

EDITORIAL:

Ye Editoraps It Up

It is a tradition in college papers for the outgoing editor to lay his words of divine wisdom on the state of the world over the past year on the masses in his last editorial, but as I gaze down at the ol' office tripewriter (the one with the "x" missing) I don't really feel up to it.

So I'm going to make some random comments, firstly on the Cadre. The problem that has arisen this year is one of (naturally) communication. A lot of what we wanted to get across was lost in abstractionism ("that's nice") and reaction was, not surprisingly, most evident in sensational things. The thing that got the most response (both from the University and throughout the Island) was our "obscene" poem, which was printed because we felt it was quite a good poem qua poem. Other pieces that got response were the fake ads (some people actually wanted to write to the American Empire, but couldn't find the address), and the satire thingies.

But some of the people who were entertained would complain at our attempts to be political (feeble as they were, mainly because we had noone to spare for local feature writing—but more on that later). If you haven't already done so, take 15 minutes and read "Why Radicalism".

What happened was that the paper became a clique, whose cliquishness was imposed upon it from without, i.e. from you students. We did not exclude you, you forced us to depend on ourselves.

The paper did not become organic because: 1) most students know piss-all about what is involved in putting it out, 2) most students don't give a damn about their own welfare unless they can see a blatantly materialistic reason, 3) not one member of the staff was living in residence, consequently resident students were not, and could not have been, represented directly in opinions expressed in the paper.

A few people in each residence who came to Cadre meetings (it would give the editor an excuse to have them) and contributed occasional articles, would give the Cadre both more scope as far as news coverage, and would relate more to joe student.

I would like to dismiss the two prevalent myths re working on the Cadre. 1) Your own opinions would be shouted down or ignored by the "stoont radicals" who "control" the Cadre. Not true. Democratic decision-making must be the basis of the paper's operations. If you have anyone to poll. There's not must point in holding a referendum for two or three people, you know what they want anyway. 2) You have to have "talent". Also not true. First, there are many other (and essential) things to be done besides the actual writing. And if you look over our back issues, you'll discover that while there are no Hemingways on staff, the level of writing improved over the year to at least a par with other papers our size. So when you say "I can't write," you're really saying "I am not interested."

Under these circumstances, complaints of a non-constructive nature were ignored.

This could be easily repaired with more involvement. We hope that those who will be back next year will seriously consider contributing something to the paper.

* * * * *

The most disturbing event this year was the indifference of students to Council, and the ensuing rise of elitism and fascism. It's true that a lot of students do not feel Council to be relevant, and would rather ignore the whole silly thing. It's quite easy to see why this feeling is present.

By your presence in the Union and by the fact of your \$35 which helps run it, it is your obligation to make your opinions known, if you don't want someone to speak for you. And there is always someone ready to do that. You cannot, in this (union) system be apolitical. You must speak, or be spoken for.

Let's put an end to wishy-washy liberal fascism! Give the Executive complete control of the union, and let it do as it sees fit. If we're going to have fascists, let's have fascists who will stand up to the helpless and ignorant like real men. We don't care if our representatives on the Board, Senate and Council don't make any attempt to represent us. That's what we want—people who realize that students can't think.

Wowie Zowie.

God forbid we should ever be 20 years without a revolution.
—Thomas Jefferson, 1787.

Succinctly the method of compromise might be described as the method whereby one hopes to control events by abandoning oneself to them.
—Harold Stearns, author of *Liberalism in America*, 1919.

The wise fools who sit in the high places of justice fail to see that in revolutionary times, vital issues are settled not by statutes, decrees and authorities but in spite of them.
—Helen Keller, 1919.

The truth is we are all caught in a great economic system which is heartless.
—Woodrow Wilson, 1912.

The doctrine of the harmony of interests is the natural assumption of a prosperous and privileged class whose members have a dominant voice in the community and are therefore naturally prone to identify its interest with their own.
—E. H. Carr, 1939.

There are thousands hacking at the branches of evil to every one who is striking at the root.
—Henry David Thoreau, 1858.

"RECONT - - - ABJURE"

On March 17, 1970, during the radio programme "University of the Air" President Baker claimed as erroneous Professor Hahn's reference to the condemnation of Galileo. President Baker stated that... "He (Galileo) was warned (in 1616) that's right, but he was not convicted of heresy, that was in 1633."¹

It will be the intention of the following documentation to prove not only that President Baker's statement was in error but also that Prof. Hahn's statement regarding Galileo was correct.

According to theological law a heretic is an actual or former member of a church, or one whose allegiance is claimed by it, who holds religious opinions contrary to the fundamental doctrines and tenets of that church.² One, by virtue of theological law, in the Roman Catholic Church, is a heretic when he holds an opinion, on any subject or proposition, that has been characterized as heretical by the church.

