

FELLOWSHIP OF CATHOLIC SCHOLARS

NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 4, NUMBER 4

SEPTEMBER 1981

Letter From President James Hitchcock

Lovers of modern music have reason to look back with a certain nostalgia to the famous 1914 premier of Stravinsky's *Le Sacre de Printemps*, when a riot broke out in the theatre, formented by those who were outraged at the composer's daring. The nostalgia derives from the fact that, while no contemporary audience would riot, and few would even show overt displeasure at music that offended them, it can also be wondered if this is due as much as anything to the fact that they are no longer capable of taking music as seriously as audiences did in 1914. Instead there is a polite and rather jaded blandness.

We may well wonder if a similar situation does not now exist in the Catholic Church. A few questions, e.g., the ordination of women, are still capable of eliciting passion. However, these passions are in a sense artificially contrived and organized, and they are confined for the most part to theological issues that are seen as having immediate practical relevance.

This is in contrast to the spirit that prevailed around the time of the Second Vatican Council and its immediate aftermath, when there was much lively debate and discussion about a whole host of things. In recent years anybody in contact with the people in the pews (and for that matter many of the clergy as well) cannot escape the impression that there is now a general indifference.

In a sense this is seen as a gain, if the *odium theologicum* can be a sin. However, peace bought at the price of indifference is bought too high. It was hardly the intention of the Second Vatican Council to promote such indifference.

In a sense this can be seen as a "liberal" victory, in that people now find it easy to give up formerly cherished beliefs. But liberals should ask themselves if they are willing to gain victory at that price either. The much discussed decline of Catholic publishing is merely one example of the effects of such indifference on the life of the Church. Modern liberal Protestantism shows how impossible it is to build religious life on the foundation of doctrinal disinterest.

It cannot be stressed too much that the anti-dogmatic principle in religion is also the principle of anti-intellectualism, since a faith seeking understanding necessarily seeks doctrinal formulations which embody that understanding. To speak now of a theological "pluralism" is often to speak less, at the practical level of Church life, of contending theological positions than of a situation in which one party affirms that doctrine is indeed important and the other dismisses it as obfuscation. The latter position, whatever it may be, is hardly Catholic in anything like the historical meaning of the faith. A major project of reeducation now faces the Church.

Friends of the Fellowship

Fr. Raymond T. McCarthy
Professor G.E.M. Anscombe
Most Rev. William J. McDonald

Items of Interest

- An *International Symposium on Natural Family Planning* has been reset for the Catholic University of America, November 5-8, 1981. Registration fee will be \$100 (after October 25th \$125). For further information write Fr. Paul Marx, OSB, Human Life International, 4 Library Court S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003. (202) 546-2257.

- Sister Bernadette Counihan O.S.F., a well-known member of the School Sisters of St. Francis, with six other nuns of the same community, has founded a new community to be called The Franciscan Sisters of Christ the Divine Teacher. For many years she has been the leader of the "loyal opposition" within the School Sisters against the secularization process which has gone on in that community since 1966, an order which fell from 2,500 members with a median age of 40 in 1966 to 1,800 with a median age of 65 in 1980. It was the conviction that community life in accordance with Church directions was no longer possible and the continuing abandonment of the teaching apostolate by School Sisters that led to the move toward a new community which will cherish both values. The new community makes its headquarters in St. Alphonsus Convent, 2605 Boies Avenue, Davenport, IA 52802 (319) 323-1502.

- A Lutheran couple has been certified as the 400th volunteer teaching couple by the Couple to Couple League (CCL), one of the nation's leading organizations for teaching natural family planning. Ken and Kaye Lysen, of Seattle, Washington have completed the League's certification course and will begin teaching natural family planning this summer in the Seattle area.

John F. Kippley, president of the League, is pleased to see the involvement of couples who are not Catholic. "All Christians must confront the contraception question, and we need teaching couples to branch out to all churches. Every couple has a right to learn natural family planning and the traditional Christian teaching on birth control."

The League's 400th couple brings representation to 44 states and 3 foreign countries. For more information about natural family planning, contact the CCL national headquarters at P.O. Box 11084, Cincinnati, Ohio 45211.

- Report of Delegate Robert Emmet Curran, S.J. to the Joint Committee of Catholic Learned Societies and Scholars for the *Catholic Historical Society Review* (April 1981 pp. 263-264):

"The major activity of the Joint Committee

has been the promotion of the continuing colloquium between bishops and scholars on the general theme of scholarship and the Church. The third annual colloquium, sponsored by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and the Joint Committee, was held at St. Joseph's Seminary in Washington, D.C., on October 23-25, 1980. The special theme of this third colloquium was Pastoral and Academic Knowledge in the Church. A group of twenty-seven scholars and ten bishops participated. Among the scholars was not one historian. Last summer I submitted three names to the planning committee. A month after the colloquium I was informed that none of the persons I suggested had been able to participate. That of course does not explain why the committee did not seek additional suggestions for a representative from history. Of the twenty-seven scholar participants fourteen were from theology, four from philosophy, and four from sociology. These skewed proportions reflect, among other things, (1) the initial occasion for the colloquium (the perceived lack of support for theological scholars by the hierarchy), (2) the presence of a philosopher on the planning committee, and (3) the favor with which theologians currently regard the social sciences. I pointed out at the annual meeting of the Joint Committee that if the colloquium continues, there should be a more equitable representation of the member societies and less reliance on the wisdom of the behavioral and social sciences.

"As a result of the latest colloquium there was widespread dissatisfaction with the present format and a consensus that changes need to be made if it is to continue. It appears likely that any future gathering will be more focused, have fewer participants, and be more equally balanced between scholars and bishops to encourage more of an exchange between the two communities. There is a difference of opinion about how heavily the theologians should be represented but very probably the colloquium will continue with certain changes in its structure."

- On August 15, 1981 Mother Mary Angelica, a contemplative Franciscan nun from Birmingham, Alabama made history when her *Eternal World Network* began public transmission of Catholic television programs. Linked to the Westar III satellite, her programming can be picked up by cable TV companies throughout the entire country and redistributed to individual homes. Mother Angelica is the abbess of Our Lady of Angels monastery in Birmingham and her work has the

blessing of the Holy See, to whom she is directly responsible. During May of this year Silvio Cardinal Oddi, Prefect of the Congregation of the Clergy, visited EWN and blessed the 30-foot satellite transmitting dish in the monastery backyard which is hooked up to the most sophisticated television production facility which modern technology can offer. It is estimated that the entire facility is worth about \$10 million dollars.

Asked what a contemplative nun is doing in the television business, Mother Angelica responds by reminding questioners that cloistered nuns have been involved throughout the ages in communication from copying scriptures to printing to television in our day. With a wry smile, she reminds her audiences that the patron saint of television is another Franciscan nun — St. Clare — declared so by Pius XII a quarter century ago.

Mother Angelica first became interested in Catholic television when she found herself a TV star on the Protestant TV programs widespread in the South. Within hardly more than two years she has pieced together a remarkable studio and programming components which now is transmitting five hours of Catholic television each day.

The *Orlando Florida Catholic* devoted several lead stories to Mother Angelica's foundation (June 12 and June 19). Fr. Desmond Daly, editor of the St. Petersburg diocesan edition of *The Florida Catholic* spent two days in the Birmingham monastery to "discover the truth about Mother Angelica and the Eternal Word Network". He had heard that while she was a "fabulous teacher", she was also a "disobedient nun" who should "stay in the cloister". Some of the criticism apparently came from within the USCC, which on behalf of the American bishops is putting together its own network, projected to be completed by 1982. Fr. Daly reports that in one interview with a journalist an official of the USCC's Communication Department did call Mother Angelica too conservative. Richard Hirsch, USCC's Communication secretary in a conversation with Fr. Daly also expressed concern about EWN duplicating the USCC effort.

Mother Angelica is aware that "right wing" Catholics might try to use her and she is prepared to deal with that effort if it arises as a problem, but she asks: "What's so conservative about cloistered nuns erecting the first Catholic satellite in the U.S.?" She is, she says, as conservative or as nonconservative as the Church and the Holy Father. Mother Angelica in tune with Vatican II demands as interpreted by the magisterium, is aware of the Council's decree on Communications (*Inrer Mirifica*) which speaking of press dissemination says: "Whether it be established and directed by ecclesiastical authority or by individual

Catholics (it) would have for its manifest purpose to form, to consolidate, and to promote a public opinion in conformity with the natural law and with Catholic doctrines and directives." (No. 14)

To her harshest critics she replies: "They think I am a sort of an Archbishop Lefebvre who wants to be a slave to past tradition. I have nothing to do with such people". As to the charge of conservatism, she asks: "Is being orthodox all that much of a crime these days?"

