

Maybe We Won't Have a June 29th

—Father Henry A. Atwell

I was going to write this week about the new liturgical directives which go into effect June 29th — but then Monday's headlines made me wonder if there would be a June 29th.

And the change in the number of genuflections paled in significance when the grim prospects of Armageddon loomed as a very real possibility.

What can we say here that has not already been said better by statesmen and prelates and news commentators around the world?

I looked for some thought starters in a few books at hand. Maybe just quoting from them will be a solution in our editorial dilemma.

"It is impossible to know with any precision what the outcome of a nuclear war would be. Some think that half the population of the world would survive, some think only a quarter, and some think none. It is not necessary, in considering policy, to decide among such possibilities. What is quite certain is that the world which would emerge from a nuclear war would not be such as is desired by either Moscow or Washington. On the most favorable hypothesis, it would consist of destitute populations, maddened by hunger, debilitated by disease, deprived of the support of modern industry and means of transport, incapable of supporting educational institutions, and rapidly sinking to the level of ignorant savages. . . . It is on this kind of ground that the national interests of different nations, however they may conflict on minor issues, are all identical on one point: that nuclear war must be prevented."

—Bernard Russell in Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare.

"Some people today are certain that the only way to insure peace among men is to play up the tremendous horrors of the next war. . . . But we know that people do not entirely abhor carnage and gruesomeness; they experience hidden pleasure even as they shudder. Anyone who sees movies, watches television, or listens to radio programs must be convinced of man's self-intoxication with destruction. . . . So when we read scare stories about a possible atomic war, about the unspeakable destruction it will cause, about the countless cities that will be turned into rubble, about the millions of casualties that will result, can we be expected to react by becoming so afraid of war that in self-defense we will outlaw it? I say no. We are afraid, true, but as soon as we become afraid we begin inwardly to mobilize ourselves for attack. . . . And the culmination of these scares unwittingly builds up the primitive lust to fight, with its attraction of horror and terror lurking in each of us and waiting only to be discharged again."

—Joost A. M. Meerloo in Breakthrough to Peace.

"In our times, thermonuclear war may seem unthinkable, immoral, insane, hideous, or highly unlikely, but it is not impossible. To get intelligently we must learn as much as we can about the risks. . . . We cannot wish them away. Nor should we overestimate and assume the worst is inevitable. . . . Whether we intend it or not, we may have obligated ourselves to go to an all-out central war. Attempts at restraint may turn out to be unrewarding, passion, irrationally, and technical difficulties of control might cause escalation into all-out war. . . . For these and other reasons it is possible that the most objective and careful discussions may still influence events in a wrong direction. Indeed, the final outcome of decisions that are well meaning, informed, and intelligent can be disastrous. However, few would argue that this is a good reason to be malevolent, uninformed, or stupid. Those of us who have not received any divine revelation as to the correct course must do the best we can with the knowledge and intellectual tools we have available. I for one do not believe that it makes sense to depend any more than can be helped on blind luck or faith—even though I concede we will need both if we are to negotiate safely the treacherous terrain before us."

—Herman Kahn in Thinking about the Unthinkable.

"Whatever conclusions may be drawn from these facts — and facts they are — this is certainly not the liberated Europe. . . . (and today we could say this of the whole world) . . . we fought to build up. Nor is it the one which contains the essentials of permanent peace."

—Winston S. Churchill in The Second World War.

"People live in constant fear lest the storm that threatens every moment should break upon them with dreadful violence. . . . There is an immense task incumbent on all men of good will, namely, the task of restoring the relations of the human family in truth, in justice, in love and in freedom. . . . Every believer in this world of ours must be a spark of light, a center of love, a life-giving leaven amidst his fellow men. And he will be able to do this all the more perfectly, the more closely he lives in communion with God in the intimacy of his own soul. . . . May He banish from the hearts of men whatever may endanger peace. . . . May He enkindle the wills of all so that they may overcome the barriers that divide, cherish the bonds of mutual charity, understand others, and pardon those who have done them wrong. By virtue of His action, may all peoples of the earth become as brothers, and may the most longed-for peace blossom forth and reign always among them."

—Pope John XXIII in Pacem in Terris.

Time to Speak Up Or Hopes Will Die

London — (RNS) — The time has come for those who believe the Vatican Council offers the way to the Christian future to make their voices heard, according to Auxiliary Bishop Basil Christopher Butler of Westminster.

