

FELLOWSHIP OF CATHOLIC SCHOLARS

NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 4, NUMBER 3

JUNE 1981

Letter From President James Hitchcock

At the recent Fellowship convention, there was a profitable informal discussion among about a dozen members on the dangers of negativism, particularly the danger that the Fellowship and some of its more visible members might acquire an image of always counter-attacking, never having anything positive to say.

There is no doubt that this danger is real. It is easy to let others always define the terms of the discourse, then to react to their positions.

At the same time there are certain factors which make this negative stance almost inevitable at the present time. Those who believe that certain things are sacred find it impossible to remain detached as those sacred things are undermined. Too much is at stake for purely disinterested discussion.

It is also worth noting that, although the defenders of orthodoxy are often perceived as negative, it is really the posture of dissent which, as its very name implies, is negative. The energy of dissenting scholarship over the past fifteen years has precisely derived from its systematic assault on accepted truths. The defenders of orthodoxy seem negative mainly because dissent itself has become a kind of orthodoxy, which now seeks to protect itself from critical scrutiny.

The negative tasks are often distasteful. But they are necessary because, as I have often said, it is impossible to rebuild a structure while debris is still falling around one's ears. Only when the debris has been cleared can solid rebuilding take place. Many sincere people who look to scholars for guidance remain confused as long as they are not sure what in fact is debris and what is the authentic cornerstone. So long as dissenters occupy so much of public attention it will be necessary to devote a good deal of effort to denying dissenting claims.

However, when all this has been said, it remains true that there is a real danger of being carried along purely by the dynamic of the battle itself and to allow oneself always to be on the defensive. Over fifteen years after the end of the Second Vatican Council the rich promise of that council remains largely unfulfilled. While the primary reason for this is the skewing affects of militant dissent, it is also true that orthodox scholars have not sought to develop the promise of the Council as assiduously as they should.

The most promising thing in the Church today is the evident resurgence of interest in orthodox Christianity among young people. There is a tremendous hunger for genuine Catholicism waiting to be filled. In this hour we can do no better than to emulate John Paul II, who, although he is never too timid to rebuke the faithless shepherd, also never goes away leaving the sheep unfed.

Friends of the Fellowship

Bishop Anthony G. Bosco
Bishop Charles G. Maloney
Bishop Joseph McShea
Thomas Aquinas Collins Charitable Trust

1981 Convention Workshop

RELIGIOUS OBEDIENCE & COMMUNAL DISCERNMENT – Rev. Kenneth Baker, S.J., Chairman

I. Religious Obedience

Religious obedience has undergone many changes since the close of Vatican II. Here I understand it as the virtue which inclines the will to comply to the will of legitimate authority.

Because of modern intellectual currents, the ideal of “blind obedience” as proposed by St. Ignatius Loyola, seems to have been abandoned by most religious orders and congregations.

At least in the West, we have been influenced by democratic procedures, ideas of power-sharing and the right to challenge all authority, the need for consultation, the drive for self-fulfillment, personal responsibility.

Consequently, superiors have, to a great extent, been toppled from their pedestals. They are now looked upon more as equals than as “superiors.” The hierarchical model has been replaced by an egalitarian model.

The trend is not to consider the voice of the superior as “the voice and will of God.” For many religious, God’s will is revealed through a process of *dialogue* and *consultation* between the superior and the subject (terms infrequently used).

In religious life obedience is experienced mainly in two areas: 1) community life, and 2) apostolic work or “missioning.”

In many religious congregations (perhaps most) almost all the common structures of religious life have disappeared, that is, common rising, retiring, prayer, Mass, meals, recreation, etc. In theory just about everything in the day of a religious has been personalized and probably worked out with the superior. Little is done in common, except perhaps taking meals and drinking together. What is evident is that communal, visible obedience hardly exists.

With regard to missioning, this is usually done in close consultation between the superior and the subject. Generally, if a religious does not want to do something he/she will not be ordered to do it.

In the 1970s theories were developed to support the initiative in missioning as coming from the subject. Two such were: “Principle of Attraction” and the “Method of Apostolic Discernment” (the MAD principle). There seems to be less emphasis on this now than there was just five or six years ago.

The widespread *pluralism* in the Church, not just complementary but also contradictory pluralism, is common in religious institutes. This is tolerated by most superiors, and even promoted by some.

Today there is little emphasis on the *supernatural* dimension of religious obedience. To a great extent it has been rationalized and secularized into a *reasonable* way of doing things. The idea that the superior takes the place of Christ (“He who hears you hears me . . .”) and speaks in the name of Christ has receded remotely into the background.

Because obedience has become so personalized, on the part of superiors there has been a major shift from concern for the apostolic work, to concern for the happiness and self-fulfillment of the subject. Consequently, many religious groups have allowed their common works (i.e., schools, hospitals, orphanages, colleges) to become secularized or to close, while religious personnel are assigned to individual apostolates of their own choosing.

The form of the relationship now between superior and members is *mutuality*, i.e., the relationship is founded on the desire of superior and members for the same goals and purposes to be achieved by dialogue and discernment. Accordingly, in many institutes the very title of “superior” has been eliminated and replaced by such titles as “community representative” or “community co-ordinator.” It seems, then, that what characterizes obedience today, rather than its hierarchical character, is the form of mutuality.

Changes in the theory and practice of obedience in the religious life were inspired by the Second Vatican Council, or at least by certain interpretations of Vatican II. The goal was: renewal of religious life. In the 1960s and 70s the hope was that this renewal would lead to fresh enthusiasm, deeper prayer and commitment. Many expected the renewal to result in an increase of vocations. Instead, there has been a regular decline in vocations in most orders and congregations, with some exceptions, especially among the stricter orders and some of the contemplatives.

PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS: I was asked to give some practical suggestions, if possible. Here are a few observations:

1. Personal freedom has been maximized in the religious life, often to the detriment of communal works such as schools and hospitals. I think this has been exaggerated and that superiors should show more concern for the apostolic works that have been committed to them.

2. In most orders there should be more regularity and uniformity in things such as daily life, common prayer and wearing the religious habit.
3. Many religious — both men and women — do not and will not encourage youth to enter their institute because they have no confidence in the training program and the people who run it. In order to change this unhappy situation superiors must first restore discipline to the training program and install as directors and teachers only those persons distinguished for piety, learning and fidelity to the Magisterium. When that has been done, religious will once again urge young people to enter the religious life.
4. Religious institutes should follow the directives of Vatican II (*Perfectae Caritatis*); they should listen to and obey the Sacred Congregation for Religious & Secular Institutes; they should do what the last three popes, Paul VI, John Paul I and John Paul II, have been telling them to do.

II. COMMUNAL DISCERNMENT.

During the 1970s the word "discernment" was very popular. It was borrowed from the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius. It is a combination of prayer, reflection and ascetical exercises that is used to perceive or recognize an inspiration of divine grace. Used during a retreat, it is an individual enterprise.

The Vatican Council urged religious to renew themselves. The Church under Pope Paul VI urged them to update their constitutions and rules. This led to many meetings and general chapters. Since they were sincerely seeking God's will, it was logical to make use of the method of discernment in a community setting. Hence, *communal discernment*. There are excellent precedents for this in the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15), in General Councils, and in Conclaves to elect a new pope. St. Ignatius Loyola and his first companions used this method in trying to discover whether or not it was God's will for them that they start a new religious order.

Communal discernment of God's will can be defined as a process of prayer and deliberation undertaken by a community for the purpose of judging what God is calling that community to do.

The process or method requires serious, lengthy, persevering prayer. All the members of the community must know clearly what it is they want to decide, for example, whether or not to close a school that the congregation has conducted successfully for a hundred years. Once the question(s) has been formulated, then they must carefully examine all the pros and cons. There must be a free dialogue about the pros and cons.

After more prayer, the members then move to deliberation of some kind, usually by a vote. This is followed by more prayer for confirmation. Confirmation is sought in a feeling and conviction of unity, peace and spiritual consolation.

When all of these steps have been taken, it is felt that God has spoken — at least in some sense.

In theory, communal discernment can be justified from Scripture and Tradition. In practice, it is very difficult. It requires a deep sense of prayer on the part of all the participants, with both remote and proximate preparation. It requires mutual *trust* among all the members involved — not easy to achieve in the post-conciliar period. It requires the careful use of critical intelligence in finding the right question to answer and in evaluating all the pros and cons. It requires a sense of not demanding more from the method and the persons involved than they can reasonably deliver. Finally, it demands patience and the resolve not to try to force God to give an answer according to human specifications.

I have the impression that communal discernment is used less frequently now than it was a few years ago.

PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS:

1. Great caution should be exercised in the use of communal discernment.
2. A community should not tempt God by raising a specific question and requiring an answer by a fixed date.
3. Communal discerners are not infallible. Even if they arrive at unity and peace, they could still be in error.
4. Communal discernment should not be about trivial matters, nor about questions that can be answered by human reason; it should be about truly great religious issues.