The charge of duplication troubles her less because the entire Church duplicates itself all the time. There is no reason why a bishops'—only network is desirable, since in a country as large and as affluent as the U.S. most higher educational institutions and national magazines/newspapers are owned and operated by other than bishops. In fact, as the secular scene makes clear, the effectiveness of private effort is frequently the yardstick by which centralized government service is judged.

Mother Angelica has 12 nuns who produce 1,000,000 devotional booklets a month distributed free of charge all over the world. They do this and their TV productions in four hours of a given day. The rest of the day is given to the usual occupations of monastic life, including five hours of daily prayer.

Our Lady of Angels Monastery is situated at 5817 Old Leeds Road, Birmingham, Alabama 35210 Phone 205-956-5987.

- Robert L. Spaeth, Dean of Arts and Sciences at St. John's University in Collegeville, MI. discusses a hot contemporary subject "sexism" but in an unusual framework. His article "The Nonsexist Assault on Language or A Memorandum to the National Council of Teachers of English" (*Change*, July/August 1981). *Mankind* becoming *genkind* is only a harbinger of what might happen when words like *manhole* and *horseman* are desexed. His final advice is, borrowing from John Simon's *Paradigms Lost*, that feminists fight for woman's rights but leave the language alone.

- An up-to-date report on the state of the Church in the Netherlands is contained in *Communio* (Summer 1981) by Dutch Jesuit Jan Bots. The early 1980 Synod of Holland's Bishops in Rome, convoked by the Pope himself, was expected to get the Church of the Netherlands out of a difficult situation and reverse its record losses in vital areas of Church life. Bots concludes that the main (and salvific) effect of the Synod was to force the underground Church in control of many Catholic institutions into open defiance of Pope and Synod in a move to turn the Church into a lay Church. Not only ex-priests but theological faculties are laying the groundwork for lay pastors independent of bishops.

Silvio Cardinal Oddi on *Catechesi Tradendae*

(On May 15-16, 1981 the Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Clergy celebrated the second anniversary of John Paul II's Apostolic Exhortation on catechetics – issued October 16, 1979 – at a Symposium in New York City. A copy of the full text of his address is available from the Newsletter Office. The following are the major points he made.)

Introduction

1. *Catechesi Tradendae* may be considered “overly fundamental by some until one realizes that not a few of today’s attacks on the Church are going for the jugular, the very fundamentals of our faith: the Divinity of Christ, the Resurrection from the dead of His true Body, our own immortality, and so forth.”

2. The faithful are bewildered and are being misled – by “what is being said in some quarters within the Church” and by “catechetical excesses.”

3. The priest is “the central figure in the catechetical apostolate” explaining why the *Congregation for the Clergy* has responsibility for catechesis.

Substantive Points about Catholic Truth

1. *Pluralism*: “Catholics are not free to espouse theories and practices which violate the God-given nature which man has received.”

- “When it is a question of essential doctrine it would not be honest for either side (in ecumenical discourse) to make superficial concessions to express a fundamental unity which, in fact, would not exist.”
- “Careless pluralism results in a distorted view of things and the principle of pluralism cannot be used to justify the validity of contradictory ideas.”
- Legitimate pluralism means that “all men should be free from coercion.”

2. *Age-Level Catechesis for Old and Young*

- “Religious formation cannot be considered over when a child makes his or her confirmation.”
- “The young remain the primary object of the Church’s catechetical solicitude.”
- “Advanced courses in theology [are useless] unless aspirants to these have first been taught their prayers and the essentials of their Religion.”

3. *The Catechetical Mission*

- “A catechist is a man or woman sent by the Church as Christ was sent by His Father.” (The Fourth Gospel) mentions Jesus as having been *sent* by the Father 42 times).
- “Unless the catechist is sent directly or indirectly by the Church, he or she is not authorized to teach the faith of the Church.”
- “The catechist is obliged to teach what the Church believes rather than what might be his or her personal opinion.”
- “It would be anomalous, indeed, if a catechist of whatever level would pretend to a doctrinal autonomy that the Messiah himself did not profess.”
- “Jesus did not change his teachings to make them more palatable.” – “Catechists (must be warned) against the temptation to dilute Christian doctrine to make it more attractive to some of its critics.”

4. *Revelation and the Signs of the Times*

- “Revelation is not revelation unless it certainly comes from God.”
- “The signs of the times are not infallible keys to the divine mind but opportunities and warnings along the Church’s route to heaven . . . the only proven Chart of the sea of life remains the Word of God as transmitted to us by the Church, for without the Church we would be on a very uncertain journey, indeed.”

5. *The Kingdom of God*

- “The catechists conception of [the Kingdom of God] must, of course, be made that of the Church – (which) is not the Kingdom of Caesar.”
- “Earthly progress is not an end in itself, but is useful when it strengthens the Kingdom of God among men.”
- “The catechist has no special competence *qua* catechist to discuss and to teach the means to be used to bring about temporal progress.”
- “The catechist’s purpose in going ‘to the other cities’ (besides the Kingdom) is not to *find* something there but to bring someone there.”
- “There has been a certain tendency here

and there to dilute Christian teaching to try to make it conform to behavior which is objectively at odds with Christian morality, and to take it for granted that the Kingdom of God already exists everywhere even among those who have not yet been 'born again'."

Conclusion

1. Points not discussed for lack of time –
 - "Utility of a universal outline of Catholic Doctrine to guide authors and publishers in producing reliable national, regional and local catechisms."
 - "the correct sequence for the reception of the Sacraments of Initiation, which has deviated in some places along emotional instead of theological directions."
 - "The importance of memory in religious formation, which is no less than it is in other disciplines."
2. Future catechesis not in one direction family vs. school, CCD vs. school, adult vs. youth, etc.
3. The importance of Catechetical Institutes in dioceses "to form faithful and competent catechists all over the United States."

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Board of Directors 1981-1983

President –

Rev. William Smith
St. Joseph's Seminary
Dunwoodie
Yonkers, New York 10704

1st Vice President –

Rev. Earl Weis, S.J.
Dept. of Theology
Loyola University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois 60626

2nd Vice President –

Dr. Joseph Boyle
Dept. of Philosophy
University of St. Thomas
3812 Montrose Blvd.
Houston, Texas 77006

Executive Secretary – and Treasurer –

Dr. Joseph Scottino
Gannon University
Erie, Pa. 16501

Fellowship Board of Directors 1981-1983

(continued)

Directors:

Dr. James Hitchcock
Dept. of History
Saint Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri 63103

Rev. Kenneth Baker
Homiletic & Pastoral Review
86 Riverside Drive
New York, New York 10024

Dr. Anne Carson Daly
1208 Enchanted Forest
South Bend, Indiana 46637

Dr. Eugene Diamond
8700 121st Street
Palos Park, Illinois 60464

Rev. Msgr. George A. Kelly
Editor, The Newsletter
St. John's University
Jamaica, New York 11439

Rev. Ronald Lawler
Director of the Center for
Thomistic Studies
University of St. Thomas
3812 Montrose Blvd.
Houston, Texas 77006

Rev. Joseph T. Mangan, S.J.
6525 Sheridan Road
Chicago, Illinois 60626

Dr. Glen Olsen
Dept. of History
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Rev. Richard R. Roach, S.J.
Jesuit Residence
1404 W. Wisconsin Ave.
Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

Rev. James Schall, S.J.
37 & O Streets, NW
Washington, D.C. 20057

Dr. Paul Vitz
110 Bleeker Street, (23-A)
New York, New York 10012

Rev. Michael Wrenn
St. Joseph's Seminary
Dunwoodie
Yonkers, New York 10704

Critical Reflections on the USCC Publication — Education in Human Sexuality for Christians

by the
Religious Education Committee of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars

Recently the United States Catholic Conference published *Education in Human Sexuality for Christians: Guidelines for Discussion and Planning*. Prepared by the National Committee for Human Sexual Education of the *Department of Education of the United States Catholic Conference*, its purpose is to provide a curriculum for sexual education from preschool years through high school “from a Catholic perspective” (p. vi). The document outlines a program that in practice is to be implemented, primarily by professional educators and only secondarily by parents, pastors, and others concerned with the Christian education of youth.

It is the considered judgment of this *Religious Education Committee of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars* that the USCC document is deficient as a guide for the “sex education” of young Catholics and may be harmful to their formation as responsible and truly Catholic adults. After study and consultation we are of the opinion that the content of this document should be reviewed by the *Administrative Board of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops to determine precisely how the Church from parish to university should be dealing with this sensitive area of human development in the light of our own National Catechetical Directory and the many statements of the Holy See on this subject.*

The reasons which have led us to this conclusion are threefold: (I) The present Document omits elements absolutely essential for a Catholic approach to sexual education; (II) Sections are ambiguous and open to unacceptable interpretations; (III) Certain proposed views are highly debatable. The significance of this Document for the Catholic Education System with Suggestions for a Program of Catholic Sexual Education complete the findings of this Fellowship committee.

