

# FELLOWSHIP OF CATHOLIC SCHOLARS

# NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 5, NUMBER 3

JUNE 1982

## Letter from Father William B. Smith

Our recent convention on Catholic Social Thought in the Teaching of Pope John Paul II brought together many insights and perspectives that underlined both the deep continuity and the nuanced contemporary application of the Holy Father's teaching.

More than one scholar recalled the priorities and program outlined by the Pope at the General Conference of the Latin American Bishops at Puebla (Jan. 28, 1979).

Speaking to the Latin American Bishops — and all pastors and teachers — the Pope stated his pastoral priorities and program clearly: (1) the first and principal duty of pastors is to be "Teachers of the Truth" (purity of doctrine; the truth about Jesus Christ is the center of evangelization and its essential content); then (2) Unity within the Church (unity among bishops, unity with priests, religious & faithful); finally (3) advancing and defending human dignity (not through violence, power & politics but through the truth concerning man).

The Pope clearly rejected those who foster or allow a certain 'separation' between the Church and the Kingdom of God. Indeed, the Kingdom of God is emptied of its full content and understood in a rather secular sense when: "interpreted as being reached not by faith and membership in the Church but by the mere changing of structures and social and political involvement, as being present whenever there is a certain type of involvement & activity for justice" (Puebla, I, 8).

No economic rule nor change in political mechanisms, by themselves, will advance human dignity. "Primacy must be given to what is moral, to what is spiritual, to what springs from the full truth concerning man" (Puebla, III, 5).

It is now clear that the Pope himself has faithfully held to these priorities and this program: *Redemptor Hominis* ('79), *Dives in Misericordia* ('80), *Laborem Exercens* ('81), *Familiaris Consortio* ('81).

Any pastor or teacher or both might examine trends and situations in the Church in our country in view of the papal priorities: teaching the truth; uniting the church; efforts for or at human dignity. In many cases, the papal priorities seem to be in American reverse.

Some in the Church do not see at all how evangelization and education in the truth contributes very much to justice or peace. Moral-spiritual truths rarely receive primacy of place, more usually they are but rhetorical mentions to decorate policy proposals arrived at on economic or political grounds.

While much is proposed in terms of advancing human dignity, the bulk of such proposals slant all in one direction, they pretend to come from a unity within the Church which is just not there. Indeed a steady diet of ideologically one-sided proposals has caused and will cause more and deeper polarity on particulars on which reasonable Catholics can and will disagree. The truth status of such proposals is rarely discussed; it is simply assumed and announced as self-evident when many such moves are anything but self-evident.

This reversal of papal priorities — almost silent on truth; consensus-sounding proposals that engender contention; a cascade of detailed policy statements, more and more pointed as they are less and less cogent — this reversed priority has invaded many areas of Catholic life — social, educational & sacramental.

Simply stating the existence of problems is not, of course, to invent them; but pastors and teachers in the Church should understand them first and then, perhaps, contribute to a solution.

A number of Fellowship members and friends have already done this at book length. I'd like to recommend such reading keeping in mind the papal priorities and program above: Msgr. George Kelly's *The Crisis of Authority* (Regnery, 1982); Prof. James Hitchcock's *Catholicism & Modernity* (Seabury, 1979) and Ralph Martin's *A Crisis of Truth* (Servant Books, 1982). These are well-documented accounts of reversed priorities; they also suggest forward solutions.



## Report of the 1982 Convention in Chicago

"Catholic Social Thought and the Teaching of Pope John Paul II" was the theme of the Fifth Annual Convention of the Fellowship held on March 26-28, 1982 at the Sheraton-O'Hare Hotel in Chicago, Illinois.

More than 150 members and guests of the Fellowship participated in the sessions of the Convention which was chaired by the Rev. William B. Smith, St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, President of the Fellowship.

Major addresses were presented by the Rev. Ronald Lawler, O.F.M., Cap., Professor John Finnis, the Rev. John R. Connery, S.J., the Rev. James V. Schall, S.J., and Professor J. Brian Benestad.

Father Smith presented the 1982 Presidential Address at the Convention Dinner of the Fellowship on Saturday evening.

Convention workshops were held on Family Life, Catholic Higher Education, Religious Life, and Social Action.

Papers were presented by Richard LaSalvia, Esq., Professor Thomas Werge, Professor Maura Daly, and Professor Regis Martin at a "Colloquium on Religion and Literature."

Fellowship members and guests attending the Convention participated in masses celebrated at Our Lady of Hope Church on Saturday and Sunday mornings.

The Addresses and papers presented at the 1982 Convention will be published in Proceedings of the Fellowship Convention. Summaries of the discussions in the Convention workshops will be published in the Fellowship Newsletter.

---

## 1981 Convention Proceedings Published

The 1981 Convention Proceedings edited by Paul Williams of Scranton — entitled *Catholic Faith and Freedom* — has been published. Members of the Fellowship will receive their copies in the mail. If by June 30th the book has not arrived please let Msgr. Kelly know. Because of the high cost of printing and mailing we are suggesting that members send \$5.00 to our treasurer Dr. Joseph Scottino, Gannon University, Erie, Pennsylvania 16541.

## Report on the Convention Workshop on the Family Life

It was announced that there is a commentary on *Familiaris Consortio* presently in preparation with an expected publication date of Fall, 1982, by Franciscan Herald Press. Contributors include Father William Smith, Father Ronald Lawler, Dr. William May, Dr. Joseph Boyle, Dr. Josef Seifert, Father Robert Levis, Father James O'Connor, Monsignor George Kelly, Father Henry Sattler, Father John Woolsey, and Father Michael Wrenn who will provide the Introduction and serve as Editor.

Members of the Convention Workshop expressed the need to emphasize Evangelization of the Family in order to assist in building and supporting Catholic family identity. A number of participants expressed the need for support groups to serve families and observed that *Familiaris Consortio* is presenting guidelines for a family to family type of ministry and even implies the possibility of an internship, within cooperating families, for young people who will eventually marry. This would be but another way of assuring the Holy Father's express desire that marriage preparation programs always accord with the Church's teaching and practice.

A suggestion was made that a subsequent convention of the Fellowship be devoted to an interdisciplinary treatment of *Familiaris Consortio*.

Interest was expressed regarding Pope John Paul II's desire for a Catechism of Family Life mentioned in the Exhortation. All were agreed that the theological precisions and pastoral implications of *Familiaris Consortio* are almost limitless provided every effort is made to promote and guarantee its acceptance among Catholics in the United States.

Fr. Michael J. Wrenn

---

## Wright Award at September Board Meeting

Dr. Scottino reports that the nominations for the 1982 Cardinal Wright Award, named after the former bishop of Pittsburgh, have been received from the membership. The Executive Board will be polled and a selection made during the next month. The Award itself will be conferred in connection with the September 18th meeting of the Executive Board in Chicago. John and Eileen Farrell first conceived the idea of a Wright Award in 1979. The earlier recipients were Msgr. Kelly, Dr. May, and Dr. Hitchcock in that order.



## Report on the Convention Workshop on the Religious Life

A discussion of religious vocations was the first item. Imprudent, unmonitored, and unevaluated experimentation in the novitiate and subsequent formation programs was recognized as the source of many problems. For example, the lack of enthusiasm for encouraging vocations by religious active in the apostolate; a hesitancy on the part of young people to commit themselves to the religious life (they want to give themselves to Christ, not to an experiment); and the actual poor formation of young religious subjected to it.

Religious should be shown by Fellowship scholars what the consequences of unlimited experimentation are. Publicity should be given to communities that have retained authenticity; prospective novices should be steered to them. Sodalities and other groups that foster the spiritual life in students should be revitalized, for it is of such beginnings that religious vocations come.

A considerable amount of attention was then given by the workshop members to a new document on the religious life to be issued by the Holy See. It apparently has already been circulated in draft form for comment by the experts. When it first appears in its final form, the Fellowship could be prepared to issue a positive statement about it, and then later, after careful study, a positive, more lengthy commentary designed to counteract negative reaction that will certainly be forthcoming. A committee of the Fellowship could now be set up to prepare itself and stand by for such a task.

Other items entered the discussion (not necessarily in this order): the need for a definition of genuine religious life; the questions of theological anthropology involved; rigid homogeneity of outlook among all communities of women religious enforced by national conferences to the detriment of particular spirits and spiritualities; possibilities of renewal derived from new vocations of gifted people; withdrawal from formation supervisory functions of those directors of novices and others who do not have balanced views or whose spirituality is shallow and prone to acceptance of fads; making available to sisters and brothers spiritual directors and chaplains of substantial spirituality; making good communities visible; availability (for prospective novices) of lists from the Institute on Religious Life of religious communities that are holding together well; and the role of the journal *Consecrated Life* (originating in the Sacred Congregation in Rome).

Earl A. Weis, S.J.

## Convention Workshop on Catholic Higher Education

This workshop rehashed the problems associated with the separation of Catholic Higher Education from ecclesiastical control – the alleged reasons that such separation (federal funding and cultural respectability) and the effect of such separation on Catholic teaching and the lives of Catholic students attending these institutions. The *Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities* (NCEA) has been resisting efforts by Rome to regularize this situation and presently is opposed to the New Code of Canon Law's stipulation that theology teachers in Catholic colleges must operate out of a canonical mission from Church authority. In 1976 the *International Theological Commission* explained the importance of this requirement: "The Catholic theologian is not engaged in a profane enterprise. He is exercising a 'genuinely ecclesial authority,' which usually derives from his canonical mission. He is sent to preach and teach by pope and bishops in a way no different than the apostles who were sent by Christ. Even if this canonical mission has not been explicated, theologizing can only be done in communion with the faith, and this means with the magisterium. (Thesis 7)."