Mini-Convention in Milwaukee

Professor Maura A. Daly of Notre Dame moderated a Colloquium in the Astor Hotel on "Faith, Freedom and Vocations in Literature" prior to the opening of the Fellowship's Convention. The participants were Dean Michael Quigley (River College), Rev. P. W. Platt (U. of St. Thomas), Roy R. Barkley (U. of Michigan), Carson Daly (N.D.) and the Rev. William E. Hart (St. Joseph College, Co.). The event was unique at Fellowship conventions. Carson Daly explained its significance: "A good case can be made for literature as the center of humanistic studies. Not that literature is the most important study, nor the most excellent, but because it is the most accessible of disciplines."

1981 Fellowship Convention Events

One hundred fifty members of the Fellowship attended a successful fourth convention at the Astor Hotel in Milwaukee March 27-29th. Fr. Richard Roach, S.J. of Marquette University was host and chairman.

1. Appreciation was extended to Sr. Rose Eileen Masterman for completing her paper on religious life during an extended period of illness. The Fellowship is on record not only in appreciation but with solicitude and prayers for her complete recovery.
2. A resolution was passed that the 1982 convention, and subsequent conventions, be held in a hotel adjacent to a parish church in order that the full liturgy be celebrated with appropriate solemnity.
3. Dr. Germain Grisez, a charter member of the Fellowship, was presented with a special award for his longtime service to the Church as an outstanding Catholic scholar.
4. The Proceedings of the 1980 Convention will be mailed to members prior to June 1st. The cost of publication and mailing is \$6.00.
5. The Executive Board of the Fellowship announced that the third Cardinal Wright Award will be presented to Dr. James Hitchcock at the September 26 meeting of the Board in Chicago. John and Eileen Farrell will be in charge of the event.

Items of Interest

- The statement of the *Fellowship* issued in its September 1980 Newsletter in support of the implementation of *Sapientia Christiana* was reprinted in *Origins* February 19, 1981, pp. 573-576.

- *Call For Papers: Faith & Reason* plans to devote one issue of its 1982 volume to a celebration of the centenary of the birth of the Norwegian Catholic novelist, Sigrid Undset. We are now soliciting papers of a scholarly or critical nature on any significant aspect of her life and work. We are especially interested in original work by persons with professional competence in Scandinavian language and literature, but we shall also consider studies of her work in translation. Please direct inquiries and completed papers to R.V. Young, Jr., Department of English, N.C. State University, Raleigh, North Carolina 27650.

Newly Elected Fellowship Officers (1981-1983)

President

Fr. William Smith,
Dunwoodie Seminary, New York

1st Vice President

Fr. Earl Weis, S.J.,
Loyola University, Chicago

2nd Vice President

Dr. Joseph Boyle
St. Thomas College
St. Paul, Minnesota

Executive Secretary

Treasurer

Dr. Joseph Scottino
President, Gannon University
Erie, Pennsylvania

New Board Members

Fr. Kenneth Baker, S.J.
Editor, *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*

Dr. Ann Carson Daly
Notre Dame University

Dr. Paul Vitz
New York University

Fr. James Schall, S.J.
Georgetown University

New Executive Secretary-Treasurer

All correspondence concerning membership, dues, etc., henceforth is to be directed to Dr. Joseph Scottino, Gannon University, Erie, Pennsylvania 16501

- A correspondent writes with a reminder *on the declining number of confessions* as follows: "Three years ago, the Chicago Archdiocesan Liturgical Conference published in *Liturgy* the results of their penance survey. 'We must remember,' it said, 'that there are only 25 confessions per week occurring in our parishes.' According to the November, 1980 Clergy Report for the Archdiocese of New York, 'about one-half of the confessions which take place in Manhattan are in the non-residential parishes located in the business areas.' Five of these parishes account for 40 percent of the confessions in Manhattan."

Fellowship Endorses Inclusion of Catholic Universities Under the New Canon Law

While abstaining from approval of specific language in the proposed series of canons now under consideration by experts in Rome for Catholic institutions of higher learning, the Fellowship at its recent convention in Milwaukee unanimously endorsed coverage of Catholic colleges and universities in the new Church law. In releasing the resolution to the press out-going president James Hitchcock made the following comment: "In 1917 when the present Code of Canon Law was promulgated, Catholic institutions of higher education were not covered largely because such institutions were Catholic not only in their foundations and management but, as far as theology was concerned, were Catholic in their teaching. Today the situation is radically different. Many contemporary colleges and universities which use the name Catholic fail to uphold Catholic teaching. It is necessary for these institutions to meet the minimum requirements of Catholic law, as they do those of the civil law in the states where they are chartered."

The resolution of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars reads as follows:

"The Catholic Church has always affirmed the right of all Catholics to receive without omission or distortion the truths of the faith and the teachings of the Church which are necessary for salvation.

"Current disorders in Catholic education, especially in universities and other institutions of higher studies which designate themselves as Catholic, violate the right of all Catholics to be taught the truths of our Catholic faith without omission or distortion.

"The *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars* has expressed its concern about the rights of the faithful and the disorders in Catholic universities

and other institutions of higher education in a statement published last year. (*Fellowship Newsletter*, September 1980).

"In recognition of these disorders, of the rights of all Catholics, and the obligations of the Church, the Pontifical Commission for the Revision of the Code of Canon Law has proposed the inclusion in the Code of Canon Law of a new section dealing with Catholic universities and other institutions of higher education.

"The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, without endorsing any particular language at this time, expresses to the Pontifical Commission for the Revision of the Code of Canon Law and to the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education the belief of its membership that a proposed new section of the Code of Canon Law dealing with Catholic universities and other institutions of higher education is sound and necessary and urges the adoption and effective implementation of this new section of the Code.

"The Fellowship also urges the promulgation of an *Apostolic Exhortation* embodying the principles of the new section of the Code of Canon Law dealing with Catholic universities and other Institutions of higher studies operating under civil charters.

"The *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars* is confident the new section of the Code of Canon Law dealing with Catholic Universities and other institutions of higher studies, and the implementation of this new section of the Code, will be undertaken in a manner that will assure the integrity and rights of such institutions consistent with the rights of all Catholics to be taught the authentic truths of the faith of the Catholic Church."

(This resolution was drafted by the Fellowship Committee on Higher Education chaired by Dr. Joseph Scottino, President of Gannon University)

Dr. Herbert Ratner on Biology and Biologism — II

Some theologians and ethicists who conceive the human person an entity disengaged from and independent of human nature (embodied man) dismiss the besouled body as having little relevance to human decision making. In condemnation, they categorize others who hold that the body naturally inclines towards ends that fulfill human nature and are normative as victims of *biologism* — the employment of biological knowledge to illuminate the goodness or badness of human acts.

These critics of traditional morals and ethics, e.g., Frs. Charles E. Curran and Hans Kung, emphasize the “danger of identifying the human action with a mere animal or biological process.” They believe that the “distinction between natural and artificial is arbitrary (and becomes a matter for the microscope and of milligrams), and that the genius of contemporary man makes “nature conform to him rather than vice-versa.” (CF 16:98, 1977) By holding this position, they betray their superficial understanding, if not gross ignorance, of nature. It is as if their knowledge of biology and nature came from a biology course dominated by Cartesian Dualism and la Mettrie’s belief that man is a machine. (The highlight of such courses has always been the eliciting, in the laboratory, of spinal reflexes from a decerebrated frog.)

If ever we needed a return to common sense, it is now when theologians and ethicists are robbing society of the distinction between the natural and the unnatural by dissociating the person from the body and elevating the former to the status of a free spirit, a disembodied intellect, as if man were an angel.

But man is not an angel. Whatever else he may be, man is an animal, a creature in and of nature, a composite of body (matter) and soul (form), each of which came into being made for the other. (Even those religions that consider the human soul immortal and believe in the beatific vision hold for the ultimate resurrection of the body.)

Man belongs to the class, Mammalia. Without particular knowledge, anyone can recognize the unnaturalness of a mammalian mother eating her young or refusing to nurture her young. By any definition of *mammal*, this is unnatural or abnormal. Abandoning the young after birth is also unnatural because it signifies a lack of fealty to the welfare of the newborn. To define the mammal, therefore, as some do, simply as a milk producing animal, although sufficient for taxonomic purposes, is insufficient for grasping the true nature of a mammal. Faithfulness, a correlative to lactational ability, is a distinguishing attribute of

the mammal. It is the norm by which we measure natural and unnatural maternal behavior.

In all animals below man, faithfulness is attained automatically by hormonal and other physiologic and psychic influences ordered to the fulfillment of the female as a mother. These animals have no choice but to lead the good (animal) life. The human animal, however, is unique by virtue of reason, which makes *humanum*, in essence, a free agent, a decision or choice-making animal, capable of making bad decisions as well as good decisions, of choosing the wrong as well as the right of evil as well as good.

The woman, however, has not been abandoned by nature. She has a natural inclination propelling her toward motherhood, the analogue of automated instinct or “crystallized intelligence” in lower animals: the inborn, natural virtue of fidelity. Reason, however, can be adversely influenced by confused emotions which lead to rationalizations capable of overriding woman’s natural mammalian inclinations. When, as a result, a woman is unfaithful to her child, as in the case of abortion, infanticide, or any lesser maltreatment, such as, child abuse, we look upon this as abnormal or unnatural behavior. It goes against nature’s norm for motherhood: the obligation to cherish and rear the newborn — and the unborn — to mature adulthood to take his or her proper place in society.