1. The Present Document Omits Elements Absolutely Essential for a Catholic Approach to Sexual Education.

The Foreword asserts that this document was written to provide a program in sexual education from a “Catholic perspective” (p. vi) and that the guidelines it contains “are meant to support the teaching of the Church on sexuality and sexual morality” (p. vi). However, the authors fail to achieve their objectives in three important respects:

1. *The Guidelines never propose as a goal the acceptance of the Church’s teaching on sexual morality and a willingness to shape one’s life in conformity with the truths taught by the Church about human sexuality.*

The teaching of the Church generally is included as one datum among others to be provided for teachers and students. It is never presented as a *liberating truth* about ourselves. One of the major goals of a *Catholic* approach to human sexuality must of necessity be an understanding of the Church’s teaching on sexual morality and of the *truth* of that teaching. A *Catholic* approach must help young people freely accept the Church’s true teaching on human sexuality and encourage them to shape their lives by it. By doing so they will become the men and women they are meant to be as human beings and as Christians redeemed by Christ and called, in Him, to a new way of living. This essential goal of *Catholic* education in sexuality is not sufficiently recognized in the USCC document.

2. *Its treatment of the human condition fails to take seriously the consequences of original sin and the serious reality of personal sin.*

In the original draft of this document there was no reference to original sin and its consequences. The present manuscript does not reflect the constant teaching of the Church on the nature and effects of original sin. Vatican Council II reflected this constant tradition with precision when, immediately after affirming the inviolable worth of the human person made in the image of God, it stressed the serious consequences of original sin. The Fathers of Vatican II made clear that as a result of original sin man is divided in himself: “As a result, the whole life of man, both individual and social, shows itself to be a struggle, and a dramatic one, between good and evil, between light and darkness. Man finds that he is

Education in Human Sexuality for Christians (cont'd)

unable of himself to overcome the assaults of evil successfully, so that everyone feels as though bound by chains. But the Lord himself came to free and strengthen man, renewing him inwardly and casting out the 'prince of this world' (Jn 12.31), who held him in bondage of sin" (*Gaudium et Spes*, n. 13). The present USCC document does not adequately reflect this teaching.

The document refers in several places to sin and its effects on human existence. But it is not sufficiently specific about the reality of sin and the need of human repentance. The New Testament call to *metanoia*, to a change of heart, to the need for us to recognize our sinfulness and our utter dependence on God to free us from the bondage of sin, is not mentioned.

The document frequently speaks of God's love and his willingness to forgive us -- but does not speak of the obstacles we place against maintaining that love. Nowhere does it insist on the need for repentance and of contrition for sin, which as most Christians experience is the major reason for failing to respond to God's love and for failing to lead a good and holy life. One cannot teach sexuality in a Catholic way without giving sufficient stress to the teaching that sexual sins gravely offend the Lord, endanger one's eternal salvation, and make authentic Christian living impossible. The realism and truth of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians (Chapter 6) is missing from the USCC presentation.

3. *In its treatment of human sexuality the Guidelines fail to make key distinctions essential for any adequate Catholic approach to sexual education.*

The term "human sexuality" is used frequently but without definition. It is said, for example that "human relationships are expressed in a way that is enfleshed and sexed" (Theological principle no. 4, p. 6 and passim). This is a truism. But what do the words "enfleshed and sexed" mean? What does "sexuality" mean in its many and diverse uses? "Sexuality" usually designates the fundamental quality or modality of human existence which distinguishes males from females, men from women. As persons with bodies we all possess a sexed humanity. In this basic sense our human relations and activities are all "sexed". Yet not all of our activities and relations are "genital". Genitality pertains to any activity of ours that is inherently procreative and unitive. By its very nature it is intimate and exclusive.

Without adequate definition of terms like *sexuality*, *genital sex*, *sexual desire*, *chastity* it is almost impossible to articulate clearly or accurately the Church's understanding of human sexuality and sexual morality.

Readers can become easily confused by the document's failure to define terms. Phraseology in certain sections could lead some readers to conclude that sexual relations (here equivalent to genital relations) need be exclusive and faithful only for married couples, and not be exclusive but still be considered maturely responsible for non-married persons (Cf. p. 14).

II. *Sections are Ambiguous and Open to Unacceptable Interpretations.*

Attention has already been called to the essential ambiguity in the document's use of the term "human sexuality." but it is ambiguous on many other points as well.

1. *The articulation of Catholic teaching on sexual morality is obscure in many places.*

Catholic teaching on sexual morality is presented as a datum that ought to be included (among others) in a sexual education program, not as a liberating truth of Christian faith. The document urges that this doctrine be made known, but it never insists that it be accepted and made real in the lives of people because of its truth. Further, the document counterposes truth that comes from the Church's teaching to truth that comes from the "Spirit speaking in the lives of committed Christians." Surely this needs further explanation. Today many allegedly committed Christians claim that contraceptive intercourse, genital activity by unmarried couples "committed to one another", and homosexual activity by homosexually oriented persons who enjoy a relatively stable relationship with one another, are morally good and a witness to committed Christians. Indeed, there are theologians who assert that "official" or "authentic" teaching of the Church on these issues, while requiring our respect (much as we ought to respect the views of Moslems regarding polygamy), may well not be true, that perhaps the Holy Spirit, speaking to us through the lives of these committed Christians, is seeking to show us how the Church *today* ought to respond to human needs. For this reason alone, a document purporting to represent the thinking of the United States Catholic Conference ought to be more specific in this area lest it be used to justify advocacy within the Catholic Church of moral positions firmly opposed by the Church's highest teaching authority.

Education in Human Sexuality for Christians (cont'd)

2. *The treatment of contraception is not as clear nor as strong as in other Church documents.*

The *National Catechetical Directory*, for example, requires that catechesis include "a clear presentation of the Church's teaching concerning moral methods of regulating births, the evil of artificial birth control and of sterilization for that purpose, and the crime of abortion; it should stress the protection due to human life once conceived." (No. 131) In another place the NCD says: "The Church proclaims the value of the life-giving meaning of marital intercourse. It rejects the ideology of artificial contraception. The Church forbids methods of family limitation directed against the life-giving meaning of sexual intercourse. It condemns the view that sterilization and artificial contraception are morally legitimate means of family limitation." (No. 105b)

The above selections from *Sharing the Light of Faith* (NCD) represent clearly and strongly the mind of the Church on all forms of contraception expressed by the American bishops in 1979. One would expect two years later that a USCC document, restricted to the area of "sex education" alone, would not only be as clear and as strong but even more specific in assisting teachers to teach and students to learn how to apply properly the teaching of the Church (cited above) in their single or married life.

Yet *Education in Human Sexuality for Christians* is timorous in its approach to this admittedly difficult area of conscience formation. The Document does urge repeatedly that high school students, even at the junior high school level, "be introduced to the scientific data regarding all methods of family planning and the Church's teaching on this subject." (pp. 85, 88, 89) But beyond a few broad directives (e.g. the psycho-sexual processes must be handled responsibly — p. 92), little guidance is given on how to deal with contraception, sterilization, abortion in a booklet designed for this very purpose to spell out the broader directives of the *National Catechetical Directory*.

Why should Catholic guidelines for sex education courses not instruct teachers to teach and students to learn why contraceptive techniques, including contraceptive sterilization, are "evil"? And why not that abortion is a "crime" (NCD language)? Why should they not be informed also that some methods of "contraception" widely used in the United States (e.g. interuterine devices and pills) not only are contraceptive but abortifacient? Should they not also be taught why fertility awareness programs, requiring the exercise of the virtue of chastity (cf. *Gaudium et Spec*, 51) are not contraceptive?

When we couple the limited discussion of contraception here with the previous suggestion that the Holy Spirit is at work in the lives of "committed Christians", it is possible for students completing courses based on these guidelines to reach unacceptable conclusions.

In places, the document urges that students understand the stages of moral development. (See p. 95, objectives 1-6) Here there are implications that the moral theory of Lawrence Kohlberg or of various advocates of values clarification is to be employed, without any suggestion of the serious difficulties involved in adopting these positions. Nor does the document adequately consider the moral logic entailed in the acceptance of a new way of life in Christ, with a resoluteness to shape one's life in accord with the radical demands of the Gospel and to eschew evil, even when some temporary gain derives from it. The moral thinking rooted in a love for the goods of human persons made in the image and likeness of God is not developed. Instead one finds here implicit endorsement of contemporary psychological theories of moral development which are already seriously questioned by well known leaders in the psychological community.

III. *Certain Proposed Views are Highly Debatable*

The Church wishes children to be taught Catholic doctrine on the meaning of human persons, the meaning of human sexuality and its purposes. The Church also wishes its own norms of sexual morality to be clearly and persuasively presented to youth. All this is quite clear.