He expressed the view in a long article in the influential Roman Catholic weekly review, The Tablet, published here, in which he charged that the field of discussion in the Church now seemed divided between reactionaries and experimenters. He also asserted that the Church has so far insufficiently "lived the Council."

"The very texts of the documents have, so far, been only very imperfectly communicated, expounded, understood and assimilated. But there is more, much more, to the Second Vatican Council than the letter of the texts subscribed by its members."

"The Council substitutes the dynamic for the static as the appropriate category for Christian thinking and acting. By its own spirit, it should be leading us on first to digest and practice, but then to outstrip and transcend, the letter of its own enactments. One way to bury the Council would be to turn its decisions into a fresh chapter of canon law."

Look's 'Modern Priest' Touches 'Exposed Nerves'

Father Cooke reviews in this article a book recently published by Father James Kavanaugh of Michigan, titled "A Modern Priest Looks at His Outdated Church." Major portions of the book were printed in the June 13 issue of Look magazine. The author, ordained in 1954, last year wrote an article "I Am a Priest, I Want to Get Married" for the Saturday Evening Post.

By REV. BERNARD COOKE, S.J.

Marquette University,

Father Kavanaugh's book is a very human document, obviously rooted in anguish and written in a passion. For this reason it is difficult to review, for it seems almost ghoulish to probe critically into another man's sorrow. Yet, because Father Kavanaugh has raised issues that extend far beyond his own experiences and reactions, because this book could be misleading and disturbing to many who do not have the background of understanding and personal experience to evaluate it, because the book is almost certainly going to be sensationalized, it does seem important to give some appraisal of it.

The book has many good things, even important things to say. But it is sad that it probably will not be listened to carefully by those who can do most about the questions it raised — and this because of the author's over-simplified and unbalanced presentation of the situations he describes.

By and large the book tends to throw all the blame for the human problems and anguish in the Catholic Church upon those in higher positions of authority. Certainly, the responsibility that the bishops and those closely associated with them bear for the reform of Catholic life is very grave; but neither all the responsibility nor all the blame rests on them.

It is hard to be critical of Father Kavanaugh's book, because it is clearly written by a man who has a deep priestly longing to have the Church he loves be all that it is meant to be. But he is not alone in this longing. Very many of us who are his fellow Catholics and his fellow priests would want to lay claim to this same desire. This is at one and the same time the promise and the pain that has come with Vatican II: as never before we have become aware of the extent to which in our day Christianity can reach out to men with the saving Gospel of Christ; yet we are staggered by the immensity of the task and irritated by the slowness with which it is advancing.

To express this longing and this frustration does serve some purpose — but Father Kavanaugh's book is not adding anything new in this regard; these topics are discussed in countless formal or informal gatherings of priests throughout the country. Such discussion, however, is scarcely a beginning.

Changes in Christianity will not take place simply because of criticism and demands for reform, but because of hope-filled and imaginative planning and effort. And one thing that Father Kavanaugh seems to miss from the message of Vatican II is its insistence that much of the renewing of the Church's life must arise out of the grassroots initiative of those of us who do not exercise any authority in the structures of the Church.

In the course of his book Father Kavanaugh manages to touch on most of the exposed nerve ends in Catholic life — ranging from the problems of young assistant priests in parish rectories, to the need for changes in the life of women religious, to the "failure" of Catholic schools. He manifests a deep human sympathy for the painful experiences that many have undergone, or still under-

go, because of deficiencies in the structures of the Church. Certainly, Father Kavanaugh is very right in insisting that there is a need to face these questions honestly.

One can not pretend that the Church needs no reform; one cannot pretend that all the structures that have come down as historical heritage fit our increased modern awareness that the dignity and development of the human person depend upon his free commitment of himself to life. The Gospel message is meant to bring joy and liberation. And until such joy and freedom characterizes the life of the Christian, conditions in the Church cannot be considered ideal.

There is no question but what in the situations Father Kavanaugh analyzes there is need for some change. But it must also be admitted that change has happened, and is happening. Perhaps at too slow a pace, but what has taken place in the Catholic Church in the last quarter century can well be described as revolutionary. And with all due credit to Pope John — to whom all of us look back with great gratitude — the "new Pentecost" is not basically his work but the work of the Spirit. Even we men, who are so fearful and timid in the face of needed change, cannot ultimately resist the action of the Spirit in the life of the Church. For this reason, the present moment in the life of the Church should be one of great optimism despite the questions and problems we face.