Heresy. The crime which a person commits who, after he has received the Christian faith and still keeping the name of Christian, either denies or doubts some truth which was revealed by God and is taught by the Church as revealed. Heresy is called formal heresy (and is a mortal sin) if the person knows that his error is contrary to the Church's teaching, yet continues to hold it.³

In Feb. 1616, a committee of 11 theologians viewed the "two propositions representing Galileo's doctrine" that:

- I. The sun is the centre of the world and completely immovable by local motion.
- II. The earth is not the centre of the world, nor immovable, but moves according to the whole of itself, and also with a diurnal motion.

The consultors met on Feb. 23, 1616 and decided upon the following censures:

The first proposition was declared unanimously to be foolish and absurd in philosophy and formally heretical inasmuch as it expressly contradicts the doctrine of Holy Scripture in many passages, both in their literal meaning and according to the general interpretation of the Fathers and Doctors.

With regard to the second proposition: All were agreed that this proposition merits the same censure in philosophy, and that, from a theological standpoint, it is at least erroneous in the faith.⁴

On Feb. 25, the following decision was handed down:

The Lord Cardinal Mellini notified the Reverend Fathers, the Assessor, and the Commissary of the Holy Office that the censure passed by the theologians with regard to the propositions of the mathematician Galileo, the effect that the sun is the center of the world and immovable by local motion, and that the earth moves, and even with a diurnal motion, had been reported; and His Holiness had directed Cardinal Bellarmine to summon before him the said Galileo and admonish him to abandon the said opinion; and, if he should refuse to obey, the Commissary should enjoin on him, before a notary and witnesses, a command to abstain altogether, from teaching or defending it; and if he does not acquiesce therein, he should be imprisoned.⁵

Let us now return to what Professor Hahn in actual fact said:

In Feb. 1616 the "establishment" condemned Galileo as a heretic for stating that the earth rotated around an immovable sun.⁶

Allow us now to cite President Baker's quotation regarding Professor Hahn's statement;

...any more than I think that Prof. Hahn was right in saying that Galileo was convicted of heresy on the date he gave — which is quite wrong.⁷

Obviously there is some misunderstanding as to the meaning of the words "condemn and "convict". Undoubtedly this difficulty can be resolved by citing the following definitions:

- condemn:** to pronounce adverse judgement on; to express strong disapproval of; censure.⁸
- convict:** to prove or declare guilty of an offense, esp. after a legal trial.⁹

It has thus been shown that condemn may mean censure, which was in fact the judgment of the eleven theologians on the propositions of Galileo in 1616.

President Baker further states that:

This (1616) was not about Galileo at all but about Copernicus.¹⁰

At no time did the censure of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office refer to Copernicus. Perhaps the misconception is due to the fact that:

On March 5th, (1616) the Congregation of the Index published a decree regarding the Copernican astronomy.¹¹

which suspended, until corrected, books by Copernicus and Zuniga and prohibited one by Foscarini.¹²

It is commonly held that Copernicus' theories were condemned as heretical. This is an error. The truth is that only those works which taught that the Copernican doctrine was consonant with truth and not opposed to Holy Scripture were condemned. Copernican Theory was allowed to be taught as a hypothesis. Galileo's propositions, on the other hand, were condemned as heretical in 1616. (See above)

One further point should be brought to light. In 1633 Galileo was sentenced as vehemently suspected of heresy, and by the words of his own abjuration:

...and after it had been notified to me that the said doctrine was contrary to Holy Scripture (Feb. 26, 1616), I wrote and printed a book in which I treated this new doctrine already condemned.....¹³

President Baker stated that he felt that Professor Hahn's attack on what the university is doing simply wasn't valid and further stated:

...any more than I think that Prof. Hahn was right in saying that Galileo was convicted of heresy on the date he gave — which is quite wrong.¹⁴

It should be abundantly clear, even to the novice historian, that President Baker was in fact incorrect. Therefore, by virtue of President Baker's reasoning, it is evident that the opinions expressed by Prof. Hahn in his interview are given increased credibility. For that, President Baker, I thank you.

—Maffeo Barberini

1. University of the Air Broadcast, March 17, 1970
2. Standard Dictionary of the English Language (Funk and Wagnalls Co., N.Y., 1903), P. 841
3. Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information (Catholic Press, Inc., Chicago, 1955), P. 10
4. Langford, Jerome; Galileo, Science and the Church (Desclée Co., N.Y., 1966), P. 89
5. *ibid*, p. 92
6. Cadre, March 13, 1970
7. University of the Air Broadcast, March 17, 1970
8. The American College Dictionary (Random House, N.Y. 1962) P. 251
9. *ibid*, P. 266
10. University of the Air Broadcast, March 17, 1970
11. Langford, op. cit., P. 97
12. *ibid*, P. 154
13. *ibid*, P. 154
14. University of the Air Broadcast, March 17, 1970