being done at Melita House, St. Joseph's House of Hospitality, Carmel House and all the others. What is needed at these places? Why not a column informing people how to get involved in changing things that need

change? I mean information on bills and such before Congress that threaten our Christian way of life, and letting us know what needs to be done, and how we can go about doing it. How about more faith in action articles that could help motivate our youth in seeing the good that comes out of putting God's work into good deeds?

We all need motivation in this world to do what needs to be done. What better forum than the diocesan newspaper to give us constructive ideas to get going. We shouldn't be spending more time on looking for more ways to enjoy the luxuries that most of us in this country already treasure too dearly. I believe time should be spent, as Christians, seeking ways to alleviate the pain, sorrow and sufferings of our brothers and sisters in this country before we find more ways to become insulated in our comfortable indifference.

Mary Ellen Frisch
2 Blossomdale Circle
Hamlin

EDITOR'S NOTE: We have to clarify a point in Ms. Frisch's letter. The Dining Out in the Diocese "special section" to which she refers is nothing other than an advertising promotion, not a restaurant review column taking "valuable printing space." Advertising, such as this, is the life blood of any newspaper, diocesan newspapers included. Without advertising — even for restaurants — we wouldn't have any space for instructive articles nor money to pay a staff to write them. It is our policy, however, to reject advertising for items or services that are contrary to Catholic doctrine.

Answer 'a profound joy to read'

To the Editor:

With regard to your editor's note in the June 26 issue of your paper. Bravo! Hooray! Congratulations! It was a profound joy to read your denunciation of Mr. Clarence Amann's letter to you and your paper.

Amann, despite his apparent possession of the requirements for teaching at the college level, focused his readers attention on his ignorance. He appears to me to be a member of the "intelligencia" as defined by the late Archbishop Fulton J. Sheen: "those educated beyond their intelligence."

For instance, I believe any reasonably bright teenager learns quickly on his first part-time job that there is considerable truth in the old adage: "The boss may not always be right, but he is still the boss."

Your telling him how you felt the Democrat and Chronicle would handle a situation on their paper, if they ever had one, was certainly on target, and his in effect telling Bishop Clark how he should have handled the situation — in an area of what is only one of his many responsibilities — is laughable.

I seriously doubt that either you or Bishop Clark need his (Amann's) help in running the

paper. I am sure that in your interviews prior to your hiring by the bishop, he became convinced that you had the necessary qualifications. He certainly had to be certain that you could make the normal decisions without running to him. After all, if he had to make all the decisions about what and what not to print, he would not need you.

One of the most humorous parts of his letter was his threat to go to the secular media if you did not print his letter. If you were still boiling with anger at this point, you might not have laughed uproariously then, but I bet you did later, and said: "Well for pity's sake, bub, be my guest."

In closing, I shall only say that my personal opinion of the shakeup of the staff was that the bishop might have told the readers that the paper was reorganizing the staff, and that when that was concluded, the paper would reappear full size and better than ever.

With all good wishes for continued success.

W. Donald Barrett
192 1/2 W. Second St.
Corning

Writer praises columnists

To the Editor:

Father Cuddy's June 26 list of procrastinations hit me. I shall make this short and snappy. Reading Father Cuddy's June 19 column was like greeting old friends whom I haven't seen in a long time. In Father Shamons's column of the same date, he

encouraged us to trust in God, realizing that He is in charge and knows what He is doing.

We have two wonderful priests as columnists. May God bless them and their work.

Isobel McCarthy
1116 Hoffman St
Elmira

On the Right Side

With Father Paul J. Cuddy

From an exasperated professional:

"I've had it up to my eyeballs. Now the latest edict is Communion under both forms. For 1,000 years, the Church has given us Holy Communion under the form of bread. My college professors taught us clearly that Christ is fully present in the Sacred Host — Body, Blood, Soul, Divinity. One tough teacher made us translate the 'Pange lingue gloriosi Corporis Mysterium,' saying if we know that, we know the theology of the Eucharist. When was the last time you heard the wonderful hymns like 'Ave, Verum Corpus,' or 'O Sacrament Most Holy'? Is there a conspiracy to downgrade devotion to the Blessed Sacrament?"

"Now, why after 1,000 years is the Church adding more instability to the dozens of other changes that have caused some to leave the Church, and others, like myself to be uneasy and unhappy in this constant commotion?"

Response:

Oh, hold it! First of all, the order to offer the chalice is not a universal Catholic directive. It is local, and applies only to the Church in the States, and only in dioceses where a bishop so orders it. Secondly, our bishop has not "ordered" the faithful to drink from the chalice. He is just directing that people who want it should not be deprived of the consecrated wine. If you do not want the chalice, pass it by.

Both the Councils of Constance (1415) and Trent (1562) justified the omission of the chalice for the faithful, not as an ideal, but because of existing causes. There were several abuses by those who took the cup because of the alcohol; danger of spilling the Precious Blood; but especially because of the heresy of the priest Berengarius and others who taught that Christ was not present excepting when both species are present. However, the ideal is Communion under both forms. Why? Because it follows the Last Supper method and gives the full sign value of the Eucharistic banquet.

I am surprised that you do not mention the problem of hygiene. It may be that in backward countries where Pasteur's discoveries have not penetrated, a common

cup brings no repugnance. But we who are hygiene-conscious have a justifiable askance about drinking from a vessel after 20, 30 or 40 mouths have lipped it. The June 29 Rochester Times-Union had a three-page article on the disease AIDS. It reads: "While the virus (AIDS) can be found in saliva, there is no proof yet that the virus can spread through saliva. But the possibility has not yet been ruled out." When I filled in at Our Lady of Lourdes in Elmira last February for Father McCabe, an inmate from Elmira Correctional Facility died from AIDS after months of dying. I remember the daily sadness of chaplain Father Ed Golden for the young man and his family. Frankly, I have a horror of that disease, and an uneasiness drinking from a cup that would have the civil law breathing down the neck of restaurateurs. Include transmittable diseases: hepatitis, tuberculosis, and social diseases to give pause.

Sunday, June 30, I was returning from a glorious celebration of the 100th anniversary of St. Columba's, Caledonia, and stopped off a Tom Wahl's to get a large root beer. A nice couple, Mr. and Mrs. Reeves, greeted me cordially, so I sat with them. "We know you from when you helped out at St. Mark's, Greece, and we read your article in the Courier." They then expressed interest about the proposed use of the cup. Mrs. Reeves is a Lutheran, and she chuckled: "You Catholics are becoming like us." She explained that Lutherans use the cup one Sunday, and a tray with little glasses the next. She said "It's hard to get the little glass out of the tray." I am familiar with this from my Air Force days, when Protestants had Communion and used trays with about 30 little shot glasses sitting in holes in the tray. Many used grape juice instead of wine.

But cheer up! The bishop has no thought of forcing you to use the chalice. He just wants those who want "the fuller sign" to have it. If you have sympathy, give it to priests like me who have to be the last ones to lip the chalice, no matter what we feel about Pasteur's discovery.