

FELLOWSHIP OF CATHOLIC SCHOLARS

NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 3, NUMBER 1

DECEMBER 1979



Letter From President James Hitchcock

On Sunday November 11th several officers presented to Archbishop John Quinn an official statement of the Fellowship, passed by the Board of Directors, entitled "The Catholicity of Catholic Universities and Colleges." This 2,300 word document was the Fellowship's response to Pope John Paul II's concerns expressed in his address on October 6th at the Catholic University.

The tremendous sense of the universality of the Church – its Catholicism if you will – and of its faith meaning, which was generated by the Pope's visit cannot help but have a profound effect on the intellectual life of that American Church. Catholic higher education, in particular, has a special role in the formation of Christian intelligence and Christian virtue. The pope's call to its teachers to communicate authentic Catholicism is relevant to the contemporary situation.

It is for this reason that the Fellowship's Board endorses two official documents dealing with the same subject – "The Catholic University in the Modern World" and the Apostolic Constitution, "Christian Wisdom", which call upon all Catholic institutions of higher learning to make its Catholic commitment without equivocation. The First document requires (1) Institutional recognition of the Church in Doctrinal Matters; (2) the autonomy of the Catholic university within the ambit of Catholic law; (3) academic freedom hand in hand with faculty responsibility to the Catholicity of the University; (4) recognition of university officials as the normal custodians of Catholicity on campus without denying the hierarchy's rights in doctrinal matters.

The Fellowship statement concludes:

"Why the corporate body of Catholics that constitutes a university community cannot make a Catholic commitment is difficult to comprehend. Personal witness to the faith by Catholic academicians at secular and state universities is commonplace. This private witness is not, however what defines a Catholic University. By definition a Catholic University must be a corporate moral person committed totally to the mission of the Church – the pastoral mission, no less than the intellectual."

The other signatories of the document are Dr. Eugene Diamond (Loyola Medical School), Fr. Joseph Farraher, S.J. (University of Santa Clara), Sr. Janet Fitzgerald, O.P. (Molloy College), Fr. Frederick Jelly, O.P. (Josephinum School of Theology), Mrs. Mary Joyce (Author), Msgr. George A. Kelly (St. John's University, New York), Fr. Ronald Lawler, OFM, Cap., (Catholic University of America), Sr. Carolyn McGinty, C.S.J. (Rosary College), Fr. Joseph Mangan, S.J. (Loyola University), Dr. William May (Catholic University of America), Fr. John Miller, C.S.C. (Provincial Superior, Holy Cross Fathers, Southern Province), Fr. James Turro (Darlington Seminary), Fr. Earl Weiss, S.J. (Loyola University).

Copies of the Fellowship statement are available from Msgr. George A. Kelly, the Fellowship's executive secretary, St. John's University, Jamaica, New York 11439.

Business of the Fellowship

Board of Directors Meeting – Chicago, September 8th

This meeting coincided with Fr. Joseph Mangan's 50th anniversary as a Jesuit, which was duly celebrated.

Among the actions taken by the Board, the following are the most significant:

1. Approved the final Statement of Purpose and future election procedures, reserving to itself the right to make literary corrections.
2. Agreed to pursue publication of the 1979 Proceedings.
3. Approved widening participation in the publication and distribution of the *Newsletter*.
4. Set the dates for the 1980 Convention as March 28-30 preferably in Cincinnati (although that later proved to have no open facilities). Subject areas were discussed; psychology, world culture, pluralism, evangelization, etc. No final decision was reached on the subject matter, although an interdisciplinary approach was recommended. It was also suggested that next year's business meeting come early in the program, that workshops be based on scholarly presentations circulated in advance.
5. Unanimous approval was given to drafting and issuing a Fellowship statement on the Catholicity of Catholic universities and colleges.
6. The president was authorized to investigate the participation of Fellowship scholars in on-going diocesan programs of priest education.
7. Approval was also given to the formation of local chapters. Milwaukee is the latest center under the chairmanship of Fr. Richard Roach.
– *Frederick Jelly, O.P.*

1980 Convention in Chicago – March 28-30

Due to the careful preparatory work of Fr. Earl Weis, S.J., arrangements have been made to hold the 1980 Convention in the *Sheraton-O'Hare Motel* 6810 North Mannheim road, Rosemont, Illinois 60018.

This is five minutes from the airport. Further details will be supplied in a later mailing.

Benefactors

Fr. Raymond McCarthy
Riverside, Ill.

* * *

In Memory of
Msgr. John J. Moylan
and
Msgr. Arthur E. Murphy

Fellowship Fund Raising

As the Fellowship enters its third year of existence with the publication of this Newsletter, the sources of continued funding must be expanded. The Fellowship now engages in many more costly enterprises than merely publishing a *Newsletter*. We are supplying to members and to interested parties a good deal of research material and scholarly commentary. The publication of *The Proceedings* of the 1979 convention will involve an outlay of almost \$5,000 including mail and secretarial work. Even though we are now approximately 500 members strong the annual \$15 dues obviously does not cover the cost of the growing service provided by the Fellowship and we have no desire to increase the annual dues.

At this time, therefore, we earnestly solicit from those in a position to do so a contribution to the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars. This contribution is tax deductible. All checks so designed should be made out to the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars and will be gratefully received and dutifully acknowledged by the executive secretary.

Ballot of Membership

The vote on the Statement of Purpose –
18 for the old; 126 for the new; 2 abstentions

The vote on the Formula of Election –
20 for the old; 122 for the new; 4 abstentions

Fellowship Officers

By request of members a repetition of the addresses of some officers is provided:

President: James Hitchcock
University of St. Louis
St. Louis, Missouri 63103

Treasurer: Sr. Janet Fitzgerald
Molloy College
Rockville Centre, New York 11570

Executive
Secretary: Rev. Msgr. George A. Kelly
St. John's University
Jamaica, New York 11439

1979 Dues

Those who have not yet paid their dues for 1979 are asked to do so.
Approximately 150 members are in arrears.

Items of Interest

- The time has come to stress *Natural Family Planning*. John and Sheila Kippley have recently sent Fellowship members a copy of the latest edition of their splendid work on NFP. The timeliness of their work can hardly be exaggerated in the light of Pope John Paul II's courageous restatement of the Catholic marital ethic. Teaching natural family planning in Catholic circles is a serious contemporary need at the parish or diocesan level. Fellowship members are requested to promote this apostolate.

- The Kairos Foundation will sponsor a program of "Studies in Christian Culture" from June 24 to August 11 at San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Spain. Courses in English for American college credit may be taken in the following: Fundamentals of the Catholic Tradition; the Problem of God in Christian Philosophy; Christianity, Social Thought and Modern Society; Topics in Christian History; Christian Literature; and Spanish Language. Graduate students and non-matriculated students may also enroll. The total cost from New York, including room, board, and excursions to some of the principal historic sites in Spain is \$1875. Further information is available from the Kairos Foundation, 3819 Sassafraas Street, Erie, PA 16508.

- **CALL FOR MORE EXCELLENT SEMINARY EDUCATION.** Responses to two questionnaires prepared for CUA's *Workshop* on "Philosophy and the Priest Today" revealed that seminary officials and American bishops generally agree that the philosophical education of priests must be strengthened, and that the intellectual formation of seminarians is today notably weaker than it should be. A notable majority agreed: "the academic preparation of many students entering theology has shown notable deficiencies: in language skills, knowledge of history and literature, understanding of science, and the like."

A more detailed and nuanced report on the questionnaires will be prepared by Fr. Stephen Minkiel, C.M., of Gannon College, Erie, after the completion of the Workshop.

- Hans Kung's commentary on John Paul II's first year as Pope questioned whether the Pontiff was (1) a man open to the world (2) a spiritual leader (3) an authentic pastor (4) a true fellow bishop, or (5) an ecumenical leader. This was no mere op-ed page in *the New York Times* (October 19, 1979). Nor was it a simple expression of one-man's opinion. The Kung commentary not only appeared in several major American newspapers but also in European journals notably *Le Monde*. And reasonably simultaneously.

- On April 26, 1979 the Italian Episcopal Conference issued a pastoral letter on "The Apostolate of Remarried Divorcees and of Those Living in Irregular or Difficult Situations." The English translation begins with the August 13, 1979 edition of the English *L'Osservatore Romano*. The pastoral provides clear guidelines — both theological and practical — for pastors who are undertaking this important, and at times, difficult ministry.

- Dr. John Rock was presented in 1963 as a Catholic doctor promoting contraception because its time had come. As early as 1941 in a medical volume *Gynecology and Obstetrics* edited by Dr. Carl Henry Davis (W.F. Prior of Maryland, publisher), he appears as an expert in the field of abortion, surgical and spontaneous. On page 1 of this medical book, the editor makes this 1941 statement: "Improvements in medical therapy *have largely* eliminated the need for therapeutic abortions."

- **NEEDED:** Experienced Director of Religious Education. Grades K through 12. Salary \$10,000, more with experience. Begin Summer or Fall 1980; 600 family parish. Write John Hammes, Department of Psychology, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602.

- Fr. Bernard J. Rosinski, SCJ, is collecting data for a doctoral dissertation on declining enrollments in seminaries. He would like to obtain unpublished studies, memoranda, etc. containing statistical data, hypothetical explanations, and methodological models connected with decline in seminary enrollments, enrollments in religious life, religious communities, etc. His address: 2300 West Jackson, Muncie, Indiana 47303. Phone: (317) 288-5308.

- Fr. James W. Anderson is academic dean of *Holy Apostles College*, (33 Prospect Hill Rd.) Cromwell, Connecticut 06416, a seminary for second career vocations of men between 25-50 years of age aspiring to the priesthood.

Fr. Anderson is looking for someone to teach an undergraduate course in ethics or moral theology during the Spring 1980 semester.

This is a faith-filled faculty interested also in hiring a professor of philosophy.

- A facility with a large chapel, eight classrooms, bedrooms (three to a room), library, recreation rooms, is presently available in the Diocese of Baton Rouge, Louisiana to an Institute ready to serve the Church. For details, write to the Chancery Office, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821.

Two Vatican Documents

The Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued two important documents within the past six months:

1. *Letter on Certain Questions Concerning Eschatology* (May 17, 1979) which concerned itself with the "doubt gradually insinuating itself into people's mind" viz. about everlasting life. The Congregation affirms: (1) the Church believes in the Resurrection of the dead; (2) of the whole person; (3) i.e. of the conscious human self (soul); (4) which is the basis of the Church's prayers and funeral rites; (6) the Assumption of Mary; (7) the existence of hell and purgatory.

Concludes the Congregation: "We increasingly remind Christians of the Church's teaching which is the basis both of Christian life and of scholarly research. Efforts must be made to ensure that theologians share our pastoral concern so that their studies and research may not be thoughtlessly set before the faithful, who today more than ever are exposed to dangers to their faith."

2. *Observations on the book Human Sexuality: A Study Commissioned by the Catholic Theological Society of America* (July 13, 1979) The Congregation finds the book defective for the following reasons:

First, "a most pervasive mistake in this book is the manipulation of the concept or definition of human sexuality." Defining sexuality in generic terms, the book nonetheless deals primarily with genital sexuality and then proceeds to set aside Catholic moral norms and even to distort the teaching of Vatican II. Concerning this latter point the Congregation says: "This book repeatedly states that the Council deliberately refused to retain the traditional primary and secondary ends of marriage, opening the Church to a new and deeper understanding of the meaning and value of conjugal love." (p. 125 and *passim*) On the contrary, the Commission of the Modi declared explicitly, replying to a proposal brought forward by many Fathers to put this hierarchical distinc-

tion into the text of [G.S.] no. 48, 'In a pastoral text which intends to institute a dialogue with the world, juridical elements are not required . . . In any case, the primordial importance of procreation and education is shown at least ten times in the text.' (Cf. NN. 48 and 50)

Secondly, the book proposes "a gratuitous change in the accepted terms (substituting 'creative growth toward integration' for 'procreative and unitive purpose' or sexuality) without any substantial argument, a change which contradicts the formulation used in Vatican II and assumed in *Persona Humana*. This change not only changes all the traditional conclusions about sexual behavior; "it even precludes the possibility of fruitful theological discussion by removing the common terminology."

