

FELLOWSHIP OF CATHOLIC SCHOLARS NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 5, NUMBER 2

MARCH 1982

Letter from Father William B. Smith

This March, the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars will sponsor its fifth annual convention. By most standards, five years is a small milestone but our large – and largely successful – purpose is, I think, verified in the theme and content of this convention.

Our purpose is to bring Catholic scholars together in fellowship by helping one another and by putting our abilities more fully at the service of the Church in the service of the Catholic Faith.

The FCS convention theme is Catholic Social Thought with particular emphasis on the teaching of Pope John Paul II. In three vital years, both the continuity and contemporary application of the social teaching of the present Pope is enormous: *Dives in Misericordia* (11/30/80), *Laborem Exercens* (9/14/81) and *Familiaris Consortio* (11/22/81).

The Board of Directors of the Fellowship purposely chose this focus in part because this is what the Fellowship can do best – draw from scholars who share the same Faith but master different competencies. And so, in Chicago, we bring together Prof. Finnis, one of the most respected minds in the English-speaking Church; Fr. Schall and Prof. Benestad, trained and accomplished political scientists; and two established and recognized theologians, Frs. Lawler and Connery.

It is, unfortunately, common to read of or hear about all sorts of contradictory claims jockeying for position under the banner of Justice & Peace in the name of Catholic social thought. Some of this is Catholic; some is not thought out; and some is just twisted ideology, quite alien to the Gospel, masquerading as Catholic social teaching.

Negative critiques of the last are available and necessary. But the positive and enduring antidote to this nominally social disease is a sound and reliable grasp of what the Church actually does teach. This is especially the need with the rich and recent social teaching of our Holy Father, John Paul II.

Regardless of our teaching field or professional practice, it is the duty of every educated Catholic to be better educated in authentic Catholic social teaching. I think our convention presents a timely, even a unique, learning opportunity for all of us in every field. I hope to see you in Chicago . . .

**Fifth Convention of
Fellowship of Catholic Scholars
March 26 — March 28, 1982
Sheraton-O'Hare Hotel, (near Airport)
Chicago, Ill.**

**THEME: — CATHOLIC SOCIAL THOUGHT
AND
THE TEACHING OF POPE JOHN PAUL II**

PROGRAM

Chairman and President — Rev. William B. Smith
St. Joseph's Seminary
Dunwoodie, New York

Friday, March 26th

3:00 — 8:00 p.m. — Registration

4:00 p.m. — Meeting of Board of Directors

7:30 p.m. — General Meeting of the Membership

8:00 p.m. — *First Plenary Session:*

Address: "Personalism in the Thought of John Paul II"
Rev. Ronald Lawler, O.F.M., Cap.
Director, Center for Thomistic Studies
St. Thomas University

9:30 p.m. — Reception

Saturday, March 27th

9:00 a.m. *Second Plenary Session:*

Address: "The Encyclical, *Laborem Exercens*"
Prof. John Finnis
Fellow & Praelector in Jurisprudence
Oxford University

10:45 a.m. Address: "The Family as a Social Insitution in *Laborem Exercens* and
Familiaris Consortio"

Rev. John R. Connery, S.J.
Loyola University
Consultant, Doctrinal Committee N.C.C.B.

12:30 p.m. Lunch

1:45 p.m. *Third Plenary Session:*

Address: "The Encyclical, *Dives in Misericordia*"
Rev. James V. Schall, S.J.
Prof. of Political Science
Georgetown University

- 4:00 p.m. Concelebrated Liturgy
 6:00 p.m. Convention Dinner – Presidential Address
 8:45 p.m. Workshops
 9:30 p.m. Reception

Sunday, March 28th

- 7:00 a.m. Concelebrated Liturgy (private)
 9:00 a.m. *Fourth Plenary Session:*
 Address: "Aspects of Catholic Social Thought & Political Philosophy in
Laborem Exercens"
 Prof. J. Brian Benestad
 University of Scranton
 10:45 a.m. Business Meeting for Fellowship Members
 12:30 p.m. Lunch

Convention Workshops:

Distinguished leaders in the field of Family Life, Catholic Higher Education, Religious Life and Social Action will lead workshops on desirable agenda for Catholics in each of these areas of Church concern.

Friends of the Fellowship

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Bishop Richard H. Ackerman (Retired) | Bishop Robert F. Joyce |
| Bishop Joseph B. Brunini | Bishop Thomas M. Kealy |
| Bishop Stanislaus J. Brzana | Bishop Charles Koester |
| Archbishop James J. Byrne | Bishop Daniel W. Kucera |
| Bishop Mark K. Carroll | Bishop W. Thomas Larkin |
| John Cardinal Cody | Bishop Bernard F. Law |
| Bishop William B. Connare | Bishop David M. Maloney |
| Terence Cardinal Cooke | Bishop Joseph McShea |
| Bishop Joseph R. Crowley | Bishop John A. Marshall |
| Bishop Thomas F. Daily | Umberto Cardinal Medeiros |
| Bishop John Donovan | Bishop Charles P. Mulrooney (Retired) |
| Bishop Glennon P. Flavin | Fr. Orlando Prospero |
| Bishop Bernard J. Ganter | Bishop Lawrence J. Riley |
| Bishop Francis Garmendia | Bishop John J. Russell |
| Bishop Eugene Gerber | Dr. John B. Shea |
| Bishop Lawrence B. Graves | B. Edward Shelesinger |
| Bishop Hilary B. Hacker | Bishop George H. Speltz |
| Archbishop Philip Hannan | Bishop Joseph Sullivan |
| Bishop Jerome J. Hastrich | Fr. George Voiland |
| Bishop Edward D. Head | Archbishop John Whealon |

For further information concerning the Fellowship Convention write or call Executive Secretary Dr. Joseph Scottino, Gannon University, Erie, Pennsylvania 16541, (814)-871-7345

Items of Interest

- **Conrad W. Barrs, RIP**

This well-known Catholic psychiatrist was one of the early members of the Fellowship. The author of many books on emotional life, Baars served as a consultant to the Congregation for the Clergy and the Roman Synod on problems in the priesthood (1971). Born in Holland he was a Christian humanist in the best sense of the term, conscious of Christ's humanity, the Church's and his own, but submissive to the voice of Peter as the voice of Christ in our day. One of his last communications with the Fellowship was an expression of interest in developing the notion of religious obedience in collaboration with Fr. Kenneth Baker. He was buried in Sam Houston National Cemetery, San Antonio, October 22, 1981. Pray for him.

- **Frank Sheed RIP**

Prior to his death Mr. Sheed reminisced about his street corner preaching for the *Catholic Evidence Movement* which was so successful prior to World War II in the U.S. as in England. He blamed television for diminishing the street crowds in the post World War II period and then added the following:

"More seriously, however, we were affected by the growing confusion about what the church taught. It got to be the case that any priest was apt to say anything from his pulpit. I think I can safely say that there is not one Catholic doctrine or moral teaching that I have not heard denied in the pulpit.

"When nobody knew any longer what the church taught, nobody felt called upon to go out and tell people what the church taught," Sheed said. (*Boston Pilot*, November 27, 1981 p. 3)

Pray for a grand apologist for the faith who was lecturing in Catholic Churches almost to the end.

- The Kairos Foundation is sponsoring *Studies in Christian Culture*, June 26 – August 11th, 1982 in Spain – Six weeks of study and travel, with credits (up to 9) earned through Gannon University. The cost of the summer program including board and travel is \$2,275 (\$3,875 for married couples). Write for information to Dr. Martin Larrey, P.O. Box 5512 Arlington, Va. 22205 or call (703) 527-7353.

- *A Center for Christian Political Thought*, operating out of 1308 Perry St., N.E. Washington, D.C. 20017, directs its principal research on to the values, attitudes of Christians as these are relevant to the political process. The hope is that the Center will become a unique informational center available to scholars and public persons. The program consists of an annual symposium, development of an archive on Christian political movements, and an oral history project. The president is Charles R. Dechert with Fr. Robert F. Trisco as secretary. Information is available from either CUA professor.

- Information about how to obtain copies of Archbishop Fulton Sheen's cassette tapes and albums is available by writing Fr. John B. Brady, Minister-O-Media, Inc., St. Joseph's Church, P.O. Box 155, Pomfret, MD, 20675.