What is not clear, however, is that the Church wishes sexual education to be given children in mixed classes, as the document insists. The call on the part of the document for sex education in classes composed of both boys and girls is one that can reasonably be challenged, and is sure to be unacceptable to many.

This is particularly so since the document calls for explicit instruction on the physiology and biology of sexual relations to be carried out in mixed classes, even for children whose sexual interests are generally latent. In many ways, we believe, the suggestions in this regard unnecessarily encroach upon the privacy of children and the rights of parents in sexual education. Although Catholic institutions have obligations to

Education in Human Sexuality for Christians (cont'd)

prepare children for life, the rights and the obligations of parents to provide proper *Catholic* sexual education for their children are still preeminent. Catholic schools rightfully may provide such instruction even over the objections of some parents, but the question of mixed classes for such instruction is of another kind.

Vatican II called, as the USCC Document notes, for "positive and prudent sex education" (*Gravissimum Educationis*, n. 1). The Council insisted on this need in the introductory paragraphs of this conciliar declaration in connection with its discussion of the general principles that apply to education in general. *Gravissimum Educationis* does not mention formal sex education in a school setting until much later, thus making it difficult to conclude that the Fathers of Vatican II were mandating, even preferring, sex education in Catholic schools, or in mixed classes. In fact, *Gaudium et Spes* says, "especially in the heart of their own families young people should be aptly and seasonably instructed on the dignity, duty, and expression of married love" (n. 49). It seems more reasonable to conclude, therefore, that what the Council meant in *Gravissimum Educationis* (n. 1) by a "positive and prudent sexual education" was not necessarily the explicit formal school programs for every school age group to which by far the greater part of the USCC's Guidelines are directed.

As recently as February 19, 1981, in Cebu City, the Philippines, Pope John Paul II said that "the delicate responsibility for sex education belongs principally to families, where an atmosphere of loving reverence will be conducive to a fully human Christian understanding of life and love" (*L'Osservatore Romano*, English edition, March 2, 1981, p. 5). In the judgment of this *Fellowship Committee* the type of formal school programs in sex education advocated in this document will be unacceptable to many Catholic parents. Further, the insistence in a Church document on explicit instruction in the physiology of sex will also disturb the equanimity of some children and their natural right to privacy, if they or their parents shall so decree.

Significance and Suggestions

We recognize the Church's need to support families in providing children with prudent sexual instruction *in the light of their Catholic faith and the teaching of their Church*. We also believe that the primary responsibility for sexual education rests with parents, that Catholic schools should follow guidelines which will be worked out with parents at the local level and that will truly support parents in carrying out their responsibilities.

We are convinced that the USCC booklet, *Education in Human Sexuality for Christians: Guidelines for Discussion and Planning*, is unsatisfactory by reason of its ambiguity and its omission of essential Catholic directives. The "principles" provided, more psychologically oriented than theologically, are unable to sustain the measure of Catholic education expected in this important area of human development.

Furthermore, the potential effects of this document, if used exclusively as a guide, may not be what Catholic bishops anticipate. The booklet's obscurity on major points of Catholic doctrine leaves room for justification of moral positions firmly opposed by the teaching authority of the Church.

We believe that any program of Catholic sexual education must make crystal clear the truth and beauty of the Church's teaching on human sexuality. The dignity of the human person redeemed in Christ who is called to holiness in this life and union in the next must be examined for its spiritual as for its psychological significance. The falsity of secular views on sexuality must be explored in greater detail. Any program of Catholic sex education must show that Christian charity also involves Christian chastity, the virtue which enables us to give ourselves to others as selflessly as possible with full regard to their needs, the needs of society and the mind of God himself. Only by learning to be chaste can the young shape a society in which every human person is wanted and loved, where infants will enter homes capable of developing their human potential, where they will be members of Christian Families which will incorporate them fully into the help made possible through the saving death and resurrection of Jesus.

Today, the permissive society with its acceptance of diverse genital activity is pervasive and even affects large numbers of Catholics. This includes priests, nuns, the teaching laity and others. It is reflected in the widespread defections from the teachings of the magisterium as exemplified by public and private dissent from *Humanae Vitae*. Accordingly, classroom teaching must be based on a document that is definitive and

Education in Human Sexuality for Christians (cont'd)

clear about the Church's teaching and the obligation to adhere to its moral authority. Ambiguity on the part of any text invites the intrusion of the teacher's personal opinion, a temptation to which teachers with their captive audiences are more susceptible than others.

The adverse results of ambiguity about magisterial teaching are two-fold. First, the efforts of parents trying to rear their children in conformity with the explicit teachings of the Church are impaired. They already have enough difficulty combating the insidious influence on their children of today's secular society. They need the firm support of the Church more than ever. Secondly, there is no reason to believe that open-ended teaching will have any better results under Church than it has had under secular auspices. The failure of secular formal sex education to control or ameliorate the sex activity of teen-agers is well established. In the absence of a firm teaching of Catholic doctrine persuasively and inspirationally taught by a committed teacher, parochial classroom sex education is also bound to fail. The young have enough psychological difficulties maturing without being exposed to any program which by its intrinsic nature, by its subject matter and group setting furthers sex preoccupation and sex curiosity. Surely, we should be able to learn from the experience of our secular society.

It is our recommendation that each bishop review this booklet personally and that the National Conference of Catholic Bishops provide sure and certain guidance to priests, religious and most importantly to parents who in these perilous times have reason to fear for the human and Catholic development of children whom they love dearly and upon whom the future of the nation and the Church depend.

Signed by

Dr. & Mrs. Eugene Diamond
National Conference of Catholic Physicians Guilds

Mr. & Mrs. John Farrell
Chaircouple, Cardinal Wright Award Committee

Mr. & Mrs. Robert Joyce
St. John's University, Collegeville, Mn.

Fr. Ronald Lawler, OFM, Cap.
St. Thomas University, Houston, Tx.

Fr. Robert Levis
Gannon University, Erie, Pa.

Dr. William May
Catholic University of America

Dr. Herbert Ratner
Visiting Professor at New York Medical College

Fr. Henry Sattler, CSSR
University of Scranton

Fr. William Smith
St. Joseph's Seminary, N.Y.

Fr. Michael Wrenn
New York Catechetical Institute

Publications of Interest

- Paul Quay, S.J. has an article in the March 1981 issue of *Theological Studies*: "Angels and Demons: The Teaching of IV Lateran", pp. 20-45. It examines the constitution *Firmiter* and concludes that the Council solemnly defined the existence of angels and demons as an article of Catholic faith; their existence was not merely presupposed; the Council did not mention them only to manifest the universality of God's creative action and the creaturely origin of evil but positively asserted Catholic faith against heresies in which false teaching about angels and demons was central.

- Yves Simon, *A General Theory of Authority*, (University of Notre Dame Press). This 1962 book by one of Notre Dame's most distinguished philosophers is available in a 1980 reprint (\$4.95). The thesis of the book is that authority is an essential concomitant of liberty. Simon sees authority as the catalyst necessary to bring together the seemingly disparate demands of liberty on the one hand and order on the other. Well worth having.

- *The Ignatian Press*, situated at the University of San Francisco (P.O. Box 18990, Ca. 94118), continues to publish otherwise unavailable volumes.

Two books by John Paul II are now available in English.

Faith According to St. John of the Cross by Karol Wojtyla

This is the Holy Father's doctoral dissertation, done under the direction of the late Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange at the Angelicum in Rome. An early work, it shows an important stage in the intellectual development of the Holy Father. The Mystical Doctor, John of the Cross, is studied in the light of the Angelic Doctor, Thomas Aquinas. (\$11.95 hard-covered and \$7.95 paper)

Love and Responsibility by Karol Wojtyla

Combining his widely-respected scholarship in the field of ethics and his years of pastoral experience with the problems of married people, the Holy Father has produced a work that is of permanent value for its successful integration of his own profound philosophy of the person with Catholic teaching on sexual morality. It is of great relevance also to the continuing controversy surrounding the encyclical *Humanae Vitae*. *Love and Responsibility* was first published in 1960, when the author was auxiliary bishop of Krakow.

This book is fundamental to an understanding

of the man who already has had such a major impact on the world and who promises to give the Church a renewed understanding of its ethical tradition in the context of Christian love. (\$12.95)

Other new Ignatius Press offerings include

First Glance at Adrienne von Speyr by Hans Urs von Balthasar

First Glance is an introduction to Adrienne von Speyr, a contemporary Swiss mystic (1902-1967), wife, medical doctor, author and co-foundress of a secular institute. This account of her life, written by Fr. von Balthasar, her spiritual director for nearly 30 years, includes an appraisal of her contribution to theology, a complete bibliography, and passages from her writings that are representative of the contents of her more than sixty books. Also included is a collection of her prayers. (\$6.95)

- William Brennan, *Medical Holocausts: Exterminative Medicine in Nazi Germany and Contemporary America*, Vol. I. (Boston: Nordland Publishing International, 1980, 392 pages, \$8.95) This volume, by a professor of social work at St. Louis University, marshals massive evidence of the ready cooperation of the German medical profession with Nazi eugenic and exterminative programs and shows how these preoccupations even pre-dated the Nazis' coming to power. Disturbing parallels are drawn with the expressed attitudes of the medical avant-garde in modern America. Despite its controversial character, the book would be hard to argue against.

