

Newsletter

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars

VOLUME 7, NUMBER 1

DECEMBER 1983

The Fellowship — Six Years Later

In May 1977 in St. Louis' Kenrick Seminary, under the patronage of John Cardinal Carberry, *The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars* was born.

The founding members were an interesting mix of priests, religious, and laity engaged in various aspects of the Church's academic apostolate — scientists, medical experts. Some worked in the Church's social apostolate years before many of their contemporaries realized that *Quadragesimo Anno* was the foreshadow of Vatican II's *Gaudium et Spes*. Other attendees were theoreticians, religious superiors, NFP practitioners, seminary professors, even a few with an academic background engaged in the primary apostolates of raising Christian families or running Catholic parishes.

These pioneers in *Fellowship* were united in their commitment to the mission of the Church and to the authenticity of its teaching as affirmed in its constant tradition, re-affirmed and developed in the Second Vatican Council.

What brought these disparate academics together in Fellowship?

1. First, a shared concern that the integrity and the truth of the Church's message, as contained in the teaching of Vatican II, need be properly witnessed and authentically presented.

2. Secondly, a recognized need to counterbalance the discipline being exercised within the Church *against* those in their academic or religious capacities who insisted on fidelity to Catholic norms in worship, life, and teaching.

3. Finally, Paul VI, by 1975 highly critical of dissent, was beginning to ask, "Where are our faithful sons?"

The *Fellowship* from its inception was greeted with suspicion — from virulent dissenters, but also by those anxious (as one *America* letter writer put it) lest it represent "those who want to be more papist than the pope." Some of those fears were legitimate enough, because defenders of magisterium and critics of dissent were not always sensible in their approach to the post-Vatican II controversies, nor charitable in their demeanor towards antagonists. Some followers of tradition deserved the name "reactionary" because they resisted the legitimate forward thrust of Vatican II as authenticated in approved reforms, or were themselves disobedient to competent Church authority.

However, those early Fellowship members had a common objective — to help with the implementation of Vatican II reforms according to the meaning of the Council documents as

(continued on page 2)

WHAT TO EXPECT IN THIS ISSUE?

CBS Radio and John Paul II — p. 6

"Either tacitly or aloud — but always forcefully, we are being asked: Do you really believe what you are proclaiming?"

Evangelii Nuntiandi No. 76

Professor Germain Grisez — p. 7

"If anyone in this faithless and corrupt age is ashamed of me and my doctrine, the Son of Man will also be ashamed of him."

MK 8: 38

Catholic Colleges and the Code — p. 13

"Never be ashamed of your testimony to our Lord, nor of me, a prisoner for his sake; but with the strength which comes from God bear your share of the hardship which the gospel entails."

II Tim: 1: 13-14?

Professor Henry Paolucci — p. 16

"How long, O Lord? I cry for help
But you do not listen!
I cry out to you, 'Violence!'
But you do not intervene."

Habakkuk 1: 2-3

The President's Corner

[Editor's Note: Fr. Earl Weis, S.J., the new president of the Fellowship, was one of its founding members in 1977. At that time he was Chairman of the Department of Theology at Loyola University, Chicago. An STD from Gregorian University in Rome (1958) led him to a succession of teaching positions in the U.S. where he specialized in dogma and biblical studies.

Fr. Earl Weis's accomplishments are listed in the Directory of American Scholars and Who's Who in Education. A native of Toledo, Ohio he has spent most of his priestly life in Chicago.]

"Humbly proud" seems to be a fairly common expression on the lips of successful candidates for office in the political arena. Despite the problem of internal logic in the phrase, and despite its lack of rhetorical elegance, I think I am going to borrow it to describe my feelings as I received the news that I had been elected President of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars. I thank the Fellowship for the honor.

Even as much as in the days of its founding, and perhaps more, the Fellowship has a role to play in the life of the Church in the United States. I shall strive to keep the Fellowship a living organization in the services of the Church, true to the character that was forged for it in the foundational meetings. That character includes the important elements of corporate support and action, a high level of scholarly standards for what it puts out in its own name or endorses, and loyal support of the papal magisterium. The desire to make an interdisciplinary contribution, characterized by these notes, to the functioning of the Mystical Body of Christ was the charism of the Fellowship's founders.