To understand nature and her operations, we must distinguish between the natural and the unnatural; between that which occurs in nature (e.g., a deformed or malformed newborn.) and according to nature. We cannot say that something is natural simply because it occurs in nature, or because it has natural causes. A thing is natural, that is, according to nature, when it acts and functions correspond to its basic design or nature; a thing is unnatural when there is discordance between its function and design. To see these universal distinctions clearly, attunes us to reality and provides us with direction (1).

It is paradoxical that the two theologians quoted above, Frs. Curran and Kung, are Roman Catholics, for we see in them the ‘flowering’ of some seeds of the Reformation which gave rise to rugged individualism and the free life — an overemancipation from the moral guides of an earlier age. As happens so often, as the unliberated move to liberate themselves from the traditional past, the liberated move to recapture the traditional past. The former attempt liberation from the alleged slavery of the past, whereas the

latter attempt liberation from the enslavement of the present, from the popular, the stylish, the new.

The highly respected Protestant theologian, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who was hanged by the Nazis in April 1945, strikingly illustrates this in his reflections on the natural:

The concept of the natural has fallen into discredit in Protestant ethics. . . . this was a disastrous mistake, for its consequence was that the concept of the natural no longer had a place in Protestant thought but was entirely abandoned to Catholic ethics. Now this meant a serious and substantial loss to Protestant thought, for it was now more or less deprived of the means of orientation in dealing with the practical questions of natural life. The significance of the natural for the gospel was obscured, and the Protestant Church was no longer able to return a clear word of direction in answer to the burning questions of natural life. She thus left countless human beings unanswered and unassisted in the midst of vitally important decisions, and confined herself more and more to an (orthodoxly static) apology for the divine grace. . . . The consequences of this loss were grave and far-reaching. If there were no longer any relative distinctions to be made within the fallen creation, then the way was open for every kind of arbitrariness and disorder, and natural life, with its concrete decisions and orders, was no longer subject to responsibility to God. The sole antithesis to the natural was the word of God; the natural was no longer contrasted with the unnatural. For in the presence of the word of God both the natural and the unnatural were equally damned. And this meant complete disruption in the domain of natural life. (*Ethics*. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1965, pp. 143-4)

Herbert Ratner, M.D.

FOOTNOTE

(1) For a further discussion of this distinction, see: Ratner, H. Practical Difficulties in Defining the Word "Normal" in Medicine. *Ill. Med. J.* Vol. 97, No. 3 (Mar.), 1950. Reprinted in *CF* 13:111, 1974.

Symposium on Catechesi Tradendae

Silvio Cardinal Oddi journeyed to St. John's University May 15-16th to celebrate the second anniversary of John Paul's apostolic exhortation on Catechetics. His keynote lecture was sponsored there by the *Institute for Advanced Studies in Catholic Doctrine* which grants to its M.A. graduates a Catechetical Certificate from the Congregation of the Clergy, of which Cardinal Oddi is Prefect. Approximately 300 participants from various parts of the United States and Canada, mostly teachers and catechists, attended sessions, one of which was an open dialogue with the Roman Cardinal about the contemporary problems of the Church in the area of catechetics.

On Growing in Grace

In a clear response to theologians who are recommending reception of the Eucharist to married Catholics who regularly use contraceptives, as if this would gradually wean them away from the vice, Pope John Paul in his final address to last year's Synod of Bishops directed attention to an important pastoral principal. In Section 8 of the address entitled "Duties of the Christian Family in Modern World," the Pope said: "The Fathers of the Synod rejected any type of division of 'dichotomy' between a pedagogy, which takes into account a certain progression in accepting the plan of God, and doctrine proposed by the Church with all its consequences, in which the precept of living according to the same doctrine is contained: *in which case there is not a question of a desire of keeping the law* as merely an ideal to be achieved in the future, but rather of the mandate of Christ the Lord that difficulties constantly be overcome. Really, the "process of gradualness," as it is called, can't be applied unless someone accepts divine law with a sincere heart and seeks those goods which are protected and promoted by the same law. Thus, the so-called "lex gradualitatis" (law of gradualness) or gradual progress can't be the same as "gradualitas legis" (the gradualness of the law), *as if there were in divine law various levels of forms of precept for various persons and conditioins.*

"All spouses are called to sanctity in marriage according to God's plan; but this vocation takes an effect in so far as the human person responds to the precept of God, and with a serene mind has confidence in divine grace and one's own will. Therefore, for spouses, if both are not bound by the same religious insights, it will not be enough to accommodate oneself in a passive and easy manner to existing conditions but they must try, so that, with patience and good will, they might find a common willingness to be faithful to the duties of Christian marriage."

Fellowship Dues to Dr. Scottino

Since Dr. Scottino has been elected as Executive Secretary Treasurer of the Fellowship, henceforth all dues payments will be paid to him. His Address is: Gannon University, Erie, PA. 16501.

State of Catholic Higher Education

● **Richard McBrien** (In the keynote address given to the *Conference of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities* in Washington, D.C., February 3, 1981.)

“A Catholic college or university would be viewed, according to the institutional model, almost as an educational tool of the apostolate, an apostolate wholly determined and directed from the top. The Vatican or the local bishop would have to have the final say in college or university policy insofar as that policy touches upon theology or ecclesiastical discipline. The mission of this institution includes as one of its constitutive components the responsibility of teaching. The hierarchy, in turn, is responsible for this teaching mission, to be shared, according to their own determination, with whomever else they feel to be competent and reliable. But those who *do* share in *their* teaching mission, at whatever level, do so on the hierarchy’s terms and at the hierarchy’s pleasure. This is the old understanding, for example, of Catholic Action, i.e., the participation of the laity in the work of the hierarchy.

“If the Church is understood primarily as a community – a second major model of the Church – then the individuality of each component of the larger community must be respected and even nourished. A Catholic college or university would be perceived, according to the community model, as a community within a community, or, perhaps better, as a community within a community of communities. In fact, to understand the Church as a community of communities is to understand the meaning of collegiality. The principle of subsidiarity, alongside the principle of collegiality, would require that policies affecting the college or university should be decided at the level at which those policies would have their immediate and greatest impact. But if the community model were taken too single-mindedly and not sufficiently balanced off against the institutional model of Church, it is possible that the college or university might begin to see itself as an entirely independent enterprise within the Church, deriving its name and ethos from the total Catholic tradition but holding itself theologically accountable to no Catholic agency outside the school . . .

“The Church is the whole People of God. This principle, expressed in the second chapter of *Lumen Gentium*, replaced the pre-Vatican II emphasis on the Church as hierarchical institution, whereby the study of the Church was more akin to “hierarchyology” than to “ecclesiology”. Pope John II, for example, has insisted in his writings and

public statements that the laity do not simply participate in the mission of the hierarchy. The hierarchy assist the whole People of God, to which they themselves belong, in fulfilling the mission which is theirs by baptism. On the other hand, the noun “Church” is still employed in its more restrictive sense (Church-hierarchy), as in the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith’s document declaring Hans Kung no longer a Catholic theologian. When we talk about the obligation of a theologian to serve the Church,” do we mean the Church in its organizational and hierarchical sense, or do we mean the Church as indeed the entire community of the baptized? The same ecclesiological point has to be kept in mind as we face the perennial question of the Catholic college’s or university’s responsibilities to “the Church.” Is it a responsibility to the local bishop, or to the Vatican? Or is it a responsibility to the entire community? If not the latter, then most of us will find ourselves enmeshed in a kind of geographical orthodoxy. A Catholic institution of higher learning which happens to be situated in a diocese whose bishop is theologically very much to the right will feel compelled to meet one standard of orthodoxy and Church discipline. A Catholic institute of higher learning in a diocese whose bishop is more theologically advanced and more sensitive to the inevitable pluralism of contemporary theology will find itself with a much greater measure of latitude and freedom in constructing its curricula and programs as well as in recruiting and reshaping its faculty.

“As we continue to move theologically, if not always canonically, away from an exceedingly clericalized, hierarchically-oriented concept of the Church, Catholic higher education will increasingly recognize that matters of orthodoxy and ecclesiastical discipline have to be resolved in the context of wider, more complex processes of reflection, argument, and consensus-building. This is not at all to suggest the Church of the 1980’s and beyond will be a Church without papal and episcopal supervision, but only that the Petrine and episcopal ministries will be perceived increasingly and ever more profoundly as ministries *to* and *for* the community rather than ministries *over* the community. Furthermore, that community – thanks in no small part to the work of our several institutions – is, and will be, an increasingly well-educated community of reasonably sophisticated and critical adults. If the expression “simple faithful” is less and less applicable to the laity at large, then it is certainly not applicable to those who serve in our Catholic institutions of

State of Catholic Higher Education *(Continued)*

higher learning as faculty, as administrators, and as staff. A Catholic college or university which yields too quickly to ecclesiastical pressure sins not only against good ecclesiology but against the intellectual integrity and the maturity of faith of its own people . . .