- Jose Escriva de Balaguer, *Friends of God* (New York: Scepter Press, 1981, 296 pages, \$8.95).

This collection of homilies by the founder of the Opus Dei movement gives an excellent introduction to the spirituality of the movement, which is modern and yet ageless. It has relevance to all Catholics living in the modern world.

- *Sacred Signs* is a new journal devoted to liturgy and the religious arts. It is published quarterly and costs \$10 a year. Subscriptions may be ordered at P.O. Box 577, Newport, R.I. 02840. Father Giles Dimock, O.P., a Fellowship member, is one of the editors.

- *Center Journal* is a new publication of the Center for Christian Studies. The Fellows of the Center, Professors Donald Bloesch, John Evans, Theodore Jungkuntz, Ralph McInerny, and Gerhart Niemeyer announce that this quarterly will address itself primarily to those issues which arise out of the exchange between modernity and

Christianity. To receive a complimentary copy of the first issue contact: Center for Christian Studies, P.O. Box A, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556.

- James V. Schall, S.J., *Christianity and Life*, (San Francisco, California, Ignatius Press, 1981)

Fr. Schall has a nice little book here which seeks to explain "human life" in the Christian way. Those who know his style and interests will be familiar with how he deals with the modern "technological effort to allow the sex without the begetting"; "the efforts of women to establish a separate world"; the problem of *Humanae Vitae*; and the significance of the test-tube baby Louise Brown to the case for "life begins with conception", etc.

- John J. Mulloy (Ed.) *Christianity in East and West*, (La Salle, Ill., Sherwood Sugden & Co., 1981)

The Sugden company is dedicated to bring back the Christian Classics and their new list makes Chesterton, C.S. Lewis, Newman, Maritain, Gilson and many others available at bargain prices. John Mulloy is a protege of Christopher Dawson and reproduces the master, who had few peers as an historian-analyst of Christianity's impact on world development. This present volume is an expanded version of *The Movement of World Revolution* published in 1959. Those who respect and revere Dawson will be happy for this recapture of a great Catholic mind. The epilogue entitled "The Papacy and the Modern World" was written in 1956 but is pertinent for those who live with a pope who one day may be the equal, if not surpass, the influence of Pius XII in the world of secular revolution.

Periodical Reviews

Professor Noonan, Church Teaching, and Contraception

The 1980 issue (Volume 25) of the important *American Journal of Jurisprudence* contains a noteworthy essay by Professor John T. Noonan, Jr., entitled "Natural Law, the Teaching of the Church, and the Regulation of the Rhythm of Human Fertility." Since Noonan's essay not only sets forth a quite unique "interpretation" of the teaching of the Church on this issue but also is certain to be very influential, it will be worthwhile to offer some comments on it and to note what I believe are serious errors in it.

Noonan, whose essay has already been cogently criticized in a probing analysis by Charles E. Rice, early in the essay admits that the teaching of *Humanae Vitae* is a "given of Catholic doctrine" and that our task now is properly to understand and apply this teaching (p. 16). He then provides his exegesis of this teaching and offers applications of it.

Noonan believes that *Humanae Vitae* offered "a new and distinctive doctrine forbidding intervention which deliberately deprived a *natural-ly fecund marital act of fertility*" (p. 21; emphasis mine). It is most important to keep clearly in mind the way Noonan expresses the "doctrine" of *Humanae Vitae*; as Rice has noted, "Noonan is stating the teaching in such a way as to foreshadow his own conclusions." Again and again Noonan claims that what the encyclical condemns is the "deliberately willed dissassociation between the conjugal act and the *natural rhythm* of fertility" (p. 35; emphasis mine; cf. pp. 30, 32, 33). The

encyclical condemns this very specific "dissassociation," Noonan argues, because the teaching of the encyclical is itself grounded in "natural rhythm of fecundity and infecundity." It is this natural rhythm that "serves as the basis for the symbolic human significance of conjugal acts in which fecundity accompanies the expression of love" (p. 23). Therefore the teaching of the Church, set forth in *Humanae Vitae*, "builds on," "is based on," and "rests on" natural rhythm of fertility and sterility (pp. 22, 23, 29).

Because this is the teaching at the heart of the encyclical, Noonan contends that for the sake of accuracy we must speak not of "contraceptive means" but rather of "dissassociative means," not of "contraception" but rather of "disruption of the unity," i.e., the *naturally given* unity of fecundity and conjugal acts expressive of love (p. 30). Thus for Noonan the "doctrine" of *Humanae Vitae* forbids any human intervention ("dissassociative means") that would deprive the marital act *during the fertile phase* of the woman of its fecundity. Noonan then contends that sterilizing or contraceptive means used to prevent or impede procreation in the marital act during the non-fertile phase of the woman's cycle would *not* be "dissassociative means" and would therefore be in keeping with the teaching at the heart of the encyclical (pp. 29-37). To support this claim Noonan argues that in the human being God intends fertility and the consequent union of the unitive and procreative meanings of marriage and of

human sexuality to be present only for 96 hours (4 days) of the woman's twenty-eight day cycle. Fertility in the woman at any other time during the cycle is, Noonan asserts, "unnatural" (p. 33), and consequently may rightly be eliminated by sterilizing or contraceptive means.

I believe that there are insurmountable problems with Noonan's "interpretation" of *Humanae Vitae*. The most evident is that he misrepresents the teaching of the encyclical and seems to misunderstand what it was all about. According to Noonan, the "new and distinctive doctrine" of the encyclical is that any effort to break the "natural nexus" between conjugal intercourse and procreation, a nexus that exists only for 96 hours of the woman's twenty-eight day cycle is morally wrong whereas deliberate choices to contracept or sterilize during the balance of the woman's cycle are morally good and do not "dissociate" the unity of the unitive and procreative meanings of marriage and of human sexuality. Noonan insists, as we have seen, that the teaching of the encyclical is "based on" the "natural rhythms" of fertility and infertility, and he likewise claims that Pope Paul VI is not to be taken literally in affirming that "each and every marriage act (*quilibet matrimonii usus*) must remain open to the transmission of life" (*Humanae Vitae*, n. 11; cf. Noonan, pp. 33-34).

If we look at the encyclical itself, however, a much different "doctrine" is found. Pope Paul taught that what the moral law forbids is not simply, as Noonan says, any "deliberately willed disassociation between the conjugal act and the natural rhythm of fertility" (p. 35) but rather "every action which, either in anticipation of the conjugal act or in its accomplishment or in the development of its natural consequences, proposes, whether as an end or as a means, to render procreation impossible" (*Humanae Vitae*, n. 14; emphasis added).

Moreover, in an important passage completely overlooked by Noonan, Paul clearly shows that it is immoral to choose to impede or destroy either the unitive or the procreative meanings of the marital act (*Humanae Vitae*, n. 13). His point is that it is wicked to choose to act against the real goods of human sexuality and of marriage, i.e., the unitive and procreative goods. Noonan's failure to consider the moral significance of this passage is, I believe, one major reason why he misconceives the "doctrine" of the encyclical.

Furthermore, the Pope does not claim, as Noonan does, that "the inseparable connection, willed by God and unable to be broken by man on his own initiative, between the two meanings of the conjugal act: the unitive meaning and the

procreative meaning" (*Humanae Vitae*, n. 12) is based on the "natural rhythm of fertility and infertility" (Noonan, p. 30). Rather the Pope teaches that these meanings are inseparably connected, indissolubly joined; and he insists that only "by safeguarding both these essential aspects . . . does the conjugal act preserve in its fullness the sense of true mutual love and its ordination toward man's most high calling to parenthood" (*Humanae Vitae*, n. 12). He further teaches (*Humanae Vitae*, n. 13) that these essential goods are safeguarded by respecting them and that the choice to impede or destroy either is what is forbidden by the moral law.

In addition, since Pope Paul recognizes that "God has wisely disposed natural laws and rhythms of fecundity, which, of themselves, cause a separation in the succession of births" (*Humanae Vitae*, n. 11), he evidently does not regard this "separation in the succession of births," caused by the "rhythms of fertility," to entail the dissolution of the inseparable connection willed by God between the procreative and unitive meanings of conjugal intercourse or the "openness" of conjugal acts to the transmission of life. A conjugal act that respects the gift of fertility, or procreativity, is one that is intrinsically open to the transmission of life, even if conception, as an empirical event, does not take place or cannot take place because of natural causes. There is a significant moral difference between a conjugal act that is sterile because of natural causes and one that has been deliberately sterilized by the free choice of the spouses. Noonan ignores this distinction, and for this reason seriously misunderstands what the encyclical means when it speaks of the "openness" of every conjugal act to the transmission of life.

