

The Mandatum, Again

Gerard V. Bradley

The penultimate act of an overripe melodrama played out in the nation's capital last month. This one has nothing to do with the U.S. presidential election (sic), which remains unresolved as I write. I write, yet again, of the protracted struggle to implement *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*. I write specifically about the *mandatum* requirement of Canon 812, which ECE presents as central to the Catholicity of a college or university.

The matter is not settled. But from the bishops' discussion of draft "guidelines" for implementing the *mandatum*, you can bet that the NCCB will enact next June the plan recently proposed to them. And that will be it. Rome is no longer in the picture; these guidelines do not require the Holy See's approval, and all signals suggest that Rome will not intervene further in any way. The pending proposal, then, is going to be the blueprint for the future.

Much valuable ground has been gained. The Land o'Lakes declaration of independence has been repealed, or at least overcome. But there is also much cause for disappointment. I personally registered an objection to the process by which academic consultants to the Ad Hoc Committee, chaired by Archbishop Pilarczyk, were selected. Many "learned" societies were asked to nominate consultants. The groups solicited ranged from bad to awful in their recorded support of the *mandatum* requirement. And the consultants actually selected were, apart from Rev. James Conn, S.J., not known as supporters of Canon 812, either. The Fellowship was asked nothing. A copy of my letter to Archbishop Pilarczyk appears later in this issue.

For the next issue of the Quarterly I have invited each FCS Director to submit an essay evaluating the draft, and indicating where things are likely go from here. Your letters on the topic are welcome. The full draft guidelines will also appear in the next issue.

One cause for disappointment. The draft is noteworthy for its lack of a stated link between the *mandatum* and the Catholicity of the university. The guidelines do flatly state that "[a]ll Catholics who teach theological disciplines in a Catholic university are required to have a *mandatum*." But about the *consequences* of dereliction of this duty there is only this: the local bishop "should notify" the college or university. That's it. No bishop is required or authorized or encouraged by the draft to say, or do, anything further.

This arresting feature was debated, a bit, by the bishops as about the wisdom of "punishing" or "denouncing" nonconform-

(continued on page 2)

O Timothee, depositum custodi, devitans profanas vocum novitates et oppositiones falsi nominis scientiae, quam quidam profitentes circa fidem aberraverunt. Gratia vobiscum. 1 ad Timotheum 6

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly

VOLUME 23, NUMBER 4 DECEMBER 2000

CONTENTS

PRESIDENT'S PAGE:

The *Mandatum*, Again 1

DOCUMENTATION:

Homily of Archbishop John Donoghue 2

Cardinal Wright Award Acceptance 4

ARTICLES:

The Credibility of Miracles 6

Meditation (Conference on Faith and Science) 12

MEMBERSHIP MATTERS 14

AROUND THE CHURCH 15

Installation of Most Rev. Edward Egan 18

BOOK REVIEWS 19

BOARD OF DIRECTORS 22

Letter of President Bradley to Most Rev. Daniel Pilarczyk 23

ing theologians and, in turn, their colleges. But why on earth should one think of the issue in such terms? If a *Catholic* professor teaching *Catholic* moral theology at a *Catholic* college is unable or unwilling to teach in communion with the Church—which is what the *mandatum* signifies—a pastor’s first duty scarcely is to “punish” anyone. It is rather to save people from a threat to their faith and, in the case especially of moral theology, to

save perhaps their souls.

The pastor’s duty is to the truth. And he not only may, but must, ameliorate the scandal inevitably created by the derelict theologian. I can think of no way to do so save by an unambiguous public statement exposing the scandal, and warning the faithful about it.

For this, the inalienable duty of a pastor, “notify[ing] the university” just won’t do. ✠

DOCUMENTATION

Homily of Archbishop John Donoghue

25th Sunday of the Year, Cycle B
Vigil Mass, Fellowship of Catholic Scholars
September 23, 2000

Dear Friends in Christ,

If we call ourselves Catholic scholars, then it seems to me, putting aside the general ramifications which flow from that premise, that our sole preoccupation in life is the truth: the discovery of truth, the illumination of truth, the enthronement of, the apology for, and finally, the ultimate surrender to, Truth.

Veritas tells us a little more about this spirit we follow, for the Latin word comes from the ancient root describing not just sight, but those able to see, those who can look into reality, and understand how reality is, was, becomes, and perhaps above all, how it can be used, how it translates into power.

For this reason, scholars *have* great power—they know how to look *at* the truth, look *into* the truth, and use it as the fulcrum against which all reality in some way or fashion must move, or be moved, dislodged, even, so that new reality may move in, so that change and progression may occur. And thus time may pass, not unwarranted, but with purpose, with end, with goal, as progression, and not aimlessly and without point.

All scholars subscribe to these truths, but being Catholic scholars, we look to a higher plane, a personal verity, a reality above all realities which communicates to us, not a proposition, but a Name—for our truth must be Truth with an upper-

case T—our Truth must be, as we finally see it, and are perhaps blinded by it, God.

This Truth is an inexorable thing. It hounds our steps, as the Hound of Heaven pursued doggedly the mortal person and immortal soul of Francis Thompson

*Deliberate speed, majestic instancy,
Came on the following Feet,
And a Voice above their beat—*

“Naught shelters thee, who wilt not shelter Me.”

It draws enemies across our path, for those who will not bow to the Truth love to knock down those who kneel already in service, the posture inviting martyrdom. It draws the greatest enemy of all—Satan, Lucifer, Mephistopheles, Old Nick. Job was a truth-seeking man, but God proved his worth by allowing him to be tempted severely, to the point of exhaustion, of crying out, “*Surely now, God has worn me out,—he has made desolate....*” Faust was a scholar devoted to knowledge, but God allowed the Evil Spirit, the Spirit of negation and of the abyss to lead him down the paths of futile human endeavor—youth, love, industry—before He would grant him to see the ultimate truth, the vision of God in His heaven, and to speak the saving confession: “*Stay! for thou art yet lovely!*”

It cannot then be said that God is kind to scholars, for He must Himself find out, that the mind of the scholar is not arrogant, is not proud. God Himself must hear, from the depths of the pool of knowledge, the scholar confess that the water of wisdom flows from one source only, a source on high, and not from man’s own ingenuity.

The readings of today’s Mass speak well to this danger and dilemma faced by the seeker of Truth, and the enemies who lurk, both within and without.

The Book of Wisdom recounts the words of the Evil Ones:

Let us beset the just one, because he is obnoxious to us ... let us put him to the test [and] see whether his words be true ... let us find out ... [if] God will take care of him.

They are always there, those evil ones. They attack the faith of the simple, of the innocent, by attacking the knowledge of those who teach. For if the teacher falls, who then will follow his ways?

The enemies lie as well within the human breast, too close for comfort, yet too fast upon our nature to lose. St. James understood, and wrote warnings to the beloved Faithful:

Where do the conflicts and disputes among you originate? Is it not your inner cravings that make war within you? But listen... Wisdom from above is innocent, rich in sympathy, impartial and sincere.

For scholars, for seekers of the truth, and—more than for others—for Catholic scholars, need protection from the enemies who run about the walls of faith, safety from the devils who lurk even within those walls, scratching and digging, always trying to undermine the foundation. Protection and safety is to be found in Christ, in the simplicity of Christ's love, in the simplicity of the child who clings without question, without subtlety, without analysis, to that same simple love, and who, by embracing this Simplicity, finds the utter being that is the Godhead, the sublime and First Person of the Blessed Trinity.

St. John, who perhaps knew the Lord best, says, *Jesus Christ is called the truth.*

And in another place,

To do truth is to practice what God commands.

Dear friends, and scholars, I can think of no better definition, no better slogan, no better axiom underlying the essence of our efforts, our efforts in fellowship as Catholic scholars, than this simple utterance: *to do truth is to practice what God commands.*

And simply to underline the theme of this conviction, I can think of no one in our time who wears the meaning of this statement more visibly than our Holy Father, Pope John Paul II, whose life and witness are the focus of our appreciation during these days of meeting. Karol Wojtyla has certainly faced the enemies from without, valiantly surviving perhaps the worst and most monstrous tyranny that our world has yet seen. From his reflections on his own life, we know too that he has had his own

struggles with the enemies from within. For what man of his gifts has not had to face the devils of ego, ambition, pride, and lust, and put them down, before going on? But go on he has, to become the greatest of the Church's teachers in our time. Sometimes brief, sometimes lengthy, but always with complete effectiveness, with complete gentleness, and with complete respect for all that is sincere in the world. He is a true champion of truths, while simultaneously leading the charge against what is false, what is spurious, and what springs from the culture of death, the culture he has espied with a clear eye, and which he has named with fearsome accuracy. And true to the dictum of our Lord, that "the first must be the servant of all,"—the very definition of the office he holds—Pope John Paul II has followed his course without one blemish of self-acclaim, conceit, or fatuous construct.

Dear friends, we are young and old. Many of us, with our Holy Father, have passed from youthful vigor, into the concentrated stillness of old age. Others among us come to this table yet young, and able to read in his eyes and in ours perhaps a certain kind of wisdom, which will lead them in the days and years to come, and which, God willing, they will themselves hand on to another generation waiting in the wings.