Thirdly, the book's criteria are entirely subjective and yield "no manageable or helpful rules for conscience formation in matters of sexuality." The book offers instead "guidelines which can never be regarded as 'absolute and universal moral norms.'"

Fourthly, the book's practical applications "either dissociate themselves from or directly contradict Catholic teaching as consistently proposed by moral theologians and as taught by the Church's magisterium." If the book disapproves some forms of sexual conduct (swinging, mate-swapping, bestiality) it is not for the reason that "these actions are opposed to the nature of human sexuality" but because the authors happen not to see, for their part, any way of making it serve for some human integration."

In the letter to Archbishop Quinn the Congregation expressed its concern that "a distinguished society of Catholic theologians would have arranged for the publication of this report in such a way as to give broad distribution to the erroneous principles and conclusions of this book and in this way provide a source of confusion among the people of God."

ITEMS OF INTEREST *(Continued from page 3)*

● *From a New York City Planned Parenthood Report dated June 21, 1979:* More than half of the entire teen pregnancies in the State come from the City; venereal disease among 15-19 year olds has doubled during the last seven years; rape is the most common violent crime in that age group.

PP's answer: a compulsory sex education pro-

gram in the public schools — K through 12; peer communication as an important tool; demonstration lessons for all grade levels on site; recruiting and training "a corps of students who would recruit and provide sex-related information and guidance to their peers."

PP would like public money.

Editorial — Pope John Paul II

Pope John Paul II has given Catholic scholars and pastoral leaders a splendid opportunity. During his visit here he spoke with courage and brilliance the elements of faith we most needed to hear.

He spoke of the importance of simple and profound faith in Christ; of the transcendent dignity of each person; of the Church's stirring social message; of faithfulness to principle in every area of Catholic moral life. He was not afraid to speak clearly and with conviction on points that make some Catholic scholars, and even Catholic pastoral leaders, nervous.

And he was received gladly by the Catholic people.

Those who reject some or many of the elements of Catholic teaching are beginning to assail even the Pope. And their comments on his background, intelligence, and openness are not complimentary. This brilliant scholar and pastoral leader is said not to "understand" people whenever he stated Catholic Doctrine dissenters do not want asserted. Papal critics are still cautious, however, because John Paul II has proved to be the most popular public figure of his time.

If, however, other Catholic leaders do not follow his lead a gradual erosion of the good

effects of his splendid pastoral visit will set in. The time, has come, therefore, for bishops, pastors, scholars, happily supportive of Catholic teaching, to express themselves forcefully. The time has come for church leaders to collaborate with sound Catholic Scholars in articulating Catholic doctrine. The Pope's recent visit was a time of grace. Many who had rejected Catholic teaching have been moved by his presence, some of whom are again willing to listen to intelligent and attractive presentations of whose teachings of the Church that have met with some resistance.

It is desirable that members of the Fellowship especially speak to audiences of priests, sisters, and religious educators in the knowledge that much good can be done by teaching vigorously in the Holy Father's shadow. Skill and gentleness are required but so is plain speaking about the Church's sexual ethic, the dignity of women, the Church's sacramental teaching on ordination to the priesthood and the essential integrity of Catholic faith as the Word of God.

Nervous silence does more harm sometimes than dissent. Pope John Paul's leadership gives us courage to follow him in the clearly marked path he has blazed.

Ronald Lawler, OFM, Cap.

Official Catholic Teaching, Wilmington, North Carolina, Consortium Books, 1978)

This is a six volume series covering such wide areas of Catholic thought as scripture, liturgy, Christology, social justice, clergy and laity. In each thick volume all of the pertinent Church documents can be found. From this point of view the series has value to scholars seeking ready reference to official texts.

The volume entitled *Love and Sexuality* is edited by Odile M. Liebhard whose introduction ends on the following note:

"*Gaudium et Spes*, the Council's Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, carries a tone quite different from the encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI on marriage already discussed. It reveals a sensitivity for 'the joys and hopes, the griefs and anxieties of the men of this age.' For once, change is looked upon with respect, as integral to the human condition and worthy of dialogue, not as a problem. It suggests that many human questions have not yet been answered and may never be. It provides a statement on the human person that could be a rich starting point for a new understanding of sexuality. Its insight on man's incarnate condition recognizes the wholeness of matter which is the foundation for sexuality. The document is positive and encouraging. The problematic is secondary.

"Obviously the atmosphere and mentality of a century cannot be set aside in a day, nor can the documents of a Council turn thought patterns around in a few years time. The Second Vatican Council could do no more than open possible directions. Pope Paul VI, with the encyclical *Humanae Vitae*, dealt a severe blow to the hopes and expectations of millions of Catholics. This was due mainly to the fact that he himself was and remained a child of the spirit that dominated Christianity before the Council. It is unfortunate that he was not more fully attuned to the human condition and its needs, as reflected through the report of the Commission on birth control. There are other documents, however, originating in the National Council of bishops, which indicate that many Church leaders really are in contact with their people and are struggling to incorporate the needs of their followers into their thinking.

"Since the concept of teaching authority is expanding to involve more maturity not only popes, bishops and sacred congregations, but theological thinkers as well, there is reason to look toward the future optimistically. The Common Catechism is one good example of the direction that Church thought patterns are taking. With dedicated research, open and sincere dialogue, and creative use of insight based on both Church traditions and contemporary sciences, the Christian can realistically assume that a full, thorough, mature theology of sexuality will soon be available.

Book Reviews

THE APOSTOLIC EXHORTATION OF POPE JOHN PAUL II — *Catechesi Tradendae (Handing on the Teaching)*

On the anniversary of the inauguration of his Pontificate (October 16) Pope John Paul II published his Apostolic Exhortation which incorporated the reflections of the late Popes Paul VI and John Paul I on the propositions presented by the 1977 Synod of Bishops on Catechesis. The present Holy Father's personal interest in the catechetical enterprise is reflected early in the document: "Catechesis has always been a central care in my ministry as a priest and as a bishop." "I ardently desire," he continues, "that this Apostolic Exhortation to the whole Church should strengthen the solidity of the faith and of Christian living, should give fresh vigor to the initiatives in hand, should stimulate creativity — with the required vigilance — to spread among the communities the joy of bringing the mystery of Christ to the world." There is much of John Paul II in the document, due, in part, to the fact that he served in the General Secretariat for the Synod of 1977.

The Holy Father applauds the progress made in catechesis; appreciates that it is not just didactic or totally doctrinal; recognizes that it is both cognitive and affective. He chooses also to treat some of the problems that have arisen as a result of an emphasis on just one dimension of religious education or some particular theoretician's personal opinion. The constant appeal for a systematic catechesis dealing with essentials, and his statement that what he is saying he is saying because of practical difficulties, is indicative of his awareness of the problems and misunderstandings that have emerged in catechesis in recent years. He invites the readers of the document to celebrate the progress made in the field, but also to recognize that there have been publications which have bewildered young people and adults by deliberately or unconsciously eliminating elements essential to the Church's faith. The Holy Father does not mince words. He seems to be setting the parameters for the catechetical enterprise in a very balanced but direct fashion. Recently, a statement was made that the Church in the United States' excellent *National Catechetical Directory* is both conservative and liberal because the Church is conservative and liberal, that every reader can look at it and see whatever he or she wants to see. (Confer the analysis of the special summer issue of the *Living Light* on the *National Catechetical Directory* in the *September 1979 F.C.S. News letter*, page 17). Certain elements of the alleged

ambiguity, viewed by some as present in the *National Catechetical Directory*, are addressed clearly and forcefully in a practical and pastoral fashion in this Apostolic Exhortation. Attention is drawn to the sections on continual balanced renewal; the need for systematic catechesis; catechesis and life experience; the source of catechesis; adaptation to local cultures; research and certainty of faith; catechesis and theology; catechetical literature; the role of the parish and school in catechesis; ecumenical catechesis. In the wake of the issuance of the *National Catechetical Directory*, discussion has arisen on a number of these points. The publication of this Apostolic Exhortation will serve to enhance the value of the *National Catechetical Directory* and contribute, in a significant way, to the on-going process of authentically implementing *Sharing the Light of Faith*, the *National Catechetical Directory*.

Some EXCERPTS:

"The Catechist . . . will not try to inculcate his personal opinions and options as if they expressed Christ's teaching . . ."

". . . catechesis is an education of children, young people and adults in the faith, which includes especially the teaching of Christian doctrine imparted, generally speaking, in an organic and systematic way . . ."

". . . It is useless to play off orthopraxis against orthodoxy: Christianity is inseparably both . . ."

"It is also quite useless to campaign for the abandonment of serious and orderly study of the message of Christ in the name of a method concentrating on life experience." . . .

"Nor is any opposition to be set up between a catechesis taking life as its point of departure and a traditional, doctrinal and systematic catechesis." . . .

"An exceptionally important expression of the living heritage placed in the custody of the pastors is found in the Creed or, to put it more concretely, in the Creeds that at crucial moments have summed up the church's faith in felicitous syntheses" . . .

"In the Creed of the People of God, proclaimed at the close of the 19th centenary of the martyrdom of the apostles Peter and Paul, my predecessor Paul VI decided to bring together the essential elements of the Catholic faith, especially those that presented greater difficulty or risked being ignored. This is a sure point of reference for the content of catechesis." . . .

Michael Wrenn

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

Msgr. Eugene Kevane, *Creed and Catechetics*, (Westminster, Maryland, Christian Classics, 1978)

Thomas F. Sullivan of Catholic University's religious education department finds (*Living Light*, Spring, 1979) *Creed and Catechetics* by Monsignor Eugene Kevane "an altogether incredible work." That is perhaps unconscious confirmation of what Cardinal John Wright in the book's foreward cites as the modern threat against the Church — "she is offered the option between preaching a message that men will accept or losing her 'credibility.'" The Church losing credibility in our time is a genuine threat. Which makes Fr. Sullivan's charge real. But readers are entitled to ask: Is Fr. Sullivan's incredulity Msgr. Kevane's fault?

The book is faulted in *Living Light* for the fact that "only a fraction — 83 pages in all — is actually devoted to a commentary on the Creed of the People of God. Approximately half the book is comprised of documentation: the texts of the Apostle's Creed, the Nicene Creed and the Creed of the People of God are given in both Latin and English." Faulted too, for the inclusion of other magisterial and Papal documents.

As a high school religion teacher I welcome this documentation. Many of today's catechetical experts eschew documentation, for it interferes with their own speculations or hypotheses. Father Sullivan, for example, remarks: "The author's central premise is that most or many contemporary religion textbooks are mortally ill with dreaded Neo-Modernist creedlessness. What is astonishing is that so sensational a charge is simply *gratuitously* (emphasis added) asserted throughout the book."

As a matter of fact, Msgr. Kevane's book demonstrates the following:

1. Cardinal Wright, late head of the *Sacred Congregation for the Clergy*, gives expert support to the same charge, and calls it a position of the Holy See in regard to the so-called Dutch catechism.
2. Catholic laity of Holland protested Modernist error in *A New Catechism* in a letter to Rome that promoted Papal intervention;
3. Pope Paul VI himself complained of the disloyalty of writers in our times.

Monsignor Kevane's book lends support to my own observations as a teacher that many of today's catechisms not only reflect the failings of the Dutch catechism, but are miniature versions of that work. The remedy for teachers are references, information, and documentation such as those in *Creed and Catechetics*.

An examination of Fr. Sullivan's own book explains his unhappiness with Msgr. Kevane's. In that work Sullivan accepts the "process" on

on-going revelation, a point of view rejected by the Holy See when it corrected the final draft of NCD, insisting that the word revelation be reserved to mean the full and completed Christian message. Sullivan also gives a false importance to "experience". As a teacher who has followed the statements of the 1977 Synod of Bishops I can testify that the "experiential" approach to catechetics is deficient. Thus the recent study of the National Catholic Educational Association finds seventh and eighth graders largely unaware of the fact and meaning of the Mass, the Real Presence, the Church, ecumenism, the Scriptures, the Immaculate Conception, grace, miracles. It is impossible to convey those meanings depending largely upon "experience."