It is very easy to say that this book presents the situation in the Catholic Church today in an oversimplified way; this could be a subtle way of avoiding the accusations of lethargy and unconcern contained in its pages. Let me, however, give one example of what I mean:

Clearly, one of the deepest sorrows Father Kavanaugh has is for those Catholics who find

themselves involved in a tragic marriage situation, and who because of the Church's position on divorce seem doomed to a life of suffering and frustration.

Any priest who has done the least bit of marriage counseling is more than aware of the deep human hurt attached to these situations. And we must do everything possible by study and reflection to find ways of alleviating this human sorrow. But many of us priests encounter an allied situation of great tragedy and suffering: the young people who come from broken homes — and that is one reason why we would not wish to rush into an abandonment of the Church's position on divorce. The disastrous impact on young people which comes from the divorce of their parents is one of the great evils in our society, at the present time. The psychological harm, the disillusionment with respect to human affection, the rejection that has come because of the fractured home, are things that deeply bother those of us who deal day in and day out with wonderful young men and women whose lives will never be what they really should be because of parents who did not maturely accept the responsibility of their relationship to one another.

I am perfectly aware that the effect on children does not give a totally justifying basis for ruling out all divorce; aware also that the mere existence of laws about divorce does not adequately solve the manifold human factors in these cases. However, I think it is necessary to remember the vast complexity of the question when one looks at society as a whole; and it seems to me that Father Kavanaugh's book does not do this.

It is quite clear that Father Kavanaugh is deeply troubled by the human grief that he has met in his priestly work. This, however, is due in large part to

is inseparable from priesthood the fact that such an experience in the Church, for this priesthood is of its very nature a ministry of helping people in the problem situations of their lives.

Human life, for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is our human inability to face reality with full maturity, is involved in numberless situations of tragedy. A man who exercises an ordained priesthood with openness to people, who sympathetically ministers to people in their sorrows, will inevitably feel the pain that comes with identifying with these people he loves.

For a priest to hold himself aloof from such involvement in the lives and problems of his fellow men is to deny one of the deepest elements of his priesthood. But it is one thing to say that a priest should have this open affection and sympathy for his fellow men; it is another thing to say that he should be sentimental in his dealings with them. He is meant to be a guide; he is meant to communicate, as far as he possibly can, the mature strength that men need when they find themselves in human situations that admit of no simple solution.

Mere legalism will, obviously, not provide the kind of human guidance that is needed; but law and order in the deepest sense are absolutely needed, for freedom itself can only exist if there is order. The priest must help people with human warmth and understanding; but to substitute sentimentality for reason would be to deprive men of the possibility of growing to maturity.

Perhaps this review will seem too harsh; I can only hope that as a devoted priest I can help respect the reasons why Father Kavanaugh has written, even though I have found it necessary to disagree with him.

A Curate's Comments

75% of Expenses For 2% of Pupils

By FATHER ROGER BAGLIN
St. Bridget's Church, Rochester

The Superintendent of Catholic Schools in our Diocese has recently, in his monthly newsletter, thrown out a somewhat rhetorical question — as to finding it difficult understanding the "pessimism shrouding the future of Catholic education in the Diocese of Rochester."

When one asks a rhetorical question, one runs the risk of having it answered, perhaps in a way not in accord with expectation. Our apologies first if this seems controversial — it is intended to be informative — to state a position — to set forth the opinion of a certain segment — a privilege sometimes violently denied to those whose views are labeled as irresponsible or impractical.

First, let us say that we who share this viewpoint refuse to have our outlook called "pessimism" — this does rather depend on your point of view, after all — we would much rather have our outlook classified as "realism."

Now straight to the heart of the issue. The question as phrased is completely misleading and inaccurate — whether intentionally or not it would attempt to pull the rug out from under the feet of the answerer before he can get a chance to open his mouth.

The phrasing refers to the future of "Catholic education" when obviously its intent is to refer to "Catholic schools" or "Catholic parochial education" — thus it sets up a prejudiced identity between the two. This false concept has to be pointed out of our thinking, and violently. Catholic education does not, must not, equal or mean "Catholic schools." Fuzzy thinking must not be permitted here.

