



"While a bugging device was not used, I rule that a police officer cupping his hand to his ear can be considered unconstitutional eavesdropping!"

The Church: 1970

If Luther Had Not Left

By Fr. Andrew Greeley



"What would have happened," asked a very prominent European churchman, "if Martin Luther had not left?"

It is certainly a fascinating historical question; one can speculate even if one refuses to engage in discussion as to whether Luther or his enemies were more responsible for the split in 16th Century Christendom. Presumably at this point those on both sides of the Reformation fence would be willing to admit that things would have been much better if the break between Luther and Rome had not occurred. Lutherans may feel that the break was necessary, if tragic, and Catholics may feel that it was tragically unnecessary, although now many Catholics would place substantially more blame on Rome than they would have even 15 years ago. But both sides would agree that the great division of the Reformation was a tragedy.

What did the Roman church lose in the break? It lost, of course, the northern half of Europe. The mind boggles at the thought of what the world would be like if during the ages of great exploration and then of industrial expansion, England and Germany had been Catholic countries. It lost the reform tradition which had been thoroughly Catholic in previous centuries.

Protest against the failings in ecclesiastical authority had marked great reformers like Francis, Dominic, Benedict, and Catherine of Siena. While both reform and protest remained in the Roman church, the voice of protest and reform was substantially muted. The Roman church also lost the spirit of creativity and experimentation in the liturgy which it was not to recapture for 4 1/2 centuries. It lost its own democratic tradition which had flourished vigorously in the Middle Ages. It lost its flexibility and its ability to change and grow and develop to meet the challenges in the world in which it found itself. The rigid, inflexible, authoritarian structure of the counter-Reformation Church may have been necessary for survival once the break with Protestants was definitive, but a terribly heavy price had to be paid for the counter-Reformation.

We should not overlook, either, the fact that a heavy price was paid by the reformers themselves. Unity and order went down the drain. Despite Luther's own vigorous orthodoxy, many of those who came after him in the diverse manifestations of Protestantism believe things wildly different from the Christian tradition and still others believe hardly anything at all.

Furthermore, even though Luther himself was a great liturgist, the liturgical innovation

of the Reformation gradually led to a liturgy that was impoverished and dry and finally to a liturgy which, in some churches, has lost all sense of the sacred. And if the reform churches managed to keep alive the democratic procedures of the Middle Ages, they frequently did so at the cost of leaving clergy at the whims of the prejudices and the complacencies of local congregations.

In other words, for neither side did the Reformation and the counter-Reformation turn out to be very advantageous; the immense amounts of energies poured into the conflict between the separated branches of western Christianity could have been put to much better use during the industrial, scientific, and technological age.

One suspects, therefore, that if the leaders on either side in the early 16th century saw what was going to happen they would not have permitted the break. One suspects that both Luther and his adversaries would have been horrified at the thought of the Reformation Church and the Roman Church being separated for 4 1/2 centuries and even more horrified at the cost that each would have to pay.

The whole point of this very sketchy outline of the history of the Reformation is that one does not reform the Church by leaving it. As I have argued repeatedly, the Christian church will become a light on the mountaintop not because people depart from it and stand in the valleys screaming criticisms at it; it will be reformed by those who replace the fuses, repair the electrical wiring, and turn the switch back on.

As I have said before, I do not propose to question the motives of those who have departed from the priesthood or the religious life or even from the Church itself. I do not for a moment doubt that much agony and soul searching went into their decisions and, in many instances, the decisions are mature and intelligent, but I do want to insist once again that however mature and intelligent the decision to leave may have been, it is not a decision which is likely to contribute very much to the reform of the Church.

If they feel that they have to leave or that they want to leave or that, for them, it is even a good thing to leave, it behooves no one else to question their motivation, but it is not inappropriate for those of us who are still in to assert that we will miss their support in the struggle to renew and reform the Church. That they have decided to withdraw from such a struggle is their business but that we feel the loss of their energies and commitments is our business.

On The Right Side

St. Anthony Does It Again

By Father Paul J. Cuddy



Have you ever found your pocketbook missing, and with it your driver's license, auto registration, a credit card? And add to the documents missing, exactly \$177? If you have, then you know the jolt to my soul in August.

On our annual vacation Father Kress and I had left the diocese by gradual stages. We left Canadian Niagara Falls to spend a day at St. Michael's College in Toronto. This college is of special diocesan interest because of the Basilian Fathers. These fine priests who run Aquinas and St. John Fisher also run St. Michael's, and many have their roots by birth or by service in Rochester.

I have had a jaundiced eye regarding St. Michael's because of theologian Leslie Dewart, whose phenomenological use of terms, e.g. person, being, God, quoted in popular weeklies gives the people utter confusion. Dewart teaches there. However, after meeting the Basilian Father Gardner who hails from Fairport, Father William Principe of St. John's, Humboldt Street, and the Superior, Father Robert Madden, each of whom is scholarly, gracious, Catholic and priestly, my jaundice dissipated.

En route from Toronto back

to Montezuma, my billfold disappeared, with all the contents described above. In my last recollection it was resting on the front seat of the car in the village of Coburg, where we stopped at a couple restaurants and motels. Had it just fallen out of the car? Only God knew.