- **Position Wanted**

Teaching position in area of History, Latin, or Linguistics.

B.A. & M.A. University of Utah, Ancient and Medieval History. Experience on both college and secondary (private) levels. Excellent reference available.

Robert J. Welsh
1884 South 1600 East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84105

- **Position Open**

In Chicago a pastor of a large parish would like to get an experienced person, priest religious, or lay man or lay woman to become principal of an elementary school with 675 students. The school is thoroughly Catholic and the pupils are well disciplined. The opening is for the Fall of 1982. Please contact:

Pastor
St. Rita's Rectory
6243 So. Fairfield Avenue
Chicago, IL 60629 Telephone: (312) 434-9600

- **A New Book**

George A. Kelly, *Crisis of Authority: John Paul II and the American Bishops* (Regnery-Gateway Publishers, February, 1982.

The Church in France

[Fr. Michael Wrenn has recently translated a major work of French scholar Fr. Paul Toinet. The book will be published later this year by the Franciscan Herald Press with the title: Theological Cautions: A Doctrinal Analysis of the Church in France and Elsewhere. The theological insights and the prose are reflected in the following paragraphs:]

The dilemma of a certain number of French bishops appears great — and, in a certain sense, it appears fortunate — given the “complex system” with which they are attempting to cope and from which they even derive some advantages — namely those of non-intervention and non-involvement. The services rendered to the leaders of dioceses by a national bishops’ organization, even if they leave a great deal to be desired in a number of areas, are not to be gainsaid. But it is some of the other effects produced by a national bishops’ conference which prove troublesome.

Certainly, in spite of the complexity of the organization with which he is involved, nothing can prevent a bishop from making his voice heard if he has the courage to speak his mind . . . but the fact still remains that there are a number of obstacles to be overcome. Experience, however, shows that a fair number of bishops have difficulty intervening during the course of plenary sessions, either because the presence at these sessions of one of another non-episcopal member disturbs or frightens them off, or because experience has taught them to be skeptical about the Assembly’s giving any serious attention to an opinion which does not reflect the feeling of the majority. Thus a relatively significant number of bishops never express themselves during the plenary sessions. Some, who, during the early years of their participation, readily took the floor, simply have decided now not to intervene any longer. The conversations taking place in the aisles and cloakrooms substantiate the reality of this situation, as do the type of letters addressed to the administration board after the adjournment of the meeting.

. . . Once the general meeting is adjourned, the bishop returns to his own diocese. Some powerful structures: Administrative boards, Commissions, and Departments, supply him with information on all the problems about which he can hope to be enlightened, but in the face of which he is defenseless, even if he takes maximum advantages of his standing in the bishops conference. . .

The bishop feels himself inferior to these Commissions and only participates in one of them. yet, he does so more as an expert than as a

shepherd of the diocese, and his focus is no longer exactly the same as when he is in his home diocese. But there are the other committees in which he plays no part. If he wants to intervene in a particular area, he has the impression of venturing into unknown territory and he is afraid to express an opinion contrary to the one prevailing in that particular Committee. Thus, the temptation to take refuge in silence, even if he is vaguely aware of being out of step.

The Committees themselves do not always enjoy complete freedom of movement. They have to reckon with the special concern and tendencies of Catholic Action whose members consider themselves superior. . . Sometimes these organizations have pursued such a consistent line that they have become, willy nilly, pressure groups to be reckoned with, which do not accord ready acceptance to the admonishments of the bishops. The fear lest conflicts result in splits reducing to nothing apostolic activities, whose value and evident fruitfulness cannot be denied, leads to difficult and sometimes interminable negotiations. Thus ambiguities and a general malaise exist and run the risk of being protracted in the hope — not always disappointing — of more agreeable times ahead. In the matter of the negotiations, the bishops cannot always count on the unconditional assistance of chaplains or spiritual directors of these movements who, more than being the representatives of the bishops to the movements, have currently become, in certain cases, the representatives of these movements to the bishops, to as great or to a greater extent than the actual lay leaders of these movements. . .

For Pope John Paul II
on Sex Education see
Familiaris Consortio
No. 37.

The Hatch Amendment and Morality

Comments by William E. May

The constitutional amendment, introduced into Congress by Senator Orrin G. Hatch (R. Utah) on September 21, 1981, reads as follows: "A right to abortion is not secured by this Constitution. The Congress and the several states shall have the concurrent power to restrict and prohibit abortions: Provided that a law of a state which is more restrictive than a law of Congress shall govern."

This amendment and the bishops' support thereof at their November 1981 meeting summoned severe, bitter criticism from leaders involved in the effort to reverse the 1973 Supreme Court decisions and to extend to the unborn the equal protection of the law prohibiting homicide.

Today no one has any legal power to prevent the deliberate destruction of a child at any time during pregnancy should the woman bearing the child choose to destroy it for the sake of her "emotional" well-being. This is now the law of the land.

The Hatch Amendment, if accepted, would *not* immediately put an end to abortion or extend to the unborn the equal protection of the law against homicide. But it would *immediately* grant *power*, now withheld, to take effective legislative action to protect the unborn, and it would *immediately* withdraw the basic freedom to abort, *constitutionally protected*, granted to childbearing women by the Supreme Court.

If the Hatch Amendment were to become part of our Constitution, a Human Life Bill could be enacted by that body and/or by any and every state legislature *without any threat* of being declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

Granted the Hatch Amendment does not obligate the legislature(s) to pass such a law. Nonetheless, it gives to rightminded persons the legal power to carry out their moral obligation to defend unborn human life from attack. This is surely a great good and is obviously the good that those who support the Hatch Amendment, including the bishops, intend. Granted that the legislature(s) after passage of the Hatch Amendment, could enact quite permissive abortion laws, the Amendment in no way *requires* such permissive legislation; nor does it prevent those who rightly oppose permissive abortion laws from seeking to strengthen the legal protection accorded to the unborn.

If the analysis of the Hatch Amendment provided here is correct, and in my opinion it is, then it is an amendment that can be — and indeed ought to be — supported by persons anxious to remove from our society the moral blight of abortion and "stand up for human life." Admittedly the Hatch Amendment, unlike human life amendments proposed by many or the human life bill, will not immediately bring to an end the holocaust of the unborn and that it is morally incumbent upon those who support the Hatch Amendment to use effectively the power it grants to afford real legal protection to the unborn. Yet it is by no means unreasonable or immoral to support this Amendment if one judges that proposals such as the paramount Human Life Amendment or the Human Life Bill have little likelihood of being successful in the battle for the unborn, whereas the Hatch Amendment does offer good prospects for being effective. This judgment, I grant, is one upon which reasonable persons disagree. It is of its nature a factual judgment, not a moral assessment. One who makes it is in no way saying that in principle or in theory the Hatch Amendment is preferable to, say, the paramount Human Life Amendment or the Human Life Bill; one making it is simply saying that in his or her reasoned judgment of the factual situation today the Hatch Amendment offers the best hope to protect the lives of unborn human beings.

The Hatch Amendment, while not recognizing the personhood of the unborn, in no way accepts the premise that the unborn child is a non-person. Likewise, it in no way *removes* from the unborn legal protection accorded to them by the Fourteenth Amendment. Nothing that the Hatch Amendment says is in conflict with Catholic teaching.

The American bishops have made the prudential judgment that those working to protect the lives of the unborn should now support the Hatch Amendment. One can reasonably disagree with this judgment, and it is surely not a doctrinal statement. Against critics, we say that the bishops are not asking us to do anything *immoral*. They are rather asking us to cooperate with them in a political strategy that, in their judgement, will eventually end the nightmare of abortion in this country.

Moral Theology Note: Trans-Sexuals and Sex Change Operations

By Joseph J. Farraher, S.J.