"The principle of collegiality has implications for Catholic colleges and universities. If the Church is not simply one big parish subdivided for administrative efficiency, but is a community of churches, then the Catholic college or university cannot see itself as simply one subordinate element in a single organizational network. In this view, the Catholic institution of higher learning is directly subject to the Vatican. A collegial understanding of the Church, however, makes it clear why there must be such organizations as yours on a national and international level. We are a community of colleges and universities with important horizontal as well as vertical relationships. A Catholic college or university which looks always and only above (to the bishop or to the Vatican) is an institution which does not understand collegiality, nor the correlative principle of subsidiarity . . .

● **David Riesman** — (Riesman co-authored with Christopher Jencks *The Academic Revolution* (1967) which plotted the course by which faculties in secular universities took control of their institutions out of the hands of presidents, Board of Trustees and (where necessary) Board of Regents. In the January/February issue of *Change* (pp. 13-20), his article *The Evangelical Colleges: Untouched by the Academic Revolution*, while plotting the resistance of Protestant colleges to contemporary secular standards, speaks of "the Secularization of Once-Catholic Colleges.")

"It would be too farfetched to suggest that a kind of Protestant Reformation has occurred within Catholicism in the Western world and that, as more and more religious have "kicked the habit" and laicized the institutions, one cannot speak of a truly Catholic college in the way that one can speak, let us say, of a Mennonite college or a Southern Baptist college. In 1964, when Father Theodore Hesburg, president of Notre Dame University, addressed the National Catholic Education Association and its annual meeting in Atlantic City, he was regarded by many of the priests and sisters in the audience as a heretic. But in the fall of the same year, when Monsignor Ivan Illich was one of the leaders of a meeting of the Sister Formation Movement held at Marquette University, Illich was regarded, in all his charisma, as something of a hero, and many of the sisters

who heard him journeyed to his center at Cuernavaca for study with him and his group. Only a few years after the Catholic colleges and universities has been attacked for their antiintellectualism and their backwardness when compared with their secular counterparts by John Courtney Murray, S.J., Thomas O'Dea, Monsignor John Tracy Ellis, Philip Gleason, Robert Hassenger, James Trent, and many other Catholic intellectuals, a number of the Catholic colleges moved into the very forefront of what was then the academic avant-garde . . .

"Every year in its annual education issue, the intellectual Catholic weekly, *Commonweal*, carries an article with a title such as "What Is Catholic About the Catholic College?" . . . If we return, then, to our focus on the question whether in these more or less religious institutions the academic revolution has subordinated the student body to internalization of faculty values, the answer would seem generally to be in the affirmative for the evangelical Protestant colleges and in the negative for the once-Catholic colleges. But the former groups subordinated the students to an ethos that combines religious values with the ethical neutrality traditional in the American campus culture; these transcendent norms dictate the nature of the curriculum, within the limits imposed by vocational and academic aspirations. And although these colleges cannot in fact provide the safety or insurance they appear to promise, what they can do is to give moral aid and comfort to students who on cosmopolitan campuses would feel like misfits. What seems hypocrisy to many is an effort to validate consensual norms even while recognizing that they will sometimes be violated in practice. The evangelical colleges offer a partial and temporary escape from freedom — an enclave that is neither total nor totalitarian."

● **Rosemary Radford Ruether**

"A new consensus could only come about if this traditional power [Vatican Curia] could be deposed and the Church restructured on conciliar, democratic lines accountable to the people. Then the theological consensus of the academy could serve as a guide for the pastoral teaching of the Church. This is really what Kung is calling for: that the academy replace the hierarchy as the teaching magisterium of the Church. This cannot be accomplished by the academy itself. It entails the equivalent of the French Revolution in the Church, the deposing of a monarchical for a democratic constitution of the Church. No one has seriously discussed how this is to be done. But one thing is

State of Catholic Higher Education *(Continued)*

sure. It will not be legislated by the present power holders. It demands a revolution from below of a type that is difficult to imagine, much less to organize.

"In the immediate future we cannot hope for a new consensus that will overcome this theological split between the academy and the hierarchy. Rather, the best we can hope for is the defense of pluralism. Pluralism will not be conceded as a theological principle by the Curial theology. The Curia demands not only a consensus, but a consensus that is fundamentally subservient to the defense of the traditional power structure. Pluralism can be defended only by making sure that this hierarchical power structure is not strong enough to repress successfully the independent institutional bases of conciliar and liberation theology.

"There are a number of institutional bases of the new theologies. These are Catholic academic institutions, Catholic faculties of theology at colleges and universities, seminaries (primarily order rather than diocesan seminaries), renewed religious orders, lay-run base communities, independent study and action centers and movements concerned with social justice, and the independent Catholic media. The reason why there is any significant intellectual pluralism in the Catholic Church today is primarily because the hierarchy has lost control of a number of important institutions, especially educational institutions and Catholic media. In addition, new kinds of Catholic movements have developed, outside of direct ecclesiastical control. These are the social bases of liberal and liberationist theology.

"We can expect to see in the coming years, under the new pontificate of Pope John Paul II, a concerted effort by the Vatican and national hierarchies to recapture control over these Catholic groups, especially educational institutions and religious orders, and to marginalize and delegitimize the catholicity of those autonomous lay movements, action centers and media which they cannot control. Already we have seen a number of evidences of this. The Jesuits have been issued a directive by Arrupe not to engage in any popular protest on controversial issues opposed by the Vatican. Seminaries have been told that they must take a new loyalty oath to the traditional Catholic teaching authority.

"The defense of theological pluralism in the Catholic Church (which is to say, the survival of conciliar and liberation theologies as options for Catholics in the future) fundamentally hinges on

the successful defense of these independent bases of Catholic thought and life. Catholics must learn to fight in new and more political ways to defend the freedom they have achieved. When the faculty of The Catholic University is threatened by the bishops with withdrawal of funds if they don't conform to a certain doctrinal line, one must do more than appeal to Church authority. One must demonstrate the large amount of funding of this university that comes from American governmental sources. One must threaten the possible loss of this American funding if investigation turns up serious violations of academic freedom.

"When priests with tenure on religion faculties are threatened with dismissal when they marry, one should take the case of the American Association of University Professors as a violation of tenure contract. In short, one must use the liberal institutions of the secular society against the illiberal practices of the monarchical Church to limit the latter's power. Above all, one must cease to internalize the authority of unjust power. What the Pope says is not necessarily right because he says it. If, as I contend, the lack of consensus in theology is rooted in power struggle, then the liberal wing of this dissension must defend the autonomy and Catholicity of its institutional power bases, if it hopes to survive as an option for the future."

(In the Journal of Ecumenical Studies Winter 1980 pp 65-67)

Chronicle of Higher Education (March 9, 1981)

● The front page headline read "Rule Allowing Bishops to Veto Appointments in Theology Worries Some Catholic Educators." The concern expressed was that their academic freedom may be circumscribed by a proposed change in canon law. Bishop Daniel Pilarczyk of Cincinnati did not concur with the anxious educators. Granting the need of creative theologians, Pilarczyk made this point "Catholicism is more than speculation. It's a church with a clear and complicated dogma. The purpose of this canon is to insure that what is taught as Catholic teaching is indeed that and not the speculation of a theologian. Even now, local bishops have the right to intervene if they suspect that Catholic doctrine is not being taught properly. But I am aware that when you say a Church leader is giving permission to teach that seems contrary to the traditions of American higher education."

Msgr. Frederick McManus, Dean of Graduate Studies at CUA says the new canon would "at the very least give an appearance of a loss of

(Cont'd on page 11)

Chronicle of Higher Education

(Cont'd from page 10)

institutional autonomy." Fr. James A. Coriden, once CUA's theology chairman and now dean of the Washington Theological Union, favored those who want to have an instrument by which the Vatican cannot remove someone whose teaching does not meet Rome's standard of orthodoxy. He cited Hans Kung as a case. Sr. Alice Gallin, executive director of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, said "we don't see the necessity for the suggested modifications — the need simply hasn't been demonstrated." Gallin and McManus took their case to Cardinal Baum in Rome last January.

Fr. James H. Provost, assistant professor of canon law at CUA, believes the new canon is included because the Vatican "is concerned about controlling people. They want to be able to stop someone whose positions are objectionable." Sister Gallin thinks the canon would get Catholics in trouble with the AAUP.

The Contraception Question Again

The Population Reference Bureau is one of the later offshoots of the contraceptive movement in the United States. When medical and psychological rationalizations for the use of contraceptive techniques, including sterilization and abortion, began to lose their force, PRB came into being (1929) to exploit the dangers of the world's "population explosion". Advertised as "an organization that is dedicated to the objective analysis and reporting of one of the world's most compelling concerns", PRB from its Washington, D.C. headquarters regularly publishes six booklets a year which together are offered as scientific and social support for various aspects of the international birth control movement.

One of the members of Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of PRB — is Francis X. Murphy, C.S.S.R., rector of the Redemptorist Holy Redeemer College in Washington, D.C.

The Population Reference Bureau has recently published a 45 page booklet authored by him entitled "Catholic Perspectives on Population Issues II". In its abstract describing what the booklet is about PRB takes note of the fact that "Pope John Paul II and the Vatican, while insisting on human rights and the need for a reordering of unjust economic, social and political structures, seem to be neglecting the threat of civilization breakdown that looms with the prospect of too many people in too little space with too few resources."