But wherever we find ourselves situated on this carousel of life, let us all remember that we revolve around one core Meaning, one central Verity, one Power that calls us to the center, one supreme Potency that fills us, one Word that gives all understanding to the gestures, to the supplications of our lives—God, and He, revealed in our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

May our quest, diversifying as it may upon the consequences of our individual talents, never stray far from this unity which ever brings us together again. And as we grow, and as we pass from this scene and others, let us take to heart the peace and comfort traced in lines of poetry, which reassure us, and console us, as we lift our hearts and voices in prayer, and say to the Supreme Other, to the Truth who makes us real,

*All those who seek Thee tempt Thee,
And those who find would bind Thee
To gesture and to form.*

*But I would comprehend Thee
As the wide Earth unfolds Thee.
Thou growest with my maturity,
Thou art in calm and storm. ❧*

(Rilke)

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Atlanta, September 23, 2000 Cardinal Wright Award Acceptance Mary Ann Glendon

I am deeply grateful for this honor, especially when I contemplate the names of the persons who have received the Cardinal Wright Award in the past. I feel very fortunate indeed to be in the company of so many people who have been an inspiration to me in so many ways.

A few weeks ago, Professor Bradley mentioned to me that the remarks made by previous recipients of this award have centered around a common theme—the experiences of “the faithful Catholic intellectual in today’s academic world.” So I took his comment as permission to contribute my own two cents on that topic.

I can think of no better capsule description of the role of the Catholic intellectual in the academic world than that which George Weigel chose for the subtitle of his magnificent biography of Pope John Paul II: *Witness to Truth*. The hallmark of Catholic scholarship is that it is oriented toward truth—borne along, as the Holy Father says, on the wings of faith and reason.

There was a time, of course, when almost any academic, Catholic or not, would have insisted that his or her scholarship was oriented toward truth. That was a time, as some of us remember, when it was also taken for granted that we would strive for objectivity in our research. Certainly those were the elements of the credo of my mentors at the University of Chicago. And that must have been the idea behind the choice of “Veritas” for the motto of Harvard University. In fact, the original Harvard seal had the words “Christo et Ecclesiae” (for Christ and the Church) around its border. Veritas was in the center along with three books. Two of these books were open, symbolizing revelation in the Old and New Testaments, and the third book was shown closed, signifying that not everything is accessible to human reason.

Modernity and Enlightenment changed all that.

First, Christ and the Church were eliminated; then, the third book was shown open! Veritas, however, remained.

But a funny thing happened to Veritas in the secular universities on their way to post modernity. It became harder and harder to find many intellectuals other than Catholics who were willing to affirm the existence of truth, or the once-prized values of reason and objectivity. Perhaps the next edition of the Harvard seal will place Veritas in quotation marks to reflect the triumph of relativism in the secular academic world.

So where does that leave the Catholic intellectual? I would argue it puts him or her in the vanguard. The fact that our forebears were never totally swept up by modernity has, I believe, helped us to harvest the benefits of modernity while avoiding many of its pitfalls. It helped us to avoid the kind of hubris about truth that has led so many heirs of the moderns first into disappointment and then to cynicism and nihilism. Catholic scholars seldom flatter themselves that they are in complete possession of the truth. We have always understood that human beings in this life apprehend truth only as through a glass darkly. But that does not mean that truth does not exist, or that we cannot draw closer to it through our God-given capacity for reasoning in the light of faith.

It helps us, too, that Catholic intellectuals never bought into the Hobbesian notion of reason as calculation in the service of self-interest. Our tradition understands reason in terms of the recurrent, collaborative, and potentially self-correcting processes of human knowing—experiencing, understanding, and judging. Catholic intellectuals thus tend to value qualities that seem to be in increasingly short supply in the post-modern academy, such as freedom of inquiry, willingness to listen to those who do not share our views, and respect for the accumulated wisdom of those who have gone before us.

So far as objectivity is concerned, a lively understanding of sin preserved us from the illusion that we can ever wholly rise above our biases and blind spots. But we also know that we must not ever stop striving to overcome those failings. As Clifford Geertz memorably put it, the fact that a surgeon can never have a completely sterile operating field does

not mean he has to conduct surgery in a sewer. In this struggle, too, we are sustained by our great intellectual tradition.

Rarely a day goes by when I do not thank God for that tradition. And I am sure all us members of this Fellowship feel the same. How fortunate we are to be Catholic Scholars! Yet here is a puzzle: recently I had a queasy feeling when I saw myself described in a law review article as “the Catholic scholar Mary Ann Glendon.” It was an article on the legal profession and the author had cited many writers besides me. But he did not refer to the others as the Jewish scholar X, the Marxist scholar Y, the knee-jerk liberal scholar Z. I was the only one given a special identifier. I wear the label “Catholic” as a badge of honor, yet I can’t help wondering whether the label here was in the nature of a warning to the reader: this author, unlike the rest of us, has a bias; she alone may not be a disinterested seeker of truth.

It was a trivial incident, but it reminded me of what my favorite law professor, the emigre scholar Max Rheinstein, told me about the German academy in the 1930s. One of the first signs that the great German universities were becoming corrupt was that Rheinstein (a Christian of Jewish descent) and others, when cited, were labeled as Jewish authors. Later, it was forbidden to cite them at all. I am not suggesting, of course, that any of us is in danger of being rounded up or driven into exile. But I imagine most of us here have had little experiences of exile—

when our work is not mentioned in literature dealing with subjects on which we have written, when our books are not reviewed, or when our writing is handed over for evaluation to persons who do not give us a fair hearing.

Am I suggesting that the intellectual establishment in this tolerant and politically correct age is anti-Catholic? Not at all. The knowledge class loves Catholics—at least a certain kind of Catholic. Peter Steinfelds explained the situation well in a recent New York Times column. He reported hearing a woman with a reputation for supporting “liberal” and “humanitarian” causes discussing her son’s wife at a Washington dinner party. After singing the praises of her daughter-in-law, the woman said, “She’s a Catholic, you know, but she’s a thinking Catholic.” Steinfelds surmises that what the woman meant was that her daughter-in-law is a Catholic who dissents from the Church’s teaching wherever it conflicts with reigning moral and political dogmas. If you’re a “thinking Catholic” in that sense, the welcome mat is laid out for you. You can help the reigning elites to maintain that they are not anti-Catholic.

If, on the other hand, you’re a just a “Catholic Scholar,” you’d better look for fellowship somewhere else. But what a fellowship we have! What companions, living and dead! And what a joy it is to be in each other’s company this evening! Thank you very much. ✠



The Credibility of Miracles

Very Rev'd Peter M. J. Stravinskas, Ph.D., S.T.D.,
*(An address to the "Faith and Reason" symposium of the
 Archdiocese of Portland in Oregon, on 11 December
 1999.*

Introduction

I don't know what God is trying to say to me but, within the past six months, I have been invited to be involved in three situations involving the miraculous: the Fox TV special ["Signs from God"] which many of you saw this past summer; serving as spiritual director for a woman who has been publically identified as a seer; and delivering this conference on the credibility of miracles, past and present. Honesty compels me to admit from the outset that my own predisposition to it all is quite negative, taking as my starting point Our Lord's reminder that "an evil and adulterous generation seeks a sign" [Mt 12:39]. Or, as Archbishop Jean Honoré of Tours states quite bluntly: "Contrary to what certain Christians may think, [the Church's] attitude is not one of favorable disposition, but rather of skepticism and of the most extreme reserve."

That having been said, I am reasonably certain that Almighty God must have something else in mind, seeing that His Providence has put me into circumstances where something a bit more than one scriptural verse seems called for.

Our approach will be rather simple. We shall begin with a dictionary definition of "miracle"; a survey of miracles in Sacred Scripture, in both covenants; a review of miracles in Church history; and, finally, a consideration of such phenomena in contemporary ecclesial life.

The dictionary offers us the following description of a miracle: "A wonderful happening that is contrary to or independent of the known laws of nature." Now, what does Christian faith add to the picture? From the start, we must admit that the picture is far from clear. On the one hand, we sense Our Lord's annoyance with wonder-seekers, as we

hear Him say, "unless you see signs and wonders, you will not believe" [Jn 4:48]. On the other hand, He promises His disciples that they will work signs even greater than His [cf. Jn 14:12]. Indeed, the performance of miracles by the early believers in Christ was seen as confirmatory of their message [cf. Acts 2:43].

I would suggest that our approach to this entire topic must be very cautious. Often we hear people say that faith means believing without seeing, and they would ground that understanding in the comments of the Risen Lord to St. Thomas [cf. Jn 20:29]. And there is certainly validity in that interpretation. At the same time, we might look at faith in this light: faith is not "not seeing," but seeing differently or through different lenses. One of the effects of original sin is that our intellects have been clouded over and our vision blurred; in fact, at times it may seem that we have actually been blinded. The theological virtue of faith — first given to us in Baptism — gives us a capacity to see things from God's perspective; it sharpens our natural perspective, if you will.

A supposedly "modern" view of reality excludes the miraculous, a priori, but on what grounds? Simply on the basis that because man can't do something, it should be fairly obvious that God can't, either. In this way, these "moderns" prove the truth of the insight of Voltaire — surely no client of the supernatural — who asserted, "God made man in His own image and likeness, and man has never ceased to return the compliment!"

Some years ago, travelling in a taxi in Jerusalem operated by a non-practicing Jew, I noticed with interest how the driver consistently referred to Our Lady as "the Virgin." Finally, I asked him, point-blank: "Do you believe that Mary was a virgin?" "Why not, Father?" came the quick retort. I pressed on: "How many mothers do you know that remain virgins?" "Look," he replied, "if Almighty God could make the whole universe, don't you think he could make a nice little Jewish girl a mother and keep her a virgin at the same time?" That non-practicing Jew had retained an appreciation of the

miraculous which is rooted in the Bible. In truth, he understood that the same God was and is working throughout, a point made in the lovely line of Jesuit Father Avery Dulles when he declares, “If nature is God’s prose, miracles may perhaps be called his poetry.” Dulles goes on to assert that “to drop out the miraculous element from Christianity is, inevitably, to mutilate the Gospel.” So, what does the Bible tell us about God’s “poetry”?