On my return to Hornell I offered Mass in honor of St. Anthony, petitioning for the recovery at least of the documents. Then I went to our 90 year old Sister DeSales, who has a formula of petition she brought from Ireland 70 years ago. "Sister, my pocketbook has disappeared. Will you start the prayers to St. Anthony, please? "Of course, Father."

Nine days went by. On the tenth day Sister DeSales said to my part-time secretary, Sister Teresita, with a bit of annoyance: "Hasn't Father gotten his pocketbook back yet?" "I don't think so." "Well, that's funny!" And she scolded St. Anthony prayerfully.

Two hours later I was working at my desk. The phone at my elbow rang. It was long distance. "Mr. Cuddy," "That it is." "This is Mr. Schill of Cedar Knolls, New Jersey. I just wanted to phone you I found your pocketbook in case you were worried. I'll send it

by registered mail today." And it came two days later, documents, \$177 cash and billfold.

Promptly I sought out our local Petitioner, "Sister. I just had a phone call from Mr. J. M. Schill of Cedar Knolls, New Jersey. He found the pocketbook." Sister's face lighted up and she said with a trace of irritation: "Well, I was wondering what was the matter with him (meaning St. Anthony). I'll go to the chapel and say two rosaries in thanksgiving." Then she added with the tone of a first sergeant to a new rookie: "And you must offer a Mass of Thanksgiving!" "Indeed, you don't have to tell me that. I've scheduled it for Sunday."

Skeptics may be skeptical, but "by their fruits you shall know them" (Mt. 7:16) St. Anthony has been recovering things too long for me and for so many who have faith to count us among the skeptics.

As God used His angels to accomplish sundry works, so He uses His saints in similar manner. The Creed says: "I believe in the Communion of Saints." Thanks be to God for our Brother Anthony, doctor of the Church and patron of lost articles. And thanks to Sister DeSales, too.

The Morriss Plan

Mundelein Talks Questionable

By Frank Morriss



I was fortunate enough to be able to attend the "feasibility consultation" at Mundelein College, Chicago. The study drew laity, clergy, and religious from around the country and was supposedly to bring forth ideas on whether a national pastoral council for the United States could and should be formed.

Part of the failure of the study to reach any solid agreement or conclusion can be blamed on the nature of the consultation itself. On its surface, at least, it was not constructed to draft resolutions, make recommendations, etc. But there can be no doubt that the study was designed to be the first step toward having a pastoral council, and it would have perhaps been a bit more honest of the organizers to have admitted that.

Not only were all the official position papers heavily biased toward possibility and desirability of a pastoral council, but the presentation of the official "reactors" to those papers showed the same bias. Where there was criticism of the papers it was feeble. There was no mechanism for member rebuttal on the same level with the presentation by these experts, although one presentation drafted mostly by John J. Mulley of Philadelphia for Catholics United for the Faith reached the attention of the delegates, who found unsatisfying the one-sided view they were being fed.

This CUF paper pointed out the danger of having another bureaucratic structure that might interpose itself between the Church's teaching and the faithful, and which might even usurp authority or at least activity that belongs elsewhere, both above it in the hands of

the bishops and below it in the hands of the faithful.

Another reason for the failure of the delegates to build any sort of constructive foundation for a decision regarding the feasibility of a pastoral council is the intellectual chaos introduced into the Church by existentialism. There were many who were able to talk intelligently about the meaning of the idea involved, but there were more who simply employed words as emotional triggers rather than as the expression of ideas. The widespread and vigorous applause that these words drew is alarming, because I am convinced that those employing them cannot approach a correct or proper definition or appreciation of the concepts they should represent.

Thus, "People of God" means to these existentialists admitting John, Joe, and Jane into levels of competence and authority which have been closed to them. Prescinding from whether such would be good or bad, that is not what "People of God" means as used by the Second Vatican Council. There was no hint of proletarianism in the conciliar invocation of that ancient concept.

One thing that did emerge as certain from the Mundelein study is that those who are most determined to have a pastoral council and to have it immediately are those who want it to be a vehicle toward what they call "progressive change." It was brought to light that the major pressure which resulted in the feasibility study came from nuns and priests. It is clear that it came from nuns who believe Vatican II emancipated them from their former purpose and methods, and from

the younger priests who are followers of the new theologians and seek a radically reformed Church.

Thus those who are most anxious for the national pastoral council envision it as an instrument for more "enlightened" participation of the Church in problems of population, equality of the sexes and races, ecology. A pastoral council for them would be a means of putting into both theory and practice their own understanding of the demands of Church doctrine.

And if the liberal use of some very doubtful theologians as sources for the stand or the position papers and of equally doubtful theologians as the sources for what substituted for traditional prayers opening the study meetings indicates anything, the national pastoral council is being pushed as a vehicle for enforcing certain personal opinions upon the faithful in this country.

The only purpose and value of a national pastoral council would be to strengthen communion in the Church, unity and respect between all members particularly in regard to Christ's Vicar, the Pope. The Mundelein meeting did not hold out great promise in this regard.

(Sister Mary Margaret Ellen Traxler, head of the National Coalition of Nuns, responding to a recent column, assures me that while she supports Mrs. Betty Friedan and the Women's Liberation Movement in some areas, she does not support that movement's demand for free and unrestricted abortions — F.M.)