In *Creed and Catechetics* Monsignor Kevane has offered teachers the way out of undue "focus" upon experiential catechetics. His book provides background for the many statements from the Synod on the need for doctrinal content, for Christ-centeredness and for fidelity to the Magisterium.

Sister Mary Francis

(Sister Mary Francis is a member of the I.H.M. Community in Wichita, Kansas)

Stanley L. Jaki, *The Road of Science and the Ways to God*, (University of Chicago Press, 1978). Reviewed by Fr. Vincent J. Rigdon, priest of the Archdiocese of Washington, D.C.

Fr. Jaki, who has earned doctorates in both physics and theology, confronts the relativist pre-suppositions of our age regarding science and Christianity and proposes counter-arguments. He argues convincingly, that Christianity is not *counter* to true scientific inquiry, and that *only* in the Christian milieu, a climate receptive to its metaphysics, is science able to grow. The Christian milieu, in his view, is not merely one among possible "culture media". It is the *only* one.

The Road of Science and the Ways to God is a collection of the *Gifford Lectures* given by Fr. Jaki from 1974 to 1976. He treats there the intimate connection between natural theology and the progress of science. He hammers home again and again that "real science is the science of a contingent universe." If genuine contact with reality, is lacking, if we are locked into some form of apriorism (in flavors ranging from Plotinus to Kant), genuine progress in science is not possible. Only with the belief that there *are* universal laws in a rational contingent universe, which men can practically hope to learn, is there reason to engage in scientific research — to dirty one's hands with experiments. Fr. Jaki argues that only in the

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

Christian West, starting about the time of the High Middle Ages, did there exist the cultural and philosophical matrix upon which to construct a valid scientific enterprise.

Fr. Jaki outlines the history of scientific endeavor from the ancient Greeks to the present. He points out the frustrating "blind alleys" along the road and analyzes them. Why, for instance, with the hopeful start of Greek science, did nothing of great substance happen? Why did the Chinese, who were well versed in astronomy, or the ancient Indians, who started so promisingly, fall by the wayside and fail to build on such promising foundations? Basically, says Fr. Jaki, because they were held captive by the cyclical view of history, the "Great Year" concept — flawed science because of flawed natural theology, flawed or non-existent metaphysics.

Fr. Jaki's arguments against Kant (to use just one example) are quite different from anything most readers of this review are likely to have seen-yet, they are possibly more telling. Not only was Kant a dangerous philosopher, he was a phenomenally bad scientist. Having destroyed metaphysics Kant proceeded to cut scientific facts down to size on the Procrustean bed of apriorism.

One cannot argue that all good scientists must be Christians — but the argument is made that all truly great minds of science at least implicitly accept the Christian matrix of natural theology. Albert Einstein and Max Planck are two such great men. Each was officially called an atheist because neither explicitly professed belief in a personal God. Yet each was humble in the presence of truth and "realized that their science had brought them dangerously close to being considered theists." (p. 322) In a letter written when he was seventy-three, Einstein spoke with childlike wonder at the simplicity and order in the universe — speaking of it as "miraculous" in nature. No wonder Einstein, at the end of his letter, felt it necessary to reassure his correspondent that he had not "fallen into the hands of priests." Max Planck, near the end of his life, found it necessary to deny rumors of his conversion to Catholicism!

The famous "Theory of Relativity" has an interesting sidelight. Fr. Jaki reports that in a widely publicized lecture entitled "From the Relative to the Absolute", given in 1924, Max Planck marshalled four elements in support of his thesis of absolutes in the physical world. One of them was the Einsteinian teaching of the absolute value of energy in terms of mass. Planck pointed out the "paradox" of relativity: "instead of relativizing everything, it unfolded absolute, objective aspects of the physical world." (p. 183)

Fr. Jaki's book is a real contribution, both to science and philosophy. It is strongly recommended, especially to those working in the sciences or teaching students exposed to the positivism of which this book is subversive. The fears of Einstein's friend have been realized and he has, with a rather noble company, "fallen into the hands of priests". There are worse fates.

Vincent J. Rigdon

(Fr. Rigdon is a priest of the Archdiocese of Washington, D.C.)

Dennis Doherty (Ed.) *Dimensions of Human Sexuality*, (New York: Doubleday, 1979, 249 pp. \$8.95).

This is a collection of essays responding to the Catholic Theological Society of America's report, *Human Sexuality: New Directions in American Catholic Thought*, by Anthony Kosnik et al. Nine chapters are included, with the final being a "Rejoinder" by Kosnik to the essays of the other contributors.

Two of the essays are sharply critical of the Kosnik volume. The one, concerned with the "Relevance of the Old Testament," was written by Joseph Jensen, O.S.B. and Carroll Stuhlmueller, C.P. Jensen endeavors to show that the Kosnik report's "use of Scripture is superficial and tendentious" (p. 2) and that a careful examination of its use of Scripture gives the impression "that area after area is being dealt with in order to stay up conclusions already arrived at" (p. 2). Stuhlmueller expands on some earlier criticism he had made of the report, arguing, among other things, that in the report "sexual sin is reduced too simplistically to ritual misdemeanors" (p. 8) and concluding that "the prophets condemned all adultery and prostitution, literally as such" (p. 16). Kosnik, in replying, argues that the use his committee made of Scripture was "selective" and not "superficial." contrasts the positions taken by Stuhlmueller with that of John L. McKenzie who is cited to the effect that "it is remarkable that the entire Old Testament never manages a clear and unambiguous moral condemnation of prostitution," and caps his rebuttal by lauding the "welcome contribution of Eugene LaVerdiere" to the collection (pp. 205-207). Since appeal to LaVerdiere (and the use he makes of redaction criticism in assessing "The Witness of the New Testament" to human sexuality) seems to be the clincher in Kosnik's rebuttal of the chapter contributed by Jensen and Stuhlmueller, it is useful to look at this "welcome contribution."

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

LaVerdiere, after praising Kosnik et al for recognizing that "all such New Testament statements passages on sexual morality / were occasional and historically conditioned" (p. 21), offers an exegesis of the Matthean account of Jesus' saying on marriage and divorce that to me can hardly be squared with modern biblical scholarship. According to LaVerdiere "adjustment to an ongoing mission to the gentile world and to the realities of this challenge . . . led Matthew to temper Mark's position on divorce and adultery. While the prohibition of divorce remains the *general rule* (emphasis added), the author recognizes situations which may call for divorce and he accepts possible exceptions in cases where unchastity has disrupted marital solidarity:" (33). The implications of this exegesis of Matthew are quite patent, and LaVerdiere draws them out when he says: "through the years, every effort has been made to explain away the exception clause which he (Matthew) included in his statement on the indissolubility of marriage. *It appears better to accept the obvious and to recognize that Church practice is at variance with the openness which Matthew felt free to affirm even in the face of Mark's absolute position.* Following Matthew, the Church would hold that while the marital intention must be unconditional and maintained until death *in fidelity* (emphasis added), conditions would well arise in which this intention is unfulfilled and marriage relationship dissolves" (pp. 37-38). Readers of LaVerdiere will doubtlessly conclude that Matthew, by his famous "exceptive clause," held that unchastity (of unspecified kinds) can indicate that there has been a "death in fidelity" and that the marriage relationship is dissolved so that divorce and subsequent remarriage are called for. I find this appalling exegesis and hermeneutics, and I find it most disturbing when it comes from one who claims to be presenting the best in modern biblical scholarship. The position developed by LaVerdiere in an essay that Kosnik warmly applauds as "welcome" would seem to be one utterly devastated by contemporary biblical scholarship, of which LaVerdiere is presumably cognizant. Here it should suffice to refer readers to Joseph Fitzmyer's article, "The Matthean Divorce Texts and Some New Palestinian Evidence," in *Theological Studies*, June, 1976, 197-226. Why this and similar studies on *porneia* in Matthew were ignored by LaVerdiere is a mystery to me.

The other essay sharply critical of the Kosnik report is one that I contributed. In it I contrasted the "separatist" understanding of human sexuality (with its attendant notion of the person and of moral norms permitting the deliberate repudiation of "biological functional goods" for the sake of

more "personalist" values, that is found in the Kosnik report) with the "integrist" understanding of human sexuality as inherently life-giving (procreative) and life-uniting (unitive), with its understanding of the person as a living human body and of moral norms respective of the goodness of every basic good of the person, that is found in *Humanae Vitae*. In replying to this essay Kosnik saw fit only to refer to the accusation that he and his associates are dualists who consider the person as a conscious subject and the body as the tool or instrument of the person. He heatedly rejects this criticism, holding that he is *not* a dualist in this sense. Here I think he speaks with the voice of Jacob, but his hands are the hands of Esau.

The dualism operative in Kosnik is indeed manifested in the contribution of Daniel Maguire to the volume, "Of Sex and Ethical Methodology." Maguire who is generous in his praise of Kosnik et al and who in turn is generously praised by Kosnik in his response, sharply distinguishes between the *physical function of sex, its means of reproduction*, and the *personal meaning of sex*. I agree, as do all who affirm the goodness of human sexuality, that the life-uniting, unitive dimension of sex is integral to its meaning, but I also hold that the *procreative* dimension of our sexuality is an integrally personal and not merely physically functional aspect of our sexuality. The hands of Esau are manifest in Maguire's chapter, and these hands betray the dualism of Kosnik despite his verbal denials.

Archbishop Bernardin, who is also critical of the report, is represented in an interview with the editor. It is unfortunate I think, that this format had to be followed, as it more or less constrained the Archbishop to set forth his views in a somewhat artificial framework. Nonetheless, it is good that this interview was included, and it merits considered attention.

A lengthy essay on "The Tradition in History" by Editor Dennis Doherty, is among the chapters. His essay needs to be very critically assessed; in my initial judgment I believe that he has read the history with a jaundiced eye, delighting in all the aberrations and anti-sexual, anti-feminine material that can be found in the Fathers, the scholastics, the manualists. Despite all that he says, however, it remains true that for Aquinas and other great medieval theologians, the exclusive procreative ideology of Augustine was broken. The goodness of marital intercourse, undertaken not to avoid fornication, but simply to express *fides*, was clearly recognized, and this aspect of the tradition is ignored. Ignored too is the stress that Aquinas gives to the friendship that should exist between spouses and the significance of this.

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

A chapter by Gregory Baum, heartily endorsing the Kosnik report and concerned with the kind of critical "enlightenment" that can come if we take seriously depth psychology and sociology, and a very challenging essay by Mayo and Patricia Mohs complete the volume. Scholars who know something of depth psychology and sociology could, I am sure, provide a much needed critique of the Baum contribution, and the deeply felt concerns of the Mohs need to be compassionately and *intelligently* responded to.

William E. May

John T. Catoir, **CATHOLICS AND BROKEN MARRIAGES**. Pastoral Possibilities of Annulment, Dissolution, The Internal Forum. (Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 1979. 69 pp. PB \$1.95.)

It is a shame that a potentially excellent book on broken marriages is substantially spoiled by one serious flaw that may be the occasion of leading many divorced and remarried Catholics into error about their situation. John Catoir has had ten years of experience as *officialis* in the Paterson diocese and should help many to form correct consciences regarding their rights and obligations with respect to marriage, divorce and remarriage. But, in my judgment, he proposes, or at least seems to imply, false doctrine about conscience, by applying sound Catholic doctrine regarding conscience in one sense to a different though legitimate understanding of the term. I find this form of error unfortunately all too common these days. When accepted Catholic teaching holds that a person must follow his conscience even if it is (invincibly) in error, it is in the context of defining conscience as a mental judgment of the rightness or wrongness of an action under consideration. To define conscience as an internal feeling of rightness or wrongness, as many Protestant moralists have done, is legitimate, etymologically speaking, and is the meaning understood by most people not formally trained in Catholic moral theology. But in this second sense, the above principle does not apply. One should consider whether this feeling is correct or not, and if it is incorrect, correct it. Several Anglican books of moral theology have made this distinction clearly. Many Catholics these days do not make the proper distinction. This is to be expected of those who deny any kind of objective morality — a position certainly not in accord with accepted Catholic teaching, including the clear teaching of Vatican II. Fr. Catoir, like others making similar claims or implications, appeals (on p. 60) to Vatican II's *Dignitatis Humanae* (Declaration on

Religious Freedom) to establish "the overall importance of conscience in the attribution of sin, and we have a responsibility to look upon the consciences of such people with respect." Such claims seem to result from a misreading or a very selective reading of the document. The declaration itself states that it is treating only of the right of persons to be immune from coercion by civil authorities to perform acts or accept a religion contrary to their conscience. And the same document states that Catholics should try to form correct consciences, using, among other means, the teaching of the Church. And other documents of Vatican II make it clear that it is the duty of bishops and priests to help those under their care to form correct consciences.