There is little chance that the Holy See will revamp Canon 767 of the New Code to satisfy the ACCU. A more important question may be: Will that canon become a dead letter immediately after promulgation? The requirement of canonical mission for teachers of theology may inspire some colleges to reassert their Catholicity, but others have already indicated their intent to forswear publicly their allegiance to the Catholic Church. If this latter occurs a step will have been taken toward the "truth in advertising" some Catholic educators claim is a minimum norm for trading on the Church's name and claims. Another possibility, of course, is that some agreement will be worked out whereby the College Board of Trustees and/or the College president will be delegated by Rome or bishop to authenticate the Catholicity of the institutional commitment and theological teaching.

Traditionally, the canonical mission (and the guarantee of authentic teaching) was supervised by the superior of the religious community which sponsored the college or university, the superior in turn being responsible to hierarchy at some point. The lines of jurisdiction (like authority lines in a family), though clear in principle, were often fuzzy in practice. This relationship ended when the college institutes declared themselves independent

(continued on page 11)



## Items of Interest

- John Kippley has called for more thorough marriage preparation. The president of *The Couple to Couple League* thinks the new canon law will make this more necessary because annulments may not be so easy to obtain, certainly down from the 31,000 reported by the Vatican for 1979 (as against 445 in 1969). Kippley is concerned that 95 percent of the people seeking annulments have used unnatural methods of birth control or engaged in pre-marital sex.

"It's very hard for a young couple to take seriously the Church's teaching on birth control," he explained, "when a doctor at their pre-marriage classes explains how to use every imaginable form of abortifacient and contraceptive. It's hard for them to believe that the local church really cares about its own teaching when a parishoner who lets it be known that she had a tubal sterilization is given the privilege of reading the Bible or distributing the Eucharist at Mass.

"These young people assume that such a person wouldn't be allowed to hold such an honor if she let it be known around the parish that she was running an abortion clinic or working as a call girl; and so they assume that the Church isn't serious about the morality of birth control." (For further information on NFP write Mr. Kippley, P.O. Box 11084, Cincinnati, Ohio 45211.)

- Patrick Riley, longtime correspondent for the NC News Service has written an article in HPR (April 1982) entitled "What are the Bishops Saying", an analysis of recent statements emanating from the Church's central headquarters. Seeking to perfect future episcopal statements, Mr. Riley proposes that an adversary system be established for the drafting of the bishops' public statements. The key paragraphs are found on pages 18 and 19:

"Let a team of expert adversaries be appointed for each major document to scrutinize it and present criticisms to the bishops. Then the bishops could enter their deliberations armed with an understanding of the weaknesses of the documents handed them by their bureaucrats . . .

"The adversary system would fit in easily with regulations adopted in November 1981 by the bishops for the drafting of public statements. The new 'pre-decision stage,' which enable the bishops to decide whether they wish to issue any statement and, if so, what its drift should be, offers an ideal opportunity for adversaries to present both sides to the deciding bishops. Then, the draft of the

statement could be critiqued by appointed adversaries both before and during its presentation to the bishops. Bishops who rise from the floor to comment on the draft could avail themselves of the expertise not only of those who drafted the document — which situation obtains at present — but of appointed adversaries of the document. (It is worth recalling that in highly-developed legislatures, such expert help is regularly available to members opposing particular legislation.)"

- The March Newsletter's report of Andrew Greeley's objection to celibates in Rome settling marriage problems for married people, brought this note from a reader: [The pope's tough pronouncements on polygamy in Africa stirred some anger in predominantly Muslim Nigeria]. "Said a trader in Kaduna: 'How can the Pope tell me how many wives I can have? Has he got one?'"

- Edward Fiske's book *Times' Selective Guide to Colleges* (Times Books \$9.95) grades 19 Catholic Colleges among its 250 entries for their quality of academic, social, and community life. Those colleges are Alverno, Boston, CUA, Dayton, DePaul, Duquesne, Fairfield, Fordham, Georgetown, Holy Cross, Loyola (N.O.), Manhattan, Marquette, Notre Dame, St. John's (Collegeville), San Francisco, Santa Clara, St. Louis, Xavier (N.O.). None of the 19 were given five stars for academics but Fiske thought Dayton deserved five stars for its "fun-filled" social life.

- On March 18th Bishop James W. Malone, Vice-President of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and Msgr. Frederick McManus, board chairman of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities and a delegation which included Sr. Alice Gallin, ACCU executive director and Fr. William Byron, S.J., forthcoming president of CUA, were received in audience by Pope John Paul II. The delegations were in Rome to secure modifications in the revised Code of Canon Law, particularly C. 767 ("In any kind of Institute of Higher Studies those who give theological courses or courses related to theology require a canonical mission.") It does not seem that the ACCU mission was successful.

- Msgr. Eustace D'Lima, deputy general secretary of the Indian Conference of Bishops in New Delhi and a friend of the Fellowship from the beginning, died of a heart attack on March 3, at the age of 49. Msgr. De'Lima had corresponded with various members of the Fellowship and was extremely interested in the organization and the help it might provide for the Church in India.



## The Present State of Jesuit Affairs

### 1. What John Paul II Said to the Jesuits

*[The Assembly of Jesuit provincials – in Rome at the request of the Pope (February 23 to March 3) for “reflection” – heard John Paul II (February 27) indicate the six areas of his concern about the Society: (1) the identity and ecclesial function of the Society; (2) the “sentire cum ecclesia”; (3) “the apostolate”; (4) “the quality of Jesuit religious life”; (5) formation; (6) what the Church expects from the Society of Jesus. Beyond many expressions of affection and appreciation for the Order’s long and useful service to the Church, which dominate the text, the following excerpts seem to reflect the Pope’s mind on how his concerns should be resolved.]*

No. 7 – “Allow me to insist once more and solemnly on the exact interpretation of the recent Council – This renewal of fidelity and fervour in all sections of the Church’s mission, matured and expressed in the collective heeding of the Pentecostal Spirit – must be welcomed and lived today according to the same spirit and not according to personal criteria or psycho-sociological theories.”

No. 8 – “The Church first of all requires you to adapt the different forms of traditional apostolate which even today retain all their effectiveness and to work for renewing of the spiritual life of the faithful, the education of youth, the formation of the clergy, of religious men and women, and missionary activity. This requires catechesis, proclamation of the Word of God, the spreading of Christ’s doctrine, Christian penetration into the culture of a world trying to establish division and opposition between science and faith, pastoral activity for those on the fringe of society, the exercise of priestly ministry in all its authentic forms.

“ . . . Concern for justice must be exercised in conformity with your religious and priestly vocation – this must be even more emphasized in our times against the many tendencies to secularize priest’s work by reducing it to

a purely philanthropic function. He is not a medical doctor, a social worker, a politician or a trade unionist . . . Priests are not meant to take the place of the laity, and still less should they neglect the duty that is specifically theirs.”

No. 10 – “There should be no separation between the interior life and the apostolate.”

No. 11 – “Together with solidity of virtue, your Constitutions insist on a solidity and soundness of doctrine, such as is essential for an efficacious apostolate – The same should remain true in the future by means of that loyal fidelity to the Magisterium of the Church and in particular of the Roman Pontiff, to which you are in duty bound.”

No. 12 – [Concerning the special vow to Popes present and future]

It is evident that here we are touching upon the essence of the Ignation charism, and upon what lies at the very heart of your Order. And it is to this that you must always remain faithful.”

No. 13 – [Concerning their own deliberations during the Roman visit.]

“I am confident that this preparation will proceed in such a manner that it will be possible to convoke the [33rd] General Congregation within this year.”

---

### 2. What Paolo Dezza, S.J. Said to the Jesuits

*[Fr. Dezza, one-time confessor to Paul VI and presently Delegate of the Holy Father to the Society, who in the Pope’s name convoked the Roman meeting sent a letter “to the whole Society” on March 25th with the follow-up directives to guide Jesuit deliberations in the coming months. In the letter he communicates “in more explicit detail, the desires of the Pope in our regard and of furnishing directives for carrying out these desires. “Help the Pope” is Fr. Dezza’s message as he warns against division within the society. He calls for absolutely essential cooperation and unity from every Jesuit: “This union is possible for us only through our acceptance and fulfillment of the desires of the Holy Father and of the directives which I have indicated in conformity with those desires. I ask the cooperation of all of you in a sincere and generous acceptance and implementation of these*



directives," *Speaking of their forthcoming discussion, Fr. Dezza concludes: "I am confident that this preparation will proceed in such a manner that it will be possible to convoke the General Congregation within this year."* The significant excerpts from the Directives are the following:

#### I *The Apostolate of the Society*

Since the Jesuit "mission" comes from the Pope or the General in virtue of the "faculty granted by the Sovereign Pontiff", it is necessary to follow his directives just as any person who is "sent". Since, too, Jesuit missions are carried out in the local Church, the proper norms of relations with bishops must be observed.