Murphy's booklet is a propaganda piece for the birth control movement beginning with a simple acceptance of PRB's statistics and a simplified statement on Margaret Sanger, concluding with the following judgment of the significance of the 1980 Synod of Bishops:

" . . . By forcing Catholics and the world to examine a new and in depth many of the aspects of the population problem and the solutions proposed by various experts, nations, and ideologies, the Synod, following *Humanae vitae*, may prove to have been a benefit to mankind. On the strictly Catholic level, it may further emancipate millions of educated faithful from subservient reliance on hierarchical pronouncements to closer cooperation with pastors and religious counsellors in making up their consciences. This conviction should enable them to demand a hearing when they give authentic witness to their experiences in helping to form the 'mind of the Church,' as they did in preparation for the recent Synod.

"Through their witness was ignored by the Holy See in good part, the record of their experiences in attempting to live a truly Christian family life has been registered by their outspoken cardinals and bishops. Although temporarily sidetracked, this witness cannot but have an effect in gradually accomplishing the teaching of Vatican Council II that the faith and activity of 'the people of God,' along with the Pope and hierarchy, constitute the Church. This, in turn, should give a new thrust to the nature of the Church's *Magisterium* (teaching authority) which is no longer to be considered uniquely the function of the hierarchy.

"While this may seem exaggerated, wishful thinking particularly in light of the recent Synod, the experience of Vatican Council II must be kept in mind. There the Church was forced to make 180-degree turns in its teaching on Religious Liberty, Ecumenism, and Conscientious Objection, etcetera — all tenets bearing on the conscience of the faithful confronted with traditional teaching that had to be updated. Close analysis of previous crises in Church history suggests a solution. It is only after an indignant attempt on the part of Rome to prevent turnabouts in its teaching, such as that required by the drastic event of the "population explosion," that the *sensus fidelium* (mind of the faithful) will finally assert itself.

"With the full weight of the laity finally being introduced into the thinking on and witness to Catholic doctrine, the contribution of the Roman Catholic Church to the settlement of such pressing world problems as that of rapid population growth could become substantive. For an institution that still affects the intimate thinking of some one-sixth of the world's population, this is no mean consideration." (pg. 38-39)

Proposed Canons for the New Code of Canon Law

Book III — The Teaching Office of the Church
 Title III — Catholic Education
 Chapter III — Catholic Universities and
 Other Institutions

Canon 762: The Church has the right to establish and direct universities, which work toward the advance of human culture, the greater progress of the human person, and the fulfillment of the Church's office of teaching.

Canon 763: No university may bear the name *Catholic University* unless it is conceded by the Apostolic See.

Canon 764: The conferences of bishops should see to it that, if possible and expedient, there be universities or at least faculties, suitably distributed within their territory, in which the various disciplines are investigated and taught in the light of Catholic understanding and truth.

Canon 765: 1. It is the duty of the competent authority, as determined in the statutes, to name teachers in Catholic universities who, over and above their scientific and pedagogical qualifications, are outstanding in integrity of doctrine and probity of life and, in the absence of such requisites, to remove them from office, observing the procedure determined in the statutes.

2. The respective conferences of bishops and diocesan bishops have the right and duty to exercise vigilance that the principles of Catholic doctrine be faithfully observed in these universities; and likewise to require that teachers be removed from office if reasons of faith or morals demand.

Canon 766: 1. The competent ecclesiastical authority should see to it that in Catholic universities, and indeed in other universities if expedient and possible, a faculty or institute of theology or at least a chair of theology be established in which courses are given also to lay students.

2. In each Catholic university courses should be given in which theological questions which are related to the disciplines of these faculties are chiefly treated.

Canon 767: In any kind of institute of higher studies those who give theological courses or courses related to theology require a canonical mission.

Schema for Institutions of Higher Studies

Canon 58 (new): The Church holds in high esteem universities and faculties in which diverse scientific disciplines are studied and taught. These institutions, while contributing to a more elevated human culture and the progress of the human person, also benefit the spiritual welfare of men and women. In addition, as they seek more profound knowledge, they may help in the better understanding of revealed truth. (See II Vatican Council, declaration *Gravissimum educationis*, no. 10.)

Canon 59 (new; canon 1376 of the Code of Canon Law) No university may bear the name, "Catholic university," unless it has been erected by the Apostolic See or by the conference of bishops or has been granted this name by the Apostolic See or by the conference of bishops.

Canon 60 (new): 1. Wherever they judge it possible or expedient, in view of all the circumstances, the conferences of bishops should see that these are universities, suitably distributed within their territory. In these universities the various disciplines should be taught in such a way that, while their legitimate autonomy is preserved, the universal presence of a Christian mentality may be made effective in promoting the entire study of culture and that account may be taken of revealed truth as this has been declared by the Church's magisterium. (See *Gravissimum educationis*, No. 10.)

2. The conferences of bishops and the interested diocesan bishops have the right and duty to be vigilant that the principles of Christian doctrine be faithfully maintained in Catholic universities.

Canon 61 (new) 1. So that theological inquiry may be more closely related to contemporary questions and may also help students of various disciplines to reach a fuller knowledge of faith and a broader understanding of the order of creation, the competent ecclesiastical authority should see that in Catholic universities and, where this is expedient and possible, in other universities as well, there be erected a faculty or institute of sacred theology or at least a chair of theology, so that courses may be given that are also accommodated to lay students. (See *Gravissimum educationis*, no. 10; constitution *Gaudium et spes*, no. 57.)

Report of ACCU to the International Federation of Catholic Universities (August 1980) on the Proposed Canons

ACCU questions the need for these canons since it has already taken the position that the ministry of higher education in the Church can best be achieved without the development of juridical or canonical bonds.

Canon 59: Requirement that a university to bear the name Catholic needs ecclesiastical recognition will make it impossible for some of our institutions to maintain any formal profession of their Catholic identity.

Canon 60: The expression that bishops have the right and duty to be vigilant about Catholic doctrine in universities is "needlessly harsh and authoritarian."

Canon 64: (Canonical mission from a bishop for those who teach theology in Catholic colleges and universities.) See this external intervention as perilous to the academic integrity and the civil and academic recognition of our institutions. The phrase "canonical mission" is anachronistic since a genuine mission of teaching is exercised by many by virtue of their Baptism.

The Catholic University of America

• The latest information from Washington indicates that the extension requested and granted for CUA to submit acceptable statutes for its ecclesiastical faculties in response to *Sapientia Christiana* expires June 30, 1981, not June 1st as previously reported. The Joint Committee composed of faculty and two bishop members of the Board of Trustees submitted these revised statutes. The Chancellor, although not a member of the Joint Committee, participated in two of its meetings. The proposed statutes, while not giving the Chancellor authority to grant or deny tenure, do confer on him the right to determine that there is no impediment in giving tenure or appointment at the highest academic rank (*nihil obstat*). The only faculty to reject the statutes proposed by the Joint Committee was the Department of Theology. The combined ecclesiastical faculties voted 19-5 to accept them. The Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees of CUA in January 1981 unanimously approved the statutes proposed by the Joint Committee.

• While efforts are being made to persuade the Holy See to exempt CUA from some of the requirements of *Sapientiae Christianae*, which was drafted and approved by three Popes in order to bring under Church overview precisely those institutions which historically have been accredited as Catholic, the CUA committee on appointments was recommending for an assignment in moral theology the Reverend Edward Vacek, S.J., assistant professor at the Jesuit School of Theology in Chicago.

Fr. Vacek came to public attention with his article in *Commonweal* (December 5, 1980, pp. 681-684) entitled "In the Light of Scripture, Authority and Reason: A Christian Homosexuality?" Vacek agrees that "scripture does not offer much comfort to those who engage in homosexual acts" and admits that "Church tradition and ecclesiastical authority have continuously rejected homosexual activity". Yet he wants to know: "Should the significant numbers who are homosexual remain permanently single or celibate? Is this a cross they are given by God to be carried all their adult life? As a personal vocation from God, it might well be that they are called to genital non-activity. The desire never to act contrary to certain explicit statements of our scriptures and tradition may itself constitute a vocation for some."

Vacek's conclusion: "Apart from this personal vocation, it seems a violation of humanness automatically to deprive homosexuals of the values that Christians have found in sexuality." (p. 684)

Vacek turned down the CUA appointment to accept a position at the Weston School of Theology which trains future Jesuits.

• The faculty of the School of Religious Studies at CUA voted to approve the appointment of Fr. Robert M. Friday as assistant professor in the Department of Religion and Religious Education. Fr. Friday is the author of a 40 page resource paper on adult decision-making drafted for the National Conference of Diocesan Directors of Religious Education. This is the booklet described by Dunwoodie moralist Fr. William B. Smith as "a handbook on how to divorce and remarry 'responsibly' within the Catholic Church", one which "completely ignores the bishops' teaching (in their 1976 pastoral *To Live in Christ Jesus* pp. 14-17) and in practice contradicts it and counsels against it." (See *National Catholic Register* July 6, 1980 p. 4)

Publications of Interest

The Couple to Couple League has recently published several brochures that can be of assistance to anyone treating the subject of family planning. They include: *What Does the Catholic Church Really Teach about Birth Control?*; *The Pill and the IUD*; *Sexual Sterilization*; *Not in the Public Interest: The Planned Parenthood Version of Sex Education*; *The Legacy of Contraception: Fornication, Divorce, Abortion.*

If you would like all of the above publications, please send \$1.00 along with your self-addressed envelope stamped with 35c postage to The Couple to Couple League, P.O. Box 11084, Cincinnati, Ohio 45211

● Fr. Christian Cochini, S.J., who will begin teaching theology at Fujen Catholic University in Taipei next October, has completed a 600 page book on the origins of ecclesiastical celibacy. This work, originally done as a dissertation for a doctorate in theology (Paris 1969), was first published in French, in the "Sycamore" collection by the Lethiellieux Publishing House. It has obtained endorsement from French scholar Henry de Lubac, S.J. and Fr. Alfons M. Sticker, Prefect of the Vatican Apostolic Library.