A recent series of articles in the *San Francisco Chronicle* on transsexualism seemed to take it for granted that a so-called sex-change operation, or even a change of clothing and make-up, could change a human being from male to female or the reverse. The same person was identified at one time as "he" and then easily became "she." It should be obvious that a change of clothing does not change the sex of a person. And, in fact, neither does a "sex-change" operation. A chromosome scan would show that the person was of the same sex after the operation as before. Those who defend such operations try to define sex as what a person feels he/she is. But again it should be obvious that sex is related to the production of new living beings of the same species. And no two persons of the same physiological sex can produce offspring, even with elaborate operations. For, in the so-called "sex-change" operations, there is no real change of physiological sex, but only a superficial imitation of it. The "John" who becomes "Jane" does not have ovaries nor female chromosomes, which are the primary determinants of physiological sex. The most that might be said is that "Joan" is a strange mixture of male and female without being wholly either one, and so is certainly incapable of marriage in any true sense of the word. Besides psychological conditioning and the injection of sex hormones to help alter the secondary sex characteristics like voice and facial hair, there is surgical removal and plastic construction to imitate the external genitalia of the other sex. Physiologically the resultant "Joan" is a mutilated male with a certain external resemblance to a female. The external resemblance is somewhat closer on the male-to-female operation than on the female-to-male, but neither is a complete change of physiological sex. And so, such a person is incapable of true marriage.

One might ask whether such an operation would ever be morally permissible for a transsexual who intended to remain celibate and chaste, so that the transsexual could like and be accepted as a member of his/her psychological gender-role without embarrassment. All moralists agree that operations to correct merely physiological anomalies are permissible, provided that the correction is in the direction of a clearly predominant physiological sex, if there is one. (True hermaphroditism is extremely rare.) But the ordinary sex-change operations performed on transsexuals

have nothing to do with physiological anomalies. The transsexual, in the generally understood meaning of this relatively new term, is a person who feels that he/she should be of the sex opposite to his/her clearly defined physiological sex. There is a conflict between the "gender role" of the person and the physiological sex. This can obviously cause tensions and conflicts in the person's psyche, creating a state termed the "gender dysphoria syndrome." Since it is very difficult if not impossible to change such a person's "gender role," why not change the physiology to fit the psychological self-identification?

First of all, as already stated, the so-called "sex-change" operation does not change the person's physiological sex; it only disguises it. The male who has the operation is still a male; no matter what he would like to be or what he thinks he is or what he feels like, he has not become a woman. If the cause of his dysphoria is the opposition between his imagined role and his physiological sex, the operation is no solution. His physiological sex remains the same. So he should not be surprised if the operation does not cure his dysphoria. It can only help if he deceives himself or is deceived into thinking that he has truly changed his sex.

I find it interesting that the defenders of these operations insist that the psychological gender role is a part of the nature with which the person is born, while many women's liberationists claim that the gender role is entirely learned and not innate. The truth seems to be somewhere between the two extremes: much of the gender role is learned very early in life, but some of it flows or should flow from the physiological sex.

But even supposing that the operation would cure the subject's dysphoria, it is still an immoral means in the judgment of most moralists who are in accord with traditional Christian morality. Obviously those who dissent from practically all of traditional Christian sexual morality might also dissent regarding these operations: some because of their theology of compromise, others because they judge as moral anything that seems to help a person feel better as long as it does not cause disproportionate harm to others. The latter might recall that the resulting person is consciously and constantly deceiving others and in some cases unjustly taking advantage of others in such things as sports competitions for money.

(Continued on page 8)

Sex Education Guidelines Again

● As a result of the controversy over the USCC's *Education in Human Sexuality for Christians*, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops at its last meeting (November 1981) issued new regulations for USCC publications. In the future books and booklets printed under USCC auspices will be required in a prefatory note to specify the authorship and the responsibility or lack thereof of the body of bishops for the content. Such regulations in force earlier would have forestalled the impression that the USCC sex education guidelines were an official document of the American bishops, which they were not. The new regulations, as far as one can judge, do not yet guarantee that the content of such publications, however clear their limited committee or personal sponsorship, will reinforce Catholic doctrinal and moral norms as these are enunciated by the Holy See. The Doctrine Committee of the NCCB is charged with this responsibility but was unable to prevent the publication of the USCC's sex education guidelines, nor was the final version cleared with its membership.

● The General Secretary of the United States Catholic Conference said guidelines for education in sexuality, published by USCC last year, are "a first step in a critically important area." (*NC News* January 8, 1982)

Archbishop Thomas C. Kelly, O.P., said in part: The guidelines are a preliminary attempt to do something difficult but necessary: provide a sound pedagogical basis for education leading to healthy attitudes and behavior fully in accord with the Church's moral teaching.

The volume is not a textbook for students. Nor, as the foreword states, is it "an exercise in ethics or moral theology; it is a specialized educational text, intended primarily for a specialized audience of professional educators." At the same time, it assumes the Church's teaching and is oriented toward it. This is expressed in the body of the text and by the inclusion in its entirety of the Holy See's *Declaration on Certain Questions Concerning Sexual Ethics*.

● *Our Sunday Visitor* published a review of the controversy over this booklet (January 31, 1982 p. 3). The reporter singled out the Fellowship for having "ripped to shreds" the USCC guidelines, explaining that the USCC document is not deficient but merely "another sign of the fogged cliffs that stretch between the various factions in the Church and where bridging the gulf is the real issue."

The OSV commentary cites Cincinnati's Auxiliary Bishop Pilarczyk (one of the booklet's co-authors) as supporting the guidelines, explaining they are not a curriculum or a textbook and not the last word.

● The *National Federation of Catholic Physicians' Guilds* has published a lengthy paper on this subject which is worth reading. It is entitled "Education in Wholesome Chastity". While reference is made to the USCC booklet, the Physicians' Guilds draw almost exclusively on the collected experience of their members and the teaching of the Church. Their general conclusion reads:

"The *National Federation of Catholic Physicians Guilds* supports sex education for parents. We oppose all classroom sex education for children and adolescents as inherently puritanical, as a damaging invasion of the privacy of children, and as a usurpation of the rights of parents." Whereas Bishop Pilarczyk spoke of the positive tone of the USCC guidelines ("they avoid stressing the do's and don'ts of traditional moral teaching"), the physicians insist that teachers and parents (and presumptively through them students) "must be fully versed in the many errors prevalent in society (even among Catholics) and they must know why these views are false."

Copies are available from Dr. Herbert Ratner, Editor *Child and Family*, P.O. Box 508 Oak Park, Illinois 60303.

Moral Theology Note (continued from page 7)

Those who try to defend the operation by traditional principles appeal to the principle of totality. In its original meaning, this principle only applied to the sacrifice of parts of the body for the good of the whole *body*. But even supposing that it could be applied to the whole person, traditional moralists still judge that this operation is wrong because of the falsity of the whole supposition: it does not change the physiological sex. A ridiculously unscholarly paper by a non-moralist in a symposium on these operations at Stanford a few years ago claimed that several reputable Catholic moralists approved the operation. But the sections cited from every one of them dealt rather with operations to correct physiological anomalies of hermaphroditism and pseudo-hermaphroditism.

I trust that it is evident that in all the above I am speaking of objective morality and that I am not judging the subjective guilt or innocence of anyone who has undergone or performed such an operation.

Familiaris Consortio

John Paul II's Apostolic Exhortation on the Family

[These reflections released December 15th, 1981 were based on the deliberations of the 1980 Synod of Bishops. Like *Catechesi Tradendae* two years earlier, this Apostolic Exhortation is an effort by the Holy See and the world's Synod of Bishops to articulate the content of revelation in such wise as to renew a basic social and Church institution. The following brief outline attempts to summarize the total message of the Church on marriage and family life to whose individual parts Catholic scholars should, at the invitation of the pope, direct their research and rhetorical skills. (Nos. 31-)]

Introduction (Nos. 1-3)

The Church's proclamation of God's plan for marriage and the family.

* * *

Part I: *Bright Spots and Shadows for Today's Family* (Nos. 4-10)

New sense of discerning role of the family among pastors "who teach in the name and with the power of Christ" and through the laity who "by reason of their particular vocation have the specific role of interpreting the history of the world in the light of Christ." However, the "supernatural sense of the faith does not consist solely or necessarily in the consensus of the faithful." (No. 5)

Positive aspects: "Lively awareness of personal freedom", "greater attention to the quality of interpersonal relationships in marriage", "to promoting the dignity of women", "to responsible procreation", "to the education of children", "rediscovery of the ecclesial mission proper to the family". (No. 6)

Negative aspects: mistaken concepts of spousal independence, the relationship between parents and children, family values, divorce, abortion, sterilization and the appearance of a truly contraceptive mentality, selfish autonomy, the consumer mentality, neglect of the poor.