After reviewing the approved Jesuit apostolates Father Dezza said the following: "It is not possible to approve certain tendencies which consider the promotion of justice, no longer as required by the service of the faith but almost as the very expression of faith." Jesuits may not "confuse roles proper to priests with those proper to laypeople." Specifically, "the priest's role is to indicate Christian principles concerning economic, social and political life; to denounce injustices, to exhort people to work for the improvement or reform of institutions; to expound the social doctrine of the Church."

However, "ours cannot take part in political parties or assume directly political positions save in really exceptional cases, approved by the Bishops and by father General."

Finally, to remedy injustice, "it is certainly necessary to strive for a better social and political order, but it is no less necessary that such people be reached by other efforts directed toward a religious and moral improvement of man himself. And this is precisely the specific role of the priest, directed toward men of different factions, tendencies and ideologies."

#### II *"Sentire Cum Ecclesia"*

##### 1. *Fidelity to the Magisterium*

"In the exercise of our apostolate the Pope earnestly desires that the Society not diminish in any way its traditional fidelity to the magisterium of the Church."

Fr. Dezza reminds them that the 1974 General Congregation deplored "particular failings in this matter on the part of some members of the Society in recent years" and recommended "that care be taken to prevent and correct the failings which weaken fidelity to the Magisterium." Not only is he referring to the infallible Magisterium but to the non-infallible Magisterium, too (GS No. 25), especially to a doctrine clearly and repeatedly

taught in solemn documents such as Encyclicals. Jesuits should avoid publicizing outside of scientific circles "affirmations that are contrary to the Magisterium."

##### 2. *Fidelity to Church Laws*

Fr. Dezza particularly has liturgical laws in mind — e.g. tampering with liturgical forms and language ("in not a few places the lack of observance of these norms is frequent".)

If the pilgrim Church stands in need of purification "the best way to improve it is not public criticism and controversy" but "suitable ways to bring correction and remedy without a great deal of noise and provoking scandals." Fr. Arrupe is called upon as a witness to the fact that in St. Ignatius' voluminous correspondence which contributed so effectively to Church reform "there is not a word of criticism against ecclesiastical superiors."

#### III *Our Religious Life*

Fr. Dezza recalls Jesuits to the Spiritual Exercises, the Account of Conscience, daily celebration of the Eucharist, favorable community atmosphere, the evangelical virtues, etc.

#### IV *Formation of Others*

This section refers firstly to "the prolonged, solid formation of the future apostles of the Society" which the Pope does not want watered down either in its spiritual, doctrinal, disciplinary and pastoral content.

Young aspirants should be formed for "a deep and solid faith" strong enough to resist modern temptations and life's difficulties. The young should participate responsibly in their formation but we should not permit students to cancel the action of the educator. A young religious is not mature at the beginning of the process nor does he have experience. He must be solidly formed in philosophy and theology as required by *Sapientia Christiana*. Philosophy is especially important as a gateway for theological training and, respecting all theological specialties, there should be no neglect of training in a systematic theology so that "our scholastics receive that complete and organic knowledge of the fundamental points of Catholic doctrine which all need."

Fr. Dezza concludes with Fr. Arrupe's words of December 31, 1981, affirming the close union of Pope and Society and the need to search God's will: "This will of God is made known to us through the decisions and desires of the Holy Father, which I accept as expressions of the Voice of God."



### 3. What Others Say the Pope Said of Intended

- **Peter Hebblethwaite** (National Catholic Reporter, March 26, 1982 pp. 1 ff.)

This ex-Jesuit blames Fr. Dezza for the trouble the Jesuits had with Paul VI and John Paul II by "sneaking off to popes" with complaints behind the back of Fr. Arrupe.

John Paul II's Polish background is the problem, not the Jesuits. He still thinks of the Jesuits as "the pope's shock troops" and the "fourth vow" as special obedience to himself and as indiscriminate approval of every papal action, when all it really means that Jesuits go where they are sent but "for the greater glory of God" not as an ultramontane blanket approval.

The present pope has a certain hostility to Jesuits and wishes to curb their independence. If he can bring them to heel, then other religious orders without a fourth vow are particularly exposed.

The displacement of Fr. Arrupe by Fr. Dezza was like the martial law imposed on Poland by General Jaruzelski. However, the direct rule of the Jesuits will end before martial law does in Poland. If they continue to be good they will be allowed to hold a 33rd General Congregation, elect a successor to Arrupe and return to constitutional rule. Yet, though Jesuit leaders can pledge their loyalty to the pope, they cannot make the river flow back uphill. Will John Paul II learn anything from the experience? That it is not so easy to impose his vision on the Church.

As if to summarize what the Pope can expect, Hebblethwaite concludes one evaluation of the Roman assembly with this comment from a religious superior (not a Jesuit): "Collaboration is a new code word in the Vatican. It means that the religious have to line up behind the Roman curia and the bishops, who themselves are absolutely perfect. It is always the religious who have to do the collaborating." (NCR March 12, 1982 p. 4)

- **Commonweal** (April 9, 1982 p. 186)  
"Stitched into the pope's laudatory eighteen-page text were exhortations (1) to a narrower interpretation of the reforms initiated by Vatican II than perhaps many Jesuits consider either intellectually or pastorally justified; and (2) though the pope warmly endorsed action for social justice, he reiterated his anxiety that the priest's concern remain primarily spiritual."
- **Joseph O'Hare** in *America* (April 3, 1982) reprinted a *London Tablet* editorial (March 13th) which interpreted the whole speech as an

endorsement of Fr. Arrupe's generalate, a permission for Jesuits *per modum exceptionis* to engage in political activity, that in spite of local disorders the Jesuit body was healthy. The Pope emerged, says the *Tablet*, as a man who can be misled to begin with, but on digging into the problem himself, comes up with a balanced judgment. The *Tablet* thinks, too, there is a desperate need for some release from Roman jurisdiction over the day-to-day government of the Church and some recommended Vatican II decentralization, widening the local bishops' discretion.

- **National Jesuit News** (April 1982 pp. 1-5).  
Headlines:  
*'Reassured' Provincials Return From Rome* (p. 1)  
*U.S. Provincials Encouraged by Papal Address* (p. 2)  
*The Roman Meeting: Gratifying But "Open-Ended"* (p.4)

Jesuit Conference President Fr. John J. Callaghan reported to the American contingent upon his return from Rome: "The positive tenor of the lengthy talk of the Pope, even in those passages where he referred to aspects of Jesuit religious life and apostolic endeavors about which we all have concern, confirmed our hopes that progress has been made toward the resolutions of problems and misunderstandings." (p. 1) Other U.S. provincials confirmed Fr. O'Callaghan's positive evaluation of the Rome meeting. Detroit leader Fr. Michael Lavelle said: "Contrary to prior musings of the media, no knuckles were wrapped; no individuals within the Society or areas of the Society were singled out for rebuke."

National Jesuit News looks upon the Roman meeting as an "affirmation" of Fr. Arrupe's leadership, a confirmation of the decrees last two General Congregations "in full force" and a GC 33 by the Fall of 1933.

The NJN editor sees the "open-ended" unresolved questions between Pope and Jesuits to be these (p. 4).

1. Fidelity to magisterium vs. occasional "qualified" dissent.
2. Jesuits and Jesuit institutions vs. the provisions of the revised code of canon law.
3. Better communication with the Vatican.
4. Who will define "genuine priestly activity"?
5. How much local autonomy for Jesuit seminaries.



#### 4. Jesuit Books and Articles

Thomas Philip Faase, S.J., *Making the Jesuits More Modern*, (Washington, D.C., University Press of America 1981) 457 pp. \$21.00.

"In the experience of the Jesuit Order, changes in the environment induced changes in the Order in such way that experimentation and questioning led to disembeddedness from ascription and rationalization of behavior. This led in turn to the pluralism of new behaviors and new forms of integration. This increased activity resulted in the eventual generalization of values. Implementation of the changes rely on the strength of predisposing factors and the adherence to a central normative core of values in the Society of Jesus. This development could serve as a paradigm of organizational activity and evaluation for other organizations as well." (p. 336)

Translating sociological jargon worthy of a Talcott Parsons is not always easy but in essence the above paragraph says the following: Once the contemporary secular world, not the historic Church, became the dominating context for the Jesuits the ties that bound Jesuits to their own traditions were loosened, leading to release of the membership from imposed constraints (canon law, hierarchy, otherworldly conceptions including revelation etc.) and the adoption of modern world values, norms, goals and structures (temporality, pragmatism, experimentation, pluralism, rationalism, etc.), creating a modernized Order preoccupied with modern concerns (mostly secular), governed by modern rules (mostly secular) aimed toward a new type of salvation (mostly secular). This new order is a good model for what the future Church should be.

Modernization, in the sense defined by Fr. Faase, means secularization, not any kind of secularization, but Jesuits leaving their elite status within the Church for a more relevant status (if only minority status) in the secular world with legitimation being derived (not from Church or Order) from the poor and disenfranchised of the world. The modernization process, unaffected by middle class populations or nations, except negatively, can only be accomplished through appropriate legislation. The radical shift of priorities demanded by Vatican II calls for an administrative leadership capable of shaping the climate of the Society and socializing members through new formation programs and changed life styles, while simultaneously bridging the gap (read controlling) with older Jesuits raised under traditional procedures and middle class values. Jesuits from developing nations are seen as more sympathetic to the new directions. Jesuits,

therefore, are counted on to develop the pedagogy which will result in the ultimate conversion to the cause of the Society (and the larger Church) to this cause.