In some passages of his book, Fr. Catoir seems to recognize this. He indicates (p. 59) that persons in marriage situations which are insoluble under common law, should responsibly study the statements of the Church and thoughtfully review their life with a priest. But then he spoils it all by adding that, if after doing this, he "has no sense of sin, then he ought not be deprived of the Eucharist. The benefit of the doubt should favor the human conscience." (*ibid.*) And all this is the context of the previous question about "a second marriage which can never be recognized by the church as valid because the first marriage was undoubtedly valid." (p. 58)

Other passages which might lead one to suspect that Fr. Catoir is talking about conscience in the sense of feeling include: "I would ask first of all: Do you feel that you're living in sin?" (p. 59) and earlier: "A priest should be consulted in the privacy of the confessional. The priest . . . can exercise his function for the church by assisting the penitent to form a good conscience according to the circumstances of the case presented to him." Excellent, so far; but he adds: "The priest can reassure the penitent that in delicate matters such as these the private conscience can be trusted." (p. 55)

I trust that it is clear that the above criticism does not mean that I am denying the possibility that an honest and even a correct conscience in the traditional Catholic sense of the term could be in conflict with the external forum in these matters. I am even inclined to think that Fr. Catoir himself would handle such matters in the confessional in a way that I would find acceptable. But I do fear that what he says in this book will lead priests as well as lay persons in second marriages to confuse the presence or absence of guilt feelings as conscience rather than a mental judgment, taking into account the teachings of the Church. And I certainly believe that there can be internal forum

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

solutions which would justify the persons involved in receiving the sacraments.

That the Holy See accepts such possibilities of internal forum solutions was reaffirmed by the *Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* in a 1973 letter to local Ordinaries. The main point of the letter was to urge bishops to see to it that the doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage to be upheld in writings and in teaching, especially in seminary teaching. But the concluding paragraph reads:

With regard to admission to sacraments, the local Ordinaries will also please, on the one hand, stress observance of the current discipline of the Church while, on the other hand, take care that pastors of souls follow up with particular solicitude those who are living in an irregular union, and, in such cases, in addition to other correct means, use the approved practice of the Church in the internal forum. (*Canon Law Digest* vol. 8, pp. 632-33.)

Clearing up the ambiguity regarding conscience could make this a valuable book. The first chapter on "The Extent of the Problem" offers a number of worthwhile comments on the extent of divorce and the resulting evils; on the role of motherhood and childbearing; on the causes of divorce, including: not trying hard enough to make a life together, selfishness, materialism, neglect of spiritual values, and lack of proper preparation for married life. Chapter 2 on "The Annulment Process" gives a good outline of the process with some justified criticism of the slowness of handling cases in some jurisdictions. Besides the few objectionable uses of the term "conscience," I was also somewhat surprised to see a reference to a Vicariate of Rome decision of 1968 acknowledging the applicability of the distinction between notional and appreciative or evaluative knowledge as though this were the first official recognition of such a distinction. The Rota recognized the value of this distinction some 20 years before.

Even the third chapter, on "Pastoral Possibilities Where Annulments Are Not Possible," contains much that is good. The author urges bishops to greater care of their tribunals, especially by assigning more help to them. He urges avoidance of scandal in internal forum cases, and rightly adverts to and regrets many abuses in applying this type of solution.

The fourth and final chapter, "The Future of Ecclesiastical Tribunals," offers some interesting comments, including a stress on the indissolubility of marriage and the unchangeableness of human nature: "The future isn't going to change human nature and gospel values. Adultery is still going to be adultery." (p.66) Finally, as counsel to those who have been offended by their treatment by

Church authorities and tribunals, he suggests that they consider St. Joan of Arc as a model. To the end she insisted: "I love the Church, I will always love the church, because for me the church is Jesus Christ."

Joseph J. Farragher, S.J.

(Fr. Farragher, once an important Theological consultant to *Theological Studies*, now does case studies for *The Homiletic and Pastoral Reviews*.)

Thomas Michael Loome, *Liberal Catholicism, Reform Catholicism, Modernism* (Mainz, Grunewald, 1979)

Subtitled "A Contribution to a New Orientation in Modernist Research", this book was first written as a Tübingen study in theology – about ten years in the making. Its special virtue, claims the author, is its reliance on hitherto unpublished archival and other source material (p. 11). Arguing that modernist research remains in its infancy, even now almost a century after it surfaced in Catholicism, Professor Loome, who teaches theology at the College of Saint Catherine in St. Paul, Minnesota, sees his book not so much a history of modernism as a challenge to received notions on this subject and to the customary approach of historical research toward the crisis itself.

This volume of 452 pages is divided into three parts: (1) Definitions and Approaches; (2) Bibliographies; (3) A catalogue of unpublished sources and selected translations of one-time inaccessible documents. The bibliography is especially valuable because it catalogues a surprising amount of little known German literature. Readers will also be fascinated by correspondence involving such names as Lord Acton, Frederick Von Hugel, Edmund Bishop, Cuthbert Butler, George Tyrell, Albert Houtin, Wilfrid Ward and Pere Delehaye.

However, it is the first section of the book which requires detailed reporting and thoughtful analysis. "Modernism", which arose within the Church in the late years of the 19th century and which emerged again during the pre- and post-Vatican II years, should be studied for whatever lessons it has to offer – positive as well as negative – if the Church's future work of evangelization is to profit from research.

Loome distinguishes two distinct meanings to the term "modernism". First, as a self-enclosed philosophico-theological system, a heresy. Systematic modernism of this kind never existed, he alleges, was never advocated by anyone, and remains "a fiction created by Rome in order to justify its attempt to crush the real 'Modernism'" (p. 194). The second – and real – modernism was

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

"a loosely definable intellectual tradition within Roman Catholicism", "a tradition of critical scholarship among Roman Catholics", "the perennial attempt to reinterpret traditional belief in the light of the philosophy and the scholarship and science of the later and latest times." (*ibid.*) This scientific-historical tradition is identified as "liberal" or "reform" in contra-distinction to the scholastic and a-historical countertradition to which the Church had long been wedded.

Professor Loome makes another distinction important to his purposes — between "the modernist controversy" and the "modernist movement". The "controversy" or "crisis" covered a period of approximately only twenty years (c. 1895 — c. 1914) when the two antagonistic Catholic traditions engaged in embittered conflict. This mainly centered around the exegetical work of Alfred Loisy but can be found in other controversies (e.g. Americanism) which had nothing to do with Loisy. The "modernist movement," on the other hand, "at no point embraced more than a small minority of the modernists" i.e. "the adherents of the liberal Catholic intellectual tradition", was not organized, was abandoned by men of the stature of Von Hugel (When Loisy demonstrated moral failure in failing to bow to Church authority) ultimately was overrun by "third-rate Catholic scholars, by no-popery Protestants and Old Catholics, and by an odd assortment of religious cranks and eccentrics" (pp. 195-196). Loome wants it clearly understood that the "modernist movement" with its excesses and eccentricities (and implicitly a reasonable ground for Roman concerns and action) is not to be confused with the "modernist controversy" which was a legitimate episode "in the perennial conflict between two mutually antagonistic intellectual traditions within Roman Catholicism" (and implicitly which Rome wanted to strangle).

Loome's study is "a plea for a whole new orientation in modernist research", one which keeps the above distinctions in mind and makes a valid history of modernism possible.

Three models of true modernism captivated Loome and led to his research: George Tyrrell (1861-1909), "a challenge and an inspiration" (p. 13), Edmund Bishop (1846-1917), "the wisest and most perceptive commentator on the modernist controversy" (p. 62) and Frederick Von Hugel (1852-1925), "that rarest of all birds — an ultramontane: modernist", "a modernist sui-generis" (p. 131).

Tyrrell is identified as a "representative of a given Roman Catholic (i.e. liberal) tradition" (p. 125) initially formed in the Thomist tradition.

Later, he developed a disdain for the Vatican. His initial "passive resistance" to Rome ultimately became provocative confrontation for which he was excommunicated in 1907 and finally denied Christian burial. In spite of this Tyrrell always considered himself a Roman Catholic and "a representative of a legitimate Roman Catholic tradition" (p. 43).

Tyrrell's problem, unlike Loisy's, was not a matter of faith but ecclesiological. He was more interested in the importance of the invisible Church, and the devotional life of the Christian people than he was in dogmas, laws or hierarchy. Some of his more pungent remarks are reported by Loome as follows: "The Pope is not the *inherent* head of the organism" (p. 37); "Newman was an incurable ecclesiast, fighting for ecclesiasticism with modern weapons" (p. 39); "Rome is the new religion" (p. 44); "[concerning *Lamentabili*] at least 25 of these propositions will prove as evidently false to the next generation as the condemnation of Galileo" (*ibid.*); "sacraments are good: but there is something better, more necessary" (p. 45); "Roma locuta est, ecclesia finita est" (p. 53); "our work must be to work within the Church for the unravelling of this gigantic papal imposition" (p. 57); [He calls for] the inversion of the hierarchic pyramid now unstably poised on its apex and which needs to be planted firmly on its basis; for the recognition of the *Regale sacerdotium* of the Christian people as the fount of all order and jurisdiction" (p. 58); "it is perfectly clear we are in conflict with the *authorized* tenets of Catholicism" (*ibid.*).

After the encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* was issued (September 8, 1907) Loome interprets Tyrrell's reaction as follows: "The encyclical was like a sleight of hand trick. It fabricated a bugaboo to frighten the children. The children in their turn were expected to be so seized by fear that they would accept unquestionably their father's (otherwise intolerable) decision to lock them up in a closet" (p. 93). Loome concludes: "The orthodoxy preached in *Pascendi* was, for Tyrrell at least, not 'Catholicism' but a catena of the personal opinions of Pius X and his immediate entourage (p. 97)."

Edmund Bishop, on the other hand, was a layman, a liturgist, and a convert to Rome immediately prior to Vatican I (1867). Loome explains Bishop as follows: "[He] was hardly so ignorant as to identify 'the Church' with 'Rome' and was in fact acutely, even painfully aware of that other 'Church' — 'the Christian people themselves,' the community of believers, the mystical society of those living in Christ. This was the only 'Church' to

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

which Bishop was devoted and wished to serve. But with this distinction between the Catholic *religion* and the Catholic *Church* Bishop calmly and deliberately disavowed 'the Church' understood as 'Rome', as 'ecclesiastical authority', as 'the hierarchy'." (p. 63)

Bishop recognized two elements — Rome's ecclesiastical policy "that affected him personally": "first the claim of Rome to regulate all scholarly endeavor; second, the relegation of the laity to a place of passive subordination in the Church." (p. 70) Though Bishop considered himself a modernist he took no part in the controversy. However, he did identify with Tyrrell and while reading the latter's *Autobiography and Life* penned the following marginal notes: "Rome is . . . an embodied and *organized egotism*"; "Our Church is full of . . . scandals"; "The S.J. man is . . . at least a potential *fanatic*"; and so forth (p. 75). Bishop assumed these positions because he was violently opposed to the exaltation of the scholastic tradition at the expense of all others and of the clericalization of learning which meant Rome-power over Catholic scholarship. He considered the modernist controversy nothing more than a contest against 'the Roman Spirit'. (p. 101)

Professor Looome's best model of Catholic modernism (best in the sense of the one to imitate) was Frederick Von Hugel, a layman with a profound interest in the historico-critical method of research, especially as applied to biblical studies, whose rise to intellectual eminence began with Loisy but who ended his days rejecting his modernist past. Looome, however, does not want Von Hugel to be understood or judged simply within the context of modernism. Looome prefers to associate him primarily with scientific scholarship and loyalty to Rome. Although committed to historical research and correct biblical exegesis, Von Hugel rejected both Acton and Dollinger for their "deficient devotional spirit" and their unwillingness to submit to Rome. Von Hugel also rejected Dollinger's thesis that the theologian had a prophetic role to play in the Church. Von Hugel demanded that a good modernist had to be (1) a man of scholarship, (2) a man of piety, (3) with loyalty to Rome.