Also: invalid marriages, even after divorce, civil marriage, marriage of the faithful "without living faith", rejection of moral norms, etc. (No. 6)

Part II: *The Plan of God for Marriage and the Family*

The vocation of the human person realized in marriage and virginity or celibacy. Marriage involves total self-giving of man and woman to each other (not merely biologically) which is publicly confirmed in order to complete God's plan. (No. 11)

The original truth of marriage ("the beginning") finds its definitive fulfillment in Jesus Christ crucified as a symbol of the new Covenant between God and man. The communion involves an unbreakable witness to salvation in Christ. (Nos. 12-13) Marriage is the basis of family life, the couple's greatest gift being their life giving cooperation with God. Parenthood means "family" and "family of God" which is the Church. (Nos. 14-15)

When marriage is not esteemed, neither can consecrated virginity or celibacy exist. When sexuality is not regarded as a great creative value, neither is "renunciation of it for the sake of the Kingdom". Christian couples have the right to expect from Church celibates good example and fidelity until death. (no. 16)

Part III: *The Role of the Christian Family*

The recent Synod emphasized four roles:

1. *Forming a Community of Persons*

- of the couple themselves perfected through the sacrament and lasting until death. (Nos. 19-20)
- of parents with children, of siblings, of extended family, with special regard for the role of women. However, by comparison with her public roles, "clear recognition of their maternal and family role" is required, wives and mothers must not be compelled to work outside the home, nor to renounce their femininity, nor be debased through oppression, pornography, etc. Husbands and fathers have special roles, children contribute in a special way toward the sanctification of parents, and the elderly are important for bridging generation gaps. (Nos. 21-27)

2. *Serving Life*

First, Transmission of Life (Nos. 28-35)

Fecundity is the fruit and sign of conjugal love from which family life derives its whole meaning. That love "must be fully human, exclusive, and open to new life." Anti-life mentality originates in doubt, anxiety, and the panic of scientists.

Objectively moral choices cannot be achieved "unless the virtue of conjugal chastity is sincerely practiced." Contraception is "intrinsically immoral". This is not a Church norm but one interpreted "in obedience to the truth which is Christ". Further, "the concrete pedagogy of the Church must always remain linked with her doctrine and never be separated from it." How the Church is not only "teacher" but "mother" who understands conjugal difficulties. She calls for patience, trust in God, and "frequent recourse to prayer and to the sacraments of the eucharist and reconciliation."

Married couples and young adults should be trained in the natural rhythms of fertility and self-control ("the absolute necessity for the virtue of chastity"). They cannot "look upon the law as merely an ideal to be achieved in the future" but "must consider it as a command of Christ." Conviction must be instilled and offered practical help, especially from couples experienced in personal responsibility for love and life.

Second, Education for Life (Nos. 36-41)

The right and duty of parents to give this education is essential and they must train children correctly with a sense of justice, in self giving and for sexual life and chastity: "Sex education, which is a basic right and duty of parents, must always be carried out under their attentive guidance whether at home or in educational centers chosen and controlled by them. In this regard, the Church reaffirms the law of subsidiarity, which the school is bound to observe when it cooperates in sex education, by entering into the same spirit that animates the parents." The Church is opposed to sex information disassociated from moral principles. (No. 37) The Synod Fathers hoped that bishops would produce a suitable catechism for families.

3. *Participating in the Development of Society* (Nos. 42-48)

By humanizing and personalizing society through the transmission of virtues and values, by devoting itself to social service, by political intervention on behalf of the family and sound

laws, the state cannot take away from families the functions they can just as well perform on their own or in free associations. (At this point the pope lists 14 special rights of the family from the right to exist to the "right to emigrate as a family in search of a better life". (No. 46) The family should show special concern for the poor.

4. *Sharing the Life and Mission of the Church* (Nos. 49-64)

The family is "a Church in miniature" participating in the prophetic, priestly, and kingly mission of Jesus Christ.

First, as a believing and evangelizing community (Prophetic role)

Announcing the Word of God, deepening faith, celebrating married love, engaging in catechesis, performing missionary services.

Secondly, by dialoguing with God (Priestly role)

The home is a sanctuary and marriage is an act of worship and the source of the members' sanctification. The gift of Jesus Christ in marriage accompanies the married couple throughout their lives and the sacraments ongoing grace helps them consecrate the world itself to God.

The Eucharist is the very source of Christian marriage. Recourse to penance is also a recommended source of holiness. Family prayer is so important, especially on the occasion of significant family events, that parents should by word as by example teach their children the prayers of the Church, including the public prayers and the rosary.

Thirdly, by service to their fellow man (Kingly role)

To discover the image of God in each brother and sister, extending love especially to the weak — with a sense of justice.

Part IV: *Pastoral Care of the Family*

1. *Stages of Pastoral Care of the Family* (Nos. 65-69)

Pastoral intervention of the Church in support of the family is a matter of urgency — a real matter of priority.

First, preparation for marriage. Three main stages: remote, proximate, and immediate: "The Church must promote better and more intensive

programs of marriage preparation in order to eliminate as far as possible the difficulties that many married couples find themselves in, and even in order to favor positively the establishing and maturing of successful marriages." (Movements for the benefit of the family should be established.) These courses should balance the doctrinal, pedagogical, legal and medical aspects of marriage.

However, marriage preparation courses must not be an impediment to the celebration of marriage. (No. 66)

Second, the celebration of Marriage (Nos. 67-69)

Normally, this requires liturgy. The celebration must be *per se* valid, worthy, and fruitful. Pastoral solicitude calls for the Church's discipline to be met, i.e. in regard to free consent, impediments, the canonical form and the actual rite of celebration. The liturgical celebration should constitute a proclamation of the word of God and a profession of faith on behalf of the community of believers.

For those who may be imperfectly disposed to the faith pastors must bring about a rediscovery. However, the Church also admits to the celebration of marriage those who are imperfectly disposed. The fact that social motives enter into a request for sacramental marriage is not enough to justify refusal on the part of pastors. Laying down further criteria for admission to the ecclesial celebration of marriage involves grave risks — of making discriminatory judgements, causing doubts about the validity of marriages already celebrated, especially those of separated brethren. If engaged couples, however, reject explicitly and formally what the Church intends, pastors cannot admit them to the celebration of marriages. (No. 68)

Thirdly, pastoral care after marriage (No. 69)

This mainly involves mutual exchange of presence by the Church, especially to young couples.

2. Structures of Family Pastoral Care (Nos. 70-72)

First, the parish. Priests and religious should be trained for this task.

Secondly, the family itself, through social works.

Thirdly, through family associations engaged in transmitting values and developing human persons and then in work for a just and human world.

3. Agents of the Pastoral Care of the Family (Nos. 73-76).

First, bishops and priests. Their responsibility extends not only to moral and liturgical matters but to personal and social matters as well supporting and caring for families, explaining the content of the Church's magisterium.

Secondly, men and women religious. By virtue of their consecration they are called to serve families, teaching them correctly, offering their houses for hospitality and prayer, especially today.

Thirdly, lay specialists e.g. doctors.

Fourthly, social communicators, especially in their concern about the bad formation of the young. Parents are particularly important but so are TV producers, publishers.

4. Pastoral Care of the Family in Difficult Cases. (Nos. 77-85)

First, Church support for families in difficult circumstances, (migrant workers, military, old age, single parent etc.)

Secondly, mixed marriages, especially where the other party professes no religion at all, and the Catholic baptism and education of children may be in danger.

Thirdly, irregular situations

Trial marriages, cohabitation (free unions), civil marriages call for special pastoral interventions. Remarried divorced persons, especially those unjustly abandoned the first time, need special care. (However, those invalidly remarried may not ordinarily be admitted to the Eucharist, for several reasons not the least of which is encouragement of errors about the indissolubility of marriage. The exception, of course is the situation where there is sexual abstinence.) Pastors may not perform ceremonies "of any kind" for invalidly remarried divorcees.

Special concern should be paid to people who have no family life of their own, especially if they live in extreme poverty. The Church should become their family.

Conclusion (No. 86) — a final exhortation.