Miracles in the Old Testament

Why does God enable man to work miracles, asks St. Thomas Aquinas. For two reasons, he says: “First and principally, in confirmation of the doctrine that a man teaches. For since those things which are of faith surpass human reason, they cannot be proved by human arguments, but need to be proved by the argument of divine power: so that when a man does works that God alone can do, we may believe that what he says is from God: just as when a man is the bearer of letters sealed with the king’s ring, it is to be believed that what they contain expresses the king’s will.” He goes on to offer a second purpose: “To make known God’s presence in a man by the grace of the Holy Ghost: so that when a man does the works of God we may believe that God dwells in him by His grace.” That said, Aquinas concedes that “miracles lessen the merit of faith,” but — nonetheless — he declares, “it is better for them to be converted to the faith even by miracles than that they should remain altogether in their unbelief.”

It may surprise people at first blush to learn that the Old Testament is actually rather sparing in its recounting of miracles. Aside from the Exodus experience, the only other major locus of miracles is found in the material related to Elijah and Elisha [cf. 1 Kgs 17–2 Kgs 8]. According to the biblical view, miracles are essentially signs which support the word which is proclaimed. A miracle, then, is not “the holy” in itself but a sign which points to “the holy,” indeed, to the Holy One Himself, Who — through signs — reveals His nature, glory and power. The human reaction to the miraculous should be one of

wonder, to be sure, but also one of praise. In this regard, Moses’ first encounter with the Living God [cf. Ex 3–4] should serve as a paradigm. The sight of the bush which burns but is not consumed terrifies Moses, but it also intrigues him and draws him more deeply into the mystery, giving us the shorthand expression, “mysterium tremendum et fascinans.” The initial fear of Moses is transformed by the experience into calm assurance as Moses engages the Lord in conversation. That primary event of the burning bush served as an on-going reminder that the God of the Hebrews could do what He promised and was determined to do it. At the same time, Moses is told that he too will be able to work miracles. But for what purpose? Not as cheap magician’s tricks to entertain or charm, but precisely as signs to effect God’s Will — the release of His people from bondage. Cardinal Newman makes the interesting observation that the performance of miracles in the Old Testament seems to be a prerogative of the prophets, “to the exclusion of the priests and kings.” Why? Because the offices of priesthood and kingship were, in his words, “already ascertained.” That is, the institutionalized nature of those roles spoke for themselves. The charismatic nature of prophecy, on the other hand, demanded validation. We shall return to that notion when we consider contemporary miracles.

Miracles in the New Testament

The sparse nature of miracles in the Old Covenant is more than compensated for in the New, and with good reason: the prophet Isaiah announces that the age of the Messiah will be ushered in by Him Who is called both “Wonderful” and “Mighty God” [Is 9:6]; beyond that, Isaiah 35 teaches that marvelous healings will be a sign that the final age has dawned. True to that prophetic word, then, miracles dot the landscape of the pages of the New Testament. Interestingly, a key miraculous sign noted in the works of the major prophets is one connected with the coming of the Messiah: “Behold a [virgin] shall conceive and bear a son and shall call his name Immanuel” [Is 7:14]. The Jews of old

believed that the time of miracles would flower most abundantly when there arose the prophet “like unto Moses,” the very words used in John’s Gospel to describe Jesus [cf. Jn 1:45].

While the New Testament uses many different words to describe the miraculous, St. John’s word of choice is “*semeion*” or “*sign*.” John wants to ensure that every element of chicanery and superstition is eliminated from the realm of possibility. Furthermore, he is extremely selective in his delineation of signs, choosing only seven, even while noting that “*Jesus did many other signs not written in this book*” [Jn 20:30]. Those signs are arranged in a deliberate order as well, moving in crescendo-like fashion from what could be mistaken for a magician’s stunt [changing water into wine] to that of raising a man from the dead — the prelude to the greatest sign, the Lord’s own Resurrection. St. John’s methodology leads us to look at the sign as a means of transferring our gaze to the Sign-maker to discover some important truth about Him, most especially to have an experience of His glory. These signs convince the beholder that the words Jesus has spoken are true. The sign, then, validates both message and Messenger.

A pattern for the process can be discovered in the granting of sight to the man born blind. Through his interaction with Jesus and the “*work*” or “*sign*” done on his behalf, the man moves from blindness to sight [a physical change] to insight [a profoundly spiritual change]. It is also worth highlighting the fact that it is Our Lady in John’s Gospel who launches her Son on His ministry of sign-working; ironically, she who believes without any sign moves Him to work a sign. Put otherwise, her strong faith which required no sign knew that He was in fact capable of working signs, which could lead others of lesser faith to a deeper understanding of Jesus and commitment to Him.

In the Synoptic Gospels, the rash of miracles is intended to proclaim the nearness of the Kingdom and its definitive arrival in the Person of Christ. The gap between God and man has been narrowed, the divide between the natural and the supernatural has been bridged, the distance between the sacred and the profane has been lessened. Once more, even if in a different style, the same notion prevails: the wonders are worked to have us fix our attention on the

Wonder-worker, Who demonstrates concretely that the words He speaks are true and that He Himself is the true Word, now come in the flesh. Thus, the miraculous is to be seen at the service of the truth [cf. Mt 11:2–6; Jn 5:36; Jn 10:25].

The Gospel miracles may be conveniently grouped in this fashion: healings, exorcisms, and the so-called “*nature miracles*.” In the healings, the normal procedure involves a direct encounter between the Healer and the one to be healed, generally through a request for a cure and at least an implicit act of faith on the part of the would-be recipient; a notable exception to that rule is the cure of the centurion’s son/servant. The exorcisms demonstrate in very concrete manner that the Kingdom of God has come crashing into the world, breaking the power of Satan. The nature miracles [e.g., Jesus’ walking on water or calming of the storm], are, for the most part, not done for the benefit of the crowds, but for discrete groups of disciples or the like. Miracle stories, obviously, are not unique to the New Testament or the Bible in general; what is interesting and important to observe, however, is that miracles noted in pagan, Jewish or extra-biblical Christian sources are rather different, in that they rely heavily on the fantastic, the imaginative and the bizarre, whereas the New Testament miracles — whether of Christ or of the disciples — can be characterized as very straightforward, simple and lacking in embellishment. In other words, the element of the magical or vulgar display is reduced to nothingness.

Speaking of signs wrought by the disciples, it would be well to mention at this point what might appear as quite self-evident, namely, that miraculous signs did not cease with the Lord’s Ascension. On the contrary, they continued throughout the New Testament as witnesses to the reality and validity of the Holy Spirit’s indwelling within the Church and, specifically, within the ministry of the apostles. St. Mark declares that the apostolic miracles would actually bolster and give credibility to the apostolic message [cf. Mk 16:20]. Thus, we find numerous examples of such activity documented in the Acts of the Apostles, especially at the hands of Saints Peter and Paul. One should add at this point a further clarification, namely, that physical cures are not ends in themselves, but suggest a more profound signifi-

cance — an inner or spiritual healing. That is, the cure of a bodily ailment suggests the cure of a spiritual ailment, which is far more basic and important. In fact, Christ not infrequently seemed to prefer the spiritual remedy to the physical, but his audiences just as often appeared inclined otherwise. Hence, we find Him forgiving a man's sins [cf. Mk 2:3-12], which action stimulates charges of blasphemy among some of His hearers, thus making Him work a physical remedy, precisely as a sign that what has been achieved externally has an interior component.

What can we say about the effects of such miracles? Their intent, as we have indicated, is to rouse men to faith. We must acknowledge, however, that the result is not always as desired. For instance, some bystanders conclude that Jesus' works of power are indisputable signs of either His Messiahship or divinity [cf. Lk 11:14], while others conclude that He is possessed by Beelzebul [cf. Lk 11:15]. The awakening of faith, the desired goal of every miracle, does not always achieve its purpose in either the Old Testament or the New. Furthermore, the desire for a miracle is never perceived by Our Lord or the writers of the New Testament as praiseworthy. Just the opposite: they are regarded as resistance to the Lord, His message and the virtue of faith [e.g., Mt 16:1-4; 1 Cor 1:22-24; Mt 12:24; Jn 10:38; Jn 14:11]. At the same time, it must be said that Jesus held much more accountable those who had seen signs, yet who persisted in their unbelief — evidence of their hardness of heart [e.g., Jn 6:36]

With this scriptural picture in place — a mosaic, if you will, showing both Jesus and His disciples as workers of signs and wonders, we are naturally led to ask if this type of activity continued beyond their days.

Miracles in the Church

Did miracles perdure into the sub-apostolic era? Already, within the canon of the New Testament, we read in the Epistle to the Hebrews that the time of miracles was waning [cf. Heb 2:4]. However, as Cardinal Newman was quick to underscore, what God was willing to do and did do in one period of the Church, He cannot

be completely unwilling to do in another, and so we read: "It is a matter of faith with Catholics that miracles never cease in the Church." Newman explains that his contemporaries within Liberal Protestantism have a clear prejudice against the continuation of miracles in the Church: "Both they and we start with the miracles of the Apostles; and then their First Principle or presumption, against our miracles, is this, 'What God did once, He is not likely to do again;' while our First Principle or presumption, for our miracles, is this, 'What God did once, He is likely to do again.'" To be sure, he notes that complete unbelievers would argue that miracles cannot be for the simple reason that, for them, "it is impossible to fancy the order of nature interrupted." In other words, Newman reasons, the adherents of Liberalism do not contend against the evidence offered to validate alleged miracles; they merely dismiss the possibility *a fortiori*. He sums up the situation thus: their "First Principle blocks belief;" ours "encourages such belief." He challenges them to be consistent: "You believe the Apostolic miracles, therefore be inclined beforehand to believe later ones."

