



CHARLES JOSEPH SHAFFER

When the third year architects met last Thursday morning for their first class after the Easter holidays, they wondered where Charlie Shaffer was. He hadn't planned on returning late.

At that very moment Charlie Shaffer was dying in a hospital in his home town of Woodland, California. He had made his last confession. (He couldn't receive Holy Viaticum because the infection in his throat prevented his swallowing.) He received the sacrament of the Last Anointing, and then, fortified with these sacraments of the dying, he entered eternity.

The good-byes of Charlie Shaffer and his friends as they left for Easter vacation had been as casual as the good-byes exchanged among any other friends. But Charlie's good-byes had been final. And the friends were stunned at the news of his death. "Why, Charlie was a rugged guy! Whenever he had time he worked out with the weights. He was an ardent and good golfer. Why Charlie? He had so much promise as an architect. His last plan, for the underwater restaurant, had been judged the best in the class and was sent on to a national competition. And Charlie was a real guy. He liked fun."

Yes, Charlie Shaffer was one of the guys -- as a student outstanding in his course; as an athlete, not a professional, but good; as a companion, most likable, a joy to have around.

Charles Shaffer under some aspects was just another Notre Dame man. In many ways he was an outstanding Notre Dame man. Him God chose to call -- suddenly -- giving him the all-important grace -- perhaps because in all ways he was a good Notre Dame man -- to die well.

To Charles Joseph Shaffer may God grant eternal rest.

To his parents, brother, and sisters may God grant the strength of Faith to bear this separation with fortitude and holy resignation.

To us at Notre Dame may his death be a reminder that St. James calls life "but a puff of smoke that appears for a little while and then disappears." (James 4:14)

"THE DEPUTY" -- SOME REASONED AND FAIR JUDGMENTS

Many columns of newspaper print and many pages of magazines have been inked with the controversy over Rolf Hochhuth's play, "The Deputy" -- not for its qualities as drama but for its portrayal of Pope Pius XII as betraying the German Jews to extermination by the Nazis. Enough has now been written to call forth honest, unbiased summations of the play and the principles involved in the controversy. Quoted below are three very fair statements from three quite divergent sources.

"The most impressive effect of The Deputy is the candor and moral earnestness with which the various possible points of view are being compared. Hochhuth's insistence that Pius failed in his plain duty has been echoed, with urgency, by some responsible Roman historians.

"Conversely, some knowledgeable Jews have maintained that by speaking out Pius would likely have intensified the German determination to destroy a whole people; there was a precedent for this in Holland.

"Between these two extremes there are infinite shades of opinion, including the opinion that Pius was a tormented man who attempted to take everything into consideration and found everything too much for him; where all is complex, nothing can be simple, and what was needed, according to this view, was a simple human response to an incredible human need.

"These shades of opinions, these diverging investigations, have leaped across the boundaries of religious affiliation. At the best intellectual level, the Catholic community, the Jewish community, the Protestant community and the secular community seem to have become a single community in search of one particular historical truth, committed -- in pain -- to the painstaking labor of examining not only the facts but the cankers and reluctances that still cling to individual hearts. It is my view that this is an extraordinary good for a bad play to have produced."

--from Walter Kerr, drama critic
in the New York Herald Tribune

"If innumerable and immeasurable evils befell mankind, one cannot impute this to cowardice, lack of interest and to selfishness on the part of the Pope. Anyone who maintained this would violate truth and justice.

"If the results of the studies, the efforts, the prayers, and of the humanitarian and peace-seeking activities of Pius XII were not equal to his desires and

to the needs of others, he did not fail to make his own the drama of iniquity, of sorrow, and of blood of the world torn by war and obsessed by the fury of totalitarianism and of oppression."

--from Pope Paul VI
at the unveiling of a statue
of Pope Pius XII in St. Peter's.

"In my judgment Hochhuth has failed both as historian and as artist. He wrote a polemic rather than a profound discourse. It is to the credit of sensitive, sophisticated critics and scholars that this play has provided an occasion for serious analysis of the failure of the Church during the Nazi period. The play itself hinders such an analysis."