The forward movement, Fr. Faase further alleges, is the direct institutional outgrowth of the 1974 General Congregation of Jesuits (the 32nd) in Rome and the administration of Father General Pedro Arrupe – jointly fulfilling some mandate of the Second Vatican Council. The research suggests, he says, that the religious revolution within Jesuitry is directed toward reinstitutionalizing the entire Catholic Church, which has mirrored Jesuit teachings and structures, at least from Reformation times onward. Traditional doctrine has been changed in content and meaning (perhaps with the words remaining intact) because the social context has changed. Faith in Christ is best served today by promoting justice as the absolute requirement of ministry. Faase assures readers that delegates to the Roman assembly in 1974 generally favored modernized and avant-garde theology over the unchanging theology of the pre-Vatican II period. *Conciliar-Humanist Jesuits* there represented majority opinion, although *Bulwark-Catholic Jesuits* were not lacking in some power. (The very terminology Faase uses predisposes the evidence.)

What comes clear from a reading of Chapter Ten is that after 1974 Father General Arrupe and his central staff in Rome reinforced the *Conciliar-Humanist* choices of teaching, service, and life styles. Says Faase: "Through effective lobbying in every province congregation by a group of young Jesuits and information and statements of Father General furnished by his secretariat on socio-economic development, the Thirty-Second General Congregation accepted the issue of faith and justice as a priority of priorities and passed its formulation into Jesuit legislation." (p. 326) But social justice concerns were not the exclusive priority: others included removing "the mystery from revered routines", changing the relationship of superior to subject, achieved status not ascription, solidarity through self-aligned force not through submission, rationalization and relativity, the process of change itself – these were the ingredients of renewal (p. 327). Breaking down ascribed meanings and roles was seen as purification, including the demythologizing of the Church, the dismantling of the superstructure – in order to grasp Catholicism's timeless elements. Building up was to mean reinstitutionalization according to modern norms and forms. (pp. 329-330)

This book is an exhaustive study done by a



one-time Regis College Jesuit (Toronto), now a Marquette University professor, as a doctoral dissertation for Cornell University. The methodology conforms to accepted social science standards — and as usually is the case — without “controlling” the researcher’s predispositions. There are not many tears shed for the divisions and the losses among Jesuits in the process (a necessary price of change) but obvious resentment is shown not only of authority itself, but for Paul VI’s modest interventions in the 1974 assembly. Faase rules:

“Two very powerful tracks of Catholicism are presently at odds. Reconciliation must occur in a fashion and persuasion compatible with the twentieth century or else the Holy See will have less flexible recourse to a powerful ally and the Society of Jesus will be intrinsically stifled in serving the Church.” (p. 64)

I wonder who he thinks decides that. But if one wants to know why the post-Vatican II Jesuits were in trouble with that great implementer of the Council, Paul VI (to pass over John Paul II for the moment), this is a good book to read in all its detail.

George A. Kelly

---

Avery Dulles S.J., “St. Ignatius and the Jesuit Theological Tradition”, *Studies*, March 1982.

The Jesuit theological tradition, as Avery Dulles has reminded us, does not rest upon explicit theological positions deducible from the writings of Ignatius, nor does it rule out very considerable differences among Jesuit theologians. Nonetheless, given the Society’s historical shape, it is not unreasonable to seek out the features which characterize that particular concreteness. Nor should it be startling to find among the features a certain theological style specified by typical emphases. Dulles has pointed to Christocentrism, a humanistic emphasis upon freedom, a concern for the institutional Church (ecclesiocentrism), and a sense for the sacramental transparency of creation to God as the salient and identifying themes of Jesuit theology. It does not seem that his choices can be faulted. These themes (in their organic unity) certainly form the substance of the Catholic theological interest, and it is easy to find an insistence upon them in the work of the great Jesuit theologians and in the Spiritual Exercises.

The Jesuit stress upon Christocentrism in theology bears, as Dulles has seen, upon the ‘whole

Christ’; it does not then conclude to Christomonism, for it can never dissociate the Christ from the one flesh of the union with Mary, with the Church, by whose *fiat* he is present among men. It is this *sancta societas* that is the *Christus integer* upon which is focussed the entire interest of Ignatius and of the theology which accepts his vision as its own. The impact of this Augustinian insight, Franciscan before it was Jesuit, is still to be realized; its systematic exploitation is in its infancy, for it poses fundamental difficulties (problems of method) to the regnant transcendental Thomism.

The theological impossibility of dissociating Christ from the Church obviously requires the ecclesiological stress which Dulles has instanced. With an equal clarity it bars any ecclesiology which dilutes the substantiality of the Church by turning away from the concreteness implicit in its marital relation to the Christ. It does not then seem likely that a Jesuit ecclesiology can usefully understand the Church, in the manner Dulles suggests, as a “Community of disciples.” This language is evocative of a nominalism ill at ease with the personification or hypostatization of the Church which the Jesuit ecclesiology of the Church as the Body of Christ requires. This idiom for the Church is not merely one among the many images of the Church, usable but not indispensable; it has a criteriological function, linking the unity and reality of the Church to the unity of the Eucharistic worship which is the cause of the Church. It is not the local Church which is the radical concern of Ignatius, but the sponsorial Church, the Bride of Christ. This is neither feudal idiosyncrasy nor an accident of 16th century polemic; it is a radical demand of his commitment to the Christ, the whole Christ, the Eucharistic Lord present in His Church, which by that presence has the unity of the Body of Christ.

It is in this connection that Dulles’ personal agenda for the Society’s theologians begins to be apparent. After instancing Ignatius’ complete loyalty and obedience to the Chair of Peter, he inserts an obscure observation of Nadal — “Although the men of the Society are papists, they are this only where they must be and in nothing more; and even then, only with an eye to the glory of God and the general good.” — as one by which “the attitude of the Jesuit order to the papacy is perhaps best summarized.” This Dulles’ conclusion is simply out of the blue insofar as the Ignatian tradition is concerned. It rests upon nothing more substantial than the arguments which Dulles has urged in support of his notion of a double



magisterium. It is a notion rejected conclusively and beforehand in the decree of the 32nd General Congregation on "Fidelity to the Magisterium and to the Supreme Pontiff," and in the documents which have emerged from the recent meeting of the Pope with the Jesuit Provincials in Rome, particularly in John Paul II's *Allocution to the Jesuit Provincial Superiors* on 27 February, 1982, and in Paul Dezza's letter, together with its appendix, to the whole Society, dated 25 March, 1982. The Pope and his delegate to the Society present a summary of the Jesuit as 'papist' — depending little upon Nadal's minimalism, and quite unresponsive to Dulles' ecclesiology.

The humanist emphasis, another of the themes which Dulles has referred to as characteristic of Jesuit theology, is certainly that for which the Society's theologians are best known, for better and for worse. The demand for the recognition of the indispensability of human freedom to salvation dominated the four centuries of disputation *de auxiliis* — over the reconciliation of divine and human freedom — as well as founding the probabilist moral theology (to which Dulles has also referred) long calumniated as teaching that the ends justify the means. The many controversies touching freedom in its multi-dimensional unity which have enmired the Society's theologians over the centuries still are alive, *mutatis mutandis*, today; they live, as the controversy *de auxiliis* did, off the rationalization of the mysterious, or rather, off the common supposition that such rationalization is theology. This rationalization is operative today in the Jesuit discussions of the issue of academic freedom, most recently in the context of the encyclical *Sapientia Christiana* and of the imminent publication of the new code of Canon Law as it bears upon the Jesuit institutions of higher education. It is one thing to insist upon the salvific role of human freedom; it is quite another to suppose that freedom is what Adam Smith or J. S. Mill thought it to be. In brief, the humanistic emphasis, integral to Jesuit theology as to Jesuit obedience, is a religious emphasis; it cannot afford a secular overview derived from some favorite anthropology, such as, for example, the Jesuit theologians of liberation are too inclined to rely upon.

The fourth theme which Dulles mentions as specifically Jesuit is that of theocentricism, in which is summed up Jesuit spirituality, and what may be called Jesuit mysticism: the Ignatian insistence upon the transparency of the created order to God, and the correlative insistence that our way to God is lighted by faith in his creation as

holy, as created in Christ. This vision of the world is indisputably Ignatian and Jesuit: this fallen world is nevertheless the good creation, redeemed in the blood of the New Covenant, imbued with the *Creator Spiritus*, its materiality qualified as good by the Eucharistic immanence of the risen Christ, its temporality made salvific and therefore historical by that same presence within it of the Christ, the Lord of history. The indomitable optimism of Ignatius, upon which no disaster could cast its gloom for above a quarter-hour, is one his followers do well to imitate when, as often, they are tempted to find the Church's historicity opaque to God rather than the vehicle of his salvific presence and lordship. When the Church's concreteness is experienced no longer as the place of God's Spirit, effective in the gift of freedom to his people in and through their worship of Him, but is encountered instead as precisely the obstacle to that presence and liberation, then the resulting pessimism is no longer Christian, no longer Ignatian, no longer Jesuit.

The theocentric theology which can rightly call itself Jesuit is Trinitarian, not in the nominalist and minimalist fashion of a Galtier, but in the way of which Bonaventure is the authentic spokesman, which a generation ago Rahner revived in the framework of his Thomism. Today this is undergoing a revision to dimension narrower than Galtier ever knew, under the burden of a theology of history which would find even the Trinitarian doctrine dispensable, the product of a past alien to our present quest for liberation from historical fragmentation. Such devices evoke a history-as-fatality upon which even God would be impaled; long ago condemned, they can serve no Catholic interest, whatever their provenance.