Von Hugel not only had no use for excessive suspicion and antipathy toward the Vatican (which he found in Bishop) but laid great stress on the spiritual life, strongly convinced also "that men require the support and correction of an institutional life and atmosphere without which they promptly succumb to the weakest assertions of modern philosophy." (p. 189)

What can one say of this book? It is a good piece of work with valuable documentation. Scho-

lars will profit by reading its contents and weighing its judgments. There is always a question in a book like this (which originally was a dissertation) about how much or little the author is caught up in the opinions of his sources. In this particular case — because there are so many broken or partial quotations — the reader will not always be sure whether it is Looome speaking for himself or merely interpreting his sources. In some instances he identifies quite clearly with his heroes — Tyrrell, Bishop, Von Hugel — making (seemingly) his own their complaints against the Church or extolling their virtues when perhaps virtues (of faith, of temperance, prudence, or justice) were not in evidence. Enemies of modernism are sometimes called "notorious" (p. 127), hardly ever modernists; Msgr. Joseph Fenton is listed as the chief "representative of the inquisitorial school", although many of "those who took a strict orthodoxy as their guide" (Looome's words) never really identified with either the substance or the style of that Springfield (Mass.) priest (p. 133); modernists are repeatedly catalogued as a "small number of scholars" (p. 125), although if that were true one wonders why such a book is necessary at this late date; the opposition to modernism among ordinary Catholics in the late 19th century is called "prejudice" (p. 155), when it is possible that it merely represented "judgment"; and so forth. Even so, Looome taking note of the harsh and one-sided criticism of modernists immediately following the 1907 condemnation, is quick to point out that "the tables have now been reversed." Says he: "There is nothing quite so fashionable as uncritical adulation of anything and anyone bearing the name 'modernist' . . . The 'modernists' are now handled with kid gloves. For Pius X and those who bore authority in the Church at the turn of the century there is hardly a kind word, and when uttered the sheepish and embarrassed tone is unmistakable . . . The 'modernists' are hailed as the forerunners and prophets of Vatican II" (pp. 130-131).

Apart from these general observations, what else can be said about the book?

First about its general thesis. Is real modernism only an effort to update Catholicism, ruined by those whom Looome calls infidels like Loisy and third-rate thinkers like Marcel Hebert, anti-celibacy pamphleteers like William Sullivan, juvenile clerics like Ernesto Buonaiuti* (p. 169)? Were the real modernists only few in number, as Looome keeps repeating, or widespread, even among priests, as *Pascendi* suggested? Modern day sociologist Peter Berger says that birds of a feather flock together not out of luxury but as a necessity, which makes conspiracy anywhere not necessarily an organized

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

effort (and therefore readily documented) but a natural and elusive phenomenon in times of change. What is a first-rate scholar as compared with one called "third-rate"? And who determines that? Looome is high on Tyrrell, even though Bernard Reordan (*in Roman Catholic Modernism* (p. 37) does not consider him a scholar, "not perhaps even a theologian," merely an apologist for his own cause. These are not inconsiderable questions which are not always answered satisfactorily by Professor Looome, although his position seems clearly to suggest that he knows what real modernism is and that it was merely a distinct Catholic intellectual tradition promoted harmlessly by real scholars and prostituted by infidels and second-rate thinkers.

Secondly, there is a tendency in the book (as in all late treatments of modernism) to turn intellectuals into sacred cows, like Acton (who was often arrogant and not exactly the pillar of objectivity), Dollinger (who apparently never overcame the influence of his anti-clerical father), Tyrrell (who by personality was melancholic, restless, and bitter), Von Hugel (who was sickly, nervous, a worry wart, and a man of poor judgment — having patronized Loisy almost to the end, earning for himself in one place the title "Bishop of Modernism").

Thirdly, his feeling that the German influence on modernism has been underrated may be due to the fact that it was localized in that country with German scholars less extreme, than to the fact that more researchers lack adequate knowledge of the German language, as Looome asserts.

Finally, there is the treatment of decisions by Church authority which Looome handles only in scatter-gun fashion. It is not easy to tell whether ecclesiastics were ever right and academicians ever wrong. Was Rome correct in excommunicating Tyrrell (whose faith certainly was not Rome's) or was it merely persecution by "a notorious ultramontaine (Bishop Amigo of Southwark) out for blood" (p. 102-103)? Looome thinks a permissive bishop like the Frenchman Mignot would have made the difference. Yet Mignot, a patent Loisy supporter, was himself under suspicion in Rome and having almost dug his own ecclesiastical grave, was relieved (once Loisy's lack of faith was clear) to have Rome act. Modernism may have been a phantom heresy to some but there was a difference between Mohler, Newman, Blondel and the modernists who ultimately were censured. Both groups may have raised the right questions prompted by the development of the scientific method but the condemned scholars ended up offering answers that were not only inconsistent with Christian faith but hardly scientific at all. Looome himself cites Wilfrid Ward's comment (p. 178) that, while the

conclusions of science are true enough, "conjectures are not conclusions of science." Even today seven decades later many so-called conclusions of biblical science are little more than conjectures. While *Pascendi* used strong language at times in its condemnation of modernism, Pope Pius X clearly was attacking those extremist scholars who were agnostics, immanentists, and crude evolutionists. However another Pope might have dealt with this situation, Pius X undoubtedly preserved the essential life of the Church, a compliment paid him on his death by no less an observer than the Anglican editor of the *London Times* (August 21, 1914).

Recently scholarly writing tends to talk of oppression and the suppression of scholarly initiative but some use of authority in religious matters has divine sanction for men of faith. To his credit Looome tries to give proper credit without belaboring the matter. First, concerning a common presumption Church authorities at the turn of the century were cruel Looome says:

"Those who bore ecclesiastical authority at the turn of the century were conscientious and honorable churchmen; incompetent, many of them, often unprepared for the world with which they were confronted, but almost universally devout and upright men, genuinely concerned to exercise prudence, practice justice and defend the good. They were the inevitable results, and perhaps the victims also, of an ecclesiastical tradition that left them almost defenseless in the face of the 'modernist crisis' in all its embittered intensity. Nothing, however, can so obscure the dramatic nature of the events that constitute 'the modernist crisis' than the portrayal of those in ecclesiastical authority as villains of the piece. In this drama there were few villains on either side, but victims beyond number on both. The ineptness of ecclesiastical authority in dealing with 'the modernists' was surely one of the causes of the debacle that ensued, but — and it bears repeating — it was merely one cause, and not the decisive one." (p. 172)

Concerning the tendency to make martyrs of all modernists Looome says:

"There is perhaps always an ecclesiastical world composed of unstable, occasionally even unsavoury clerics, men who in times of relative calm only rarely make themselves conspicuous. In periods of uncertainty and turmoil, however, it is this element which can rise to the surface and exult in a brief moment of notoriety. The 'modernist movement' was all too successful in attracting to itself just this element, one which contributed in a major way to the disrepute into which 'the movement' soon fell and to the reaction that set in from the side of ecclesiastical authority." (p. 173)

Concerning a frequent assertion that scholars fighting authority are necessarily champions of the people Looome says this is not so (pp. 101-102):

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

"What must first be stressed is that the controversy was *not* an affair in which 'Rome' found itself alone against the rest of the world . . . The vast mass of the laity . . . if asked, would have sided instinctively with ecclesiastical authority. Rome did in fact speak for the overwhelming majority of Catholics — that 'the Roman spirit' was universally present throughout the Church in every nation, every diocese, at every seminary and university." (The same judgment could not be made in 1979).

In conclusion, one should fairly note the obvious: out of evil good frequently ensues. The modernist assault on Catholicism (once the bad days were behind) led more orthodox thinkers to rediscover Catholic Christianity more as religious experience than mechanical loyalty, the importance of scripture, the handicaps of living in a cultural ghetto, the development of dogma as an essential ingredient of a Living Church, an organic Church in which all Christians have a role, however different that may be, the vital place of Catholic intelligence, and the importance of shepherding in the Church — reaching out to the lost sheep of the fold, even to the sheep who wanted no part of the fold.

Professor Loome leaves one enigma without really touching it discursively: Why are churchmen so afraid of opening up archives once living actors on the church scene have gone to their eternal judgment? Granted the reason may be a greater concern for charity than scholars give them credit for, there comes a time when the good of the Church's reputation (and the reputation of its bishops) calls for revelation. The one-time "hundred year rule" of the Vatican (prohibiting access to archives) became senseless when it provided the enemies of the Church (sometimes within its bosom) a field day to use at will only the archives of the enemies. Loome takes note of this restriction early (p. 19), without reporting that the secret Vatican archives are now open to 1903. He also reports how much of the correspondence about modernism of people like Cardinals Vaughan and Bourne have been destroyed, forever denying history the benefits of their information and evaluations. Since the Church has suffered in the scholarly community from this self-imposed cloister, the time has come, if only as a matter of self-defense, to let scholars evaluate the whole story. Rome can never appear worse in the public eye than it has as a result of *ex parte* accusations of oppression or of sympathetic presentations of men who no longer believed in the Church. Those who have direct experience in ecclesial decision making suspect church authority might come off well, certainly no worse.

Professor Loome has made a contribution to

this understanding, although his work probably will not enjoy wide appreciation (1) because the book is available in North America only by ordering from him at St. Catherine's College, St. Paul, Mn 55105, and (2) at a cost of \$40.00.

George A. Kelly

John A. Coleman, *The Evolution of Dutch Catholicism, 1958-1974*, University of California, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1978, 328 pp., no price given.

American reviewers of Fr. Coleman's survey of contemporary Dutch Catholicism (or of "reform-Catholicism" almost anywhere) tend to praise change and the things it brings about (whether substantial change like collegiality or accidental as communion in the hand). They do not always seem to be aware that change (or experiment) is not the same as renewal. Pope John wished a renewal in the Church which he associated with a new Pentecost. Unfortunately, change took charge and frequently inhibited or seriously hampered true spiritual renewal. Change was looked upon as improvement, even as many parents complained: "I wish the change and quarrels would stop so that someone could give us a little more faith." Many young people, who no longer go near a church, still ask the right question: "Tell us who God is and where can we find Him." As a Dutch priest who has observed the Dutch Church from within Holland and from far away, I am more concerned with the substance of recent Church changes and judge Fr. Coleman's book from a perspective different from many Americans.

To do justice to this book is no easy task because it is offered as a "historical-sociological study of recent *revolutionary changes* in the Roman Catholic church in the Netherlands" while having as a title "*The Evolution of Dutch Catholicism, 1958-1974*". The book's opening sentence reads "It was apparent to anyone attentively following the religious news stories in the 1960s that a genuine *revolution* was occurring within *Dutch Catholicism* (p. 1 emphasis added)." Evidently, from the very beginning of this book confusion results from the clash between the words "*evolution*" and "*revolution*". The reader cannot be sure whether this study concerns growth through evolution, or revolutionary politics within the Church.

Writing contemporary history is always a difficult and risky business, a point that need not be elaborated in this review. While the author gives an acceptable reason for beginning his report with

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

Pope John's election in 1958, we do not find in the book a reason why he ends the story in 1974, since he refers to events occurring after that year. More disconcerting is the author's claim that this is a sociological study, a legitimate task indeed, provided that at no time a priest writer loses sight of the Divine dimension. Here in our opinion, the author has failed.