Reactions to *Familiaris Consortio*

Peter Hebblethwaite

"John Paul responded to the majority view at the synod. One cannot complain that he did not listen to *them*. But the minority view was first caricatured, then processed out and finally dismissed with arguments of questionable validity. The vanquished can console themselves with John Paul's remarks that 'the church seeks the truth, which is not always the same as the majority opinion.'

Although *Familiaris Consortio* follows the main outlines of the synod propositions, it could have been written even if the synod had never met. It contains 24 quotations from Pope John Paul's addresses delivered before the synod met. The truth is he is an expert on the subject of marriage and the family, and so he did not need the synod's advice on these matters.

But before one concludes that the synod was an expensive waste of time, one should consider the possibility that its function has changed: instead of giving advice to someone who does not need it, it becomes a celebration of the unity of the bishops gathered around the pope. It was indeed a famous victory. Time will tell whether it was a Pyrrhic victory." (NCR January 1, 1982 p. 12)

Fr. Richard McBrien

"I don't suspect it is going to change anybody's mind one way or another." "Catholics today", he said, "have learned what it means to be selectively obedient to the Church's teachings." (Washington Post, December 15, 1981)

Fr. Andrew Greeley

"There are really two different kinds of religion: the kind that thinks God talks to humankind only through religious leaders and the kind that thinks God's spirit (or God's Spirit, if you will) speaks also through ordinary people. . ."

". . . the long document shows little effect of any lay contribution. Indeed, the synod of the bishops on the family, which the pope was summarizing in his exhortation, had only a few carefully selected lay people around as 'observers.' However fine the pope's notion of lay contribution may be in theory, the Catholic Church is organized in such a way that they cannot make that contribution in practice.

"Nor are the power-hungry barons of the Roman Curia likely to give them a chance — ever, if they can help it.

"So you have the ludicrous spectacle of a group of elderly unmarried men pontificating easily and freely about the problems of marriage, sex and family life without any need to listen to those who are married, have families and experience sexual intimacy." (Los Angeles Herald *Examiner*, January 16, 1982 p. B8)

Dr. David Thomas (Lay adviser to U.S. Bishops at the Roman Synod)

"Now that I have had the opportunity to read through the document — with intensity and interest almost as great as I experienced in reading my wife's letters before we were married — I come away feeling both delighted and depressed. What delighted me most was, the outright affirmation that the Christian family is indeed church in a radical decisive way — and that the rest of the Church is best described in family terms.

"What depressed me is the same matter that bothered me at the synod itself — little advance is made in formulating a practical, experientially rooted theology of marriage and the family. Such a theology is needed — and I would add already available — yet the church does not seem to be ready or equipped to look for that treasure." (NCR January 15, 1982 p. 19)

Fr. Ronald Modras (St. Louis University, co-author of *Human Sexuality*)

"The pope speaks the language of personalism. His conclusions, however, are those of a Thomist who uses personalist categories to defend what he describes as a 'teaching and norm, always old yet always new.' His personal philosophy is consistently Thomistic.

"Can Thomism's theory of natural law be so easily reconciled with personalism? Shortly after the council Joseph Ratzinger, now cardinal prefect of the Vatican's Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith wrote, "It is simply not the same, whether a person asks himself if his actions are in accord with nature or whether he must ask whether his actions are responsible actions in view of other persons" (Theological Highlights of Vatican II, 1966, pp. 167-68). For Pope John Paul II, however, the difference is only in its expression. The philosophia is perennialis.

"Pope John Paul II is an apologist par excellence of the neo-Thomism that dominated Roman Catholic theology before Vatican Council II. It is difficult to imagine a more eloquent exponent of the Catholicism of this passing second millennium." (NCR January 15, 1982 p. 23)

John Kippley (Couple to Couple League)

"John Kippley, president of the Couple to Couple League, said that Pope John Paul II's apostolic exhortation was more than simply a condemnation of contraception and abortion and an encouragement of the proper regulation of births. He said that the 38,000-word statement went to great lengths to emphasize the importance of a mother's work in the home, chastity and the covenant relationship between a husband and wife.

Kippley praised the Pope's request that theologians work with Church administrators to present a theology of marriage which emphasizes the value and importance of natural family planning as opposed to contraception or sterilization. The pontiff asked in the statement that theologians 'unite their efforts in order to collaborate with the hierarchical magisterium and to commit themselves to the task of illustrating ever more clearly the biblical foundations, the ethical grounds and the personalistic reasons' behind the Church's teaching on birth control." (The Couple to Couple League News Release, Dec. 30, 1981)

Father Thomas F. Lynch (USCC Family Life Representative)

"The most exciting dimension of Pope John Paul's document is the issue of the empowerment of marriage and family to minister to themselves and others. Marriage and the family are called to be active participants in both society and Church life, not merely passive recipients. With a narrow focus in understanding the document, this component can be placed in secondary position.

"A challenging theology of marriage and the Pope's burning desire to provide a creative and relevant support to marriage from its preparation and through its various stages of development are highlighted throughout this exhortation. The Pope especially voices a pastoral concern for the help that young married couples need in today's world and the need that the whole community support them.

"The key to the document is the affirmation of the power and grace that belongs to married couples and families by their very vocation. The Pope sees marriage and the family as a system with an identity and mission of its own. That the family is an intimate community of life and love, founded on and given life by love, is his constant reminder. Its mission is to guard, reveal, and communicate love." (NC News December 23, 1981)

Father John Finnegan

"Divorced and remarried Catholics can still receive the sacraments under special circumstances without annulments even though Pope John Paul recently reaffirmed the church's stand against such a procedure.

"This was the opinion of Father John Finnegan, past president of the Canon Law Society of America. Finnegan, a Boston inner city pastor who has specialized in divorce ministry for 20 years, gave a workshop on divorce ministry to area priests Friday at Catholic Family Ministry. The workshop was closed to the press.

"In an interview, Finnegan discussed the implications of the section on divorce in the pope's document on family issues. While he disagreed with the section on divorce, Finnegan said he thought it was a superb encyclical that made a serious attempt to give a 'spirituality of marriage.'

"Finnegan, a marriage tribunal judge for the Boston Archdiocese, said for hundreds of years there has been a tradition in the church where confessors can reconcile people to the Church through the internal forum" . . .

"In his encyclical, the pope said the only way divorced people who remarried outside the church could receive the sacraments was to live in 'complete continence' abstaining from conjugal acts.

"I'm disappointed in that portion of the papal statement . . . the brother-sister solution was always humanly inadequate," Finnegan said. "I always felt that it could only be invented by celibates."

"Finnegan indicated the Pope's statement on divorce would have little impact on the majority of divorced Catholics in the United States because it would be ignored.

"I prefer to see Catholics . . . cull all the good out of this encyclical that is there for them . . . and be able to lay aside those sections that they feel are inappropriate for their own lives," he said.

"I used to tell my students that I never disobey a church law . . . I do dispense myself from church law at times," he said." (Milwaukee Sentinel, pg. 6 Part 1 1/16/82)

Publications of Interest

N.B. – It is not possible to review all the books requested or supplied by Fellowship members. However, we try, insofar as space permits, to alert readers to the more significant publications addressed to the editor.

- John a Hardon, S.J., *The Question and Answer Catholic Catechism* (Image Books \$8.95) 1700 questions and answers on issues of the Catholic Faith – on belief, moral life, liturgy.
- Moots & Gaffney, *Church and Campus* (Notre Dame Press \$7.95) legal issues in religiously affiliated higher education. Does not address the Catholic issues.
- William F. Maestri, *Basic Ethics for the Health Care Professional* (University Press of America \$6.75) intended mostly for radiologists.
- Don DeMarco, *Sex and The Illusion of Freedom* (Kitchener, Ontario N2M 4P3, Mission House Publications \$5.50 including postage). A good popular presentation of a popular subject. Royalties have been assigned to Birthright International.
- Thomas W. Hilgers, Dennis J. Horan, David, Mall, *New Perspectives on Human Abortion* (Aletheia Books of University Publications of America, 1981), 504 pages, \$9.00 (paperback). A collection of 31 essays, by a wide range of authors, on all aspects of abortion – medical, moral, social, philosophical, cultural. It is an excellent source book for the current state of the question.
- K.D. Whitehead, *Agenda for the "Sexual Revolution"* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1981), 187 pages, \$8.95. A good popular overview of the subject, useful for bringing together a good deal of material and for its attention to the popular media.
- Ellen Wilson, *An Even Dozen* (New York: Human Life Press, 1981), 181 pages, \$10.00. A collection of essays, originally published in the *Human Life Review*, by a perceptive and original young social critic.
- Thomas J. Higgins, S.J., *Judicial Review Unmasked* (West Hanover, Ma.: Christopher Publishing House, 1981), 273 pages, \$14.95. An unfashionable but provocative argument that judicial review, the process by which the higher courts in America have in effect become law-making bodies, is contrary to the Constitution and to the intention of its original framers.