Noonan's essay, in short, is a very serious misunderstanding of the doctrine in *Humanae Vitae*. I found it particularly illuminating that Noonan found it necessary to insist that we ought not to speak of "contraceptive means" but rather of "dissociative means." This indicates that he realizes that it is necessary to tamper with our language and our ordinary understanding of words if we are to accept his interpretation of the doctrine of the encyclical, since all readers of it up to now have held that it was forbidding "contraception" and "contraceptive means." Noonan himself, in his wonderful books on abortion (cf. *A Private Choice: Abortion in the Seventies*) has stressed how those who seek to justify abortion are forced to manipulate language, to disguise the reality of killing a human child by such circumlocutions as "terminating a pregnancy." I fear that he has tried to do the same with respect to contraception and the Church's

teaching. Since I have such great admiration for his scholarship and his marvelous and courageous articulation of the Church's teaching on the reverence due to nascent human life, I hope that he may see how, on the question of contraception, he may be misleading himself and others by a manipulative use of words.

William E. May

● Richard Taylor, "Within the Halls of Ivy: The Sexual Revolution Comes of Age," *Change*, May/June 1981, pp. 21-29.

There is nothing of value in this article save its willingness to take credit on behalf of "the Halls of Ivy" for the sexual amorality and/or immorality of today's college youth. Its opening line says it all: "What is usually thought of as the sexual revolution in this country began on the college campuses". Taylor, a philosophy professor at the University of Rochester, only wonders why changes in campus life (fornication, contraceptives etc.) "so seemingly innocuous should have waited

so long to occur." The only code of honor in force is that which respects the concealment of such relationships from parents, particularly by females, although there is scarcely any attempt to conceal them from others, including faculty and chaplains. Even "the diminishing minority who for religious or other reasons reject such relationships for themselves feel no disapproval for their friends who accept them". No university official would dream of meddling in these matters. Indeed, why should anyone? "The existence of such relationships is without doubt good, by an criterion except that of abstract, or religious, or archaic concept of morality."

● The Summer 1981 issue of *The Public Interest* has at least three articles of interest to Catholic scholars: Edward A. Wynne's (Illinois) "What are the courts doing to our Children?"; James Coleman's (Chicago) "Public Schools, Private Schools and the Public Interest"; James Q. Wilson's (Harvard) "Policy Intellectuals and Public Policy".

Book Reviews

Recent Books on Women in the Church

Great and proper interest in the role of women in the Church has been evidenced in recent years. Within the past year two books with similar titles have appeared on the subject: Louis Bouyer's *Women in the Church* (St. Ignatius Press, 1980) and *Women in a Men's Church* (Concilium theological series, Seabury Press, 1980). The two books differ greatly however. Father Bouyer's work, a theological examination of the role of women in the Church from an orthodox point of view was recently reviewed in these pages. The *Concilium* book is a collection of a dozen essays written by avowed feminist theologians who, with the single exception of Rene' Laurentin, conclude that the Church as presently structured is untenable and must be radically restructured in order to make itself viable.

Five of the twelve contributors to the *Concilium* book are located in North America, four of these are nuns, and all occupy prestigious positions on theological faculties of major universities or important religious commissions. The nature of these essays is such that they may perhaps best speak for themselves.

From 'Celibacy in the Men's Church':

" . . . For many priests, perhaps for the

majority, celibacy is not a choice made but a condition accepted in the course of their preparation for priesthood. For some of these celibacy functions as a factor in personality maladjustment and spiritual disablement. Their ministry is neither life-giving for them nor for people around them.

"Only women themselves are competent to speak to their own experience and they are systematically excluded from the exclusively male celibate hierarchical echelons.

"[Archaic principles enunciated by the male celibate hierarchy imply] "that the functions of rationality, i.e., reason and will, are the proper activity of males, while motherhood is the proper activity of females. What is proposed as the proper activity of women . . . is something which in the scale of being is shared with lower organisms.

"In an age when women are rightfully claiming their full human personhood . . . they come up against an ecclesial doctrine which is not consonant with their developing self identity.

"What the Church offers women and declares to the world at large is a veiled rationale for a secondary status wherein they are controlled, protected and prevented from sharing fully in the effects of the incarnation. In so doing the Church substantiates the premises of patriarchy and the

superiority-inferiority relationships it perpetuates in all forms of society. The contradiction to the gospel message of redemption is experienced by increasing numbers of women as frustration and embarrassment. They find themselves victims of an ideology embodied in the ecclesiastical structure which provides them no recourse. Priestly celibacy is both a symbolic expression of the predicament and a real barrier to its resolution.

"Sexual and celibate barriers impede [women religious, also] from becoming communicators of the healing, reconciling, and celebrating love of Jesus Christ in the world."

M. Nadine Foley, O.P., Ph.D., member of the general council of the Adrian Dominican Congregation, former philosophy and theology instructor at Drake University, former campus minister, currently serving on the Ecclesial Role of Women Committee of the LCWR, on the sub-committee on sexist language of the ICEL and the Bd. of Directors of the Nat'l Liturgical Conference. She was 1979 visiting prof. of Ecumenical Relations at the Harvard Div. School.

From 'Can Male Domination be Overcome':

"All domination results from human inability to deal with differences in any way except through the imposition of power . . . In the case of male domination, traditions have developed which have . . . excluded women from public and sacred space and from the cultivation of skills and intellect associated with leadership roles.

"Moreover the fullness of [the fully] human role is denied by such anomalies as refusing to [women] installation to the *lay* ministries of acolyte and lector or admission to the testing of their call to ordained ministry.

"Patterns built into the human psyche through male domination promote and legitimize racism, classism, religious hostility, aggressive nationalism and imperialism as well as individual manifestations of prejudice.

"The Church . . . has within its doctrinal armory the universal moral principles needed to conquer male domination . . . through consciousness, conviction and conversion . . . For the anger [of women at male domination] to be redemptive it must be recognized, struggled with in terms of the overarching command and power . . . to love.

"As women bearing gifts gain welcome in the secular society they will reject any artificial subordination imposed by the Church."

Elizabeth Carroll, R.S.M., vice president of the Pittsburgh Sisters of Mercy, former faculty member and administrator of Mount Mercy/Carlow College, former Staff Assoc. of the Center of Concern, where she directed the project of Women in Church and Society, key-noting the First Women's Ordination Conference in Detroit. Mem-

ber of the Core Commission of Women's Ordination Conference.

From 'Pathology of the Men's Church':

"The main pathology in a men's Church is that it is a Church for a man's world at a time when there is no longer a need to celebrate such a one-sided world."

"The . . . emphasis on ultimate salvation with attendant indifference to the social consequences of this emphasis is the major cultural source of the pathologies that characterize the male Church today. Scripture insists on planned social action for the achievement of ultimate salvation that demands response to . . . material needs. . . . Despite . . . gospel directives, society has developed under Church auspices with strong family, ethnic and national solidarities wherein racially and ethnically different people are excluded and even left to die . . .

"The Church . . . legitimates [pathological] behavior in the political, economic and class structure of society by celebration of liturgy and by affirming prayer styles that help orient the people to the existing social order. . . . When a Church . . . focuses its apostolic efforts on . . . pastoral counselling to help people survive within such a system, rather than on the . . . change of the broad social causes of that system, that is pathology. . . . Emphasis on personal holiness and communal solidarity in such a world system of planned destruction cuts God down to tribal size. . .

"There does exist leverage for change however. This justice mandate is embodied in the Human Rights Covenants of the United Nations. . . which affirm . . . social rights [and] . . . personal freedom.

"In order to eliminate pathological uses of power that have caused human oppression . . . the Church must recognize that the form of its worship is the form of the world, which form it shapes in symbol and ritual. When access to God is constrained by the form, the form is pathological."

Marie Augusta Neal, S.N.D., professor of sociology at Emmanuel College in Boston, former visiting prof. of sociology at Univ. of Calif. at Berkeley and Harvard Div. School, recipient of a Ford Fdn. Grant to study women's roles in society, past president of the Association for the Sociology of Religion, author of *A Sociotheology of Letting Go* (1977).

From 'The Role of Woman in the Old Testament':

"The Church may well be the Body of Christ. . . but . . . it also makes up a visible complex, a hierarchic society, governed . . . by ministers whose essential function is to teach and sanctify its

members, and it is from this function that women are excluded simply and solely on account of their sex, and this is why it is . . . difficult for them to feel that they are full members of the Church.

