

C-J Opinions

Writer insists that ending name calling implies deletion from scripture

To the Editor:

Through "Study theologians' efforts; stop name calling" (Opinion, June 5), Father Edwin B. Metzger made a sincere effort to be the light for those whom he regards as unenlightened, disrespectful, uncharitable name callers who anger and grieve him. The credibility of his claim to "being a great supporter of the Catholic Church" is destroyed by the content of his letter. Stopping name calling can logically imply deleting from Scripture Jesus' uses of name calling, such as "vipers," "hypocrites," "wolves in sheep's clothing." Truth and charity are inseparable; heretics are "heretics."

During the past two decades, the claim and delusion of "being a great supporter of the Catholic Church" has been a way of life for many bishops, priests, and lay-image religious. Father Metzger provides a format by which they have been deceived and now by which they sincerely thrust their delusions upon the pew people: 1) provide a specious

literacy ladder to reach the heavenly heights of charity and understanding, where dissenting theologians reside in esteem as "masters" of scripture, tradition and "sciences" of thought; 2) avoid mention of church magisterium teachings, through which the voice of the Good Shepherd can be heard; 3) redefine the Catholic Church and its magisterium, as the many men and women who are at the heights of literacy to esteem and support dissenting theologians.

Many few people are cruelly scourged by priest-tyrants who impose upon them the scandals of esteeming lay-image religious in the parish and on the altar, of woman homilists and perverted liturgies. They mislead some trusting people into acting as extraordinary ministers of the Eucharist, others as altar girls, and many few people into believing that scandals are paths of holiness rather than grave sins. In their truth-perverting delusions, the priest-tyrants see themselves as humble, compassionate,

charitable sources of enlightenment.

Of all theologians, St. Thomas Aquinas has had the most influence on the world. The depth and scope of his philosophical and theological works tend to obscure his saintliness. He pointed to the cross as the source of his intellectual achievements. He gave us treasures of his prayer in total consecration to our Blessed Mother, and his prayers and treatise on the Holy Eucharist. The saintly intellectual giant was a humble child, "... but if I have written anything erroneous ... I submit all to the judgment and correction of the holy Roman Church, in whose obedience I now pass from this life."

St. Therese of Lisieux can be seen as the

pre-eminent teacher, model and spiritual director for everyone to *become* a little child. Little Therese did just very ordinary things with extraordinary love of God. In love, she sought to please our Lord humbly with little acts of charity and received her sufferings with total abandonment to the will of God and confidence in His mercy and love. Pope John XXIII: "I have great love for the great Teresa of Avila, but little Therese brings us safe to shore. We must rely on her." Pope Pius XII: "... it is the heart of the gospel, which she has rediscovered..."

F.H. Mitay
Wyndover Road
Rochester

Urges area residents to support blood drive

To the Editor:

After nearly seven years of experience on community blood drives, I am impressed with the dedication of Red Cross personnel, donors and volunteers alike — all of whom work together to bring the "gift of life" to people in need. Personally, I have found the telephone recruitment I do to be a very uplifting experience — talking to known donors, people who are aware of the importance of the gift they are being asked to give, and who also appreciate the personal invitation of the phone call. And, for those of us who, for one reason or another, are unable to give blood, calling potential donors is a very meaningful way to help save lives.

The American Red Cross touches our lives in many ways: boating safety and swimming classes, CPR training sessions and disaster

relief, to name a few. I cannot stress enough, however, the crucial role the Red Cross plays in ensuring the safest source of blood and blood by-products for patients in our area hospitals.

The annual Charlotte Community Blood Drive will be Tuesday, July 8, from 3 to 7 p.m. in the Holy Cross School Auditorium, 4492 Lake Ave. (Lighthouse Street entrance.) Anyone at least 17 years old, weighing at least 110 pounds and in good health is eligible to give blood every two months, up to five times per year.

Join us in giving the gift of life on Tuesday, July 8 at Holy Cross School.

Joanne Fisher
Shore Acres Drive
Rochester

Victor Bartolotta Jr.

A Closer Look



Ending apartheid

As Congress debates whether to impose some economic sanctions on South Africa, that country heaves under a state of emergency. The conditions in South Africa are currently so intolerable that almost anything is likely to provoke a political and military conflagration. Some questions are bound to arise: Has the United States done all it could in the past to help blacks gain their freedom? Will the United States take the necessary steps to promote an end to apartheid?

Many Americans have been tracking the ever-developing conditions in South Africa. For those people, a discussion of conditions there will seem redundant. For others, however, elucidating the specifics of apartheid may strike them as Revelation. Regardless, change in South Africa will occur and can be guaranteed when insistent Americans demand that our government take the necessary measures. Hopefully, Christians who safeguard the dignity of human life will lead the way.

The recent state of emergency in South Africa creates conditions that normally only can be found in communist countries. South African police are now above the law and the courts. According to a report issued by the Pretoria government, police may use force whenever there is a reason to "ward off or prevent the suspected danger." Human rights advocates decry this as a policy tantamount to a license to shoot on sight.

In the past, the response of the U.S. government has been to publicly condemn the prejudicial policies of South Africa, but to do little more. A few weeks ago Secretary of State George Schultz clearly stated his belief that change in the country was only a matter of time. He proposed nothing more.

When South African President Botha issued the state of emergency, President Reagan responded by registering his disapproval. The president even went so far as to urge South Africans to "consider again the stark consequences of violence before lighting the next match or pulling the next trigger," a restraint the president himself is apparently unable to do. Regardless, no concrete action was offered.