This reviewer appreciates the formidable difficulties facing Fr. Coleman, especially the danger of factual errors and wrong interpretations. It was a wise move to subject his work to what he calls 'a manuscript length criticism' (p. viii). However, a historical-sociological study ought to be criticized and corrected by a trained historian or sociologist. Unfortunately, J. van Kilsdonk S.J. is neither historian nor sociologist by university standards. Nor is it comforting to read that van Kilsdonk saved Coleman from many factual errors (*ibid*) since the reader soon discovers that by no means all errors have been corrected. The critic was also not very strict in challenging the author's interpretations of data. Evaluating contemporary history is surely difficult for one who has lived through revolutionary changes. It may be too much for someone 'who was not there' to interpret correctly events, opinions or decisions that accompany profound change. The author spent four or five years in Holland, seemingly a fair share of the years covered by the study. But, contemporary history in Holland did not begin starkly in 1958. Preceding years are very important. Since Coleman was not in Holland during those earlier years, even decades, he is forced to rely on religious news stories (p. 1), mostly written by journalists, who rarely enjoy scholarly accuracy or depth. Another of his sources is statistics, but these too have only relative value because they deal with the Church's structure, not with its inner life. Coleman counts on questionnaires, of which there were all too many in the period covered. The question the author never asks, however, is whether these questionnaires were genuine, honest or fair. It is very difficult to frame questions correctly, as everyone knows. By way of example: the statement that a good Catholic must accept all that the church prescribes, really should employ the verb "teaches" (p. 224) for a good answer. Fr. Coleman never examines by whom and to whom questionnaires were sent, how many never replied, etc.

His third option involved conversations with people in Holland who, hopefully, were knowledgeable about what was taking place within the lives of the Catholics. However, Coleman's list of consultors does not inspire confidence, and worse, he omits names like Prof. van der Ploeg, Prof. van der Meer (both at the Catholic University

at Nijmegen), the convert Dr. Cornelia de Vogel, one time professor at the University of Utrecht. These omissions raise doubts about the objectivity of the book. Probably, the fundamental difficulty with the book is that the author operates from what is basically a political position: the old liberal versus conservative syndrome. Such a classification never yields clarity about Church affairs, because very simply the Church is not simply a political reality. No wonder in his expositions and evaluations the author hardly ever mentions dogma.

The handicaps mentioned and implied so far tend to force the author to subjective interpretations and conclusions. The study, therefore, becomes an interesting but incomplete work, slanted, and at times a very inaccurate survey of events, changes, and decisions within the Dutch Church. The book becomes so subjective on occasion that in presenting and interpreting the Dutch Catholic happenings the author's anger erupts (e.g. in his treatment of the 'Mandament', of the insignificant monthly 'Confrontatie', of the person, behavior and opinions of the youngest and rather controversial Bishop Gijzen.) Contrariwise, adulation is bestowed on Bishop Bekkers, called 'Willy Bekkers' (although in the six years that I lived in his diocese I never heard anybody call or address him in this way), on J. van Kilsdonk, S.J. called 'an important reformer', on Ousterhuis, identified as 'an internationally known poet' (p. 134: the readers better check this for themselves), on Bernard Huybers who 'resigned from the Jesuits' for being 'the leading Dutch liturgist' (p. 287), and on some others. Within the same framework Coleman goes out of his way to make unpleasant insinuations, e.g. "Rome saw to it" (p. 257). Injustice enters the picture when a highly respected priest, (indeed respected by the majority of Dutch people,) is referred to as an eighty year old priest from the 'Rich Roman Life' period, whose sin is that he was a regular contributor to the monthly 'Confrontatie' (p. 234). Not a word is said about this priest, Fr. Henri de Greeve, being forbidden in the fifties to continue his very popular and courageous radio-talks. There is injustice also in this book when Dr. Haye (always misspelt Heya) van der Meer S.J. is said to be one "whose reputation among Dutch Jesuits was that of a conservative moderate with a propensity to one-sided propagation of a traditional duty-and-humility rhetoric." This sort of description by Coleman is neither history nor sociology (p. 287). In a similar strain the new seminary in Rolduc is called 'old-style', which it is not as those who have been there and seen it will affirm.

These descriptions are all the more regrettable because the reader is now led to be suspicious of

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

the author's true intent, and, as he reads on, he gains the impression that the facts are made to fit the author's theory. The book then becomes a superficial phenomenology of Dutch Catholicism, not a disciplined sociological research.

Subjectivism also leads Fr. Coleman repeatedly to exaggerate, as when he speaks of a vigorous Catholic press. He fails to mention that a national Dutch Catholic daily no longer exists (in the fifties there were three). He speaks of a widely-read weekly *De Nieuwe Linie*, so widely read that it has been on the brink of collapse for years for lack of subscribers! Coleman writes of the *amazing collective* enthusiasm for the Pastoral Council (p. 22) when in fact there was little collective acclaim at all: it is typical of the Dutch character to watch and wait. His report that Bishop Bekkers' death in 1966 provokes him to expressions of sincere grief and loss from *every segment* of the Dutch population (presumably Catholic, Protestant, Socialist, Communist, Atheist), which is plainly ridiculous and must be balanced against the painful fact that many Catholics talked instead of Providence. That the Bishops were accepted as 'national heroes' will also make many Dutch Catholics smile (p. 201, 204). Such exaggerations go hand in hand with many inaccuracies, as when *The TIJD* is called a periodical when actually it was a daily paper; the first Gymnasium is said to have been established in 1905 (p. 44) when in fact the Jesuits opened a Gymnasium in Amsterdam in 1894 and in Nijmegen in 1900; mention is made of pre-1950 opposition to ecumenism (p. 2) when in fact Prof. J. van Ginneken and Dr. W. Kemper, both Jesuits, gave the Spiritual Exercises to Protestants before the Second World War. Coleman simply writes poetry when he says that the conservative voice was '*slightly underrepresented*' at the Pastoral Council (italics added p. 172, 193), that a return to the old-style seminary was unlikely or had not much chance of recruiting a respected faculty (p. 212), that Dutch Catholicism (sic) successfully opposed a Roman move to dismiss (p. 296) married ex-priests from their teaching posts in the theological centers (the fact being that Rome's decision left ex-priests professors undisturbed if their marriage took place before 1972); when he writes of Roman efforts to deny ex-priests the rights which all lay people possess (while in actual fact it was and still is a matter of wisdom where and how to exercise these rights p. 198). At times the unpleasant word "lie" occurs to this reviewer when Coleman maintains that *Confrontatie* does not accept the principles of pluriformity, democratization, or dialogue within the church (p. 237). *Confrontatie* may have reservations about democratization, but it is something else to accept dialogue when the enemy party lays

down the rules. And how does the reader handle, for example, the statement that according to the Jesuit Constitutions, a Jesuit may not accept an office within the diocesan Church unless expressly commanded to do so by the Pope? No reference is given to substantiate this allegation and no reference can be found. The passage which probably the author here vaguely remembers deals with a completely different situation. At times the reviewer's furrowed brow gave way to a smile as when he read that until the sixties informal rules stipulated that Dutch Catholics supported only their own milkmen, their own grocery stores, and their own taboconists (p. 66). Anyone familiar with the shopping habits of Dutch housewives knows their special gift for spotting a bargain, caring less whether the grocer or tobacconist is Jew or Christian, Catholic or Communist. It is no laughing matter, however, when the author makes the Dutch Bishops out to be religious monarchs after World War II (p. 84), and by implication priests mere agents of bishops, a charge he repeats a number of times. This may have once been true of Callier and Diepen (Bishops who go back to the twenties), but it is unjust to say this of heroic war Bishops, of men like Lemmens and Huybers, who were very much shepherds of their flock.

This survey of Dutch Catholicism is marred by a distorted vision, even bias, of which the author does not seem to be aware. The writer admits that he tempers his optimism about the future because demonstrably the Dutch Church has suffered statistical declines (church attendance, defections from priesthood and religious life, lack of vocations, etc.) He then goes on to state that such statistical evidence does not warrant the charge that the Church's institutional strength has been seriously damaged for its future mission (p. 209). A more objective assessment is that institutional strength has been very, very seriously damaged, many priests and religious just going their own way and doing their own thing, and that many lay people have become cynical about what is being done, that the Church's spiritual weakness has become a source of suffering for many who yearn for faith and true prayer.

The lack of sober objectivity, in such marked contrast with *Steps Beyond Impasse, A Chronicle of the Dutch Church: Amsterdam October 27, 1968 - March 2, 1969* (edited by Lucien Roy and Forrest Ingram, Newman Press, 247 pp. 1969) leaps to the fore as the author tackles the Dutch Bishops' *Mandatory Letter* (Het Mandament) of 1954. This pastoral letter deals with 'columnization' (the author's translation of 'verzuiling', *zuil* being translated by *column*). This metaphor became common coinage after the Second World War

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

to explain traditional political and social life. Dutch society was roughly divided into three groups (or supported by the 'zuilen' i.e. columns) Catholic, Protestant (with some three or four sub-divisions) and Socialist. There was little love lost between these political blocs. Matters did not get any better following the First World War when the Socialists staged a quasi-revolution aimed at deposing the Monarchy. Regiments from the south (mostly Catholic) quelled the unrest, but distrust of the Socialists lingered for a very long time. During the twenties elections were bitterly fought, calling forth even young bicyclers – rather innocuously – to invade Socialists strongholds in the cities. In the thirties a profound change took place. The Nazi party (N.S.B) became the common enemy of all Dutch parties. In 1933 Dutch Nazis won eight seats (out of a hundred) in the lower chamber; four years later to the great elation of all other parties this number was cut in half. About this time the Dutch obtained their first 'Rooms-Rood' (Roman-Red) cabinet, a sign that columnization was weakening. During the war the Germans eliminated all political parties, but allowed the 'Democratic Union', which cut right through the old Dutch party system, a brief existence. In 1942 the Germans swooped down upon the Dutch elite, priests and laymen, Catholics, Protestants, Socialists, Communists, placing five or six hundred hostages in their camps at Haaren and St. Michelsgestel (and promptly shooting five of them on August 15, with more to follow). It was at this time and in these camps that patriotic Dutchmen found an unknown unity and harmony. Even if they did not share each other's ideologies, they began to ask whether this oneness could or should be continued after the war. Serious thoughts were raised about a two-party system patterned after the English model. But the war was hardly over when this dream soon proved to be a fantasy. Although the country was not dissatisfied with its first three post-war Prime Ministers, Schermerhorn (Protestant), Beel (Catholic) and 'Vadertje Drees' (Daddy Drees, Socialist), power-grabbing among blocs became once again a face of Dutch political life.

Against this background the Bishops (in 1954, and nine years after the war's end) wrote their *Mandatory Letter*. It was inspired by their conviction that the country, not just the Catholics, was better served if Catholics maintained their inner unity. The letter did contain a stern warning against moving with Socialists. This, it is now generally admitted, was a political mistake. The Bishops had theoretical socialism in mind – with its abhorrence of private property, and advocacy of class warfare – when this brand of socialism hardly existed in Holland, as was made evident in the

party's name change from *Socialist Democratic Laborers' Party* (S.D.A.P.) to Labor Party (Partij van Arbeid). A small minority of Catholics rejected the Bishops' Mandatory Letter.

In his treatment of the *Mandatory Letter* Fr. Coleman gives full rein to his emotions. The Bishops are accused of continuing 'columnization', of preventing the forgoing of Dutch civil unity. They are called religious monarchs, the agents of Rome, over-anxious to hold on to power, who lord it over lay people, etc. The author's treatment of the *Mandatory Letter* is most dramatic, although after its publication (1954) daily doings in Catholic Holland went on just as before – with one exception. That was an increase in the number of 'zuilen' (columns) until by the 1960's there were ten or twelve in number. The Catholics split. The Liberals split, hence D. 66 and D. 70 (D standing for parties using the word Democrat). What Fr. Coleman gives no evidence of understanding is that these splits had nothing to do with "Catholic lay people and priests flexing their muscle", but was part of what was astir among Dutch people generally.

It is no surprise to find Fr. Coleman enthusiastic about the *Dutch National Pastoral Council* (composed of priests, religious and lay people) discussing celibacy, the authority of Rome, etc. Coleman refers to the objection that the Council was not truly representative, but he never evaluates the fact that most Dutchmen hardly took it seriously. In my town, when we were asked to vote, the local joke was "Vote Venneker", Venneker being a well-known soccer player, not even a Catholic. The author might have tempered his enthusiasm (probably) if he had checked the results of the annual collection intended by Bishops to finance the expensive Council-meetings. Fr. Coleman would have noticed a tendency towards bankruptcy because the Dutch have real skill at deciding how their money is spent.