It would be easy enough to multiply the elements essential to a truly Jesuit theology, particularly if one may speak for the present rather than for the past as well. Few would dispute that any valid theology must now be not merely a Christology, a Trinitarian theology, an ecclesiology and a Christological anthropology, but also a theology of history. It is in this dimension of theology that the contemporary questions are most clearly posed; it is a pity that so little inclination to pursue this topic is evident in the Jesuit theology faculties. One hears everywhere of the need for historical consciousness; there is a vivid interest in the work of positive historical scholarship and a considerable development of expertise in the use of its critical methodology. There does not appear, however, much interest in developing a theology of history, without which all talk of historical



consciousness among theologians is no more than fashionable conversation.

This is not to say that no theology of history is in use; there is one, inarticulate, whose radical historical pessimism, once articulated, requires no further refutation: one which finds whatever inconvenient reality of Church history disqualified from religious significance by the fact of its historicity. There is another, equally inarticulate, whose apparent optimism is upon examination mere blandness; not many exemplars of this remain, but its memory is green enough to be used to identify the cynicism of the pessimists. Between these, evidently, is a great gulf fixed.

It is a commonplace now that the Church is sacramental. Its history is to be understood only in sacramental terms, which neither isolate nor identify the sign and the signified, history and eschaton, as do the blind pessimism and the bland optimism just described. If one postulates that the meaning of history is liturgical, as Gadamer has done, and postulates further that the liturgy (which is history) is a liturgy of sacramental realism rather than, as Gadamer supposes, of the preached word heard in faith, it may begin to appear that the impossible choice between a positivist historicism and a baroque triumphalism may be refused, in favor of a historicity whose hermeneutic is not theory but the Eucharistic worship of the Church. Thus understood, history is specified as radical mystery, available to no rationale, whose unity, freedom and concreteness is that of the Church whose mediation of the Christ is established by no apologetics and submitted to no criterion other than that which is immanent within her, summoning her to a continual reformation. Such a theology of history is unlikely to find much favor in the short run, for it refuses the reduction of history to idea on the one hand and to randomness on the other which most contemporary historical scholarship assumes without discussion. Still, the question is no longer avoidable, once the impossibility of a value-free history is accepted by Catholic historians, for then the necessity for grounding one's preferred interpretation somewhere can no longer be ignored, as it is now ignored. When this question is accepted, it really does not seem to have any answer other than that history has the structure of the worship of the Lord of history. This would not, one may suppose, have much astonished Ignatius, for it does no more than corroborate his total devotion to the Church as the necessary implication of his total devotion to the risen Lord.

Fr. Donald Keefe, S.J.

Michael J. Buckley, S.J. (*Santa Clara Today*, April 1982 pp. 4-5)

This Berkeley theologian, on sabbatical leave at the University of Santa Clara, thinks the Jesuits are in counterpoint (contrast) to the Pope, not in rebellion. He argues that Jesuits historically have been experimenters for the Pope, (in China, Paraguay, etc.), experimenting being a function of obedience, not opposed to it. Sometimes Jesuits have been condemned by Popes, but most are vital leaders of the Church's mission. Says Buckley: "Many people mistake counterpoint for rebellion. Jesuits take a special vow — not of unique loyalty to the Pope as has been endlessly and mistakenly repeated, but of availability for any assignment he mandates."

Fr. Buckley argues that the Pope did not summon the Jesuit Provincials to Rome. Fr. Dezza did at the urging of Jesuit administrative assistants. The action was unprecedented but "par for the course for the Pope", who likes to intervene personally in situations where he has interests (e.g. Holland, Poland, Seminaries, writing encyclicals etc.). The Pope's intervention did not arise because of rebellion or sexual immorality or elitism among Jesuits, or because of Marxism or the identification of the kingdom of heaven with Jesuits. As a matter of fact, the Pope confirmed the Jesuit apostolate of justice "as an integral part of evangelization."

(continued from page 3)

of religious authority and responsible only to secular agencies. Presently there is no juridical link between many Jesuit governing structures and the management of "Jesuit" universities. The local Jesuit community has no directive function, through its rector, of the institution it serves. Once upon a time (and in some places still) the University President was also the Jesuit Rector. Where those roles have been separated the university president, though a Jesuit, somewhat like a Jesuit Provincial, acts under no other local Jesuit authority *qua* President. When this occurs the institutional Jesuit apostolate in higher education ends and a commitment merely of individual Jesuits to that work surfaces with no religious control (theoretically at least) over what Jesuits say or do in the University context. There is a facade of Jesuit presence but in some places the situation masks contumacious disobedience of directives from Pope and/or bishops. Proposals have been made to reestablish limited "Provincial" control of the Jesuit university apostolate, but so far the *status quo* post-Vatican II prevails. (No such arrangements are possible where a "Jesuit" university has secularized absolutely.)



## 5. The Jesuit Situation: Overview and Commentary

The Jesuits are like “the Yankees”. They have been so good and champions so long and the Church has been proud of them. Unlike the Yankees, however, no one ever chanted “Break up the Jesuits”. During the lifetime of most Catholics fifty years and older, including priests, Jesuits were the Catholic champs. They influenced almost everything Catholic in the U.S. from the literacy of ghetto kids to the piety of nuns to the confessional practice of parish priests to the exercise of teaching office by popes. Only mean-minded Catholics envied their pre-eminence, only bigots thought the word “Jesuit” meant “conspiracy”. They were the Church’s working intellectuals by far, but even their parish priests were classy.

But now they are breaking up from inside their own ranks and not as a result of enemy action or from any discipline by Popes. Not only has the Society suffered an enrollment loss of 9,000 since 1965, but a 1975 Jesuit study (*Review for Religious*, Volume 34) indicates how Jesuits are gradually running out of novices. By the year 2000 if nothing changes, they will be functioning at half their present strength. Jesuit *Studies* (1977 Vol. IX) also provides more startling evidence of growing American Jesuit weakness and some of the reasons for decline and possible disintegration of a once proud Jesuit team. In a large area like New York, for example, 585 novices and seminarians could be counted on thirty-two years ago, now there are only 83. Regis High School, also in New York, still has 55 Jesuits working from its 1930-39 classes, but only three functioning Jesuits from among its 1970-79 graduates. It is common knowledge that significant numbers of Jesuits no longer recommend young men to Jesuit novitiates/seminaries because of what happens to them when they get there.

What Pope John Paul II is trying to do – somewhat nicely it seems – is to get the Jesuits to reform themselves in ways acceptable to the Holy See. He is only the fourth modern Pope to try. Few may remember that the 30th General Congregation (1955) was sobered by what one Jesuit called “a harsh restrictive allocution” from Pius XII or that after the first session of the 31st (1965) Father Arrupe felt it necessary to tell Jesuits “obedience will be expected of you.” Most contemporary Jesuits well know that Paul VI almost disbanded the 32nd General Congregation (1974) because of Jesuit disobedience right under his nose.

Outsiders can read for themselves what the Pope – and Fr. Dezza – have said to the Jesuits recently.

The question is whether they got the message. The official line of Jesuit provincials returning to the U.S. is that there was no message to be gotten. The long anticipated “showdown” between the Holy Father and the Jesuits, it is being said, was a tempest in a teapot. Any apparent conflict was due mainly to a failure in “communication.” The different wave lengths between the Pope and the Jesuits have now, to the delight of all, been mutually clarified, with a return to normalcy, including continuance of the “priorities” and “options” of recent years, particularly the social activism, though perhaps with more prudence. The suggestion of more reserve in criticizing the magisterium publicly and for a greater fidelity in public to the Church’s liturgical norms (e.g. saying Mass with proper vestments) also seems acceptable to returning Jesuits. There should be, also, no rushing off to *Time* or *Newsweek* by scholars the moment a novel theological theory pops into one’s head. *Time* and *Newsweek* will have henceforth to do their own footwork and to smoke out the obscure journals themselves, as one Provincial intimated. This will not be improper because many “legitimate” ecclesiologies co-exist in the Church, not just the official Roman one to which the Holy Father ascribes. *In dubiis, libertas*.

Officially and by their own accounting, the Jesuit superiors did not see anything substantially wrong when they went to Rome – certainly not in matters of doctrine or religious life style. Some were willing to admit that maybe in the Yucatan there might be extreme views, even when the philosophy coming from the Yucatan, so roundly criticized by the Pope, was actually house doctrine within their own provinces. Yet once home they reported that no accusations were made by the Pope or “proved” in Rome. It was the Pope himself who changed his orientation – it is being said – largely to agree with them as John Paul II’s final rewritten speech allegedly shows.

Privately many Jesuits express doubts about this way of interpreting the Roman event, but it is difficult, if not dangerous, for them to intimate this in a public forum, Jesuit or otherwise. They know the substantive divergence between what the actual training, thought, and political persuasion is within the Society from what the Pope and the Church hold, disagreements which cannot be reconciled. No official



admissions are made here or in Rome that Jesuits have a sorry record of dissent, almost systematically from *Humanae Vitae* and are an utterly insignificant factor in the vital struggle for protecting human life in our day. Nor is there serious public mention by them about whether students in Catholic colleges/seminaries actually can learn much about what John Paul II and the Church teaches and stands for. Suggestions that not all Jesuits have observed liturgical laws in celebrating Mass, much to the scandal of the faithful, are met with denials, when the fact is that the charges are true. Indeed, praise and understanding of the Holy Father, his work and extraordinary intelligence, are rarely heard in most Jesuit houses.