Cardinal Newman locates the Catholic willingness to accept the possibility in the mystery of the Incarnation. He presents his position in syllogistic fashion: "...the Incarnation is the most stupendous event which ever can take place on earth; and after it and henceforth, I do not see how we can scruple at any miracle on the mere ground of its being unlikely to happen." He continues: "No miracle can be so great as that which took place in the Holy House of Nazareth; it is infinitely more difficult to believe than all the miracles of the Breviary, of the Martyrology, of Saints' lives, of legends, of local traditions, put together." His conclusion is inescapable: "If, through divine grace, we once are able to accept the solemn truth that the Supreme Being was born of a mortal woman, what is there to be imagined which can offend us on the ground of its marvellousness?" Like my Israeli cabbie, to whom I referred at the beginning, Newman sums up the case thus: "If they do not believe [in the mystery of the Incarnation], they are not yet Protestants; if they do, let them grant that He Who has done the greater may do the less." A century later, Jesuit Father Louis Monden concurs: "At even first glance, it is clear

that a miracle is to be envisioned as a direct prolongation of the Incarnation, as a perceptible showing forth of God's redemptive love."

Now, it must be pointed out directly that the great Newman was not given to credulity. As a matter of fact, his approach to the miraculous was rather clinical and scientific in many ways. While admitting the possibility of miracles, he was not gullible, which is to say that he always brought reason to his aid in forming a judgment. Hence, we hear his wise counsel: "And so as regards the miracles of the Catholic Church; if indeed, miracles never can occur, then, indeed, impute the narratives [about them] to fraud; but till you prove they are not likely, we shall consider the histories which have come down to us true on the whole, though in particular cases they may be exaggerated or unfounded. Where, indeed, they can certainly be proved to be false, there we shall be bound to do our best to get rid of them; but till that is clear, we shall be liberal enough to allow others to use their private judgment in their favour, as we use ours in their disparagement." Early on, in 1842, he divided miracles into two classes: "those which were to be received, and those which were to be rejected," thus calling for a critical attitude and a principle of discernment at one and the same time. After all, the New Testament does not hesitate to remind us that miracles will be wrought not only by the saints but also by the Antichrist [cf. 2 Th 2; Rev 13:13]!

As we shall see, Newman was not very sanguine about the miraculous. In one of his sermons, he says, "nothing is gained by miracles, nothing comes of miracles, as regards our religious views, principles, and habits. Hard as it is to believe, miracles certainly do not make men better; the history of Israel proves it." The convert-apologist asserts that while a miracle might "startle" you, its effect would be passing. He observes that God sends us very ordinary warnings, which we generally fail to heed, so why should miracles be any more convincing? "If we are not moved and converted by those [warnings] which come upon us, the probability is that, like the Jews, we should not be converted by miracles." As proof of his stance, he brings to his side the Gospel text in which Our Lord declares, without fear of contradiction, that "if they do not hear Moses and the prophets, neither will they be convinced if some one

should rise from the dead" [Lk 16:31]. His view is not cynical but intensely realistic and, in many ways, an echo of the mentality of Francis Bacon, the sixteenth-century philosopher and sometime-scientist, who stated that "God never wrought miracle to convince atheism, because His ordinary works convince it [atheism]."

In his realism, Newman also connected faith and prayer with the miraculous, expressing no surprise that "in a country in which faith and prayer abound, [miracles] will be more likely to occur, than where and when faith and prayer are not." Here he is not talking about a climate of superstition but an atmosphere of genuine faith, not unlike Christ's apparent linking of faith and miracles, such that the Evangelist Matthew would write: "And he did not do many mighty works there, because of their unbelief" [Mt 13:58]. He further takes into account that, with the progress of science, some acts heretofore deemed miracles might actually be naturally explainable: "I frankly confess that the present advance of science tends to make it probable that various facts take place, and have taken place, in the order of nature, which hitherto have been considered by Catholics as simply supernatural." However, he is quick to add: "Though I readily make this admission, it must not be supposed in consequence that I am disposed to grant at once, that every event was natural in point of fact, which might have taken place by the laws of nature." For instance, just because some or even several of the ten plagues against the Egyptians may have some kind of natural explanation, do not their timing and intensity bespeak acts of Divine Providence, if not of outright divine interventions or contraventions of the laws of nature?

The Church's Attitude Toward Miracles

The Church's response to miracles is conditioned by many factors: the need to balance faith and reason; the necessity of responding to various societal and intellectual claims at any given moment in her history; the importance of keeping in a healthy tension an openness to the

miraculous, all the while eschewing any possibility of the superstitious, the credulous or the faithless, which often enough masks itself in the garb of belief by being lured into a demand for miracles as prerequisites for making a faith commitment.

As I stated in the beginning, the Jews of old and Christians up through the eighteenth century had little or no problem with the concept of miracles in general, nor with the possibility of their occurrence in their own time and place. All that changed dramatically under the influence of the rationalism fostered by the Enlightenment, with names like Descartes, Spinoza, Voltaire and Hume as the prime protagonists. What happened? To no small degree, Luther — with his heavy stress on *sola Scriptura* and his concomitant discarding of magisterial authority and the suitability of philosophy as an aid in seeking the truth— may well have paved the way for all this.

How so? With the major scientific developments of the Renaissance, many theories of the origins of the universe and its daily functioning, taken for granted in biblical terms for centuries, came under scrutiny; many were found untenable in the light of those scientific discoveries. With that, the biblical Word itself came under fire as a trustworthy guide for modern men, as reason alone [understood as empirical, scientifically provable data] came to be seen as the only valid source of positions for intelligent people. With no Magisterium to safeguard the Word and its interpretation, Holy Writ was, in a manner of speaking, left hanging. Needless to say, the very first aspects of biblical writing to be attacked were the miracles of both Testaments. Liberal Protestantism was born as it breathlessly tried to keep pace with the onslaughts of science and rationalism, seen in phenomena like Bultmann's efforts at so-called "de-mythologization."

The reaction to that was the birth of Fundamentalism as an attempt to maintain traditional Christian beliefs, in spite of the mounting evidence seemingly arrayed against it. One of the approaches used was a kind of fideism, which would hold that one believes what some authority says [whether Scripture or otherwise], even if there is no rational support for it and, yes, even if rationality appears to disprove it categorically. The old proverb attributed to Tertullian and Anselm came back in full force: *Credo*

quia absurdum est [I believe because it is absurd!]. This type of "in-your-face" act of faith did little to enhance the image of traditional Christians; indeed, it started to paint a picture which continues to be popular today of ignorant, down-home yokels who can't even speak standard English.

Now, where was the Catholic Church during all this? For the most part, she was busy seeking to save herself from various political revolutions that had devastated the vineyard in countries like France, Germany and Italy, with problems yet to surface in Spain and Mexico. Which is to say that, in many ways, she was trying to survive. However, she was not totally absent from the battle, especially during the pontificates of Pope Pius IX and Pope St. Pius X. The liberalism against which Newman had fought as a Protestant was beginning to make inroads into Catholicism, and Pius IX was determined to stave off these incursions. And so, we find the Pope taking the bull by the horns in his 1846 encyclical, *Qui Pluribus*, going right to the root of the problem — which various Protestant reactions had not done and could not have done. He writes:

They [the proponents of rationalism] assert that faith is contrary to reason. Surely nothing more foolish, more impious, more opposed to reason itself can be imagined. For, though faith is above reason, there can never be found a real contradiction or disagreement between them, as both of them originate from the same source of immutable and eternal truth, from the good and great God, and both so help each other that right reason demonstrates, safeguards and defends the truth of faith, whereas faith frees reason from all errors and through the knowledge of divine things enlightens, strengthens and perfects it.

He went on, even more confidently: "This faith is confirmed through the birth, the life, the death, the resurrection, the wisdom, the miracles and prophecies of its author and fulfiller, Christ Jesus." In his 1864 Syllabus of Errors, he condemned the following proposition: "The prophecies and miracles set forth in the narration of the Sacred Scriptures are poetical fictions; the mysteries of the Christian Faith are the outcome of philosophical reflections; in the books of both Testaments mythical tales are contained; Jesus Christ Himself is a mythical fiction." Six years later, the Fathers of Vatican I set forth a

comprehensive and compelling argumentation to explain and defend the compatibility of faith and reason. Thus, we read in *Dei Filius*:

However, in order that the obedience of our faith be nevertheless in harmony with reason, God willed that exterior proofs of His revelation, viz. divine facts, especially miracles and prophecies, should be joined to the inner helps of the Holy Spirit; as they manifestly display the omnipotence and infinite knowledge of God, they are the most certain signs of the divine revelation, adapted to the intelligence of all men.

Allow me to underscore how carefully the Council Fathers maneuvered between the Scylla of unbridled rationalism and the Charybdis of unthinking fideism. Reason is not the enemy of Christian faith, but it is not a reality unto itself, either. This theme will return many times in the century that follows, most notably in our present Holy Father's writings, exemplified most powerfully in *Fides et Ratio*. Beyond that, Vatican I calls forth miracles as proof — dare we say, scientific proof — for the intelligibility of faith.

The Council makes this even more pointed in two of its anathematizing canons:

If anyone says that divine faith is not distinct from the natural knowledge of God and of moral truths; that, therefore, for divine faith it is not necessary that the revealed truth be believed on the authority of God Who reveals it, *anathema sit*.