There are other reflections of avant-garde Amsterdam Catholicism in his reporting. The Bishops did not write the 1965 pastoral letter for little reason – a pastoral in which they assured Catholics that their faith had not changed, mentioning the dogmas that still stood even though doubts about them were raised in the media – (e.g. the Resurrection, Real Presence, Christ's Divinity). Coleman glosses over the fact that when married ex-priest Oosterhuis celebrated Mass in the Amsterdam Ecclesia, Haarlem's Bishop responded to the violation merely by declaring that this student-ecclesia had placed itself "outside his responsibility". (This was his literal formula), although many Catholics expected him to say something like 'placed itself thereby outside of Catholic bounds'.

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

Another weak but diplomatic-sounding response was given by the same Bishop when an ex-priest continued to celebrate the Eucharist in Beverwijk after his marriage (p. 243). Such episcopal behavior tended to undermine the authority of all Dutch Bishops, although by that time the very word 'authority' was bad news all over Holland.

Fr. Coleman's book is not a good book nor a trustworthy guide in the labyrinth of recent Dutch Catholicism. Coleman would have profited from reading the scholarly study of Cornelia de Vogel: *De Grondslag van Onze Zekerheid (The Foundation of our Certainty)*, which would have provided the solid foundation which is so sadly absent in his "Evolution of Dutch Catholicism". The five years that have elapsed since he put down his pen have provided the refutation of his opinions. Ask anybody with a sense of responsibility toward the Church and he will hear: "Conditions are worse than ever." When the seven Bishops go to Rome in January 1980, not of their own free will, but under orders from John Paul II many Dutch Catholics will watch with interest but wariness, also. The highly praised achievement of collegiality (see Steeman's review in *America* of September 22, 1979) has been accompanied by thoroughgoing divisiveness. It is not an idle statement when the word *de facto* schism is said to characterize the Dutch Church.

There is little joy in reviewing a book in this wise. But then, with a slight variation on Gilbert and Sullivan "a reviewer's lot is not a happy one".

William Peters, S.J.

(Fr. Peters, a member of the Dutch of the Society of Jesus, received his doctorate at the University of Amsterdam. His study of the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius was first published in 1967. He has lectured widely in various countries.)

(Editors Note: Fr. Theodore M. Steeman, OFM of Boston College, praised this book in *America* (September 22, 1979) for its analysis of what he called "a successful institutionalization of post-Vatican II collegial church structures" and for having "disseminated the theology of Vatican II" and Coleman, too, for showing that collegial models invented in Holland "are indeed viable.")

A rather close analysis, entitled "Dutch Catholicism in Historical Perspective: 1919-1977" prepared by Jan Bots, S.J. for *Communio* (Fall 1979), traces the Dutch Church through various stages from a controlled obedient Church, to disintegration (1967), now a disintegrated Church controlled by "extra-ecclesiastical rulers.")

Conrad W. Baars, M.D., *Feeling and Healing Your Emotions*, Plainfield, N.J., Logos International, 1979

Dr. Baars' latest book, *Feeling and Healing*

Your Emotions, is written for all Christians, including Evangelicals and other Protestants. He successfully addresses this diverse group, not by proceeding from Scriptural or Freudian premises, but from the Thomistic perspective of rational psychology — the study of man as a whole being, including his spiritual life. Psychoanalytic views of anxiety and repression are brilliantly reinterpreted. False ways of interpreting Scriptural references to our "lower nature" and to emotions such as anger, fear and desire, are exposed. And the most pervasive psychic disturbance of our time, discovered and called deprivation neurosis by Terruwe and Baars, is explained.

The most puzzling aspect of our nature, according to the author, is our emotional life. For example, we have a difficult time properly relating emotions with morality. We are thrown off balance by the strong tendency to moralize our emotions and feelings in either of two ways: by using them as subjective standards for moral values (if it feels good, it's right), or by submitting them to objective moral standards, and judging them as morally good or bad. The fact is that our emotions, including anger and desire, are morally neutral. The emotion itself is not subject to moral judgment anymore than having arms and legs. It is what we do after our "psychic motors," as the author calls them, have been activated, that is subject to objective morality. "Unless we clearly differentiate between emotion and behavior," he says, "we will never overcome the confusion, fear and suspicion surrounding the topic of man's emotional life."

Though emotions and feelings are always naturally good like arms and legs, and are morally neutral, they have an innate need to be guided by reason. However, reason needs something to guide. Every emotion should be allowed to be itself. It should be consciously felt. But a strong arousal of anger, for example, does not have to be expressed in angry words or deeds.

Fear of what anger might lead to, or courage (energy), the opposite of fear, are two emotions that have caused many to repress anger, not even allowing it to be felt. One emotion blocks another. Eventually, the result can become a severe neurotic condition. "It is not the task of emotions to interfere with each other, nor to control each other. All emotions are to operate on the same level, and reason alone can determine what courses of action are proper under the circumstances."

This interpretation of repression — one emotion blocking another — is Thomistic rather than Freudian. According to Freud, the superego, or the inner voice of do's and don'ts, is the repressing agent. Over 20 years ago, when Dr. Baars was treating repression with psychoanalytic methods and views, healing was so rare that, at one point, he

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

decided to abandon psychiatry. Then, providentially, he met Anna Terruwe and discovered her Thomistic method of liberating buried emotions by easing the pressure of over-developed emotions that were burying others. The results were so successful that he was confirmed again in his profession.

Voluntarists have taught that virtue is a matter of will power. This is not Thomistic. "When the emotions are seen as integral parts of virtuous acts, instead of as enemies," says Dr. Baars, "the whole process of growing in leading the virtuous life will be much less painful and frustrating.

A major theme of the book is the author's distinction between the receptive and utilitarian sides of human nature. He discusses the humane emotions of love, desire and joy versus the utilitarian emotions of fear and courage; the intuitive mind versus the working mind (reason); the affective versus the effective, communion versus communication, and compassion in therapy versus technique. He shows how the utilitarian emotions serve the humane emotions, how the working mind serves the intuitive mind, and how the effective serves the affective. Once this relationship is reversed, everything goes wrong.

This illuminating relation of opposites is fruitful, also, in the discussion of deprivation neurosis, the most significant neurotic condition of our time.

The humane emotions can be stunted in their development not only by repression, but also by deprivation, another neurotic condition rarely recognized and treated as such by other therapists. This neurosis develops when an individual is deprived in infancy, childhood or puberty of affirming love for what he or she is, as different from being loved for good behavior or for what is done or achieved. The victim grows up anxious and hungering for the *feeling* of being loved just for being oneself.

In reacting to the vacuum in his humane emotions, the individual might over-activate his utilitarian emotions and become energetic in striving to prove his value — something that can never be proven. In other words, he engages in self-affirmation, trying through effectivity to attain the feeling of being good, lovable and significant. But even if he becomes rich and powerful, or famous as a politician, scholar or preacher, he still *feels* unloved, worthless and insignificant.

Deprivation neurosis is serious, not only for the suffering it causes, but also for its contagious effect on society. It contributes to society's growing psychic debility. According to the author, the mature ability to strengthen others is on the decline. Unaffirmed parents raise unaffirmed child-

ren. And few therapists are really able to help. Few know what healing through affirming love actually is.

The humane emotions and the intuitive mind, according to Dr. Baars, are the primary source of authentic affirmation. Together they compose the "heart" as different from the "mind", which is composed of the utilitarian emotions and the working intellect. The "heart" is active in communion, in being fully present to another, and in compassion. No program, no method, no technique, no device of any kind can affirm or strengthen others. This happens only when they live in the orbit of one who lives the affirming life. Pseudo-affirmers and self-affirmers, when trying to affirm others, put doing before being. They can be recognized by the fact that they do not live, habitually, the affirming life, which is a warm, spontaneously felt, as well as intellectually intuitive, receptivity to all that is good, true and beautiful.

The person who wants to be healed needs to learn receptivity to affirming love. The author gives many valuable suggestions toward this end.

Affirming living is not at all the same as the popular notion of affirmation. It includes the capacity to correct, admonish and, if need be, to use strong language when the other is able to receive it. But affirmation techniques are usually practiced in an atmosphere of permissiveness and of "not hurting anyone's feelings." To affirm another authentically is to open the other's heart to his own goodness and to respond to his fundamental need for all truth, so he will be able to establish order in his life.

Assertiveness training for unaffirmed people, according to the author, only makes them self-affirming. Thus, many of the demands of "liberated" women who have become assertive, such as free and easy abortion, are forms of self-affirmation, which are basically futile in solving the problem of deprivation.

Casual sex, fun sex and impersonal sex are all forms of self-affirmation, which have brought alienation and hostility between the sexes. The so-called sexual revolution has been able to spread like wild fire, says Dr. Baars, in large part due to the constantly growing number of unaffirmed people.

Lack of affirmation is a cause of depression. But repressed anger, too, is a most important source of depression. "Ninety five percent of my patients recover from their depression when they learn to ask themselves, not 'why am I so depressed?', but 'What is annoying me; who is making me feel angry?' One cannot be angry and feel depressed at one and the same time."

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

In dealing with anger, forgiveness is both psychologically and spiritually necessary. But premature forgiveness is dangerous. If one forgives too soon, he forgives but cannot forget. As a result, guilt feelings and self-blame begin to weaken the spiritual life. Anger must be felt. And efforts must be made to resolve the cause of the anger in reasonable and effective ways. Only when efforts have been made to correct the situation, whether or not the other person or persons reciprocate, is it time to forgive.

Jesus never taught a beatitude of illness, says Dr. Baars. His life was apparently free of physical, emotional and mental illness. In order to take up our cross of being, like Jesus, misunderstood, hated, persecuted, tortured and put to death, and to do so gladly, we need good health, especially good psychic health. "Sharing in carrying the Cross while physically and/or psychically ill is more than Jesus did Himself."

The beginning of psychic wholeness — emotional, mental and spiritual health — is a wholesome attitude toward, and understanding of, our

emotions. Viewed with caution and suspicion, our emotions have little chance to grow. And a stunted emotional life can severely affect faith. "A well-developed emotional life is indispensable to a satisfying, fruitful spiritual life."

Pope Paul VI called the work of Dr. Anna Terruwe a "gift to the Church." I think this book is a special gift to all the Christians to whom it is dedicated. Ecumenical bonding is the work of the affirming Spirit of God bringing about a personal union of all Christians with Jesus. If this union is to deepen and grow strong, all will need to understand more clearly and correctly who they are, not only in God's affirming love, but also in their own nature as persons. We need to learn more fully how to be ourselves, how to be *human* beings. Teeming with insights beyond what can be suggested here, *Feeling and Healing Your Emotions* is a unique and fruitful contribution both to Christian living, and to what Pope John Paul II said in Puebla, Mexico: "The truth that we owe to man is, first and foremost, a truth about man."

Mary R. Joyce

Publications of Interest

- Professor John Finnis, Fellow of New College, Oxford, has written *Natural Law and Natural Rights* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980). This work will be helpful to teachers of moral theology, ethics, and of the moral foundations of law. It is the latest volume in the prestigious *Clarendon Law Series*. Here a highly articulate account of natural law in the Catholic tradition. While sensitive to contemporary problems with natural law, Finnis provides a clear defense of the moral heritage that is a critical part of authentic Catholic moral teaching. The book is not addressed primarily to the special controversies created by dissenters in Catholic moral thought in our time, but its clarity exposes the theoretical deficiencies that underlie the work of prominent Catholic dissenters.

- Paul C. Vitz *Psychology as Religion: The Cult of Self-Worship* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company 1979)

Although this paperback has been criticized for not appreciating the importance of self-love and autonomy to personal and Christian development, Karl Menninger thinks "it says what ought to have been said long ago." The author, a psychology professor at NYU, provides an intense critique from the Christian viewpoint of the fallacies in humanistic psychology — notably the idolatry of

self and its anti-religious effects. Vitz says unashamedly: "The time has come for Christian academics and intellectuals to speak out publicly in defense of the faith regardless of the professional risk and isolation this may entail."