Many think, too, that a new censorship is now operative within the Society and in a much more ominous way. Candidates for the Jesuit ministry seem deliberately moulded toward a sympathy for the "socialist" ideology. Religion more and more seems to be identified with certain political and social "options", whose roots are not mainly within the Christian orbit. Chapels in academia often have been used to promote (as a religious cause) leftist governments in Central America and elsewhere. Additionally, the universities are claiming that the Pope does not "understand" real university life in free societies, that to put his quaint ideas into effect would make the schools illegal or culturally disadvantaged. Jesuits, like many curial officials, hear increasing talk of the "American Church", not the Catholic Church – and promotion of a slick political ideology recognized for what it is in the secular media. This makes it difficult for ordinary people to sort out what the Church might itself be or what Church teaching is other than a kind of advocacy platform for certain trendy ideas among a certain intellectual elite.

The Holy Father, perhaps rightly, seems reluctant to "administer" the Society. John Paul II is brilliant in explaining the faith and the world and man to himself. No objective person can really doubt this. However his preaching seems to have produced few tangible results, except among some younger Jesuit thinkers who read the Pope carefully rather than what the aging theologians of post-Vatican II say. The Jesuit leadership has already proved that it did not grasp what Paul VI was telling them time after time. One former Jesuit University President, thus, may have been closer to the mark than some of his confreres in predicting: "We Jesuits either get our act together or we get dumped. That is the message that was really given by the Pope." These lines will be heresy to people who think the Jesuit act is already together. However, it is a fact that some Jesuits, especially those in post conciliar leadership positions, have failed to comprehend the criticisms of the previous four popes.

In spite of Fr. Dezza's particularized bill of goods and evils, the whole controversy has been treated as an incident of unfortunate confusion, worrisome because the Pope acted at all (rashly, one gets the impression) outside the Society's constitutions (for no adequate reason), and threatening because it seems to question the chosen and reinforced policies of identifying the Christian witness with justice and peace. Assuming that the Pope does not entirely agree with the Order's optimistic view of the recent Roman meeting, the Jesuit leadership's message is that John Paul II is wrong, that he should discover the truths and movements of their scholars' counter-magisterium, and propagate their message among the bishops and faithful, not the one popes usually send. If, instead, the Pope does not view the Roman meeting with the same optimism, he will have to do something extraordinary to make his points stick. Otherwise, business will go on as usual. The pope has written and spoken so often that no one can claim not to have understood him. The problem with Father Arrupe's administration was not one of personality or communication. It was, instead, one of doctrine and practice, philosophy and rite. Unless the Order itself gets its act together by its own devices, unless it begins at its highest levels to understand what recent Popes have been saying, then the Pope, a firm and very intelligent man, will turn to other institutions and individuals willing and able to understand what he means when he talks about Catholic Christianity and its truth.

The Jesuits may yet save the Church in our time – at least those fully committed to all that the Pope and Fr. Dezza ask of them and whose voices have not been fully heard. Jesuit dreamers will not help, those who call their institutions Catholic when they are not; nor depressed Jesuits, some of whom hurt badly and have been hurt, and who think additional conciliation is counter-productive; certainly not the dissenting Jesuits. But there are Jesuits by the hundreds – still champs – and waiting to go to bat for John Paul II and Fr. Dezza. May God increase their tribe and give them wisdom. Amen. (GAK)



## Publications of Interest

- *Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education: Purposes and Leadership* is a publication of the Association of Catholic Higher Education (A Department of NCEA), Editor, Sr. Alice Gallin, OSV \$2.00.

This booklet, intended to enhance dialogue over the mission of the Catholic college, contains short articles on the college presidency, college trusteeship and corporate models. Santa Clara's president William Rewak, S.J. comments on the recent Bishops' pastoral on Catholic higher education by summarizing its general tone and content. Jude P. Dougherty et al. collaborated on a fine summary of the roots of the present Catholic college identity problem under the heading "The Secularization of Western Culture and the Catholic College and University." This committee of the American Catholic Philosophical Society (including Desmond Fitzgerald, Thomas Langan, Kenneth Schmitz) raise all the right historical, philosophical, theological and political points. They deftly point the finger at the right issues:

"Catholic educators must realize that certain issues inevitably have to be faced on the basis of principle." (p. 12)

"The Church has a mission to preach a gospel and has a clearly and fully articulated purpose. The Catholic university must be associated then in a more determinate way, and must seize willingly the articulation already set forth by its sponsor." (p. 19)

"Is there not an episcopal responsibility to encourage the adequate teaching of essential doctrine?" (p. 20)

- Don DeMarco's, *Sex and the Illusion on Freedom*, is available at Mission House Publications, 101 Silverspring Cr., Kitchener, Ontario, Canada N2M 4P3. Fellowship members can receive a 20 percent discount (that is, for \$4.00 instead of \$4.95, plus fifty cents postage).

- *St. Paul Editions* – Four new books and booklets

- Bishop John J. O'Connor for the N.Y. State Conference of bishops *If You Wish Peace, Defend Life* (54 pp. 75 cents)

The moral and political aspects of abortion

*To the Church of America: A Collection of Papal Addresses by Popes Paul VI, John Paul I and John Paul II* (166 pp. \$3.00 paper)

John Paul II, *Original Unity of Man and Woman* (Preface by Donald W. Wuerl). The Pope's catechesis on the Book of Genesis (178 pp. \$3.00 paper). The pope's brilliant meditations on sexuality given in weekly audiences shortly after his election.

George A. Kelly (ed.), *Catechetical Instruction and the Catholic Faithful* (226 pp. \$4.95 paper) Introduction by Silvio Cardinal Oddi, prefect of the Congregation of the Clergy. Articles by Bishop Anthony Bevilacqua, Bishop Austin Vaughan, Professor Paul Vitz, Sr. Michelle McKeon, S.C., Sr. Theresa C. Shea, O.P. and Msgr. Kelly dealing with the significance and content of *Catechesi Tradendae*.

- *The Gallup Organization – Two Research Reports*

*Religion in America 1981*

Statistical data on the state of church, religion and politics. Impact of religious TV programs, giving to churches.

*The Unchurched American*

A study convened and coordinated by the National Council of Churches of Christ (1978); trends from 1952; comparison of the church and unchurched.

Available from The Princeton Religion Research Center Inc., Box 310, 53 Bank Street, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.

Priced at \$25.00

- *University Press of America*

*The Social Teachings of Wilhelm Emmanuel Von Ketteler* (Bishop of Mainz 1811-1877) translated by Rupert J. Ederer (1981).

This book presents the first complete translation (from the original German) of the major social teachings of Bishop Von Ketteler. He was a major teaching bishop of his time. Pius IX once told him: "You wield a great pen, my son. In fact, I believe your pen writes better than my own." The influence of his thinking on later papal encyclicals is well known. (Leo XIII once said "It is from him that I have learned.") Less well known is his view that the socialist program was worse than the disease it was supposed to remedy. This book of 600 pages covers the following



topics: freedom, authority, labor, work, liberalism, socialism, democracy and national welfare.

● *Recent Publications of Works by Henry V. Sattler, C.Ss.R*

On the distinction between obedience to the Magisterium and ordinary Catholic faith in the Magisterium: "Living with the Certainty of Faith" in *Pastoral Life*, July-August, 1981.

On the impossibility of discussing ecology and overpopulation for human persons as one can of fauna and flora: "Overpopulation and the Moral Challenge" in *International Review of Natural Family Planning*, Spring 1981.

On the necessity of being a gnostic manichee if one wishes to promote human sterilization: "Dualism and Sterilization" in *International Review of Natural Family Planning*, Summer/Fall, 1981.

Can there be adultery within marriage between husband and wife? "Adultery Within Marriage" in *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, December 1981.

If sexuality is merely instrumental, consequentialism is legitimate in sexual morality, but if sexuality is both naturally and supernaturally sacramental, it involves inherent and immanent moral value. "Sacramental Sexuality" in *Communio* Winter 1981.

On the two kinds of secularistic humanism in contrast with Christian humanism: What Is Secular Humanism? Stafford VA, *American Life Alliance Foundation*, Spring 1982 (PB circa 125 pp. illustrated).

On the necessity of true rhetoric for the proper formation of conscience, and the perversion of rhetoric to promote immorality: "Rhetoric and Moral Discourse" in *Fidelity*, April 1982.

- *The Word Among Us*, a new monthly Bible study aimed at helping Catholics read, understand, and act on the teachings of Scripture, recently began publication. Since the first issue appeared in December 1981, the publication has received unanimously favorable responses from readers.

Written in a popular style, *The Word Among Us* presents sound biblical teaching in an easily understood, lively, and readable format. Contemporary approaches to the study of Scripture are used without diluting or departing from the heart of the Gospel message.

*The Word Among Us* will prove to be useful to leaders of Bible studies of prayer groups, moderators of religious study groups, and priests seeking to enliven their preaching. Teachers in CCD programs, Catholic schools, and adult religious education programs will also find the series valuable in planning and carrying out their activities.

A Nihil Obstat and Imprimatur have been granted.