- The current issue of *Law and Contemporary Problems* (Duke University) is devoted to the subject of American pluralism and religion, and includes articles by two Fellowship members – Father Francis Canavan, S.J., and James Hitchcock.
- Raymond Dennehy (Ed.), *Christian Married Love*, (Ignatian Press \$7.95) Five fine papers by Malcolm Muggeridge, Louis Bouyer, Han Urs Von Balthasar, Jean Guiton, Joseph DeLestapis.
- Raymond Dennehy *Reason and Dignity* (University Press of America, \$8.25) An analysis of empiricism and its implications for realistic philosophy.
- James Hitchcock has published a new book, *The New Enthusiasts* (Thomas More Association). It is an updating of Ronald Knox's *Enthusiasm*, with special reference to religious developments of the past twenty years.

Periodical Reviews

- A first-rate article by William May, "Church Teaching and the Immorality of Contraception" (*Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, January 1982) dealing with earlier (and mistaken) efforts to explain *Humanae Vitae* by Lawrence Porter, O.P., John Noonan and John Wright, S.J.
- Dr. Hanna Klaus (Sr. Miriam Paul) has an article entitled "Natural Family Planning – A Review" in the February 1982 Supplement of *Obstetrical and Gynecological Survey*. The article is intended to deal with the positive errors on the subject recently published by the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. She maintains the success of NFP is frightening government family planners who now tend to favor sterilization.
- Other worthwhile articles
 - 1). "Catholicism and the American Experience," *This World*, Fall, 1981, pp. 7-19.
 - 2) "Revelation, Reason, and Politics: Catholic Reflections on Strauss, I," *Gregorianum*, Rome, (No. 2), 1981, pp. 349-66; Part II, in (No. 3), 1981, pp. 467-98.
 - 3) "On Imitating the Creator: On *Laborem Exercens*." in *Papal Economics*, Edited by Philip Lawler, No. 6, The Heritage Lectures, Washington, The Heritage Foundation, 1982, pp. 18-28. (With essays by Jude Dougherty, Claes Ryn, and William Stanmeyer. Available from 513 C St. NE, Washington, DC, 20002, \$2)

Periodical Reviews

David O'Brien, "The Jesuits and Catholic Higher Education", *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* (November 1981)

This review will not be evenhanded or impartial because it deals with a one-sided and imbalanced study of a serious Church problem. Considering the fact that pursuit of academic excellence has been the main justification for separating Catholic colleges from their religious sponsors and from the Church's teaching authority, it is surprising how "American Jesuits working out their aggiornamento in the spirit of Vatican Council II" can publish this booklet as a contribution to the Church's renewal or, for that matter, as an example of research excellence. The contents rely heavily on the one-sided views of academicians like Richard McBrien, William Sullivan, Thomas Shannon, Peter Henriot, Thomas Faase, Timothy Healy, and David O'Brien himself (none of whom have demonstrated any sympathy with Catholic higher education as the church understands it). Their combined views, if followed to the letter, can only continue the disintegration of whatever fidelity remains among Catholic college students to Catholic religious truth.

Let us begin at the end of the O'Brien analysis. Why a Jesuit and Catholic education a generation ago? Because "Jesuit schools prepared young men and women for successful participation in American life, while insuring continued loyalty to the Church, its faith, its moral discipline, its organizational requirements." And now? Because Vatican II allegedly gave us a new Church with a new mission, Jesuit schools today must direct educated Catholics toward "changing the world, not simply succeeding within it." (Observe the complete absence of any reference to Catholic faith in the alleged new purpose of Jesuit education — pp. 28-29) When the author speaks about changing the world he means, of course, changing to a secular view of Vatican II popular among some Jesuits. And to his view, David O'Brien is a self-proclaimed Socialist in the Secular City mould.

The Jesuits and Catholic Higher Education opens with an historical retrospect, not a very long one to be sure because it leaps immediately into the uncertainty of some recent Jesuits about whether institutions of higher learning can be Catholic and professional at the same time. O'Brien cites official documents in favor of continued Catholic identity without explicating the case on behalf of such identity. For example, in describing the characteristics of "The Catholic University in the Modern World" — set down in a document written in Rome at the *Second Congress of*

Catholic Universities of the World (in 1972, not in 1975 as he says), O'Brien lists the fourth characteristic as "an institutional commitment to the service of the people of God and of the human family." But the document continues O'Brien's line to read further — "in their pilgrimage to the transcendent goal which gives meaning to life." The Roman document explains this characteristic when it says that a Catholic University must attend to "those problems which are of the most vital interest to the faith, to morality, and to the life of the Church in contemporary society." Obviously this means more than an institutional commitment to God's people or to social justice. By carefully choosing his authorities Dr. O'Brien is eloquent in describing how weary Jesuits are in dealing with their collective enterprise so that they adopt a policy of live and let live (p. 7). He suggests they will serve better in a voluntary association (p. 8) and best if they work — not as elites "within the structure of a bounded Church" — but as minor agents "on behalf of the disenfranchised and the poor." (p. 9) By that standard much of the Order's existing work could be deemed illegitimate since only a portion would be evaluated positively by his social justice imperative. The author takes care to note that academic Jesuits resist his "adventurous thinking" but does not rate this opposition highly because by 1972 most of their colleges were legally separated from the Society (p. 11). O'Brien is quick to quote the 1971 Bishops' Synod for saying "action on behalf of justice and participation in the transformation of the world fully appear to us as a constitutive dimension of the preaching of the gospel." But following the lead of some Jesuits he would translate "constitutive dimension" (i.e. measured aspect or element) into the norm for or perhaps the total content of the gospel itself. Contemporary Catholic renewal thereby is equated with his idea of what socio-political reform should be (p. 13). O'Brien thinks identification of Jesuit schools with this cause is salvific because the so-called *Project One Report* of the Society confessed that "a convincing corporate rationale for Jesuit education did not exist." (p. 17)

Part II of this study is entitled "Reflections for the Future: A Program to Meet the Chief Present Needs". The needs, as listed, are four: a decision about educational goals, resolution of the conflict between professionalism and Catholicity, clarification of the Jesuit role in the contemporary Church/World and the Will to do what they decide. The only trouble with O'Brien's treatment is that he joins selective Jesuits in looking upon "old time" Catholic college life as repressive (most of us

thought it was fun), Catholicity as an instigator of second-rate faculties, academic quality almost guaranteed to undermine Catholic identity, the American economic-cultural system possibly "the least favorable context of our ministry of preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ," and the lack thus far of the will to commit Catholic higher education to his concept of justice and peace.

If this study was done in 1961 or even in 1971 and if David O'Brien were chosen to do it then, few knowledgeable people would be surprised or dismayed. By now the booklet would be a piece of folklore associated with what O'Brien himself identifies with the Catholic radicalism of the Vietnam era — an ideology unconcerned with internal Catholic issues, or with "retarded questions" about Church institutions or government, but a strong identification of *aggiornamento* with a special brand of social and political action. By 1981 however, many Jesuits (unrecognized by O'Brien) have come to be ashamed of confreres who lead the charge to secularize their successful college system, who mislead the Catholic public about their intentions and their programs, while continuing to appeal for Catholic students and Catholic money. A little more than a year ago a Notre Dame theologian still could accuse Jesuit leadership of obstructing efforts to restore Catholic identity to pseudo-Catholic campuses. But today a new order is coming to the Jesuits. John Paul II is seeing to that. The 10 day meeting of Jesuit provincials in Rome (February 23 — March 5) will undertake to make the expected reforms required by the Holy See. The religious goals of the Society and the Church will once more be enfolded in their apostolates, including the terribly important one of fashioning the minds and souls of Catholic youth. When the social justice objectives of the Church are institutionalized they will be somewhat more objective than David O'Brien's.