"The fact that creation and the fall are diametrically opposed . . . is recognized by most modern commentators. It has, however, not always been like this. We need go no further than the Pauline corpus to see that [the author of Timothy] . . . confuses these stages of creation and of sin [in Genesis 2 and 3] when he attributes man's authority over woman to the creation itself — 'Adam was formed first, then Eve' for this represents a profound misunderstanding of Genesis 2. . . . Focusing on certain details of the story . . . led Paul virtually to fail to respect the context and main thrust of Genesis 2. This selective manner of arguing on the basis of certain details of the story in order to overwhelm the woman is typical of . . . rabbinic thought, including that which is documented for New Testament Times.

" . . . In so far as [the conjugal roles] are regarded in a different light, as they are today, I wonder whether it is always 'significant' to think of God as a husband and of the priest, sacrament of Christ, as a man. . . . Put in another way, does the economy of salvation demand, of itself, and in every culture, that Christ be a man?

"I thought it was important to reflect on the way in which the Church makes use of the revealed message when it elaborates its teaching on the role of women."

Marie de Merode de Croy teaches at Princeton Theological Seminary.

From 'Women and Men in Church Office':

"The references to the ministry of women [in the letters of Paul] . . . give testimony to the internalization of the tradition of Jesus expressed in Galatians 3:28, that in Christ Jesus there is no distinction . . . of sex. . . . If it is true that Gal. 3:28 is a baptismal formulation cited by Paul, then . . . Christians expressed their self-understanding . . . and affirmed at their baptisms that all religious-patriarchal distinctions were abolished in Jesus Christ. . . . Such testimony is completely overshadowed . . . by the later interpolations added to [Corinthians I] that 'women should keep silence in the plagiarization of this text in [Timothy 2:11-14] which forbids women to teach . . .

"The early Christian movement . . . testifies to the belief in and creation of a society in which all distinctions between race and sex are dissolved. . . . Later, the Christian communities were structured more by authority moving directly towards what we call Church order due to cultural differentia-

tion, heresy, etc. . . . The result . . . was the controlling of ministries by the hierarchy and an unfortunate gap . . . between clergy and laity.'

"We can conclude . . . that there must always be flexibility in the organization of Church ministries . . . and, we can hope . . . that in adjusting to new cultural situations the Church will not be compromised by existing structures or ideologies.

"Might it not be that an ecclesiology of the future needs to be open to a total reconsideration of Church order because of entirely new needs? . . . One [ramification of such radical change] might concern what we mean by ordination. It might well be that ordination itself, as an element of Church order, must be re-thought We might ask whether or not there should be any permanent ordination based on an ontological theology of orders. . . . Ministry should increasingly become a partnering.

"If we believe the Church is the divine-human community enspirited with Jesus' risen life, then, as Jesus, it must not court the temptation to compromise its saving mission by the continuation of structures that dominate and control the full exercise of gifts of women and men as well as clerics . . . The critical juncture at which the world stands makes such mutuality an imperative . . .

Margaret Brennan, I.H.M., is Associate Prof. of pastoral theology at Regis College of the Toronto School of Theology.

That the focus here has been on the American contributors and not on the Europeans has more to do with geography than with the intensity of dismay with the Church expressed. Perhaps the most disturbing effect of reading these distressing essays is not the sometimes comical use of feminist jargon, nor the treacherous reasoning, nor even the hollow ring of the continual complaining about powerlessness from women who clearly are in positions of power and influence, but that the effort of these women is directed at destruction of the single institution which is most capable of spiritual nurture and restoration. That the Church is also the institution which quite literally gives them their identity deepens the irony.

Helen Hull

- Bruce A. Williams, O.P. *American Protestantism and Homosexuality: Recent Neo-Traditional Approaches* (Rome, Angelicum University, 1981)

This is an STD dissertation, which opens with a John Paul II statement about the unity of moral

life and faith, but which is concerned exclusively with "recent efforts by American Protestants to respond to the homosexual challenge" by articulating the traditional Christian position on homosexuality while determining sound pastoral measures "to help homosexually-oriented believers live in fidelity to the gospel."

The book is five chapters long: (1) on Christian belief and life; (2) on theological perspectives on homosexuality; (3) the parameters of pastoral policy; (4) on initiatives in ministry; (5) dealing with evaluations and conclusions.

Fr. Williams concludes that biblicism cannot resolve all contemporary difficulties pertaining to sexuality unaided by a coherent rational ethics. He thinks that the reflections of Protestant theologians can help Catholic Church authorities (1) to avoid imputing guilt to the homosexual orientation as such; (2) heterosexual marriage and complete sexual abstinence remain the only morally allowable options for any persons; (3) where these are unrealistic, the homosexual requires special support for "celibately chaste living"; (4) which is "compatible with healthy self-acceptance as a homosexually-oriented person."

At a time when gay activism is particularly strong in Catholic circles, Fr. William's research project among Protestant divines is worth reading.

Peter Williamson and Kevin Perrota (EDS), *Christianity Confronts Modernity: A Theological and Pastoral Inquiry* (Ann Arbor, MI., Servant Books, 1981)

In October, 1980, a group of eighty evangelical and Roman Catholic scholars and pastoral leaders met in Ann Arbor, MI for a colloquy on the challenges contemporary society presents to Christians of all traditions. *Christianity Confronts Modernity* is the compilation of essays and responses delivered at that three-day meeting.

The papers ruthlessly lay bare the effects of a technological society on the Christian people. In particular, they discuss the results in scripture, theology, psychology and pastoral care in the Christian church at large. The fallacies in thinking in these disciplines which have over several decades led to the dilution and prostitution of the gospel message are clearly exposed and developed to their devastating conclusions. A Protestant and a Catholic response follow each essay.

Mr. Mark Kinzer, a leader in the *Word of God Community*, analyzes in clear pastoral language the effects of contemporary social change on Christian

identity. Further, he succinctly outlines a pastoral strategy necessary to counteract the powerful, formative influences of a technological society.

Dr. Dale Vree, editor of the *New Oxford Review*, discusses liberation theology and the Christian New Right as two examples of the invasion of Christian theology by political ideology. He offers an incisive analysis of liberation theology but his portrayal of the Christian New Right creates unnecessary polarities. Vree's essay and the responses are worth close study.

In a more general essay, James Hitchcock discusses cultural attitudes which, he says, usually go unexamined but which are often the basis for doctrinal error. Hitchcock, a professor of history at St. Louis University, and past president of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, pithily exposes both the general fallacies in these areas as well as heretical attitudes which have invaded the Christian church under the guise of charity.

Dr. Paul Vitz, professor of psychology at New York University, a board member of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, examines, in a refreshingly bold essay, a variety of "isms" — atheism, naturalism, subjectivism, etc. — which he maintains permeate modern secular psychology. In addition to this comprehensive analysis he offers in broad strokes the outline of a new Christian psychology.

Stephen Clark, author of *Man and Woman in Christ*, tackles the undermining of the authority of God's word. He analyzes various methods of studying scripture but focuses mainly on their pastoral results.

Clark criticizes most strongly the secular historical method because it categorizes exegesis as history rather than as theology. The result, Clark holds, is to make something other than scripture normative. Thus the authority of scripture is undermined. Clark concludes with several surprisingly basic pastoral statements for Christian scripture scholars.

In the final essay of the series, Dr. Donald Bloesch, professor of systematic theology at Dubuque Theological Seminary, Iowa, summarizes a broad array of challenges facing the churches. In response to these challenges, he issues a sobering call for a new evangelical alliance: "In place of a religious eclecticism . . . I propose an evangelical catholicism that seeks to bring all peoples under the lordship and mastery of Jesus Christ."

These excellent essays sound the call to battle against the "aggressive paganism without and the apostasy and heresy within" the Christian church.

Sr. Ann Therese Shields, RSM

William D. Most, *The Consciousness of Christ*, (Christendom Publications, Christendom College Press, Route 3, Box 87 Front Royal, Virginia 22630)

W. G. Most's book is very helpful in opening the curtain on contemporary Church issues, and the sides drawn up on either side of these issues. This reader is able to get a good look at four different groups in various attitudes of conflict in the course of Father Most's pages on the consciousness of Jesus. The basic area of conflict is, as might be expected, in that area where the modern Church is experiencing growing pains from which, as M indicates (223), our Protestant brethren are already enjoying some surcease, namely, the area of Scripture studies.