A year's subscription to *The Word Among Us* includes 12 issues, each about 60 pages in length, and costs \$15.00. A special \$12.00 bulk price is available when 10 or more orders are sent to the same address.

Interested people may obtain a free sample or place a subscription by writing to: *The Word Among Us*, Mother of God Community, P.O. Box 3775, Washington, D.C. 20037.

- A new magazine *Filioque* gives attention to the scholarly and interdisciplinary effort of Dr. Herbert Schwartz. *Filioque* is published by Mount Hope Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit, tax-exempt corporation. The journal is supported solely by voluntary contributions. For further information write *Filioque* c/o Mount Hope Foundation, Inc., P.O. Box K Middletown, New York 10940.

- "When Schools Teach Sex" is "a handbook for evaluating your schools sex education program" by Judith B. Echaniz et al. produced under the auspices of the *Family-Life Culture and Education Council*, (P.O. Box 8466, Rochester, New York 14618) 58 pp. \$2.50.

- James R. Schaefer, "Tensions between Adult Growth and Church Authority" in *Christian Adulthood: A Catechetical Resource 1982* (Publication of the United States Catholic Conference)

Fr. Schaefer, one-time adult education official of Baltimore and now a pastor, wants to know "Can the Roman Catholic Church tolerate the emergence of mature believers?" His mature believers are those who "can stand on their own two feet spiritually and accept responsibility for their own beliefs and ethical decisions." Mature believers are also described as those "open to questions and doubts about the validity of their present beliefs." In face of a propensity to "infallibilize" authoritative Church teachings, mature believers have little choice but to "relativize" them — by following their consciences despite Church strictures. In the Schaefer view "the Roman Catholic Church" *can* tolerate such mature believers but will it? Look at what happened to Hans Kung.



## Book Reviews

*Who Is Christ: A Theology of Incarnation*, Jean Galot, S.J. Franciscan Herald Press, Chicago, 1981.

Jean Galot is professor of dogmatic theology at the Gregorian University in Rome, and author of several major works and numerous articles on Christology, all of which – with the exception of the work at hand – remain untranslated into English.

*Who Is Christ?* is not a comprehensive Christology since, as the author notes in his Introduction, the various questions touching on soteriology or the redemption are not expressly treated. Likewise omitted is any full presentation of the mysteries in word and deed of the public ministry of Jesus. Nonetheless, what is lacking in comprehensiveness is more than counterbalanced by the clarity and depth of treatment given to the major questions centering on the Incarnation itself. Those questions Galot treats in three major sections of his book as “The Fundamental Affirmations of the Faith of the Church” (Part Three), “The Ontology Of The Incarnation” (Part Four), and “The Psychology of Christ” (Part Five).

The first of these three sections is an historico-theological study of the development of Christology from post-Apostolic times up to and including the definitions of Constantinople III in 681. Without over-simplifying, Galot manages to summarize in a very precise and intelligible fashion currents of thought and events which in themselves were rich, complex, and, of course, frequently divergent and contradictory. The section terminates with a statement which may be said to be the guiding principle of the entire book: “No valid Christology can be developed, therefore, outside the path blazed by Chalcedon. – It is a stage in the doctrinal progress of the Church, a stage that can never again be brought into question but which must open the way to further advances” (p. 248). The importance of that statement in the light of various popular Christological currents of thought, Galot has developed elsewhere (*Cristo Contestato: Le cristologie non calcedoniane e la fede cristologica*, Liberia Editrice Fiorantina, 1979) where he treats the theories of Schoonenberg, Vulsbosch, Schillebeeckx, Küng, Sobrino, etc., all of which he perceptively criticizes.

That he is not locked into an outdated formulation of the Christological problem nor content to preserve a merely verbal Chalcedonian orthodoxy Galot makes clear in the way he develops that doctrine. This development he begins by a frank rejection of Aquinas’ position

concerning the nature of the relationship which God has to the world, and which the Eternal Son has to His humanity. In both cases St. Thomas denied any “real relation” on God’s part.

“Now every relation which is said of God from a temporal point of view does not posit any reality in the Eternal God Himself – Therefore, the sonship by which Christ is referred to His mother is not a real relation (in God) but only a relation of reason” (S. Th., III, q. 35, a. 5c).

That Thomistic distinction, always difficult to explain and defend, was aimed a preserving the truth that the eternal God is immutable or unchangeable. According to Galot, however, the Incarnation itself “does not permit us to affirm that the immutability of God is such as to exclude any change whatever and to render any ‘innovation’ in divine dispositions and activity possible” (p. 269). To safeguard divine immutability Galot affirms that such immutability “signifies permanence and perseverance in perfection, but does not signify immobility” (p. 271). As a result, the newness which comes about as a consequence of the Incarnation is not simply a change on the part of humanity (i.e. of the human nature of Christ) but rather “demands the affirmation of an authentic innovation in God Himself” (p. 270). In all of this, as he himself admits, Galot is influenced by the formula of Karl Rahner which says that “the immutable in itself can be mutable in another”. He rightly sees, however, that the Rahnerian formulation promises more than it in fact delivers. Galot has gone a step beyond that type of formulation to make explicit what may be but is not necessarily latent in Rahner’s formula. In a sympathetic treatment of Galot’s Christology in his excellent book *Theology and the Gospel of Christ* (SPCK, London, 1977), E.L. Mascall writes: “. . . although he does not put it in precisely these words, Galot’s view might be stated by saying that, in addition to logical relations and necessary real relations, he also postulates voluntary real relations, and he sees these, and not only logical relations, as included in God’s relationship to the world” (p. 182). For all that he approves Galot’s effort in this area, Mascall faults him for showing a “rather inadequate understanding of the relation of time to eternity” (p. 184) which, it would appear, is a way of criticizing Galot’s view of the relationship between the infinite divine nature to the finite human nature in the One Person of Christ. The Thomistic distinction may yet be saying something essential, even if one grants the inadequacy of its verbal expression.



Galot is on firmer ground in his treatment of the personhood of Christ. Rejecting the suggestions by Barth and Rahner that the terms "mode of being" or "distinct mode of subsistence" might be more adequate than "person" to describe that which is Three in God, he prefers to develop the insight of Anselm, taken up by the Council of Florence, on being as relational. "In God everything is one whenever the opposition of relation does not pose an obstacle." It is this "Relational being", the *esse ad* which constitutes the person of the Son and which is the center of unity in Christ. "In Christ there is no human relational being. The relational being of the Son of God vivifies and possesses the human nature" (p. 306). Although Galot unfortunately fails to see the harmony between this line of thinking and the teaching of Capreolus and Billot (and surely Aquinas *senior*, S. Th. III, q. 17, a. 2, ad 2), for whose view he has harsh words (p. 292), his development of personhood as relational being both preserves the meaning of Chalcedon and allows him to integrate the more metaphysical approach of that time with the psychological insights into personhood more favored in our day.

The final section of *Who Is Christ?* is devoted to what is in fact the true focus of controversy in nearly all current exegetical and theological studies of the Lord, namely His human self-awareness. While rejecting the traditional thesis that the human mind of Christ enjoyed the Beatific Vision (and here he does not give as sympathetic nor nuanced a view of the traditional position as one might have hoped for), he ably defends the truth (recently repeated by the Bishops of Canada in their pastoral letter, *Jesus Christ, Centre of the Christian Life*, No. 22-26) that Jesus was humanly aware of Himself as God and Son of God. This awareness was always there, but developed in the sense that it followed the usual patterns of human growth in self-awareness (cf. p. 359). The author's treatment of this complex but absolutely crucial point is careful and detailed. It will not convince those who defend the traditional presentation of the matter (cf. William Most's work *The Consciousness of Christ*, Christendom Press, 1980) nor will it appeal to the many who claim — without any justification except a restricted view of historical-critical exegesis — that Jesus was unaware of His divinity and messianic office. Galot's position, however, is no attempt to produce a "via media" between extremes. It is a reasoned effort to systematize faithfully the data of Tradition, Scripture and the Magisterium. And, despite the disagreements one might find with

particular sections, the same can be said of his entire work.

James O'Connor

---

William E. May, *Sex, Marriage and Chastity*, Chicago, Franciscan Herald Press, 1981, 170 pp. \$9.00

Several thoughts will occur to more than one reader of this book, at least to those readers who still believe in the Catholic Church's view of marriage, sex and the integrity of the human person. Is it not strange that so many prominent laymen and women like William May, Elizabeth Anscombe, John Finnis, Germain Grisez, Joseph Boyle, Robert and Mary Joyce, John and Sheila Kippley — are using their scholarly talents as John Paul II requested in *Familiaris Consortio*, when so many of the pope's priests and nuns are undermining the Church's norms and misleading the faithful, especially the young? Section 31 of FC calls upon theologians "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 this doctrine of *Humanae Vitae*."

This united effort, the pope insists, must be "inspired by a convinced adherence to the Magisterium which is the one authentic guide for the People of God" and "is particularly urgent for reasons that include the close link between Catholic teaching on this matter and the view of the human person that the Church proposes." John Paul II sees "doubt or error in the field of marriage or the family involves obscuring to a serious extent the integral truth about the human person in a cultural situation that is already so often confused and contradictory."