The United States is also in good company. Britain's Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher positions herself right next to the U.S. administration. Like the United States, she condemns apartheid, but has in the past refused to impose economic sanctions. And why wouldn't she refuse, considering that Great Britain earned an estimated \$5.9 billion last year on investments in the strife-torn country.

Now news that Congress may soon step in and propose a plan of action which no doubt will include the imposi-

tion of economic sanctions is encouraging. Last week, Sen. Richard Lugar (R-Ind.), chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and an opponent of sanctions, hinted that sanctions may be an inevitable step for the future.

In the meantime, the system of apartheid — a system in which inequities between the mostly white upper class and the mostly black lower class rivals almost any kind of injustice we can think of — remains intact.

Americans generally do not know specifically what apartheid means to black South Africans. We generally do not know that in South Africa blacks are not considered citizens since they have no representation in government. We generally do not know that according to South African law families are often divided; husbands can be and are separated from wives, children from a parent. We generally do not know that blacks can only hold certain jobs, live only in certain places, buy only from certain stores, go only to certain schools. We do not know that blacks cannot bear arms, assemble together in public without meeting certain requirements, and cannot move about freely.

Predicting the future of South Africa does not take a great deal of intellectual insight. The blood of South Africans that spills daily and the reports that indicate the death of 1,650 people in the last 21 months tell us the situation can only worsen.

The *least* America can do is to impose economic sanctions on South Africa, such as forbidding any American company from doing business there until the system permanently changes. The *most* we can do is to use our tremendous international influence to force South Africa to recognize that the people they oppress are not cattle but human beings.

The best corporate intentions and the significant assistance companies already have given to blacks and whites in South Africa are commendable and should be recognized. They cannot, however, be measured against the value of even one human life. Cutting economic apron strings will be a bit painful, but the moral choice appears clear.

In the end, sanctions may be only a first step before the killing stops and indigenous, native-born South Africans are recognized for who they are — citizens, children of God, and rightful heirs to integrity, to dignity, and to all the things they need to attain and maintain free and happy lives.

It may be that we in the Free World have not registered loudly enough our indignation about apartheid. Now we must guarantee that our government take such measures as are necessary to eradicate this medieval system.

Father Paul J. Cuddy

On the Right Side



Actor Guinness

Q. Who is your favorite actor?

A. Alec Guinness. His acting in "The Bridge Over the River Kwai" will live forever. After Guinness, I would list Spencer Tracy, then Barry Fitzgerald. Then O'Toole, Olivier and Burton.

Q. Didn't Alec Guinness just publish an autobiography?

A. Yes. "Blessings in Disguise." It's largely about actors and actresses, but he has a whole chapter on religion, which many will find interesting, hilarious and edifying. I got the book at the beautiful public library in Wayland and was fascinated by it. Guinness came from an unsettled background. He does not even know who his father was. His thrice-married and divorced mother gave him an unstable childhood. He had all the prejudices and suspicions about the Catholic Church for decades, and only gradually discovered how mistaken they were. Despite his prejudices he was attracted to go into our churches and just sit when few people were around to enjoy the peace and tranquility, even though he did not realize the Eucharistic presence of our Lord. One day he decided to gamble about taking instructions.

Q. Gamble? That's strange.

A. Yes, and funny. He wrote that he decided that he would go to the neighboring St. Lawrence Church and — if he met a priest who was cultured, refined and scholarly — he would ask for instructions, also indicating that he would accept what he liked and quietly ignore what he didn't. But if he met a big, red-faced Irish priest who would greet him in an Irish brogue with "The top of the morning to you," he would turn and flee. Fortunately, he met a cultured English Father Clarke to whom he explained he was a kind of lapsed Anglican. Cheerfully Father Clarke informed him that he himself had been an Anglican priest before his "submission to Rome." Guinness never speaks of "conversion to the Church," but always uses the phrase, "submission to Rome." He has read widely in religion and is a devotee of John Henry Newman.

Q. How did the instructions go?

A. They were so logical he suspected that some things were being hidden. He wrote: "In some ways I was troubled at how easily everything fell into place; all was so natural, apart from indulgences and papal infallibility, that I began to suspect Father Clarke must have missed on some essential which would turn out to be a major stumbling block. Finding no obstacle at St. Lawrence, I determined to seek the worst further afield. I wanted to see Catholicism at its grimmest and least sympathetic."

So he went to a Trappist Abbey of St. Bernard. His book gives this whimsical account: "I was given a large bedroom furnished with Victorian junk. The adjacent lavatory had an unpleasant smell. I was taxi-less, lost and unable to escape. Worse was to come, firstly in the shape of baked beans and flabby bacon on wet toast, and secondly, the jollity of my fellow guests — although one, a very serious young man, exuded extreme gloom. He stopped me on the stairs. 'You are in films,' he hissed. I sensed rising hysteria. Then he screeched, 'I never go, and I never will, not until they do away with Sex!' He clattered down the stairs leaving me dumbfounded by his holier than thou thought for the day. I longed for something nasty to happen to him in the woodshed, which was a poor start for a monastic retreat."

Q. Then you recommend the book?

A. Yes, at least for the chapter on religion. English converts have given so much to the Church that it is a pity people under 40 seem unfamiliar with the works of such converts as John Henry Newman; C.C. Martindale, S.J.; Robert Hugh Benson; Wilfrid Ward; G.K. Chesterton; Ann Freemantle; Monsignor Ronald Knox; Bruce Marshall; and finally Malcolm Muggeridge, who really came to the Church through the prayers of Mother Teresa of Calcutta. These authors were ontologically sound, and the problem today is that we have many professing to be Catholic, mod theologues, who are like Guinness when he started for instructions — accepting what they like and rejecting what they don't. Guinness eventually bought the whole package and is grateful for the gift of faith.