

letters to the editor:

"It is no longer possible to allow - - -"

To the Editor:

It is no longer possible to allow irresponsible action by University students to go unanswered. The culmination of my disillusionment with a group whom I had previously been most sympathetic to was reached when I read Kim Cameron's article on Saint Thomas Aquinas School in your paper.

I have five of my six children attending this school. As a military man, I have I believe somewhat more experience in grade schooling than your Mr. Cameron. My children have been educated in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, (Kingston, Pembroke and Petawawa) and British Columbia. I speak therefore with some considerable experience of many types of schools.

Saint Thomas Aquinas is as good if not better than any of the eight schools my children have attended. I purposely bought a house in that area on moving to Halifax so that they could attend this school.

To allow Mr. Kim Cameron (I presume it is Mr., I feel a lady would be more gentlemanly) to publish in your paper such an irresponsible, childish, and more sinister, perhaps bigoted article is your fault as much as his. I won't bother refuting the statements individually, suffice to say that even the students I have talked to realize they are stupid quotations. The students know who made them. They are not the best or even the average pupils, rather the malcontents such as even perhaps exist at Dalhousie.

I write to you with copies as shown for several reasons.

- I had at one time thought the modern student was fair, objective, and a truth seeking person; certainly this is not the case here.
- It seems a most peculiar coincidence that Mr. Cameron picked a Catholic School near Dalhousie when there were two non-Catholic schools also nearby - i.e. LaMarchant and Gorsebrook, at a time when separate schools are being discussed.
- The coincidence enlarges when one finds on the next page of the Gazette an attack by an equally unknowledgeable person on the Archbishop of Halifax.
- It becomes ridiculous when you have the audacity to publish this article of a false impression of St. Thomas Aquinas School when your editorial lambasts the Mail-Star for a far more conservative questioning of the luxuries of the new student council building. How dare

you question the Mail-Star's right when you publish such garbage as Mr. Camerons?

- To attack a separate school in such a matter appears to be an attack on one of the candidates for Alderman who happens to be a Catholic and who happens to have several children attending St. Thomas Aquinas School.
- In my days at two universities, such reporting would not happen because we were taught responsible disciplined behavior both in our actions and in our writings. Apparently both these qualities are not only not practiced by your journalists, but are frowned upon when taught at the grade school level.

I, therefore, must inform you that I shall no longer support aid to University students. I am told all of my six children are "university material" and I intend to have them attend universities if they so wish. However, I would rather pay my own way than have them pick up the "world-owes-me-a-university-training" attitude that students now have. In my day only the richman's sons could afford to be as irresponsible as so many students are now-a-days. I prefer the few of them to the great number of irresponsible parasites whom you are now developing as indicated by Mr. (?) Cameron's article.

B.T. Burke Major

...points I should like to raise

To the editor:

Having read the articles (in the Gazette on the 28th of November) on Dr. Chapman's talk there are some points I should like to raise.

To begin with, all religions appear to be classed together. This, I am sure many others would agree, is not possible when discussing a subject such as this, as many religions have vastly different histories and ideas.

The idea "that priests invented God" is quite contradictory to the Bible. Maybe this will raise the point that the Bible is not true. I would then ask what other book has survived as long as the Bible and still is a 'best-seller'. Sure, books such as Plato's Republic have lasted, but can they be classed as best-sellers?

The Bible does not produce errors when recording things that happened in the past, as has been proven by archaeology. One has only to see the different layers of the walls of Jerico; the Garden of the Tomb and the rock face to the right of it which has the appearance of a skull; and many of the excavations which have been carried out in Jordan. If the Bible was unreliable how could manuscripts which were found in 1947, hidden since A.D. 70, be found to still correspond to those scriptures?

Regarding the religious laws. One remembers that the Greeks found that Natural Law was objective and changeless, whereas man-made laws were sub-

jective and changeable. The Romans thought of Natural Law is a moral sense and that all men were equal before this law and therefore had an idea of right and wrong. The early Christians realized that this Natural Law was as God's law, (and so when considered in this light the Ten Commandments (Exodus 20) are Natural Laws).

St. Thomas Aquinas decided that Natural Law would be essential for the survival of life and to distinguish good and bad man-made laws (Human Law).

This thought still exists when one considers the present day laws of the land.

In the days of Moses there were not the leaders such as we have in today's society. Moses chose people to help him rule (Exodus 18) - with God's help. v. 23 - and the Levites were the priests to look after the Tabernacle (or church). God chose the priests (Exodus 40) not the priests choosing God.

Tithing (or one-tenth of property given under the Jewish Law for religious purposes) was being done in the days of Abraham (Genesis 14 v. 20), and Jacob (Genesis 28 v. 22).

Today we have collections in church for the upkeep of the building, support of missionaries, etc. Also, of course, today we have income taxes, and sales taxes.