Due to the technical aspect of some chapters, the editing cost is rather expensive: FF. 60,000, that is, about 13,000 US \$. So far, the two-thirds of that sum has been taken care of, but it still remains for us to find the last third, i.e. some 4,300 U.S. \$. Says Fr. Cochini: "With the agreement of my Superiors, I then dare to ask whether a short notice could be inserted in the Fellowship "Newsletter" to inform the members of this project and ask them in my name for some financial help. Any contribution, no matter how small, would be most welcome: many a little makes a nickle." Now a missionary in Taipei, Fr. Cochini can be reached at Holy Family Catholic Church, No. 502nd Sec. Hsin-Sheng South Road, Taipei, Taiwan 106 R.O.C.

● *Pastoral Renewal* has recently devoted two issues to the involvement of religious groups and religious leaders in the proliferation of homosexual behavior. For further information write 840 Airport Blvd., Box 8617, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107.

● *The Pontifical Academy of St. Thomas* in Rome has published a Thomistic study entitled *Quinque Sunt Viae* (155 p.) with a preface by Leo Elders S.V.D. available from *Liberia Editrice Vaticana*, Vatican City 00120. Price 7000 Lire.

● Fr. B. J. Tierney has written a *Catholic Family Catechism* (Pocket Edition) published by the Cardinal Newman Catechist Centre, Murphy House, Marist Place, Parrametta, N.S.W. 2150 Australia.

● Anthony J. Bevilacqua's *The ERA: What It Can Mean for Church Law* (Canon Law Society of America 1978) is a little recognized publication of some importance. This 83 page monograph covers the history of the Equal Rights Amendment, its meaning and interpretation, ERA and its relationship to military service, employment, family life, abortion, ministry, and the Church's canon law (more than 200 canons differentiating between men and women). The last chapter is entitled: "Is the ERA the Proper Vehicle for Reform?" Bishop Bevilacqua is auxiliary bishop of Brooklyn.

● James Likoudis and Kenneth D. Whitehead *The Pope, the Council and The Mass* (W. Hanover, Mass., Christopher Publishing House 1981) 281 pp. \$12.95

The authors explain what the changes in the Church are all about, especially as they relate to the Eucharist. The authors have selected the twenty four questions most commonly asked by Catholic traditionalists for analysis and response — from why change at all to "what can we do in the middle of crisis in the Church? Fr. John Hardon calls this book "doctrinally, historically and theologically sound."

John R. Griffin, *The Oxford Movement: a Revision* (Front Royal, Va., Christendom College Press, 1981); *Newman: a Bibliography of Secondary Studies* (Front Royal, Va., 1980).

These companion volumes, by a professor at Southern Colorado University, are a highly useful contribution to the ongoing scholarship of nineteenth-century English religion.

The bibliography includes material published up to 1980 and, while necessarily incomplete, includes all major works about John Henry Newman plus many unpublished dissertations and articles in obscure journals.

The study of the Oxford Movement argues the thesis that the Oxford reformers were "radical" in their politics and sociology, primarily in their principled opposition to an erastianism which was the established, conservative position of the Anglican Church over three centuries.

Periodical Reviews

Lawrence Cranberg "A Socratic Oath For the Academy?" (*The University Bookman*, Winter 1981 pp. 27-32)

It seems strange that a Texas physicist should raise a question about the professional ethics of the *American Association of University Professors* but Cranberg finds the academy itself a strange institution. What fascinates him about the *AAUP* is the low estate to which it has fallen among teacher scholars. Writes Cranberg: "During the past decade, while the membership of the academic profession has remained steady at a high of nearly half a million teacher-scholars (with an all-time high of real income), by contrast the membership of the *American Association of University Professors* has declined steadily. It fell off by half during the past decade, to less than 10 per cent of American employed faculty people. No other major professional group in the United States enrolls so small a percentage of its members in its major professional association." Part of its decline is due to the fact that the *AAUP* focuses on the security and pocketbook of its members, not on classroom and campus performance.

Once upon a time "*AAUP* spearheaded battles for academic freedom, it now acts like a fighter swinging wildly at an adversary barely discerned." Sixty five years ago at its founding John Dewey sought to follow the model of other professional associations. The watchword of that time was ethics: "professional ethics and professional standards of responsibility and excellence" — purposes on a par with the defense of academic freedom and the winning of tenure." Almost immediately, however, *AAUP's* committee A on academic freedom was activated while its committee B on professional ethics "fell into a coma and very rarely has B emerged from this ghastly lethargy."

Almost miraculously, says Cranberg, "Committee B awoke long enough in the middle sixties to produce the Association's only statement on professional ethics. It then lapsed into its former vegetal existence." This statement of less than a thousand words "has been allowed to gather dust", has had little effect on research professors gouging themselves at its public trough, on the questionable value of much research, the quality of teaching, on faculties "closed to the admitting of fresh blood", on grade inflation, etc.

One of Cranberg's final points raises the question of *AAUP's* permission (in its one ethical statement) to professors to "follow subsidiary interests" as long as they maintain "intellectual honesty." Here the reference is to the promotion of Marxism in the classroom. Says Cranberg

(convinced apparently that Marxism is uncritically presented to American students): "there seems to be no instance on record of attempts to determine by the yardstick of the statement whether anyone ever has violated those criteria of competence." The Texan finishes his critique with a request for a Socratic oath for teachers, not unlike that required of doctors: "A generation of educational 'leaders' whose chief activity has been chasing federal dollars, and whose chief message has been a monotonous demand for more", has left us stranded on a desolate shore. It is time for professors to profess belief in something better than aggrandizement."

The reason this critique deserves a closer look is that dissenting Catholic teachers have more confidence in *AAUP's* words than those of the Catholic hierarchy.

Martin Eger, "The Conflict in Moral Education: An Informal Case Study" *The Public Interest* Spring 1981, pp. 62-80.

The scene is Spencer, New York not far from Cornell University. The year is 1979 and a school board election is due in the Spring. The contest? "Values Clarification" in the classroom of their small town. Martin Eger an associate professor in philosophy and physics at CCNY tells and evaluates the story of how parents stood up to professionals.

The science of "value formation" — the kind of schooling associated with the names of Lawrence Kohlberg, Jean Piaget, Carl Rogers, Abraham Maslow became a goal of public education in New York State by 1974. The object of such education was not so much an "outcome" (i.e. an "ought") but thy inculcation in students of a process of thinking about morals. Whatever the value, it must be "chosen", must be "free" from conditioning, and must be "one's own".

Until these courses reached Spencer, people, old and young alike, thought that their "free" choices excluded things like lying or cheating. But VC was teaching children that there are no right answers. The charge of relativism begins to be made by parents and by scholars too. Many parents at first showed good will toward the theory of VC, even in the face of disturbing practice. They tended to respect professional surveys and statistics. But they also listened to their children and began to dislike what they heard.

The public controversy began when parents discovered exercises, questions, definitions and handbooks teaching their children at variance with "common human law".

Book Reviews

Bertrand De Margerie, S.J. *The Human Knowledge of Christ* (Boston, St. Paul Edition 1977) 77 pp. \$2.95 cloth, \$1.50 paper. *Remarried Divorcees and Eucharistic Communion* (Boston, St. Paul Edition 1979) 109 pp \$3.00 cloth, \$1.50 paper.

Each of these little volumes first appeared in *Esprit et Vie* and each deals with a "hot" contemporary theological subject. While well-known American theologians in recent years favor limiting the amount of praeter-human or super-natural knowledge assigned to Christ, even as they are enlarging the freedom of divorced Catholics invalidly remarried to receive the Eucharist, this French Jesuit analyzes French and German authors on both these controversial subjects.

Fr. DeMargerie is a defender of classical Christology which emphasizes not only what Jesus knew as man but all that He knew in order to carry out his mission as Redeemer. He takes up the principal objections to the traditional teaching of the Church concerning the human knowledge of Christ and counters their lack of consistency. As for eucharistic communion for invalidly married divorcees, he traces the clear and unbroken line of doctrine on this subject from New Testament times through the Church fathers to the various modern statements on magisterium.

Pius Raymond Regamey, O.P. *Renewal in the Spirit: Rediscovering the Religious Life* (Boston, Ma. St. Paul Edition 1980) 286 pp. \$5.95 and \$4.95 (paper).