William May undertakes the task of articulating in this book — clearly and persuasively-Catholic truth about human sexuality, marriage, and chastity. His five chapters deal with the meaning of human sexuality, marriage, married love, chastity in the married and single state. May's entire approach is based on the "integralist" understanding of sexuality presented in *Humanae Vitae* which insists that the procreative dimension of human sexuality and its person-uniting, love giving, unitive dimension are intrinsically and inherently interrelated, meant for each other, reciprocally interpenetrating and meaning given.

In contrast, according to May, "separatist" theologians separate the human person from his or



her body, place the human and personal value of sex in its relational purposes, make the reproductive dimension of human sexuality a biological-functional value, not necessarily personal, diminish the importance of sexual differences between men and women and permit as moral sexual activity which responsibly enhances the person (regardless of the nature of the activity itself). May insists that there is no middle ground between this view represented by the Fuchs-McCormick-Curran School of moral theology and the Catholic understanding of human sexuality. One or the other of these understandings, he says, "must be true and the other false".

About the time May's book reached bookstores, Richard McCormick's latest analysis of the same subject area was being mailed to subscribers of *Theological Studies* (March 1982 pp. 69) with the advisory that his school his right and their critics including Paul VI, John Paul II and the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith are wrong. McCormick thinks that "formally authoritative statements are no substitute for evidence" in these matters (p. 72), that defenders of magisterium such as Dario Composta and John Connery may not understand the modern terminology or question (p. 75, 80), that killing, contraception, speaking falsehood, sterilization, masturbation, "cannot be said to be intrinsically morally evil as this term is used by tradition and the recent magisterium" (p. 84), that proportionate reasons do establish the possibility of exceptions to norms governing cases involving these matters (p. 87), that one who is constantly concerned with rules is spiritually immature (p. 90), that doing the just fair chaste thing without the force of law should be the aim of moral education (p. 90), that the pope is better advised to write on sex as he does on labor — providing persuasive analysis about which there can be disagreements but which is more likely to command assent than specific directives (p. 95).

William May is absolutely correct when he says that between Catholic teachers Paul VI — John Paul II and the Fuchs-McCormick-Curran schoolmen there is no middle ground. One group of teachers is wrong.

Patient readers of the contemporary moral theology scene might find themselves asking another question: Why is the Franciscan Herald Press one of the few Catholic publishing houses interested in books by the likes of William May? What about the other religious orders still involved in the communication world of propagating Catholic truth?

Ralph Martin, *A Crisis of Truth: the Attack on Faith, Morality, and Mission in the Catholic Church* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Servant Books, 1982, 245 pages, \$10.95).

This work, by the well known leader of the Catholic charismatic movement, deserves the over-used epithet "hard-hitting."

There are those who will immediately draw back — what does hitting hard have to do with Christianity? Martin says in effect, "a lot." His point is that, where truth is concerned, it is not an exercise in Christian charity to overlook problems, or to tolerate errors out of respect for the person in error. The book is never uncharitable or mean, but it is blunt and direct.

The fact that this point first has to be made in itself shows that many contemporary Christians have lost their grip on the meaning of their historical faith. For practically no great figure in Christian history, Catholic or Protestant, would ever have doubted that true charity sometimes requires saying hard things to people, and they would have agreed that it is profoundly uncharitable to indulge people in their errors. Only in modern times has Christian charity been divorced from truth in many people's minds.

Martin first presented these essays as speeches given, usually by invitation, in many parts of the country. They seem to have attracted large audiences, and he reports strong encouragement in his efforts, some of it from bishops. His experience thus says a great deal for the residual good health of American Catholicism.

One of the book's strengths is its recognition of how far-reaching the problem actually is. It is not merely this or that doctrine or moral principle that has been called into question, but the very foundations of faith. Martin's point is that the very possibility of genuine Christianity is now undercut by certain habits of thought into which believers have fallen, sometimes misled by the very people who are supposed to be their teachers.

The basic crisis, in Martin's view, is biblical. Prevailing trends in biblical scholarship tend to destroy the supernatural credibility of the Scripture, reducing it to a human document which people are free to make use of as they please. Martin has a keen sense of the difference between a genuinely faithful approach to Scripture and one which treats it as an admirable but in the end not authoritative document. One of his chapters is titled "Silencing the Gospel," and demonstrates the various ways (some of them subtle) in which this can be done.



Inevitably, as Martin recognizes, the "demythologizing" of Scripture gets to the heart of the matter: If we cannot accept Scripture as God's Word, then what grounds can there be for conceding a unique importance to Jesus Christ, much less acknowledging Him as the Son of God? Far from being a matter of esoteric speculation, this has become an acute practical question for many Christians.

Two contemporary concerns are recognized as especially sensitive — sex and social justice. With regard to the former, Martin notes that sex is the place where traditional Christian morality is most strongly assaulted and where pagan attitudes have become most widely accepted. With regard to social justice, he correctly emphasizes its importance but also criticizes the way that idea is now frequently understood, in essentially worldly and political terms. In these and other areas he can speak of "The Secular Humanist Influence on the Church."

The first half of the book is sub-titled "Where Are We?," the second half "What Should We Do?," The second part is also extremely good, because Martin recognizes that the problem is not merely one of modernists versus the orthodox. If it were, the battle would be a lot easier. Rather the passivity, the confusion, sometimes the deliberate neglect of their critical faculties by orthodox people itself contributes greatly to the triumph of false belief.

Martin's concluding chapters aim to inspire the reader to do something, to take a stand. He speaks forcefully of the prospect of divine judgment, analyzes the meaning of true and false unity in the Church, urges personal repentance, and announces a "Time for Action."

This is not a scholarly treatise, and those familiar with the current religious scene will perhaps not learn much that is new. But there is probably no current book which sounds a stronger trumpet and which has the potential of reaching (as Martin has apparently done in his lectures) the fabled silent majority in the Church.

James Hitchcock

Bertrand de Margerie, S.J.: "Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégèse" I.-Les Pères grecs et orientaux. Coll. Initiations. Paris, Cerf, 1980, VII-328 p.

Conscious to a rather limited extent, because of where I live and what I work on, of the current crisis of the R.C. Church in the United States, and of Christian faith itself, I am glad to point out to the readers of the FCS's Newsletter the present book, written by the author of "La Trinité chrétienne dans l'histoire", which, as a distinguished Catholic biblical scholar has remarked, appears at its proper time. And I dare add that the fact that the Church is going through a crisis makes the book more relevant, especially to those engaged in the formation of candidates to the priesthood.

To put forth and clearly the main advantage I see in this book, I would say that it can contribute valuably to a reading Scripture in the light of Tradition. In other words, it is an invitation to approach the Bible as the Word of God, given to the Church and read in the Church, but without ignoring or undervaluing the tremendous efforts of modern biblical science, without reducing the study of the Sacred Books as to what the historical-critical methods can yield.

In order to open modern readers to this ecclesiastical dimension of biblical exegesis, Fr. de M. tries to clear for them a few important paths in the immense forest of the Fathers of the Church. He recognizes, though, from the very beginning, that such is the only possible way available since a command of the exegesis of the Patristic age by far surpasses the forces of a single man and even of a team. He chooses, thus, a number of representatives of the different trends and "schools" of antiquity, namely, Justin of Rome, Irenaeus of Lyons, Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius, Ephrem, the school of Antioch, John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyssa and Cyril of Alexandria. In each case he profits from the work done by specialists, yet making personal contributions, and tries to characterize the method of interpreting Scripture used by each one.

May the author promptly complete his excellent work with the second volume that will be consecrated to the Latin Fathers and may the reading of such books by young people help bring forward a new generation of exegetes who will combine both critical and faithful interpretations of the Bible.

Julio R. deEscobar, SJ



- **John T. Dunsford**, professor of law at St. Louis University and a member of the Fellowship since its inception, has been appointed McDonnell Professor of Peace and Justice at St. Louis University. This is an endowed chair which is one of the most prestigious in the University.
- **James Hitchcock**, former president of the Fellowship, has relinquished the editorship of the American edition of *Communio*, which he had held since the edition's inception in 1974, and has become chairman of the editorial board. The new editor is David Schindler of the University of Notre Dame, who had been assistant editor since the

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

- **Janice Plunkett D'Avignon**, *Psychological Influences in Modern Catholic Presentations of Sin and Redemption*

This recently completed doctoral dissertation evaluates the Sadlier, Benziger, and Baltimore Catechism texts in the light of Catholic teaching on the subject matter.

For further information write to Dr. D'Avignon, Educational Psychology Department, Campion 200, Chestnut Hill, Mass. 02167.

- Opening for a President of Kansas Newman College, Wichita. Resume and 3 references to: Search Committee, Kansas Newman College, 3100 McCormick, Wichita, Kansas 67213.

beginning. He presented a paper at the Fellowship's 1979 convention.

- The editor of *The Teaching of Christ* are beginning to prepare a new edition of that adult catechism. Every effort is being made to keep the catechism precise and well-documented. The editors would appreciate it if any readers who have observed any mistakes, omissions, or obscurities in the text, or have any other suggestions to make for a second edition, would kindly let them know. Please send comments to Ronald D. Lawler, O.F.M. Cap., University of St. Thomas, 3812 Montrose Blvd., Houston, Tx. 77006.

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

- Fr. Ronald Lawler, along with Cardinals Oddi and Ratzinger, were elected to membership in the *Pontifical Roman Theological Academy*.

---

## Friends of the Fellowship

Dr. Gerald Berry      Fr. Raymond McCarthy  
Fr. D. A. Brady      Peter A. McDonald (England)  
Bishop George H. Speltz, DD