If anyone says that no miracles are possible, and that, therefore, all accounts of them, even those contained in Holy Scripture, are to be dismissed as fables and myths; or that miracles can never be recognized with certainty, and that the divine origin of the Christian religion cannot be legitimately proved by them, *anathema sit*.

These proscriptions found their way into St. Pius X's Oath against the Errors of Modernism in 1910, as the oath-taker professes, in positive form: "I recognize the exterior proofs of revelation, that is to say, the divine works, mainly the miracles and prophecies, as sure signs of the divine. ✠"

Meditation

Conference on Faith and Science: Rome, May 23 to 25, 2000

P.E. Hodgson

Those of us who are scientists are privileged to devote our lives to the study of the natural world in all its richness and complexity. We study the whole universe, spread out in space and in time. We study the structure of matter from the atoms and nuclei, mesons and quarks, to the solar system, the galaxy and the clusters of galaxies. Our timescale extends from the fleeting existence of the elementary particles to the time about fifteen billion years ago of the primeval explosion that is presently the limit of science and perhaps the time of the Creation.

We are familiar with the many symmetries of the natural world, in sea shells and crystals, in sunflowers and cacti, and have marveled at the pictures of snowflakes, all different and yet all symmetrical. The laws of nature are beautiful and automatically produce

things that we recognize as beautiful. Einstein rejected ugly theories. He took a God's-eye view of nature, and asked himself how God would have made the world: "I want to know His thoughts, the rest are details", he once remarked.

Modern physics shows that as we probe into the depths of matter new and unexpected symmetries are found. Invariance under symmetry transformations implies the conservation laws. The elementary particles of matter are grouped into symmetry classes. Sometimes one member of a group appears to be missing: its properties are predicted and soon it is found experimentally. The conservation of parity, charge conjugation, and time-reversal invariance were all in turn found to be broken, but the product of the three is conserved.

The prodigality of creation is almost unbelievable. There are millions of species of plants and animals, and countless billions of billions of individuals. After

the rain has fallen on the deserts of Namaqualand the barren plains and hills are soon covered with a carpet of flowers, stretching as far as the eye can see. It is known as God's garden. In truth, all the earth is God's garden. If we disturb the soil, there are billions of insects, and the seas teem with fishes. Why all those insects and fishes? There are billions of galaxies, each with billions of stars, that may well have planets like our own. Why all those galaxies? We do not know. Who has known the mind of the Lord?

Each one of these plants and animals is an organism of extreme complexity. All the scientists in the world could not make a single ant, or a blade of grass or even a single cell. And yet there are scientists who affirm that the universe is made of structures of such extreme simplicity that they can drop into existence from absolutely nothing. There is nothing left for the Creator to do. One day they will find themselves standing before the Judgement Seat, and hear God asking them, with gentle irony: "Where were you when I laid the foundations of the world? Tell me, since you are so well informed. Who decided the dimensions of it, do you know? Or who stretched the measuring line across it?"

We can easily be over-awed by the vastness and complexity of the universe. Yet, with Pascal, we can reflect that it is we who know the vastness and complexity of the universe; the universe itself knows nothing. We know that the universe is precisely designed to produce life. If the fundamental constants of nature had differed very slightly from their present values, life could not have evolved. This is why we can say that it is our universe.

We thank God for such a wonderful world, and for making it so that it is open to our minds. We can, with some difficulty, attain some understanding of its structure and activity. God has not made the world so complicated that scientific knowledge is impossible, nor so simple that we can understand it without effort. In Einstein's words, *Raffiniert ist Herrgott, aber boschaft ist er nicht*; God is subtle but not malicious. More simply, the world does not wear its heart upon its sleeve. If it did, scientific research would not be nearly such fun.

Let us pray that we always carry out our work with no motive other than to find the truth. We do not care about our reputations or our positions. We treat other scientists as brothers and sisters in a great

endeavor, not as stepping stones. We share our knowledge freely and willingly help others. We prepare our lectures carefully and spend time with our students even though we know that, despite much lip-service to the contrary, it will do little to advance our career.

With knowledge comes responsibility. In our present technological society the integrity of the natural world is threatened by pollution and climate change. It is not easy to see how its integrity can be guarded, or how its riches can be used wisely. The world has no voice of its own. We scientists are the only ones who can speak for the world. In this sense we are the priests of nature, representing the world, fighting for it against the greedy and ruthless who seek only their own ends. Let us pray that we have the courage to proclaim our findings, in the teeth of political pressures, recalling with Newman that it is easier to quarry the granite rock with a razor, or to moor the vessel with a thread of silk, than to contend against those giants, the passion and the pride of man.

In fulfilling these responsibilities, let us remember the limitations of scientific knowledge, so that we are neither complacent nor alarmist. Scientific knowledge is not easily won, and the results have to be expressed precisely if they are not to be misunderstood. There are always areas of uncertainty and the possibility that some vital factor has been overlooked. And yet, despite these qualifications, we often have knowledge sufficient to form the basis of action. It is a condition of our lives that we may have to make vitally important decisions on the basis of incomplete knowledge. It is easy to say that we should postpone making a decision until we have more knowledge, but this is often the worst decision of all.

Let us pray particularly for our priest-scientists and priest-philosophers of science, who are able to show us our place in the Divine plan. Let us pray for those in authority over them, that they may understand the vital importance of their vocation and ensure that they have the support and encouragement they need to continue to develop their scientific knowledge, and to lecture and publish their findings.

Let us thank God for giving us a Pope who values scientific knowledge and blesses our endeavors.

Finally, let us pray that God may bless our work, so that we can play our full part in the life of the Church and of all mankind. ✠

Rev. Thomas F. Dailey, OSFS
Executive Secretary

The annual business meeting of the Fellowship was held at the convention in Atlanta on Sunday morning, September 24. It was attended by some 50-60 members.

The President, Prof. Gerard Bradley, reported on the following:

(1) *the Board of Officers & Directors:* Four new directors were seated: Dr. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese; Dr. Christopher Janosik; Rev. J. Michael Miller, CSB; and Sr. Mary Judith O'Brien, RSM. The board passed a resolution of thanks for the long and helpful service of the outgoing members: Rev. Cornelius Buckley, SJ; Dr. John Haas; Mrs. Helen Hull Hitchcock; and Mr. Kenneth Whitehead.

(2) *Finances:* The financial status of the Fellowship remains secure. The income/expenditure ratio for the year remained in balance.

(3) *Publications:* Through a new arrangement with St. Augustine Press, the *Proceedings* from the 1998 and 1999 conventions have been published. Forthcoming soon will be the publication of the Fellowship "Reader"—a collection of talks from earlier conventions. The delay in publishing these works can be attributed to having to find a new publisher. By the annual convention in 2001, the schedule of all FCS publications should be back on track.

(4) *FCS Quarterly:* The publication of our quarterly newsletter/journal continues to be the primary source of communication within the Fellowship. Beginning with the Spring 2001 issue, the Quarterly will have a new editor. On behalf of the Board and the membership, Prof. Bradley

extended a word of gratitude to Prof. Ralph McNerny for his tireless efforts as editor.

(5) *Legal Status:* In response to questions about the tax-exempt status of the Fellowship, Prof. Bradley has rectified the situation. The Fellowship should once again be listed in the *Kenedy Directory*.

(6) *Ex Corde Ecclesiae Application:* The Fellowship was dismayed not to have been consulted on the make-up of the committee that is working on a process for implementing the "mandatum" requirement stipulated in the *Application* document recently approved by the Holy See. The Fellowship continues to offer its service to the bishops in their work of promoting Catholic higher education.

The Executive Secretary, Fr. Thomas Dailey, reported on the following:

(7) *Membership:* Applications to join the Fellowship continue to increase. The Board of Directors formally approved sixty (60) new members at its meeting on September 22.

(8) *Directory:* The publication of the *Membership Directory* is an on-going work. It has been decided that a new edition will be published each summer, in time for distribution at the annual convention. Only those members whose dues are current will be listed in each year's *Directory*. The opportunity to order a copy of the *Directory* will coincide with the annual dues requests.

(9) *International Chapters:* With the threat of extinction looming, members in Canada voted recently to continue the chapter. They elected a new President (Douglas P. McManaman) and have inaugurated a new website (<http://www>.

globalserve.net/~sarina/doug/index.htm). Plans are underway in Australia for the first national conference, to be held in October. Information is available on their new website (<http://www.fcсаustralia.org>).

There followed a question and answer discussion among the members. Prof. Bradley then offered two announcements:

(10) The cycle of electing new directors to the Board will now continue annually. Each year four new directors will be elected. (Voting is restricted to "regular" members of the Fellowship). Next year, the Board will also elect new Officers.

(11) The 2001 annual convention will be held in Omaha, NE at a site yet to be determined. The theme for the convention is "Catholic Imagination and Contemporary Culture." The program chair is Rev. Peter Ryan, SJ, with the assistance of Rev. John Rock, SJ and Dr. J. Brian Benestad.

Following the adjournment of the business meeting, the members engaged in an hour-long panel discussion on the Jubilee of University Professors and the current status of the Application of *Ex corde Ecclesiae*.

Updated information about the Fellowship is available to all members on the website at www4.desales.edu/~philtheo/FCS.

Questions about any Membership Matters, or information about activities, should be directed to the Office of the Executive Secretary (call 610-282-1100 ext. 1464 or fax to 610-282-2254 or send email to: tfd0@email.allencol.edu). ☒

Ethicist Peter Singer embodies “the true meaning of the Eucharist” and is one of the most prophetic voices in American life, according to Nathan Mitchell, head of the liturgy program at the University of Notre Dame, writing in the liturgical journal *Worship*, published by St. John’s Abbey (Collegeville, Mn.). Mitchell, a former Benedictine monk, did not mention Singer’s strong advocacy of abortion and infanticide.