Renewal in the Spirit: Rediscovering the Religious Life is well named. If read as prayerfully and profoundly as it deserves to be read, it should accomplish for many people what its title promises. If read, pondered, and put into practice along with John Paul II's latest book, *Sources of Renewal*, it should be a powerful stimulant to that rediscovery of religious life we should see in this decade.

This is spiritual reading in the truest and best sense of the word. It engages the mind and moves the heart. It is not easy reading; it requires much quiet meditation to absorb each of Fr. Regamey's important points.

As Fr. Regamey says in his foreward: "While it is indeed true that the spiritual renewal of religious is vitally important to the entire people of God and to the world, conversely laymen and laywomen are suffering great harm from the crisis in our time in the religious life. In fact the laity are often more

acutely aware of it than are the religious themselves. For the mentality of present-day religious is too often secularistic. In a more or less conscious way the laity demand that religious be faithful to the fullness of their "charism." We need to define clearly the nature of this "charism," explaining why it is a "charism." In return, through this demand on them, religious will receive a confirmation of their own vocation, or perhaps they will at last discover it." (p. 11)

The book carries out what its foreward indicates. For this English edition (the original was French), Fr. Regamey has completely revised the book, adding two introductory chapters and a new conclusion. These three additions are especially good.

Despite a few slips, e.g. St. Mallarme (p. 43) and the lack of sync between the text and footnotes (they go astray at footnote 21) in the excellent chapter on "Metanoia" (pp. 162-173), the book is well-printed and the type is easy to read. The footnotes are often as interesting as the text.

For people looking for genuine spiritual reading — reading that will lead to spiritual renewal, *Renewal in the Spirit* will be a delight.

Sr. Bernadette Counihan, OSF

Francesco Turvasi, *The Condemnation of Alfred Loisy and the Historical Method* (Roma, Edizioni Di Sturia E. Litteratura 1979) 204 pp.

This is a publication for the first time of the letters exchanged between Loisy and his Italian friend Giovanni Genocchi and an analysis of the relationship between the two. Genocchi has not up until now loomed large in the story of Modernism, although the present author says that compared with other of Loisy's correspondents the Italian seminary professor and sometime friend of Leo XIII occupied a privileged position because of his Roman connections. Actually Genocchi did intervene once with the Holy Office on Loisy's behalf and may be the person responsible for preserving Loisy's books from the index during Leo's pontificate.

Fr. Turvasi's book does not pretend to be the last word on the Loisy case nor does it dwell on the French priest's final denial of all revealed religion. Less does the book appear as a defense of Rome's conduct vis-a-vis the most famous modernist of his day.

The eleven chapters of this book cover historical data on major figures in the early 20th

century controversy, a description of biblical criticism and the historical method, analyses of Loisy's major works and his relationship with Pius X. Genocchi's final word on the matter is expressed on Turvasi's last page:

"The cause of Loisy's confusion between historical criticism and philosophy was, in the final analysis, to be found in the ambiguity he announced at the beginning of his scientific activity: 'In the field of biblical history, as in every other subject, faith directs scientific investigations.'"

This expression was in Turvasi's view Loisy's great mistake because it ultimately drove him to choose one (reason) and to renounce the other (faith).

Apart from annoyance with acknowledged typos, the reader will find much of value in this little known side of the Loisy story.

Carl F. H. Henry, *God, Revelation, and Authority* Vols. III and IV (Waco, Texas, Word Books, 1979) \$24.95 a volume.

These two books are part of a five volume series to be completed by 1983. They deal with the general subject of divine revelation. Dr. Henry, probably the leading scholarly voice of evangelical Protestantism in the U.S., and the founder of *Christianity Today*, is praised for his comprehensive knowledge of scripture not only by his own confessionalists, but by Catholics like Fulton Sheen and by secular commentators such as Richard Ostling (*Time*) and Kenneth Briggs (*N.Y. Times*).

The series itself is devoted to 15 theses concerning God's word contained in the Bible. Vols. I and II dealt with preliminary considerations and the early stages of revelation (Theses 1-7). Volume III examines the personal revelation of Jesus as the *Logos* (Incarnation) and Revelation as rational-verbal communication (Theses 8-10). The last five theses (10-15) in Volume IV are exclusively concerned with the authority of the Bible, the Holy Spirit, the Church and Man's final end. The hot biblical controversies of recent decades — inspiration, inerrancy, infallibility, Church authority, historical criticism, the canon, even the biblical basis of liberation theology, are treated in great detail in the fourth volume.

Throughout this series Dr. Henry comes across less a technician of exegesis as a biblical theologian,

biblical historian, evangelical apologist — although it is clear that he is well versed in textual, form, and redaction criticism.

Whenever Henry speaks about Revelation he means specifically the rational and intelligible communication by God with his creatures and the disclosure of divine truths and information. In his view the Bible possesses "intelligible verbal content" and believable sentences, propositions, and judgments (III 248, 407, 429). Dr. Henry is not content with any definition which reduces revelation merely to God's action in the universe of men. Says he: "Christianity's very claim to truth collapses unless truth can be affirmed of a certain core — propositions inherent in it and integral to it." Were this not the case, he says, "We shall needlessly and disastrously sacrifice what superbly distinguishes Christianity from other religions, viz., the truth of certain specific propositions that cannot be affirmed by rival faiths." (III pp. 486-487).

How are these two volumes of Carl Henry to be evaluated? Quite simply — they are a scholarly and respectable apologia (in the best Christian sense of that term) for Evangelical Protestantism. The author is a learned man of profound biblical faith in Christ, in Christ's ethical and supernatural message. He treats his antagonists even-handedly — whether they be Jews and other Christians — and with some courage. The chief defect of Carl Henry, if one is forced to be even-handed toward him, is the weakness of the Evangelical position itself. Henry to the contrary notwithstanding, the Bible is not self-validating nor is its interpretation self-assured by self-proclamations of the presence of the Holy Spirit. Henry remains faithful to his fundamental position: "We possess the teaching of Jesus only through the teaching of the New Testament: (III 34-35). For its understanding "no additional or complimentary lamps are necessary other than the illumination of the Holy Spirit who leads us by the express teaching of the text." (IV 252) Would that the question of revelation were this simple. Those who believe in Revelation know that God's words came through living men, finally by Christ himself, whose message was made credible to followers by the signs and works done through God's power. The written words followed and were authenticated by other living men.

(For a more complete review see *New Oxford Review*, April 1981, pp. 20-22.)

George A. Kelly

Four Hundred Years of St. Vincent De Paul:

A long time ago Ecclesiastes recognized a monotonous fact of history: "What was will be again; what has been done will be done again; and there is nothing new under the sun."¹ Even a casual backward glance over the thousands of years since reconfirms the fact. It should surprise no one. History is made by the actions and reactions of men and women who have the tiresome, stubborn habit of wanting to make their own contributions and mistakes.

The current observance of the 400th anniversary of the birth of St. Vincent de Paul occasions fresh attention to these rather stale truths. The kaleidoscope of his life included a fight to the death against Jansenism, the fashionable heresy of his day, and a notable if temporary victory. A review of that right calls attention to some startling *déjà-vus* in Church controversy of today.

Vincent de Paul's deep simple faith, love of the Church, and extraordinary graces given only to God's greatest saints, as well as the reverential reputation these inspired throughout 17th Century France made him a natural enemy of the Jansenists, much as did Thomas More's silence in 16th Century England, marking him for certain martyrdom.

Indeed, a sixth sense of the spirit had made Vincent uneasy for a long time:

"All my life long I have been afraid that I should live to see the rise of a new heresy," he confided to his priests in a conference. "I have seen the dreadful ravages caused by those of Luther and Calvin and the multitude of people of all conditions in life who have inbibed their pernicious poisons simply because they wished to have a sip of the false doctrines of their alleged reform. I have always been afraid of finding myself emeshed in the errors of some new doctrine before I noticed it; yes, I have been afraid of this all my life."²

His fear crystallized in his friendship with Duvergier de Hauranne, Abbe de Saint-Cyran, disciple of Cornelius Jansen and high priest of his new religion. The friendship was so close that, before Vincent founded his community of priests, they shared common rooms and a common purse. "This friendship was maintained by bonds so powerful," attests Pierre Coste, "that St. Vincent on more than one occasion had to implore divine protection for grace to resist, lest he might glide down an incline on to which many great minds had allowed themselves to be drawn."³ Indeed Vincent remained a faithful friend to the end. When Saint-Cyran was imprisoned by Richelieu, Vincent was summoned to testify against him. Vincent's logical mind set a simple course: he would say

nothing contrary to the truth, and he would say nothing to injure the accused.⁴ There were reasons beyond friendship that cannot be gone into here, but so adept was Vincent in following the course he had set himself, both in two interrogations by the Cardinal himself and in written depositions, that his testimony was quietly set aside as useless for the Cardinal's purpose.

Once Saint-Cyran was dead the real battle was joined under Antoine Arnauld and the gentlemen of Port-Royal, however, things were different. With the Church under open attack, Vincent shed all reticence concerning his friend's heretical opinions. He was especially anxious lest any of his own priests be seduced by the "new opinions," and he now candidly, and it must be painfully, revealed anguished, intimate conversations with his dead friend.

Once such conversation occurred when, Vincent, on his way home from saying Mass at Notre-Dame, dropped in on Saint-Cyran and found him writing.