So widespread and so alive has this misunderstanding become that at times "Catholic schools" has almost been equated with the entire mission of the Church to the world. Certainly it seems evident that a state of befuddlement exists, for example, in our United States where (to use as crass a yardstick as finances) \$72 out of every \$100 income to the Church is expended on the privileged few in Catholic schools — well under 50% of the 6-21 age category — even counting only baptized Catholics. (If Catholics make up 25% of our population, the 6-21 age segment would narrow this to perhaps 5%, and the fact we do not have anywhere near half our children in Catholic schools would narrow it probably under 2%). This means about 3% of our money, and the proportion in personnel hours has to be at least comparable when you count all the nuns, lay teachers and (even) priests employed full time in Catholic schools, is spent on less than 2% of the people of the country.

Our mission, remember, is to "Go teach all nations, baptizing them." All nations, not 3% of our effort on 2% of the nation. If this is not a confusion of our mission, what is? But we are not yet finished! This disjointed situation could perhaps be borne and tolerated, (difficultly), were "Catholic schools" engaged exclusively in bringing the message of Christ to their students. But, lo, which

most of us seem to be stuck in this rut) a certain number of personnel — most have not yet mastered the art of bilocation — a certain amount of financial and certain quantity of energy expendable and assuming as we must that these will remain relatively constant if not decrease in face of a vocation lag and supposing as we may a relatively stable efficiency quotient including effective use of laymen. It is completely impossible and contradictory to expect that we shall be able to substantially increase our efforts in these other directions without decreasing them in some other area (the prime candidate in our minds being of course Catholic schools).

This is true for the simple reason that Church people who now have a full time job in the Catholic schools are simply not capable of doubling or 1 1/2 times their present effort to launch a parallel effort in adult education or a pilot program in the form of a parish school of religion. Who would deny the wonderful dedication and the sincere effort being put in now by many school teachers and priests? A person who is already giving 100%, or working at 300% efficiency, cannot be expected to give 200% or 150% — this is a stark impossibility. To expect present personnel to add additional programs without either cutting back their present efforts is to imply that they are only working now at 50% or 75% of potential, surely a hard judgment.

Concretely, for example, to expect "Sister Mary" to expand to new teaching seventh grade, taking care of the necessity and doing her fair share in the convent, to expect her suddenly to take on a couple of seminars or discussion groups with many scholars, teachers and the adult religious education program, and bear a hand in the apostolate to the non-Catholics, in addition to her already strenuous duties is rather fatuous at best, insulting to her integrity and complete dedication at worst. Where, for example, in her busy day would one suggest that she begin to fit in these other programs.

Very simply put, the stance of those who opt for keeping our Catholic schools open and expanding in these other directions are patently embracing the more for less (or at least, more for the same price) type of philosophy which has in other fields highlighted the gullibility of the American public. No less an authority than the executive secretary of the NCA has assured us that the ideal of a Catholic school in every parish in the style envisioned by the Council of Baltimore is "absolutely dead." In the context of today's problems he sees this as an impossibility. Why do others refuse to stop clinging to the corpse of this perhaps once opt and useful, but now outmoded, vision?

Now regarding a common

misapprehension of those opposed to our attitude.

What we suggest is not "giving up Catholic schools" much less "getting out of Catholic education." We do not propose a drawing back, a retrenchment or abdication or a "getting out" of anything.

What we propose is an exchange of something good for something better. We would never recommend or consider the closing of a Catholic school. We were to mean simply the ceasing of a certain amount of effort, talent and expense in a given parish or location. What we envision is that the same amount of time, personnel, money and energy will continue to be poured into the apostolate in this parish or area, but that it will now be better directed and distributed.

We have now come to the end of our discussion! Let us, however, add one last thought (by way of a reflection) which, although seemingly very remote, is none the less at least vaguely possible. Almost at random one can cite current incidents of closings of schools, limiting of enrollment, closing of grades, moratoriums on school construction, even in our diocese, as the great structure of Catholic schools begins little by little, slowly in dribs and fits to crumble and disintegrate. That is to say, we have already witnessed the beginning of the decay of Catholic schools, and they are exiting with a whimper, not a bang. Gradually and painlessly the system erodes.

Now the faint and elusive

glimmer-of-hope which presents itself is that Catholic schools could possibly be rescued by massive government, preferably state, aid. Terrified by the bugbear of state equalization control, a horribly gratuitous assertion since it is based on little or no experiential knowledge, professional Catholic educators rear back in horror from the very thought of Big Brother helping them out with these, an approach extremely satisfactory and viable approach exists right on our doorstep.