Mitchell addressed a major liturgical conference in Erie (Pa.), at the invitation of Bishop Donald Trautman, former chairman of the Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy and now chairman of the Committee on Doctrine.

Mitchell was invited to Erie by Bishop Trautman after Mitchell’s Notre Dame liturgy program gave the bishop a special award for his support of the International Committee for English in the Liturgy (ICEL), in the face of strong criticisms by the Holy See’s Congregation for Divine Worship.

Writing in the Jesuit magazine *America*, Mitchell characterized statements by Cardinal Jorge Medina Estevez, head of Congregation, as “pernicious,” “fueled by fear, fantasy, and misinformation,” and employing a “strange and violent strategy.”

★ ★ ★

A layman who opposes extensive remodelling of the Cathedral of Covington (Ky.) has been “silenced” by Bishop Robert W. Muench. Dr. Arthur Kunath, who collected several thousand signatures on a petition urging Bishop Muench to respect the architectural

character of the gothic structure, was told by the bishop to cease speaking publicly on the subject because he is “a source of division in the Body of Christ.”

★ ★ ★

A number of Catholic organizations and religious orders, as well as some bishops, are supporting the United Religions Initiative, an ecumenical project which the Holy See has disapproved. Supporters include retired Cardinal Paolo Everisto Arns of Sao Paolo (Brazil) and Auxiliary Bishop Thomas Gumbleton of Detroit, along with Father Gerard O’Rourke, ecumenical director of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, and (allegedly) 40,000 Benedictine and Cistercian monks around the world.

URI, which was started by Episcopal Bishop William E. Swing of San Francisco, aims to establish a religious group with “permanent stature, with the status and visibility of the United Nations” and has received several millions of dollars in funding. Bishop Swing and other leaders of the group are on record as warning that orthodox religious belief is a danger to society and must be strongly opposed.

Cardinal Francis Arinze, head of the Holy See’s Council for Inter-Religious Dialogue, has criticized URI as “syncretistic” and stated the Church does not support it.

★ ★ ★

Pope John Paul II expressed “bitterness” at the international Gay Pride march held in Rome in July, during the midst of the Year of Jubilee.

Vice-President Albert Gore, the Democratic candidate for President, rejected requests from

American Catholics to withdraw his expression of “warmest regards” to the demonstrators.

Although the city of Rome also originally endorsed the event, it withdrew its financial support in response to Vatican protests.

★ ★ ★

A procedure whereby electronic communications media calling themselves Catholic can request a “nihil obstat” from their local ordinaries was approved by the American bishops. The procedure includes a “civility” code defining responsible journalism.

★ ★ ★

A representative of Planned Parenthood was barred from speaking at Gonzaga University in Spokane by Father Robert Spitzer, Jesuit president of the institution, who termed the organization’s activities “blatantly contrary to the Catholic and Jesuit character of the university.” Father Spitzer’s action was severely criticized by Jesuit Father Thomas Reese, editor of *America*.

★ ★ ★

Unmarried young people should follow the Church’s teaching about chastity but, if they fail to do so, should “contracept themselves to the eyebrows,” according to Bishop Patrick Dunn of Auckland, New Zealand.

★ ★ ★

The New Zealand hierarchy, while opposing “marriage” for homosexuals, has proposed a system of “registration” for couples of the same sex, so they can obtain the same benefits as married couples. The head of the Christian Heritage Party (Protestant) said he was “staggered” by the bishops’ stand.

★ ★ ★

Bishop Kenneth Angell of Burlington (Vt.) condemned a decision by the Vermont Supreme Court recognizing “same sex marriages” in the state.

★ ★ ★

Catholic Family Radio, a nationwide network of Catholic radio stations, has ceased broadcasting because of financial losses. Its stations are being sold.

★ ★ ★

Financial transactions which cost the diocese of Vancouver Island, Canada, over seventeen million dollars were “beyond belief,” according to an investigating commission. Retired Bishop Remi DeRoo consciously circumvented Canon Law in allowing diocesan financial officer Muriel Clemenger to engage in “highly speculative” investments with no outside audit, the commission found. Bishop DeRoo was once the leading liberal in the Canadian hierarchy and was critical of ecclesiastical “legalism.”

★ ★ ★

Sister Jeannine Gramick, a member of the School Sisters of Notre Dame, has rejected a demand from the Holy See that she cease speaking and writing against the Church’s teaching on homosexuality and says that she expects to be dismissed from her community.

★ ★ ★

Pro-lifers should eschew politics and concentrate on education, according to Auxiliary Bishop Thomas J. Curry of Los Angeles, who said that parish-based political activity is inappropriate. Pro-lifers in the Los Angeles archdiocese have complained that parishes are sometimes

used as bases of support for pro-abortion Catholic politicians.

★ ★ ★

Cable Vision Systems, a major operator of cable networks, is planning a new network called American Catholic. Among those who will appear regularly are pro-abortion former Governor Mario Cuomo of New York and the anti-Catholic memoirist Frank McCourt.

★ ★ ★

Canadian bishops have publicly attacked Catholics who criticized an event called the World March of Women, to which the Canadian hierarchy gave a subsidy of \$110,000.

Critics of the grant are “the rudest people I have to deal with,” according to Bishop Frederick Henry of Calgary (Alberta), who charged that they fail to support a “full pro-life agenda” and do not represent Church teaching. He defended the grant on the grounds that the march addressed “injustices done to women.”

Bishop John M. Sherlock of London (Ont.) charged that “If the pro-life people had their way we would all be living in a ghetto and crying about how unclean the rest of the world is.”

Canadian bishops were divided over the march, with Cardinal Aloysius Ambrozic of Toronto and others withholding their support.

The march officially endorsed abortion and refused to allow pro-life women to participate. During the affair a group of women also desecrated Mary Queen of the World Cathedral in Montreal.

★ ★ ★

Catholic Relief Services, which provides world-wide assistance to victims of disasters, withdrew its endorsement of the March of Women, following articles in the National Catholic Register. At first the chairman of the CRS board, Bishop John Ricard of Pensacola-Tallahassee (Fla.), denied the Register’s claims. However, officials of the March and staff members of CRS both confirmed that the CRS had authorized its name to be used. Pro-abortion feminist Patricia Ireland praised CRS’s sponsorship, which she said had “shock value” for those skeptical of the project.

★ ★ ★

Retired Bishop Samuel Ruiz of San Cristobal de las Casas Mexico, “ordained” women to the diaconate while he was in office and used Mayan texts and rituals in some ceremonies, according to Cardinal Jorge Medin Estevez, prefect of the Holy See’s Congregation for Divine Worship. Cardinal Estevez said no disciplinary action would be taken.

★ ★ ★

An Institute for Advanced Catholic Studies is being formed to encourage high-level research on Catholic subjects and has been endorsed by, among others, Cardinal Roger Mahony of Los Angeles and Archbishop Edward Egan of New York. Among its organizers is Marianist Father James Heft, president of the University of Dayton. Also among its leaders are several dissenting theologians.

★ ★ ★

Vatican representatives and other participants expressed satisfaction with the final text of the Beijing+Five document of the United Nations. A coalition primarily of Catholic and Muslim nations succeeded in removing from the final text a strong pro-abortion bias present in earlier versions.

The House of Representatives voted to endorse the continued participation of the Holy See in the deliberations of the U.N., countering demands by radical feminist groups that it be barred. The lone vote against the congressional resolution was by Congressman Pete Stark of California.

★ ★ ★

A proposal by Austrian bishops to formally involve priests, religious, and laity in the process of nominating bishops was termed “impossible” by Cardinal Lucas Moreira Neves, prefect of the Vatican’s Congregation for Bishops, but Cardinal Christoph Schonborn of Vienna announced that he would go to Rome “to continue the conversation.”

★ ★ ★

The Oblates of Mary Immaculate in Canada and several other Canadian religious groups face bankruptcy because of massive law suits by Indians claiming to have been abused while students in Indian schools which were operated by the churches until about 1970. The Canadian government has announced an official policy of compensation, both with public and private money, and has encouraged claims, which some critics say are exaggerated and unproven.

★ ★ ★

Holy Cross Father James Burtchaell has been ordered by his superiors to cease writing and speaking publicly on the subject of Catholic higher education. His book *The Dying of the Light* (1998) traces in detail the secularization of several American institutions of higher learning, including Catholic schools, and some observers believe it influenced American bishops in their application of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* to the U.S.

★ ★ ★

Father Richard McBrien, professor of theology at the University of Notre Dame, where Father Burtchaell was formerly provost, has predicted that *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* will prove impossible to enforce. He and other critics of the document warn that its enforcement will lead to the censoring of Catholic scholars.

★ ★ ★

Bishop John Leibrecht of Springfield-Cape Girardeau (Mo.), former chairman of the bishops’ committee which responded to *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, said the final guidelines for its implementation permit much “flexibility” in implementation. The “mandate” which theologians are required to receive from their bishops will not involve close scrutiny of their work, according to Bishop Leibrecht.

★ ★ ★

Over eighty percent of students attending Catholic colleges and universities think that religion is not emphasized at their school, according to a University of Akron survey. About 65 percent of those attending Protestant colleges have the same reaction.

★ ★ ★

The American Medical Association has rescinded a proposed policy requiring all American hospitals to provide “a full range of reproductive services,” including abortion and contraception. Cardinal Francis George of Chicago threatened to close all Catholic health facilities if the policy were enforced.