"Confess sir," Vincent said, "that you have just been writing down some of the thoughts and sentiments which God bestowed on you during your morning meditation."

"I do confess that God has given me and gives me great lights," replied Saint-Cyran. "He has revealed to me that the Church no longer exists. No, there is no longer a Church. God has shown me that there has been no Church for more than six hundred years . . ."

"But consider, sir, are you prepared rather to rely on your own private views and opinions than on the word of Our Lord Jesus Christ who said that He would build His Church upon a rock, and that the gates of hell would not prevail against it? The Church is His spouse; He will never forsake her . . ."

"It is true that Jesus Christ built His Church upon a rock; but there is a time to build up and a time to cast down. She was His spouse but now she is an adulteress and a prostitute . . ."

"Is that, sir, really the respect you owe the truth? Believe me, mistrust these false lights of your own spirit for if you do not, you will wander away into the paths of error."⁵

Far from "mistrusting these false lights," Saint-Cyran once regaled Vincent at great length on the knowledge of the Scriptures God had given him, and finished, "The Holy Scriptures are more luminous in my mind than they are in themselves."⁶

Saint-Cyran's self-esteem did not even spare his friend Vincent de Paul. A Jansenist disciple, Claude Lancelot, relates an incident wherein Vincent

Fr. Joseph I. Dirvin, C.M.

refusing to accept his friend's conception of the Church, Saint-Cyran asked him, "But, sir, do you really know what the Church is?"

"The congregation of the faithful under Our Holy Father the Pope," Vincent replied.

"You know as much about it as you do about high Dutch," concluded Saint-Cyran with contempt.

Following this conversation Saint-Cyran composed a treatise on humility in which he pointed out the dangers risked by those in employments beyond their capacity.⁷

On another, more famous occasion, Saint-Cyran, thoroughly exasperated with his friend, exclaimed, "You are a great ignoramus;⁸ I am astonished that your Congregation tolerates you at its head!" To which Vincent replied – surely with a touch of the Gascon's wry wit – "I am still more surprised at the fact than you, for my ignorance is even greater than you imagine."⁹

Saint-Cyran's contempt was even more far-ranging. Vincent informed the Bishop of Lucon that "not only was he [Saint-Cyran] not inclined to submit to the decisions of the Pope, but he did not even believe in Councils. I know, my Lord, because I frequented his society for a long time."¹⁰

On an occasion when Saint-Cyran was attacking the Council of Trent, Vincent objected; "Sir, you are going too far. Do you really wish me to believe a single doctor of theology like yourself in preference to the whole Church which is the pillar of truth? She teaches me one thing and you maintain the contrary. Oh, sir, how can you prefer your own judgment to the best brains in the world and to all the prelates assembled at the Council of Trent who decided this point?"

"Don't talk to me about that Council," retorted Saint-Cyran. It was a Council of the Pope and scholastics in which there was nothing but intrigues and cabals."¹¹

Nor did the Jansenist disdain deviousness. Once when Vincent and he were discussing a tenet of Calvin's, he remarked: "Calvin was right about that."

"You forget," countered Vincent, "that this proposition has been condemned by the Church."

"I am well aware of it," was the reply, "but that only proves that Calvin made a mistake; he defended his position badly; that's all; *bene sensit, male locutus est.*"¹²

Coste charges that Saint-Cyran would not have been so open about his opinions with Vincent de Paul "were it not that he cherished a secret hope of gaining the Saint to his party," and cites Vincent himself as his authority.¹³

Further on he states flatly that "Saint-Cyran

was double-tongued; he spoke one language to those whom he thought he could easily win, and another to those who would have rejected his novel views. 'I have heard the late M. de Saint-Cyran say,' writes St. Vincent, 'that if in one room he had announced truths to persons who were capable of taking them in, and if, passing to another room, he found there were others who were not so, he would tell them the contrary, and that Our Lord had acted in this way and recommended others to do the same.'¹⁴ ¹⁵

After the death of Saint-Cyran Jansenism spread quickly like snakes of fire sent into the salons of courtiers and the halls of universities by the brilliant mind and able pen of Antoine Arnauld, its supreme theologian. Neither prohibitions by academic authorities or commands from Rome could stop eager students and theological faculties from discussing and writing about the "controversial" new opinions. Even some bishops gave these opinions their episcopal blessing.

Vincent de Paul, as a member of the royal Council of Conscience, had the plain duty to defend the faith. "The new opinions are causing such havoc that it seems as if half the world has succumbed to them . . . What should we not do to rescue the Spouse of Christ from this shipwreck!" he wrote taking up the challenge.¹⁶ He had the backing of the Queen Regent Anne of Austria, the Prince de Conde, the Chancellor, the Nuncio, and other members of the Council: Cardinal Mazarin, the Bishop of Lisieux, but not the Bishop of Beauvais. His organizational mind found a way: first a meeting with four eminent orthodox theologians at St. Lazare, his community's motherhouse, to plan the approach, then an appeal for support from the General Assembly of the Clergy of France. Out of these were distilled the famous Five Propositions to be sent to Rome for condemnation.

But it was essential that the Bishops of France sign the Petition of Condemnation. The Holy Father must be assured that it was the joint wish and action of the Body of Bishops.

To obtain the signatures became Vincent's personal task. For a year he sent long, well-reasoned, pleading letters into every diocese, into some more than once. Forty bishops, roughly a third of the hierarchy, signed early. Others had to be hectored with patient reasonableness, others to be coaxed by their friends in the hierarchy. Eleven, led by the Archbishop of Sens, signed a Jansenist counter-petition for delay. Others felt they should not take sides! Two even suggested mutual concessions, to which Vincent replied that error must yield to truth, not be mingled with it.

(Cont'd from page 19)

At length the Petition went to Rome with 88 episcopal signatures representing approximately three-quarters of the French hierarchy. Despite desperate lobbying in Rome by the Jansenists and their friends the Five Propositions were condemned by Innocent X on October 16, 1653, and again by Alexander VII in 1656 and Clement XI in 1705.

Condemnation did not extirpate Jansenism, nor any other heresy, but they exposed it firmly and uncompromisingly to all the People of God for what it was. Vincent de Paul was largely responsible for that. The Jansenist Gerberon called him "one of the most dangerous enemies which the disciples of St. Augustine have had."¹⁷ His Cause

of Beatification process contained the testimony of Martin Graudin, Doctor of the Sorbonne: "As God raised up St. Ignatius against Luther and Calvin, he raised up Monsieur Vincent against Jansenism."¹⁸

With all Vincent's evident talents and energy for the task, however, his ultimate weapon was spiritual. Recounting to his priests Saint-Cyran's determination to work for the Church's destruction because it would be rash to oppose God who "is angered and intends to deprive us of the Faith of which we have rendered ourselves so unworthy," the Saint told them: "That heresiarch lied when he said that it would be rash to oppose God in this matter and to devote oneself to the defense and preservation of His Church; for God

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

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

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars

tells us to defend her and we must do so. There is nothing rash in practicing fasting, self-denial and prayer that the wrath of God may be appeased, and in fighting to the bitter end for the defense and maintenance of the Church."¹⁹

Joseph I. Dirvin, C.M.

¹The Jerusalem Bible, "Ecclesiastes," 1, 9.

²Saint Vincent de Paul, *Correspondance, Entretiens, Documents*, XI, p. 37.

³Pierre Coste, C.M., *The Life and Works of Saint Vincent de Paul*, Vol. III, p. 113.

⁴Coste, *ibid.*, p. 137, citing M. des Lions, Dean of Senlis, *Journax*, p. 75.

⁵Louis Abelly, *La Vie du Vénérable Serviteur de Dieu Vincent de Paul*, Vol. II, p. 411.

⁶Abelly, *ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 203.

⁷Coste, *ibid.*, p. 119 citing Claude Lancelot, *Memoires touchant la vie de M. de Saint-Cyran*, Vol. II, p. 301.

⁸Although Vincent referred to himself as only "a scholar of the fourth form," he had studied at Toulouse, Paris and Rome, held the baccalaureate in theology, "graduated" in Canon Law, established and taught in his own schools, and was tutor to the children of the powerful De Gondi family.

⁹Abelly, *ibid.*

¹⁰St. Vincent de Paul, *ibid.*, IV, pp. 175ff., de Paul to Nivelles, Apr. 23, 1651.

¹²Coste, *ibid.*, p. 117 citing Abelly, *ibid.*: Vol. II, p. 104 and des Lions, *ibid.*, p. 71; also Saint Vincent de Paul, *ibid.*, II, p. 319 and VIII, p. 335.

¹³Coste, *ibid.*, p. 121 and Footnote 35.

¹⁴St. Vincent de Paul, *ibid.*, p. 366.

¹⁵Coste, *ibid.*, pp. 121-122; des Lions, *ibid.*, p. 75.

¹⁶St. Vincent de Paul, *ibid.*, III, pp. 182 ff., de Paul to Dehorgny, May 2, 1647.

¹⁷Coste, *ibid.*, p. 166 citing Gabriel Gerberon, *Historie générale du Jansenisme*.

¹⁸Coste, *ibid.*, p. 166.

¹⁹St. Vincent de Paul, *ibid.*, XI, p. 355.