The four groups who are whaling away at each other are the "Gospels give facts" group to which M. belongs, the "Gospels are composite documents" group to which R. E. Brown, and R. Bultmann, at both of whom M. whales away (passim) belong, the "Gospels expressed in Heideggerian philosophy" group, led by E. Fuchs and G. Ebeling, in whaling away at whom M joins, not without apology (185), with Brown, and the "Gospels are artfully composed" group whom M sees as led by the late N. Perrin. This group is harpooned in Appendix 2. If we may refer to these groups in conflict as the "facts" group, the "composite" group, the "philosophy" group, and the "art" group and give some consideration to their interests, as well as to their presuppositions, and conclusions, it is possible that a cease fire might be negotiated. But in M's book no cease fire is in sight. It is Brown and Bultmann "defendentes" in chapters 1 and 2 with M. as "objiciens," and posing good objections that are unanswered. From chapter 3 on it is M "defendens" and Brown and Bultmann "objientes" with M. distinguishing on the posed objections in good scholastic form. In the course of making these distinctions M. brings up some matters that need more talking about. This is not said negatively, but with appreciation for the fact that an opening was made for discussion by M's good scholastic distinctions. To Brown's objection (160), "If there had not been in the soul of Christ some other knowledge besides his divine knowledge he would not have known anything, for divine knowledge cannot be an act of the human soul of Christ," M responds by first explaining that what Brown really meant to say was not, "he" (the Divine Word) but "it" (the human soul of Jesus). Then M deprives the objection of its force as proceeding from St. Thomas by exegeting St. Thomas. However, the point that can be raised here is this: can one speak of the human soul of Jesus as an "it". The human

soul of Jesus is not a being, it is "by which a being", not ens but quo ens. Nor is the complete human nature (soul and body) of Jesus an "it", otherwise there would be two beings in Jesus. This is, of course, perfectly clear to M because he later brings up the fact that the act of existence for Jesus' human nature is the Divine word. I mention M's comment on "he"—"it" because the heart of the whole consciousness controversy, at least from a scholastic point of view, seems to lie right here. Can one speak of the human nature of Jesus as "it", let alone "he"? Is not one always speaking of the one supposite, the one being, the one Divine Person hypostatically united with a particular human nature when one speaks or thinks of Jesus in the categories of scholastic philosophy? And this has always seemed to this onetime student of scholastic philosophy to raise another problem. If as M says (167) "the divinity was joined directly without any intermediary to the entire humanity", that is, not to an entire "it" but to an entire potency, or to two quibus ens, how then did Jesus die? If the act of existence that activated body and soul never left off activating (and it didn't) body and soul, for if it did the body and soul would cease to exist, how does one explain, in terms of scholastic philosophy, that event to which the Gospels give the climactic expression, PAREDO-KEN TO PNEUMA (John 19.30), EXEPNEUSEN (Luke 23.47), EXEPNEUSEN (Mark 16.37), APHEKEN TO PNEUMA (Matt. 27.50)? Unless a reasonable answer can be given to that question, and even if one has to be given, there begins to dawn some sympathy for R. E. Brown's remark quoted by M (185) that Catholic biblical scholars have had to learn to read Scripture without scholastic glasses.

With M I prefer to think of that person John the Baptist held up to the world's vision, as we priests hold him up at Mass when we say "Behold the Lamb of God", as that metaphysically well-constructed being M. described on p. 167-168. In other words, for me, the Lamb of God coming toward John the Baptist (John 1.29), or reposing in the tabernacle is the Hypostatic Union, is "one in being with the Father", no matter what Peter, or Caiaphas, or Judas, or Herod, or Pilate thought before Pentecost, and no matter when the development in thinking took place that gained a non-biblical expression in the HOMOOUSION of Nicaea. And I agree with M that when I read that this Divine Person who is one in being with the Father is reported to have said, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me (Mark 15.34) he was reciting Ps 22 an opinion that is common among biblical scholars as well as consistent with

scholastic philosophical principles, despite an apparently contrary opinion expressed by Karl Rahner, and quoted by M (151). Furthermore, I find the formulation that this Divine Person exercised obedience to a "conditional command" (164) more expressive of that communication which one Divine Person would communicate and another receive, although I would prefer the expression of this command to be, adding a clause to M's formulation: "If you want to redeem the world, and get the world to know its redemption, in the best possible way, then meet death and rise under these circumstances". And, I could not agree more with the way M handled Wrede's "Messianic Secret" (203). Still this is because M and I are wearing the same scholastic glasses. R. E. Brown is wearing a different set of glasses, and so is Karl Rahner, at least from the quotations on p. 151, and so are many others. I think you have to let everyone enjoy his own glasses especially since Brown's glasses, and Rahner's are so fashionable that those who wear them have an establishment look already. This is so true that there will undoubtedly be those who compare M's attack on them to Iran's tweaking the nose of the U.S.A. On the other hand it will be up to Brown and Rahner to say whether or not they think their noses are tweaked just as it is up to the Pope to say when scholars like H. Kung are out of line.

In colleges throughout the country where students live and work there exist a number of fraternities whose sole function, and preoccupation, as far as I can make out, is to disdain, dislike, and sometimes commit violence on one another because they wear different sweatshirts. Part of campus life is a state of ongoing embattlement. It's the students' Sitz-im-Leben. In the same way there are several scholarly fraternities within Pope John Paul's Church which seem to be in a state of running battle with one another like the school fraternities. M has staged a border provocation with passion showing in his format, his words, and name calling. It remains to be seen whether or not the attack will draw a response.

M's book probably will not change your own look at the consciousness of Christ, the presumption being that you have long since selected your glasses and that they are well in place. The book's title merely names the battleground for a

theological rumble. But it makes it clear that all is not quiet on the fraternity fronts within the Church. This book may be very helpful to teachers whose students think – excuse me – I mean don't think, but repeat, because almost everyone gets interested in a fight, and the students might even want to know more about the participants, and join a theological fraternity. I would like to be the teacher of the first student who can explain the phrase "unsurped existence" (182). I enjoyed the book as an expression of things as they are even while being somewhat aghast at the forthright polemical language. Having struggled with the Fortress Press series on Form and Redaction Criticism I am glad to have at hand from M a summary of what it is that redaction critics do. They seem to have it both ways: if a passage is poorly composed it has obviously been interfered with by the hand of a redactor (thus, Bultmann and Brown); if a passage is artfully composed, the art has been superimposed by an editorial hand (thus, Perrin). That the evangelist could have been an artful reporter of historical facts, expressing the honest truth about Jesus (Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation 5.19) in fictional form, like an honest modern docudramatist, with no sectarian insertions that destroy its unity and continuity, and no artistic revisions from a script doctor to improve it, does not seem to have occurred to redaction critics. It does, however, occur to M (203), and although he does not go along with the idea that there may be some fiction in the Gospels, he at least touched on a possibility that may have more truth than fiction in it. In any event, it is a pleasure to read an author who is not continually conjuring up that maddening "hand of redactor", as it is commonplace for redaction critics to do with such magisterial serenity and complacency that the average reader cannot distinguish between reading Scripture, and 3-card monte. The reader, like the player, is always missing the "hand". M, therefore, is not altogether polemic, but also instructive, although the character of his book is on the whole polemic. But, as was said at the beginning, a good fight is interesting.

John Gerhardt, S.J.

(Fr. Gerhardt teaches Scripture at St. John's University on Staten Island.)

Fellowship Board Meeting

The Officers and the Board of Directors meeting of the Fellowship will be meeting in Chicago the weekend of September 25-27th.

The major officers are expected to meet Friday evening (25th), the Board itself on Saturday (26th). On Sunday, September 27th the third Cardinal Wright Award will be presented to retiring President James Hitchcock at a public meeting presently being arranged by John and Eileen Farrell, chaircouple for the occasion. Sites for both the Board meeting and the award will be announced later.

Among the issues to be discussed at Chicago will be the time, place and content of the 1982 Convention. James Hitchcock will deliver a major address on the occasion of the award.

Fr. William Smith, Dean of Studies at St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, New York, will assume his duties as President of the Fellowship at this Board meeting.

All correspondence concerning the Fellowship is henceforth to be directed to Dr. Scottino.

Matters concerning the *Newsletter*, and items, are to be sent to Msgr. Kelly.

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

Child and Family

● One of the classic papers on abortion was given on March 14, 1944 at a meeting of the New York Obstetrical Society by Dr. Samuel A. Cosgrove (with Dr. Patricia Carter). Cosgrove (not a Catholic, working in a public facility – the Margaret Hague Maternity Hospital of Jersey City) developed the case that on scientific evidence alone direct abortion was not a justifiable medical procedure. His paper was the subject of intense national discussion for many years.

A 1977 issue of *Child and Family* (Vol. 16, No. 4) contains a major portion of this discussion and the ensuing correspondence. This issue is available from Editor Dr. Herbert Ratner, Box 508, Oak Park, Illinois 60302.

Subscriptions (\$6.00 per annum) and donations may be sent to the above address.

Proceedings Available

A limited number of additional copies of the previous convention proceedings of the Fellowship are available.

Catholic Faith and Human Life (1978)

Historicism and Faith (1979)

Christian Faith in a Neo-Pagan Society (1980)

Write to Msgr. Kelly, St. John's University, Jamaica, New York 11439.

Employment Opportunity

Significant openings in a Catholic University for STD (with biblical training) and Ph.D. in religious education. Contact *Newsletter* for further information.

Also available is the deanship of a well-known department of theological studies.