Religious educators of all kinds — including theologians — will profit from the reading.

- Henry Fairlie, *The Seven Deadly Sins Today* (The University of Notre Dame Press 1979)

This is a good companion to the Vitz book, which also takes man's sinfulness as a starting point for understanding modern man. Fairlie recommends Fellowship member William F. May's *A Catalogue of Sins* as a source of his own wisdom. Earthbound moralists will perhaps lift their eyes at the information that "for an exposition of the sins of moral theology, [he] found most useful the four volumes of Henry Davis, S.J.'s *Moral and Pastoral Theology*."

- Fr. Joseph Costanza's trilogy on *Humanae Vitae*, covering *Papal Magisterium and Humanae Vitae*, *Academic Dissent: An Original Ecclesiology*, *Papal Magisterium, Natural Law and Humanae Vitae* are available to Fellowship members for \$2.25 from — P.O. Box 12546, Tuscon, Arizona 85732.

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

● A newly ordained priest, Fr. James McLucas, has written an unpublished manuscript on "Bernard Haring's Analysis of *Gaudium at Spes* as it Pertains to Marriage and Contraception." His hypothesis is that Haring misused the Council document to lay Catholic groundwork for contraception.

Someone might wish to see the manuscript for purposes of information or possible publication. It is scholarly, clearly written, about 3,000 words in length. Write to the Executive Secretary for further information.

● Francis J. Klauder, S.D.B. *The Wonder of the Real: A Sketch in Basic Philosophy* (North Quincy, Mass., Christopher Publishing House 1979)

Fr. Klauder, President of Don Bosco College in Jersey, deals here mostly with ontology.

● If you wish to read a good novel, look for USCC's Russell Shaw's story *Church and State*, Newly published by *Our Sunday Visitor Press*.

James W. Lyons, *Newman's Dialogues on Certitude*, (Rome, Catholic Book Agency, 1978)

Newman's value as a commentator on the contemporary theological scene comes through on every one of Fr. Lyons' 151 pages. For example, on page three the author lists seven propositions rejected by Newman in 1864. Some Catholic theologians today accept these as guiding principles of their 20th century presentations. The condemned Newman propositions are as follows:

1. No religious tenet is important, unless reason shows it to be so.
Therefore, e.g. the doctrine of the Athanasian Creed is not to be insisted on, unless it tends to convert the soul; and the doctrine of the Atonement is to be insisted on, if it does convert the soul.
2. No one can believe what he does not understand. Therefore, e.g. there are no mysteries in true religion.
3. No theological doctrine is anything more than an opinion which happens to be held by bodies of men. Therefore, e.g. no creed, as such, is necessary for salvation.
4. It is dishonest in a man to make an act of faith in what he has not had brought home to him by actual proof.
Therefore, e.g. the mass of men ought not absolutely to believe in the divine authority of the Bible.
5. It is immoral in a man to believe more than he can spontaneously receive as being congenial to his moral and mental nature.
Therefore, e.g. a given individual is not bound to believe in eternal punishment.

6. No revealed doctrines or precepts may reasonably stand in the way of scientific conclusions. Therefore, e.g. Political Economy may reverse Our Lord's declarations about poverty and riches, or a system of Ethics may teach that the highest condition of body is ordinarily essential to the highest state of mind.

7. Christianity is necessarily modified by the growth of civilization and the exigencies of times. Therefore, e.g. The priesthood, though necessary in the Middle Ages, may be superseded now."

Fr. Lyons is associated with the Palos Community Hospital, Palos Heights, Illinois, 60463.

● *Scholarly Communication. The Report of the National Enquiry*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979. Paperback \$3.95 176 pp. Index.

The National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication was a three-year research effort conducted under the auspices of the American Council of Learned Societies. Its goal was to evaluate the means by which scholarly knowledge in the United States is published, disseminated, stored, and used, and to formulate specific recommendations for improving the system.

The report deals in turn with problems involving scholarly journals, scholarly books and presses, and research libraries. The proliferation of scholarly materials, rising costs and prices of books and journals, and the inability of library budgets to keep pace have been contributing factors to "a crisis in finance" that "threatened the performance of research libraries and the viability of scholarly publishing."

In the view of the committee, whose chairman was R.M. Lumiansky, president of the American Council of Learned Societies, scholarly communication is a system embracing scholars and several separate but interacting and interdependent groups, all of which must act together. The committee recommended the establishment of a nationwide computer-based bibliographic system and the development of a national periodicals center to provide reliable access to a comprehensive collection of periodical literature. In journal publishing, they emphasize the need to speed up the manuscript review process. They urge collaboration among university presses and expanded participation by universities without presses in supporting the publication of work produced on their campuses.

John and Eileen Farrell

Periodical Review

● *On Alfred Firmin Loisy (1857-1940)* – Reflections prompted by “Loisy’s Theological Development” by Valentin G. Moran, S.J. (Campion College, Victoria, Australia), *Theological Studies* 40 (1979), 411-452.

Fr. Moran’s study traces the development of Loisy’s religious thought up to his excommunication in 1908, passing over in silence Loisy’s later development (Loisy lived on for another 30 years after the end of the modernist controversy, from 1909 to 1930 as professor of the history of religions at the College de France; he died in 1940 at the age of 83). Moran relies for the most part on Loisy’s own writings, in particular on Loisy’s *Mémoires* (3 volumes, 1930-1), a document of enormous psychological as well as religious interest, a massive *ex post facto* apologia for Loisy’s life and thought. As reportage of Loisy’s views and of Loisy’s own account of his development up to 1908, Moran’s study can be recommended. And yet there is in Moran’s essay something more than mere reporting, and this something more deserves comment.

At the end of his essay Moran asks, “Could Loisy under a different regime have remained in the Church?” (p. 450). This seems to me a strange question, charged as it is with so many unspoken presuppositions. There are, I think, two quite different ways in which to take the question: (1) “under a different regime” would Loisy have undergone the religious development he in fact did undergo? that is, would Loisy, in some other world, have become a different Loisy? (2) “under a different regime” would Loisy have gotten away with being Loisy? that is, would “a different regime” have let Loisy continue to call himself a Roman Catholic even though, on his own admission, he did not believe in Roman Catholicism?

If taken in the first way Moran’s question is simply unanswerable; speculation is idle (unless, of course, one is a behaviorist, in which case it might appear obvious that Loisy’s environment, in this case “the regime”, made him what he was). Taken in the second way, however, there is something we ought to be able to say: that though “regimes” may come and go, Catholicism remains Catholicism. If Loisy was not truly a Catholic in 1908, this same Loisy would not truly have been a Catholic in 1979 – or indeed at any other time. Whether Loisy would have been excommunicated in 1979, as he was in 1908, is an open question, and a relatively trivial one, although Moran himself seems to speculate that were Loisy alive today he might well be left in peace by ecclesiastical authority: “Of course, a great deal that scandalized the Vatican between 1880 and 1900 is a commonplace of today’s orthodoxy” (p. 450).

Those last two words, “today’s orthodoxy”, point to the muddle in which Moran finds himself at the end of what might otherwise have been a straight-forward and altogether innocuous reporting of Loisy’s views. Where Moran must do something more than report, when he himself must speak, uncertainty arises, for Moran and hence for the reader. Moran seems to be of two minds concerning Loisy, and the question naturally arises: why this and so many other recent articles and books on Loisy’s thought? What should we, Roman Catholics in 1979, make of Loisy? Here, it seems to me, Moran’s voice is an uncertain one.

Now as someone who has perforce followed most of “the literature” on Loisy what continues to strike me is that for many of those who have recently written about him Loisy is of interest chiefly because they are today what Loisy was yesterday. They share his views; they identify with him. They accept his version of his story because it is their story too. In defending Loisy they defend themselves. They call themselves Roman Catholics and “the regime” leaves them in peace. Were Loisy alive today would not “the regime” leave him in peace too? If they are Roman Catholics, why not Loisy also? Was not his excommunication a tragic error?

Fortunately, Loisy himself has repudiated this line of thought: “Excommunication put me in my proper place, which was outside Roman Catholicism” (p. 442). Whatever else one can say about Loisy, he was not stupid. He himself saw that his estrangement from Catholicism, which had from his own point of view been sealed long before his excommunication, was not a matter of disagreement with an unfriendly “regime”, nor did it concern such relatively insignificant questions as the *Comma Johanneum*, the authorship of the Pentateuch, or even the correct way in which to understand the historical process of theological and doctrinal development. The estrangement cut deeper and was lodged in Loisy’s heart: he was not a believer. “Logomachie métaphysique à part,” he wrote in 1904, “je ne crois pas plus à la divinité de Jésus que Harnack ou Jean Réville, et je regarde L’incarnation personnelle de Dieu comme un mythe philosophique . . . Si je suis quelque chose en religion, c’est plutôt panthéo-positivo-humanitaire que chrétien” (*Mémoires*, II 396-7). These words of Loisy, written in 1904, render utterly irrelevant the question of his excommunication in 1908. It is not the excommunication that demands explication; it is Loisy himself, above all his unbelief. His life, as he himself knew well, was one of disappointment and deeply embittering disillusionment. What had gone wrong in this priest and scholar?

What strikes me, the more I ponder Alfred Loisy, is that *he was not a Christian theologian*.

Loisy was in this respect a product, not of the monastery nor even of the seminary, but of the modern secular university. He was a kind of "religious thinker" quite foreign to the tradition which gave him birth: a kind of religious thinker who can now be found in schools of religion and of religious studies (yes, and even of theology) round the world. Loisy studied religion, but he was not a Christian theologian. Loisy was a prodigious scholar in almost all those respects that mark the modern practitioner of "religious studies", skilled in all those "methodologies" employed today in the study of religion — "religion" understood as a phenomenon of human culture and history. But on his own account Loisy was not a prayerful man nor

(Continued →)

St. John's University
Jamaica, N.Y. 11439

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars

research: questions of philology and archaeology and comparative literature, questions of chronology, brute history and textual criticism. No doubt the contemporary theologian should know these things too, or at least know where to turn to discover them. But to know these things is not to know theology. To pursue them is not to pursue theology. These tools and methodologies and skills, however useful and even perhaps necessary, can never, of themselves, give rise to a single *theological* utterance.

This, perhaps, is one moral of Loisy's story. This may be one lesson, and not an unimportant one, we can learn at his feet. Moran, I think, senses this: "But giving full recognition to the defects of personnel and machinery in the Roman Curia at the end of the last century, one cannot imagine Loisy settling into the Church with any satisfaction to himself and others." (p. 451).

(Concluded →)

was his a *fides quaerens intellectum*. He did not live within and speak from the Christian tradition. Indeed, on his own account, he was largely contemptuous of the tradition and in surprising respects wholly ignorant of it. For Loisy theology was not the believing, even prayerful study and elucidation of Christian doctrine. That is to say, Loisy's "theology" was not Christian theology at all, nor, *pace* Moran, can one possibly speak in any strict sense of Loisy's *theological* development.

Loisy, then, was a great scholar, a model, if you will, of "religious studies" and of "the study of religion". He was the kind of scholar to whom one might want to turn concerning those questions that can be answered by the tools of modern

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Jamaica, N.Y.
Permit No. 451

Here, above all, Moran comes closest to touching the real truth concerning Alfred Loisy. His is not, I think, the story of "theological development" but of spiritual and theological impoverishment leading to spiritual and theological bankruptcy. It is the story of a Roman Catholic priest and scholar, and, as such, it is infinitely sad and painful. Its moral is perhaps this: that the study of religion, even of the Christian religion, if divorced from the life of prayer and the life of the Church, can only remain the study of religion. It can never become Christian theology. About Loisy's excommunication, then, there is no mystery, only a certain logical inevitability. The mystery of Alfred Loisy is the mystery of belief and of unbelief, and precisely here, at the heart of Loisy's life and work, we encounter the one truly profound question concerning this priest and scholar. But this, thank God, is a question only Loisy need answer.

Thomas Michael Loomer