★ ★ ★

The District of Columbia City Council passed a law requiring all employers in the District, including churches, to provide their employees with health plans including full contraceptive services. The Archdiocese of Washington has protested the law as a violation of religious liberty and has asked that it be rescinded. The law was sponsored by Councilman Jim Graham, who said he resented the Church’s stand on homosexuality. His position was endorsed by Congressman James P. Moran Jr. of Virginia, who said he was a Catholic but accused the Church of “intolerance” and “hypocrisy.”

★ ★ ★

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has been keeping files on, among others, the American Catholic bishops because of the bishops’ involvement in pro-life activities. The FBI denied the allegation, but the magazine *Insight* insisted that it had obtained confidential documents confirming the surveillance. ✠

Installation of Most Reverend Edward Egan as Archbishop of New York, October 16, 2000

The new millennium got off to a rousing and encouraging start in New York with the installation of Archbishop Edward Egan as ordinary of that see and its 2.4 million Catholics. Ceremonies of canonical possession and installation on June 18 and 19 brought audibly enthusiastic, multilingual crowds to St. Patrick's Cathedral and into the surrounding streets.

Led by a banner proclaiming "Unus Dominus, Una Fides, Unum Baptisma," eight cardinals and the installing prelate, Archbishop Gabriel Montalvo, Apostolic Nuncio in the United States, processed into the cathedral along with eighteen archbishops and more than 80 bishops. Prelates and representatives of other churches, including the Primate of the Greek Orthodox Church in America and the Episcopal Bishop of New York, were there, as was the President of the New York Board of Rabbis and the Imam of the Is-

lamic Cultural Center in New York.

In the presence of representatives from 28 ethnic groups, Archbishop Egan spoke against discrimination based on race or religion. He then placed abortion within the context of unjust discrimination. In the presence of Mrs. Hillary Clinton and other political advocates of legal and publicly funded abortion such as U.S. Senators Joseph Lieberman and Charles Schumer, he asked:

"May we stand idly by while the being within the mother is killed, even though no one has ever been able to prove that it is other than a human being with an inalienable right to live?"

Applause broke out—but not from the ranks of the politicians—as the Archbishop tried to proceed with his sermon. When the applause subsided, he asked:

"May we look the other way when the elderly are put to death because someone questions the quality of their life? To all these questions, the answer must be a resounding No.

The reason is crystal clear. The victims of discrimination, the impoverished, the sick, the disabled, the unborn, the elderly, are all images of God, mirrors held up to divinity, beings for whom a God

would and did die. There can be no prayerful faith if there is wavering regarding the rights of those images of divinity."

On the divinity of Christ and the Eucharist, Archbishop Egan cited a nationwide poll that found many Catholics "unsure about the central and essential prayer of our faith, the holy sacrifice of the Mass." He commented:

"I do not know how valid that poll might have been, but I do know that we must be a prayerful people here in the Archdiocese of New York, a eucharistically prayerful people, if our basilica is to stand. There can be no hesitation, no compromise. We kneel before the Son of God we adore, we creatures whom He redeemed."

Archbishop Egan, widely known for his defense of the marriage bond as a judge of the Roman Rota from 1971 to 1985, was one of six canonists who reviewed the new Code of Canon Law with Pope John Paul II before its promulgation in 1983. In 1985 he was ordained a bishop and made an auxiliary to his predecessor in the see of New York, the late Cardinal John O'Connor. He was Cardinal O'Connor's vicar for education. In 1988 he became Bishop of Bridgeport. ✠

Pat Riley

Send Address Changes to:
Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly
Box 495 • Notre Dame, IN 46556
e-mail to: Alice.F.Osberger.1@nd.edu

When Jesuits Were Giants: Louis-Marie Ruellan, S.J. (1846-1885) and Contemporaries, Cornelius Michael Buckley, S.J. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1999.

Reviewed by James Hitchcock

I approached this book expecting to read an edifying life of a heroic nineteenth-century Jesuit Indian missionary of the Pacific Northwest, and it is in fact that. However, it turns out that Father Ruellan, whom frankly I had never heard of, spent scarcely a year in the missions, dying at age 39.

Hence, it would seem, there is not much basis for a book. But for once the broader main title—"When Jesuits Were Giants"—is not being used to aggrandize a narrow study. This is in fact a kind of social history of nineteenth-century Jesuits both in Europe and America. I can scarcely think of another book more fascinating in its account of religious life in the Victorian era, rich in the kind of details often lost between edifying hagiography on the one hand and lifeless statistics on the other.

The author uses Ruellan as the key to unlock the hidden realities of Jesuit (and Catholic) life in the nineteenth century. Thus as he follows his subject—his upbringing in ultra-Catholic Brittany, his study at various French Jesuit houses, the Jesuit exile in England, his study of English in the Eastern United States, finally his brief work in the Indian missions—Father Buckley reconstructs the whole environment in which Ruellan found himself.

Even the well-informed reader learns a good deal about what it was like to be a serious Catholic in the France of the Third Republic, when anti-clericalism was turning

into serious harassment. (At one point Ruellan and his fellow Jesuits were physically removed by the police from their house, following their official expulsion from France.)

As exiles on the mainland of England and on the Isle of Jersey, the Frenchmen continued their work, many of them volunteering to go as missionaries as far away as China. Meditating on St. Ignatius' image of the "two standards," Ruellan concluded that God was calling him to work among the Indians.

Throughout the book there are brief sketches of Jesuits with whom Ruellan had contact, providing a vivid picture of what the Society was like at the time. The author also explains in detail the educational activities of the Jesuits, showing their intellectual vitality and their significant contributions to French culture. He describes the incredibly busy life of a New York City parish in the 1880's and, finally, the frontier which Ruellan encountered at Spokane Falls.

In the end the meaning of Ruellan's life is hidden in the mystery of Providence. The reader who does not look carefully at the title may expect the story of a man who spent many years in heroic self-sacrifice, with glorious results. Ironically, as Father Buckley suggests, the priest's death was probably hastened by the fact that he received too much medical attention—supposedly suffering from pleurisy, he was over-dosed with various strong drugs.

Beyond its inherently fascinating subject, the book reads almost like a novel, and a bonus are the authors' translations of some of Ruellan's letters, themselves vivid descriptions of his milieu. ❖

Negotiating Identity: Catholic Higher Education since 1960. Sister Alice Gallin, O.S.U. University of Notre Dame Press, 2000. 269 pages hardcover. \$32.00.

Reviewed by Fr. Leonard A. Kennedy, C.S.B.

This book is a detailed history of Catholic universities and colleges in the United States during the last forty years, stopping just before the November 1999 vote by the American bishops to implement *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*. *Identity* documents the relationships of these educational institutions to (1) civic and government officials, (2) the American higher education community, (3) the Catholic Church, and (4) the internal constituency of faculty, students, administration, and trustees. Its focus, however, is the schools' relationship to the Church as they dealt with these other relationships.

The book is a storehouse of information concerning many aspects of Catholic universities, such as academic freedom, government grants, ecumenism, relations with the Holy See, and relations with the American bishops concerning *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*.

There were very many changes in American universities during the period studied. For example, many more students attended them, with more women than men entering liberal arts; professional programs began to predominate; graduate programs and research projects proliferated; single-sex institutions became co-ed; there was an emphasis on equal opportunity, non-discrimination, and affirmative action; ecumenical considerations were introduced; students led

uprisings; hiring, promotion, and tenure procedures were formalized; the curriculum became less structured; many more courses were available; and Black Studies, Women's Studies, and Native American Studies were begun.

In addition: in Catholic universities the number of priests and religious dropped precipitously; dissent appeared among professors, clerical and lay; many lay trustees, administrators, and faculty were appointed; and the philosophy of Aquinas was marginalized.

A most difficult problem in coping with these changes was money. This was of greater concern to private colleges because they had not been receiving public funds. They were told that, in order to qualify for them, they could not be "pervasively sectarian." The extent to which they had to adapt to secularism was not clear at first, but adapt they did, and, in doing so, found that each adaptation brought other adaptations with it. These later adaptations seemed to have been made with ever-decreasing concern for their consequences. The camel had been let into the tent.

In order to defend the universities from the charge of "pervasive sectarianism," a number of the leading universities, at a conference in Land O'Lakes, Wisconsin, called in 1967 for "true autonomy and academic freedom in the face of authority of whatever kind, lay or clerical, external to the academic community itself." They also predicted that "the Catholic university of the future will be a true modern university but specifically Catholic in profound and creative ways for the service of society and the people of God." The university,

they thought, could leave the Church and still remain Catholic.

What were some of the actions the universities took to de-emphasize their Catholicity? "Many of the presidents saw their 'Catholic identity' in the university's broad mission of research, teaching, and service rather than in the orthodoxy of their theology departments." Non-Catholics were hired, even for the theology department. Requirements in theology and philosophy were watered down. Theology was replaced by Religious Studies. "Teachers of moral theology shifted their focus from the traditional elements in the formation of conscience, including sin, to an emphasis on Christian service of others as the essence of Christian faith." "Ecumenical outreach in the seventies added to the richness of faculty competencies and insights, but it also diminished the number of now-tenured faculty with a deep commitment to the Catholic faith."