--from Rabbi Arthur Gilbert
in America (March 14, 1964)

* * * * *

IN YOUR CHARITY please pray for the following: Ill -- father of Joe McCarty of Lyons; grandfather of Herb Batt of Stanford; wife of Thomas Blubaugh, '56; Louis Pohlman of the maintenance department; Father Arthur Hope, C.S.C.; Brother Cyril Farr, C.S.C. Deceased -- father of Edward Galwardi of Zahm; aunt of Joe Sperber of Pangborn; uncle of John Cahalan, teaching fellow in philosophy; Mrs. Mary C. Bauer, aunt of James Walsh, Off-Campus, and cousin of the late Father James D. Trahey, C.S.C.; husband of Marie Jegier, maid in St. Ed's; Ray Murphy of Portland, Oregon; Charles R. Riley, '33; father of Thomas J. Reynolds, '54; Roy A. Worden, '28; Conn J. Horton, '21; Francis W. Leary, '27; Arnold B. McInerney, '42; wife of Frederick J. Clements, '26; Thomas M. Lee, '29; father of Roland J. Kelly, Jr., '50; Joseph J. Sullivan, '01; father of J. Barrett Beltz, '33; Dr. Edward J. Summers, '09; George Philbrook, '12.

REQUIEM MASSES FOR CHARLES SHAFFER ---

Wednesday, April 8, 5:10: Solemn Requiem Mass offered
on behalf of the University.

Thursday, April 9, 5:10: Requiem High Mass requested
by the Junior Class.

AN APPOSITE REFLECTION -- It is both a marvel and a mercy that the average man passes through an average day without ever thinking of his impending death. To say that death is an intrusive and even imminent reality is not to indulge in cheap pessimism or cheaper rhetoric. The longest life is short; sudden or early death is a commonplace; the movement we call time is inexorable. Yet for each of us death continues to be the thing that happens, naturally and of course, to the other fellow....When a Christian man does squarely confront his own sure death, his mind will not then go blank, nor need he particularly quail and cower. He will recall that he believes in the Easter event.

Father Vincent P. McCorry, S.J.

Fresh from the Pad.....

"WHEN DOES DRINKING BECOME SINFUL?"

What the one asking this age-old question really wants to know is: When does drinking become a mortal sin? What is the minimum standard? How can I judge drinking as an isolated action? How can I consider it in an impersonal way?

The standard answer to this vague question is: When one deliberately deprives himself of his humanness through drinking so that he ceases to act in a responsible human way, he has sinned mortally. But drinking is never an isolated act. A person drinks -- not a stainless steel creature who acts in a vacuum. It is impossible to talk about the morality of drinking unless you talk about it in a completely human way. Drinking must be discussed in terms of the many-dimensional person involved.

Drinking alcoholic beverages is a fine human act. Drink is a good creature. A creature for man's enjoyment. Any sweeping condemnation of drink is inhuman and un-Christian. Like every creature, drink can be abused -- abused by men. It is this ab-use which is sinful. As this particular human being, apart from all the airy and impersonal generalities, how can you ab-use alcohol?

Under its influence do I cease to act as a responsible human being?

Under its influence do I lose control over my ordinarily controlled strong sexual instincts?

Under its influence does my checked temper break lose and violently explode?

Under its influence do I continually seek to escape from the burdens and responsibilities inseparable from my state in life?

Under its influence do I violate the rights of others by damage, disobedience or scandal?

Am I becoming so chained to the spell of its influence that I, more or less, live to drink?

Can I drink at all? Can I drink a limited amount? Can I drink now?

There is nobody on God's green earth who can answer these questions for you. Each fellow must answer them for himself. The man sitting next to you at the bar, the gang back home, not even your roommate can give you the answers. This is your manly responsibility. You must face drink as you face sex and language. If you refuse to make a definite personal conviction you are avoiding the issue. You are a coward. Don't kid yourself. There will always be pressures; there will always be reasons; and there will always be the influence of others. What are you going to do about drink? What place is this creature of God going to have in your life? This is THE question.
--Father Baker, C.S.C.

P.S. College is the fountain of knowledge where everyone comes to drink.