In the provinces of our good neighbor, Canada, through legal systems of tax application, the government supports (that is to say, the people support) both public and private schools. This is very much in accord with good Christian theory of education, by which the primary responsibility for the formation, religious and secular, of children rests with the parents, not with the Church nor the State. If such a system can work in Canada's pluralistic society, it is at least an indication that its possibility should not be scorned with a snort or a catch in our ruralist society. At least it deserves some consideration.

Indeed, were the bishops of a state of province to realistically force the decline and problem of Catholic schools, take the bull by the horns, and inform the state government that either massive state aid must be forthcoming (such as would allow us to staff our schools manly with competent lay professionals, thus freeing the religious for their more specifically Christian tasks) or were such a suggestion to be presented to the State with the option or alternative that otherwise we shall be forced to rapidly withdraw from the field of schools by wholesale closing of our institutions — were this dilemma to be forcefully presented to the State, it would seem that this dream, or possibility of massive state aid might very rapidly and pragmatically become a reality.

Remember, these closing three paragraphs do not represent our main thesis. They are simply appended as a possible alternative approach, as another way in which to free our time, personnel, energy and finances for our mission. We are not pushing for government aid to education, only presenting it for what it could be.

Now the faint and elusive

Priests Form Presbytery Checks on Bishop's Senate

St. Paul — (RNS) — A new type of organization of Roman Catholic priests was formed here.

The Presbytery of the Archdiocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis was established when nearly 450 priests voted to ratify the constitution and by-laws for the organization.

In joining the concept of a "professional association" of priests with the role of a Senate established by a bishop, the Presbytery was hailed as unique in the Church.

As one of the purposes of the Presbytery, the priests voted 232 to 189 to insert the following statement:

"To promote for all the priests of the archdiocese those fundamental human rights flowing directly from man's very nature and dignity as a human person, and which are therefore universal, inviolable and inalienable."

Among other stated purposes of the Presbytery are these:

• "To develop in the priests of the archdiocese the bond of Christian charity and the consciousness of their unity.

• "To study, develop and implement policies and programs which will help the priests to live and to work more effectively in their ministry."



Which of these Nazareth St. Joseph postulants? A young girl, including Kath Giovanni, Seneca Falls adjust to the college dress.



Presbytery Touring Choir of Tr interracial Day in Ments will be used by John L. Salmon, Jr. Bethel C.M.E. Church begin with Mass at

Legion

By WILLIAM W. BUECHEL
(Special to The Courier)

"You are the only organization in the entire Church that anticipated the Vatican Council." With these words Bishop Sheen greeted the Legion of Mary Council Officers Meeting held recently at Rochester Sheraton Hotel.

The age of the laity, the Bishop said, was started long before Vatican Council II by the Legion of Mary when it became the first organized "out-ministry," emulating Jesus Christ who was in the "out-ministry."

The Council Officers meeting was sponsored by the New York Regional Senatus, which has jurisdiction over all of New York state, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Connecticut and parts of Massachusetts, and Curia officers from all these states were liberally represented. This was the first time such a Council Officers meeting was held outside New York City.

The theme of the 3-day meeting was "True Devotion to the Nation," and experts on various aspects of this were invited to speak to the gathered officers. TDN is not something new, since it was first proposed by Frank Duff, founder of the Legion, as many as ten years ago, again anticipating the involvement of the laity which was by Vatican Council II.

TDN seeks to better, in whatever Christian way possible, the secular city, seeking by group action, or individual action, groups to bring Christ to political, financial and social arenas, and thus bring in being a better world in which all men might live a better life.

As Monsignor Edward



Stewart fred Cor Legion C

The Catholic COURIER Journal
THE NEWSPAPER OF THE ROCHESTER DIOCESE
Vol. 78 No. 36 Friday, June 9, 1967
MOST REV. FULTON J. SHEEN, Ph.D., D.D. President
Published weekly by the Rochester Catholic Press Association
MAIN OFFICE — 55 Solo St. — 454-7050 — Rochester, N.Y. 14604
ELMIRA OFFICE: 217 Robinson Bldg., Lake St. RD 1-5688 or RE 1-2423
AUBURN OFFICE: 141 E. Genesee St. AL 1-4446
Second class postage paid at Rochester, N.Y.
Single copy 15¢; 1 year subscription in U.S., \$5.00
As required under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.
Canada \$5.50; Foreign Countries \$8.75