Sister Alice frequently mentions aspects of the loss of Catholicism in the universities. She mentions the scandal of selecting certain invited speakers and honorary degree recipients. She quotes the head of the National Catholic Educational Association in 1974: "Unfortunately there is considerable evidence that Catholic colleges and universities have many academically credentialed persons on their faculties who are ignorant of, indifferent to, and, yes, even hostile to the Catholic dimension of these institutions." She writes that by 1962 "the faculty at Notre Dame already included members of almost every religious tradition, a decision seen by [Fr.] Hesburgh as necessary to the realization of his

dream of Notre Dame becoming a 'great Catholic university.'" She points out that the universities forfeited "denial of tenure to those who publicly disputed Church teaching," and that, while the Association of American University Professors in 1940 allowed limitation on academic freedom because of the religious aims of an institution provided this was clearly stated in writing at the time of appointment, in 1969 the Association reported that most church-related institutions no longer desired such limitations. Catholic university presidents, she claims, were convinced that their institutions required "presence in and recognition by [the contemporary world] despite the ambiguities that would result." And she asks, concerning the requirements of the State Department of Education, "Did they not suggest that the faith that lay at the heart of the university's identity as Catholic was itself the problem?" Sister sums it all up by mentioning the title of an article in the nineties: "Jesuit, Si! Catholic, Not so sure!"

Sister Alice doesn't give a sufficiently alarming picture of the degradation of Catholicism in many universities, with prominent dissenters and pro-abortion leaders being given tenure, and generations of Catholic students being taught a false faith. I kept thinking of a letter of the Jesuit St. Peter Canisius, who was made the Administrator of the diocese of Vienna, Austria, in 1554 while the See was vacant. He wrote to Jesuit headquarters in Rome: "This accursed plague of heresy ever increases here. The professors and students are so terribly infected by it that our [Catholic] university seems a very monster, nursing

impiety and destroying rather than saving the youth of our land.

Those most addicted to the gospel of Luther are sought after diligently, and given fat stipends in more than one part of Austria.”

The book mentions an item of special interest to members of our Fellowship: that its founding in 1977 was a direct response to a question which Cardinal Garrone asked Monsignor George Kelly: “Is there no other voice within American Catholic education than that of the National Catholic Educational Association and Father Hesburgh?” Indeed, the successful negotiation of the adaptation of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* in the United States was due in great part to the persistence of Cardinal Garrone (and his suc-

cessors), and to the existence of the Fellowship.

Sister Alice does not sufficiently acknowledge the extent and effect of dissent on campuses. Dissent led to the departure of many priests and religious from university teaching posts, and affected also many who stayed. If priests and religious had remained orthodox, problems would not have been so severe. As it was, many of these persons not only became dissenters but spread dissent to the lay faculty and, as well, readily consented to the hiring of non-Catholics, not a few of whom proved to be anti-Catholic.

After completing the review of this book I read the magnificent review of it in the Aug./Sept. *FIRST THINGS*, entitled

“Negotiating in Good Faith?”

While praising Rome for its “obduracy as fidelity’s last resort,” the author calls Sister Alice, the executive director of ACCU until 1992, “an important and partisan character” in what went on, with “enduring loyalty to the hold-out presidents” who “pleadingly assured American Academe that their faith might have been just a sentimental memory . . . but never an acknowledged resource of intellectual perspective,” and who kept insisting that “Rome should underwrite whatever they do as the best that Catholics could hope for.” “The educators did not negotiate their identity,” the author says. “They bargained it away.” ❧

The University of St. Thomas English Department

The English Department of the University of St. Thomas, a private university committed to the liberal arts and to the religious, ethical and intellectual tradition of Catholic higher education, invites applications for two tenure-track positions beginning August 2001. Ph.D. required. One position is for Department Chair at senior rank and the other at assistant professor rank. The Chair’s position requires administrative experience. Priorities for area of specialization are: 1) Renaissance English Literature (non-dramatic and dramatic) and 2) Nineteenth Century British Fiction. Teaching load for Chair is 9 hours (3 courses per semester) and for Assistant professor 12 hours (4 courses per semester). There is opportunity for summer, January Intercession, and interdisciplinary teaching as well as instructing in the Master in Liberal Arts program. A commitment to excellent teaching, service, and scholarship in a Catholic liberal arts setting is required. Send application letter; curriculum vitae; evaluations of teaching; and the names, addresses, telephone numbers, and e-mail addresses (if available) of three references to Prof Elizabeth Parr, Search Committee Chair, English Department, University of St. Thomas, 3800 Montrose Blvd., Houston, Texas 77006-4696. FAX: 713-942-3463. E-mail: lparr@stthom.edu. Review of applications will begin immediately and continue until the positions are filled. EOE. Women and minorities are urged to apply.

OFFICERS

President

PROF. GERARD V. BRADLEY
Notre Dame Law School
Notre Dame, IN 46556

Vice-President

DR. MICHAEL J. HEALY
Franciscan Univ. of Steubenville
Stuebenville, OH 43952

Executive Secretary

**REV. THOMAS F. DAILEY,
O.S.F.S.**
DeSales University
2755 Station Avenue
Center Valley, PA 18034-9568

President Emeritus

REV. MSGR. GEORGE A. KELLY
107-10 Shore Front Parkway
Rockaway Beach, NY 11694

DIRECTORS

DR. J. BRIAN BENESTAD
University of Scranton
Dept. of Theology
Scranton, PA 18510

DEAN BERNARD DOBRANSKI
6225 Webster Church Road
Dexter, MI 48130

DR. ELIZABETH FOX-GENOVESE
1487 Sheridan Walk
Atlanta, GA 30324

DR. LAURA GARCIA
3 Bowdoin Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

DR. JAMES HITCHCOCK
6159 Kingsbury Drive
St. Louis, MO 63112

DR. STEPHEN KRASON
1235 Maryland Avenue
Steubenville, OH 43952-1620

**REV. RONALD LAWLER,
O.F.M. CAP.**
St. Francis Friary
2905 Castlegate Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15226

DR. RALPH MCINERNEY
Jacques Maritain Center
714 Hesburgh Library
Notre Dame, IN 46556

DR. WILLIAM MAY
John Paul II Institute
487 Michigan Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20017

REV. J. MICHAEL MILLER, CSB
University of St. Thomas
3800 Montrose Boulevard
Houston, TX 77006

**SR. MARY JUDITH O'BRIEN,
RSM**
1300 S. Steele Street
P.O. Box 101645
Denver, CO 80250-1645

REV. JOHN ROCK, S.J.
Gonzaga University Jesuit
Community
502 E. Boone Avenue
Spokane, WA 99258

REV. PETER RYAN, S.J.
Loyola College
4501 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21210-2699

REV. JAMES SCHALL, S.J.
Georgetown Jesuit Community
Washington, DC 20057

DR. MARY SHIVANANDAN
John Paul II Institute
487 Michigan Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20017

**REV. MSGR. WILLIAM B.
SMITH**
St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie
201 E. Seminary Avenue
Yonkers, NY 10704-1896

REV. EARL A. WEIS, S.J.
Loyola University
6525 N. Sheridan Road
Chicago, IL 60626-5385

August 31, 2000

Most Reverend Daniel Pilarczyk
 Archbishop of Cincinnati
 100 E. Eighth Street
 Cincinnati OH, 45202-2129

Dear Archbishop Pilarczyk,

I read with interest, and dismay, the news about consultants to the *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* implementation committee which you now chair. I am interested because, as a Notre Dame faculty member specializing in the law of Church and state, implementation of ECE is a matter of personal and professional importance to me. I am disappointed because, as President of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, I discovered *only* from the news reports — and not from any representative of your committee or any other episcopal or NCCB source — that Catholic learned societies were invited to nominate consultants. I wonder why the Fellowship was never asked for any input whatsoever.

The explanation cannot be because of suspect views about implementing ECE. From the first the Fellowship as a corporate body, and its individual members, have

called for implementation of ECE along the lines finally established by the bishops last November. None of the groups invited to nominate consultants has nearly this record of support, which the Fellowship has earned by hard work and constant witness. I wonder why several societies with (at least) mixed records of support for ECE and its implementation were invited to nominate consultants, while the Fellowship was not.

It cannot be that the Fellowship is a negligible group. We have nearly a thousand members world wide, with chapters in several foreign lands. Our members here in the United States include leading Catholic academics at Catholic *and* secular universities. Among them are Mary Ann Glendon of the Harvard Law School, Elizabeth Fox-Genovese of Emory, Robert George of Princeton, John Finnis of Notre Dame (and Oxford), and Ralph McInerny of Notre Dame. Many college presidents and deans are FCS members, as are numerous heads of Institutes and Study Centers.

I wonder then why the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars was wholly shut out of the process? We

surely possess relevant expertise. Many members of the FCS, including myself, have published commended articles and studies about ECE. In doing so they have earned the praise and thanks of many members of the American hierarchy. Many of our theologian members are scholars of the first rank with long and varied experience in Catholic higher education. Any of them would have gladly served as consultants. Perhaps a civil lawyer who specializes in education law or in constitutional law would have been an asset to the committee. We count as members many with such expertise. They, too, would gladly have served.

Archbishop Pilarczyk, I really am puzzled and disappointed at this neglect of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars. Even so, at this late date, we stand ready to serve.

Respectfully in Christ,

Gerard V. Bradley
 Professor of Law

cc. Cardinal Bevilacqua
 Bishop Braxton
 Bishop Doran
 Bishop Wuerl

24TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF CATHOLIC SCHOLARS

Program Committee:

Rev. Peter Ryan, S.J. (chair)

Brian Benestad

Rev. John Rock S.J.

DoubleTree Hotel

Omaha, Nebraska

September 28-30, 2001

Host: Archbishop Eldon Curtiss

The Catholic Imagination

**Fellowship of
Catholic Scholars
Quarterly**

Box 495

Notre Dame, IN 46556

Nonprofit Organization

U.S. Postage

PAID

Notre Dame, Indiana

Permit No. 10

Fellowship
of Catholic
Scholars
Quarterly