There is no good reason any longer why institutions of higher learning should be allowed to trade on the name "Catholic" if they do not intend to turn out a reasonably Catholic product. O'Brien would condemn such false advertising in other institutions. Why should it be tolerated then when Catholic truth about redemption and the eternal salvation of the young are at stake?

The contemporary question, therefore, this booklet raises in my mind is the following: How could the Society of Jesus, committed by vow to God, Christ and Pope publish in 1981 a study which pays so little attention to all three?

Donald Keefe, S.J., "Liberation and the Catholic Church: The Illusion and the Reality", *Center Journal*, Winter 1981, pp. 45-64.

Walter J. Burghardt S.J., "Preaching for Everyday Justice", *National Catholic Reporter*, January 15, 1982, pp. 9-11.

One of the unanticipated outcomes of Vatican II has been the shift among Catholic elites from concern for the "kingdom of heaven" to care about "the kingdom of this world". Almost overnight social justice and world peace have replaced salvation and eternity as the primary religious values. Concurrently, God's revealed Word has given way to man's religious experience as the norm for determining what is religiously true or morally right. Popes had been trying for 75 years with mixed success to involve their elite constituencies in people's human concerns and in the construction of a sound social order. Suddenly after 1965, social activism is all some of them seem to be concerned about. This and belittling the supernatural claims and message of Catholicism. The Catholic Church from the very beginning involved itself in both kingdoms, if only on the principle that you are not likely to preach heaven successfully to a hungry man. However, the Church always understood its fundamental reason for existence to be the eternal salvation of men, not the manipulation of social institutions so that man's life on this planet would be comfortable. The papal social encyclicals maintain the traditional Catholic priorities.

Around the turn of the 20th century, Liberal Protestantism turned these priorities around somewhat with the *Social Gospel Movement*. Pastor Neuhaus recently reported to Catholic Bishops of the U.S. (See December, 1981 *Newsletter*) how the prophets of that movement shifted their religious emphasis from God to man, from Christianity's truth to human service and to improving man's lot. Neuhaus does not dispute the laudable goals of those Protestant pioneers but recognizes in hindsight that God no longer was understood so much as having revealed himself in history. Instead revelation meant God working out his purposes through the evolutionary process through increased humanization. ("It would take many decades", says Neuhaus, "before it erupted in the more vulgar form of the *World Council of Church's* pronouncement that 'the world sets the agenda for the Church.'")

Humanist reasons exist for Church involvement in social problems going back to the creation of the diaconate in NT times. But at that early Christian

date the emphasis was on the priestly work of the Apostles, not the social work of deacons. The Liberal Protestantism reorientation expanded social concerns about the time divines became increasingly doubtful that there was anything substantially real about Christ's eternal pre-existence, Mary's Virgin Birth, biblical prophecies or Christ's miracles. Karl Barth and the Neibuhr brothers objected to substituting political theology for revelation, and M.A. Crowther in *Church Embattled* (1970) argues that the Broad Church of England in the nineteenth century, trying to meet doubt halfway by discarding some traditional beliefs, was a not very successful protector of the Anglo-Catholic tradition. Nor were its parishioners endeared by the effort.

Fr. Donald Keefe describes with remarkable accuracy a similar movement within post-Vatican II Catholicism. Doubts raised by the historico-critical view of revelation has led Catholic elites away from dogmas and from the Church's individualist — oriented moral theology. Ecumenism and secular city theology (later liberationism) took their place, and social sin became more serious than sexual sin. In the process, says Keefe, the particulars of Catholic doctrine suffered loss of status, notably the Marian doctrines, apostolic succession of bishops, papal primacy and infallibility, sacramental realism (*ex opere operato*), and the teaching surrounding marriage and sexuality. The humanist issues — this world — is what counted and until Secular Utopia was reached (through hatred and class conflict, if necessary) no Christian "may regard any Church institution, any office or doctrine or moral law as possessing any validity of its own."

Fr. Keefe recalls Catholic social reformers to the nature of their faith — a call to worship God as the Lord of History through Jesus Christ His Son in the Church with the fullness of Christian doctrine and practice operational. Over-emphasis on Christ's humanity, underemphasis on His divine sacramental presence in the Church, social praxis without due reverence for personal holiness deriving from faith in the Church, and without sacramental reception is a perversion of the Catholic faith. The fullness of our humanity, insists Keefe, is to be found in the parousia, not in political utopias. The obstacle to liberation is human sinfulness, which is reason enough to make the sacrament of penance central to Catholic worship. We are charged by God with responsibility for promoting the dignity and beauty of the world he originally made good, but by the same summons we are called to personal sanctification. The Church's role in political life is indirect i.e.

through the secular activity of its sanctified members.

Fr. Burghardt covers some of Fr. Keefe's ground but starts at the other end: "Does a Church committed to eternal salvation have anything to do with everyday justice?" His answer is yes because he does not see a "privatized, me-and-Jesus religion the best of Catholic tradition." In that he surely is correct. Fr. Burghardt also makes the appropriated distinctions: Christianity is not engaged in secularized goals as personality development or socialization but in divination and liberation from sin, that its Vatican II role in the social order is rooted in the *Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity*, that the liturgy is not the place for political ideology or manipulation, that there is a real distinction between sermonizing on general principles and practical applications, between pastoral letters and homilies, that priests in particular are hardly political or economic experts, that at Sunday Mass the faithful are a captive audience, etc. He makes two valuable comments about the pulpit: (1) frequently parishioners are talked down to without being given a taste for the duties that are laid out before them; (2) preachers frequently fail to celebrate or live the just word they sometimes preach.

Whereas Fr. Keefe is writing out of abuses of the priestly office for secularized causes, Fr. Burghardt tries to push that office to the limits of its secular potential. Whereas one Jesuit sees justice-seeking without holiness a contemporary Catholic aberration, the other is fighting the opposite cause — what he calls a "me and Jesus religion" which places worldly concerns of people at the outer edge of the Church, not on its altar. Burghardt is more specific. "Does it frighten you that the Liturgy in a Catholic Cathedral is expected to coexist with, perhaps even cooperate with — repression?" He cites how prelates from Ambrose to John Paul II have used pulpits to condemn specific social evils — in the hope of forming right consciences in the only practical way possible. What should a preacher do if he is personally certain about the morality of his answers to social questions? (e.g. unilateral disarmament of the arms race, a constitutional amendment to abortion, tax credits for the parochial school crisis, life imprisonment instead of capital punishments, ERA to answer feminine enslavement, boycotts instead of migrant-worker injustice, etc.) Burghardt would be careful but inclines to controversial use of the pulpit. Homilies that avoid concrete applications he says, risk saying nothing. Using the pulpit as "the podium for eternal verities alone, defined

(continued next page)

dogma, the *ipsissim verba* of Jesus" tends to render the preacher mute – if the object is to form consciences. So the editor of *Theological Studies* is willing to take a controversial leap, even though he recognizes the difficulty of locating the solutions to evil social situations.

What can we say about the Keefe-Burghardt presentations? While they tend to balance each other out in some respects, Fr. Keefe would have no objection to "passionate and angry protest" against suffering imposed on the poor or on behalf of peace; Fr. Burghardt properly presses the point that the Church's main role is to lead men and women to God.

Several principles, however, must guide common-sense people whose faith in the Church is unquestioned.

1. The preaching of the Word involves – first of all – the preaching of the Catholic faith. In the absence of authentic faith, we can expect little hearing for the Church's moral directives. John Paul II went out of his way to tell an ecumenical audience at Trinity College in Washington, D.C. (October 7, 1979) that moral life depends on the life of faith, that "deep divisions" between churches over moral matters reflects divergencies in faith.

2. When moral life is being discussed, a preacher must speak of the upright life and personal sins before he pronounces on social ills. This is the Christian priority. Pius XI in *Quadragesimo Anno* called the reform of morals the "first and most necessary" remedy for social disorder.

3. In dealing with social morality, preachers should form consciences with intelligence and courage, speaking as priests and theologians, not as social scientists or political experts.