Regarding the laws mentioned in Leviticus, these included such things as what foods were to be eaten (and which ones could cause sickness); isolation procedures as in the case of leprosy for instance, feasts to be kept to remind people of the observance of laws to be observed; and sex laws to be observed. These hygienic laws were necessary and it is interesting to see how centuries later many of them were revived. Many of them were lost because of church opposition but because people were invaded and captured so many times. If more concern was given to those sex laws many of today's social health problems could be prevented. (Editor's note: see Leviticus 15).

The opposition to the contraceptive pill cannot be stated as unaccepted by all churches.

The priest in the Old Testament, and in some religions today, could be thought of as "in a position of power". But after the coming of Christ there is no further need of a priest to intercede for us (Matthew 24 v. 51; Hebrews 10 v. 19-20; 4 v. 16; 7 v. 22-27).

I fail to see how "the church should just die away on its own" if the church is taken to be individuals (Acts 2 v. 47) and not a building. The church depends on the people of whom it is composed, so it is up to its members to strengthen it.

Pearl Herbert

More constructive activities ...

To the Editor:

In a recent issue you stated that a victory had been achieved because some sort of committee had been established to produce some sort of extra-curricular activities for the oppressed of St. Thomas Aquinas school.

It could be suggested that the most constructive form of extra-curricular activity that could be undertaken by the exploited of St. Thomas Aquinas School is the destruction of all superstitious, religious statuary that has no place in any modern academy of learning. Certainly, a school is a preparation for a mature and sane intellectual development, and not an instrument to produce toe-nail burriers and warlock worshippers. It would perhaps be of greater benefit for the older and more sexually mature students of such an institution to relieve the sexual frustration of the "wives of god" who staff the parochial schools; and perhaps, it could be hoped, that this experience would make "god's concubines" a little more humane.

It seems manifestly ridiculous for the editors of the Gazette to state that they are "not attempting to be anti-Catholic" or "express a disrespect for the Catholic religion" or become "dupes of the protestant-atheistic conspiracy", when they should be in the lead in the assault against an enemy of mankind that stands second only to Nazism in its calculated attempt to dehumanize the greater mass of gullible human beings as well as persecute the more enlightened, who recognize the conspiracy for what it is.

I ask you how can any intelligent, observant man take such a position in regard to the Catholic church, and especially the demagogic, materialistic, hypocritical hierarchy that is the Roman Catholic Church. Any moderately informed person in the world today cannot in good conscience have anything but disdain for organized religion, and dismay at the sight of its effects on people and society as a whole.

This criticism goes well beyond the recent papal document on birth control - this stand was only to be expected from an organization that would wait until the 1960's to exonerate the Jews from

being collectively classified as Christ-killers. The fears and guilt feelings that Christian traditions have fostered have caused irreparable to all around you and me. Not to mention the physical punishments the Church caused to be inflicted on certain individuals for their immoral activities - people such as Oscar Wilde, Galileo, Copernicus, and Bertrand Russell.

By not criticizing the greatest conspiracy against man's common humanity, the editors of the Gazette are bowing to the pressures too long exerted by the international capitalist-religious conspiracy against our freedom and sanity.

Eric Warren
Lee Wayne Mitchell

On criticism of the leave system

To the Editor:

In response to the letter of Dave Smith re the leaves at Shirreff Hall:

Typically, Mr. Smith has jumped to the wrong conclusion about the leaves at Shirreff Hall. Any reasonable amount of research on his part would have revealed that the "outrageous disparity on campus", as he termed it, is part of a system devised, and put into operation by the girls themselves. The leaves are set up by the Shirreff Hall House Committee, and can be approved by the Dean of Women only after the approval of residents at a General House Meeting. Thus if the majority of residents feel the leaves are adequate, they will go into effect. While you may argue that the wishes of the majority should not restrict the minority who would enjoy greater freedom, at least these girls may have their say at the open meeting, and as a rule, no system ever goes into effect if there are serious objections raised. This year it was the Dean

of Women herself, Miss Irvine, who suggested that the structure of the leave system be thoroughly reviewed, and, if necessary, completely revised in the girls' interest. Had Mr. Smith checked his information more carefully, he would have seen that a Leave Committee headed by Pat Madden was meeting under his very nose. Since then, a general meeting with the girls has been held, and a new system ushered in by a unanimous vote of the girls. If the changes are approved by the administration, they will go into effect immediately after Christmas break. Essentially, the leaves are unrestricted for all classes except freshettes, who have been given new, freer leaves than previously. Hopefully, freshettes who do well at Christmas will inherit the old "Junior" leaves. Special late leaves will be extended for freshettes also.

We hope Mr. Smith will reconsider his arguments, which, while definitely humorous, were nonetheless ill-founded.

Tona Hennigar (Hall President)
Linda Bruce (Secretary)