There are many questions rarely touched in these discussions which go to the heart of the matter and require extensive treatment but never get it.

1. Why is it that those committed to the Catholic creeds and moral code are so often mute on the doctrines involved in the Church's social message?

2. Why today – unlike yesterday – are Catholic educators in the name of Vatican II so strong about forming the social consciences of the young, while using the same Council to call for their freedom in sexual choices. (Recently high school girls were bused to Cathedral steps to protest U.S. involvement in El Salvador. These same girls would not be so bused to go to confession.)

3. Although no one thinks bishops can bind consciences on a given social issue, unless some extraordinary situation is involved, how far can priests go, especially in the pulpit, in denouncing perceived social evil or recommending a particular remedy. While denouncing politicians, or even an occasional business firm by name, is popular in recent days, do we recommend that priests from the pulpit or under Church auspices tell longshoremen (or whatever) that their union is crooked, their leaders are public sinners, call them thieves, drunks, criminals, etc.? All of these vices may well be part of a given social situation and call for remedy.

Fr. Keefe (following John Courtney Murray) is surely right in stressing the Church's indirect role in the social order (unless, of course, her own existence is threatened). He is surely correct, too, in confining priests (as the Pope does) to a priestly teaching role, leaving social activism to a well informed sanctified laity – as a general principle, admitting of exceptions in extraordinary cases. Obviously, it is the layman's role – by virtue of his marriage in Christ and his place in the world – to work out the implications of the Church's social teaching. He cannot look to his parish priest to tell him what the political implications are. The priest is required to deepen supernatural faith and encourage upright lives. If a compilation of the pastor's sermons end up more as political advice than explications of the faith, he mis-represents Christ and the Church. Eventually he will only set his own people against him – or at least divide them or lead them to disaster. These later eventualities are hardly what Christ had in mind.

George A. Kelly

Book Reviews

CHURCH AUTHORITY AND INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM, by Christopher Derrick. (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 1981. 113 pp. \$4.95.)

Though authority and freedom, political or intellectual, are often juxtaposed as contradictories so that we have to opt for one or the other, it seems clear that one cannot exist without the other, while both are in the service of truth. Of this "escape from skepticism" Christopher Derrick so brilliantly wrote in an earlier book on the Catholic university. Indeed, *Church Authority and Intellectual Freedom* and *Escape from Skepticism: Liberal Education as if the Truth Really Mattered* come as close as anything to defining what a complete education might be like if we were free enough, obedient enough to authority, but with its own unique intellectual tradition available to students in our universities and seminaries.

For some time now, not a few have suggested that certain theologians — located pretty much where Mr. Derrick indicated, in Holland, Germany, the United States, and France — have in fact been claiming for themselves a certain counter-magisterium located in their "scholarship," as they like to tell us, but whose main content turns out to be, not surprisingly if we use a content analysis on what they hold, either a sort of pious secular humanism or a lightly bathed socialism. Usually too, as Derrick also intimates, this deviation began as a "personal" problem about *Humanae Vitae*, a document ironically looking better every day (— even *The National Catholic Reporter* had a story recently (15 Jan. 82) about ordinary women saying "no" to the pill). The personal problem, in any case, grew into an independent theology to support it, then to all sorts of things quite contrary to Christian practice and doctrine. The last decade began with theologians finding nothing wrong with contraception and ended with many of them finding little wrong with homosexuality, much to the surprise of no one who read *Humanae Vitae* carefully.

Our university and seminary faculties are in fact replete with such theological "types" dreaming of a "liberation" that invariably in practice locks poor peoples up in absolutist systems or explains that the Church teaching on life is wrong because modern "practice" or "science" does not allow it. We should not be astonished, moreover, if in turn, this newly established "magisterium" appears more dogmatic and censorial than anything in the old Church structures. These are what I call, in my more pessimistic moods, the "liberal clerical

fascists," who once in power systematically prevent classical orthodoxy from gaining much of a foothold in Catholic institutions. To be sure, a reaction is setting in, much to the annoyance of the now aging enthusiasts finding themselves more and more in the seats of power in the Church. Among younger graduate students and intellectuals, usually residing in faculties other than theology, but not always, often in universities other than Catholic, more and more in specialized think-tanks founded precisely to retain and further what Christianity was about in the first place, a new intellectual consideration of faith is beginning. A further element in this change is the mind of John Paul II, even though feared and ignored by those of whom Derrick writes. As more and more young read the Pope for himself and not through the eyes of his critics, no mean feat in spite of the valiant efforts of the Daughters of St. Paul, a whole new understanding of the integrity and genius of Catholicism will begin to appear precisely as an intellectual position in itself and not only as some kind of adversary to classical orthodoxy.

In any case, nothing is more annoying to established "neo-modernist" faculties, as Derrick calls them, than someone like Derrick himself — someone who knows the tradition and what deviates from it and why, who writes well, wittily, frankly, who is relatively young, lay, and innately smarter than anything the "neo-modernist" theologians can produce. Also of Derrick, as he himself intimates, he seems more skeptical, more aware of the force of the arguments against the whole Christian position, so that he sees exactly where its real force lies — not in naively imitating the path of the secular mind. Derrick makes the same point as Professor Charles Rice in his lecture "Shortchanged at Notre Dame," namely, that it is enormously difficult for students to find out what Catholicism in particular is about in our universities, to hear the case to be made for it.

Derrick insists rightly, there is a radical injustice here, to both students who come to these universities and to parents who send them there, a real problem about truth in labelling. Derrick wrote:

This is a moral issue about which we laymen are entitled to have strong feelings, where clerical behaviour is concerned. Let us not forget that all these great Catholic universities which we see around were built and are now maintained, ultimately, by the pennies of the poor — occasionally by the millions of the rich — and that economically speaking, the entire ecclesiastical institution is wholly parasitical upon the laity. I do not mind this in the least; nor do I consider it

desirable or even possible that those who thus pay the ecclesiastical piper should call the doctrinal and moral tune. But it is morally outrageous when money raised from the people (mostly from the poor) for one definable purpose is converted without their consent to another and radically different purpose; and this happens very often in the Church of today . . .

In the marketplace of these last fifteen years, many things have been packaged and labelled and very insistently sold as Catholic theologies of some "new" or "progressive", or "liberal" sort, when on any objective reckoning they were more or less radical departures from Catholic Christianity as such. When anything of that kind happens, the Church can surely invoke the provision of Faith

Descriptions Act in order to save the customer from being fooled. (pp. 82, 84).

This comes pretty close to the sort of anger and annoyance many laity are feeling about what has happened to their institutions erected to enable orthodox Catholicism to have an intellectual voice for itself.

Derrick has an uncanny capacity to ferret out the issues and motivations in all of this. Indeed, he is just cynical enough about the vanities of the clerical and liberal mind to present a description of what has been happening that is quite coherent and plausible. I have often argued recently that the case, the intellectual case for classical Catholicism has never been stronger either in the area of human

(continued below)

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

life, family, science, or politics. But it is not being made in our universities and seminaries and most of our media, largely, I think, for the reasons Derrick has presented here. This is the real scandal of our so-called "intellectuals," who really have not understood where the vital battle was or what it was about. They have preferred to follow a modernist strand that resulted in having them say just about what everyone else was saying. The result has been a flight to the cults for many, or to the fundamentalists who at least retained the sense of the uniqueness of Christianity. The tragedy today, as Joseph Sobran remarked in the first issue of the *Center Journal*, is that the secularist attack on the fundamentalists is unerringly aimed "at the political rights of all Christians." (Winter, 1981, p. 103) When we see Catholic "neo-modernists"

joining this attack, we can be sure the goal is a Christianity without transcendence, a Christianity itself locked up in the fads of this world, as Christopher Derrick so well suggested.

There are powerful minds outside of Christianity watching all of this. They know that if there is no intelligent case for Catholicism, there is no case for religion at all. When they hear from the neo-modernist theologians merely what they already preach themselves, they know the battle is mostly over. It is for this reason that Mr. Derrick's new book is so important. It reminds us that the flag of orthodoxy is still waving on the battlements. It remains the only kingdom worth fighting for, because it is the one kingdom given to us, as Augustine said, not one we make for ourselves.

James V. Schall, S.J.