To remain faithful to the purpose for which it was founded, it is essential that the Fellowship maintain its independence. There have been a number of suggestions that have been made from time to time that the Fellowship should pair up with some other organization, hold joint meetings with some other group, affiliate with some other effort — in other words, to identify with another entity that has been seen to have a good and related purpose. As a Vice-President and a member of the Board, to which such suggestions are directed, I have always resisted such proposed combinations on the ground that they would constitute diminutions of our own identity, a misting-over of our own purpose, and a lessening of the particular value of our own specific contribution. In the United States, at least, there are no other organizations that do exactly what we do. And it is to do exactly what we do that we were founded. We have to continue to be exactly what we are if we are going to do exactly what we do. *Agere sequitur esse*. I intend, therefore, to continue this effort to keep us independent.

I look forward to working with Dr. Joseph Boyle, Msgr. George Kelly, Dr. Joseph Scottino, and the members of the board. We communicate very well, from long habit. I thank Father William Smith, my predecessor as President, for his work of the last two years and for the solid leadership he has provided.

We are now planning, in accordance with the directives of the board at its meeting of September 17, 1983, the 1984 annual meeting. It will be held once again on the last weekend of March, that is, the weekend beginning March 30. The theme chosen by the board will be "Law and the Church." I shall welcome your suggestions for paper topics and speakers. Meanwhile, reserve those dates on your calendar.

Earl A. Weis, S.J.

THE FELLOWSHIP — SIX YEARS LATER (continued from page 1)

understood by the highest authorities of the Church. At times they came face to face with illicit experimentations and false teaching. Even more troublesome a dozen years after the Council's end were the penalties, if only disapproval or isolation but sometimes removal from office, being inflicted by private persons, e.g. university officials, against scholars who supported the magisterium of the Church.

The *St. Louis Review* in an editorial at the time (September 21, 1977) welcomed the Fellowship with the view that for a long time leading spokesmen of the Church were caught in a trap, seemingly of their own making. Those who denied or doubted the traditional claims of the Church were consolidating their institutional power, while the voice of tradition, of magisterium too, was often

discounted in influential chairs of the Church academe, often, too, in Chancery Offices and Seminaries.

Rome looked with concern on ecclesiological aberrations which first appeared in Europe. By 1970 talk was heard there of "the emerging American Church" edging its way into confrontation with the Holy See. The initial object of scorn was the Roman Curia. Toward the end of that decade the enemy became Pope Paul himself. Today, John Paul II reaps the harvest of what is an engrained animus in vital Catholic centers, as he speaks more assertively than his predecessors, against a form of secular humanism masked as a *New Catholicism*. By way of criticism of the Pope, it is said that the American democratic experience demands that worship, faith and morals be subject to negotiation and that God's Word must be discovered through the conscientious modern study of that experience. The question, however, is which American experience? The one developed in the U.S. from 1789 onward when Rome named John Carroll the first U.S. bishop or the one transported a century later from 19th century German universities during the post-Vatican II experimentation? American Catholics were doing well when their teachers came from Rome, rather than Tubingen. But since 1965 the statistics of adherence to the Church have been in decline.

Harry Truman, in his darkest hour, once asked a Cleveland priest: "Hey, Father, who talks for the American people?" This may be an appropriate question to ask believing Catholics, when the American Catholic experience comes up for discussion.

In the six years since its founding, the *Fellowship* has helped to restore some sense to the Catholic scene, at least to provide an independent voice in academe. The *Fellowship* provided comradery and communication for those who take the Church's teaching seriously. Its more prominent scholars tracked the eye of the Catholic storm with remarkable accuracy. Scholarly work of a respectable nature has also been done by Fellowship members, especially in moral theology, catechetics, psychology, political commentary, and in charismatic thinking. Even so, the Catholic storm continues to move across the Church.

For example, the issues of 1977 are still with us. Paul VI, after the 1974 Synod on Evangelization, pointed to a problem still unresolved and lamented about

"Those who pretend to ignore the living tradition of the Church, from the Fathers to the teaching of the Magisterium, and reinterpret the doctrine of the Church, and the gospel itself, spiritualities, the Divinity of Christ, his Resurrection or the Eucharist, depriving these practically of their content and thus creating a new gnosis, and in a certain way introducing into the Church 'free examination.' This is all the more dangerous when it is done by those who have the very high and delicate mission of teaching Catholic theology." (*Origins*, July 7, 1975, p. 95)

The Church of Europe, especially that of Holland, was on his mind. But John Paul II seems recently to focus on the Church in the U.S. Less than eight weeks ago the new Coadjutor Archbishop of Utrecht, Adrian Simonis, explained to an American reporter what is Holland's, and America's, problem:

"At present, unfortunately, many call themselves Catholic, but in fact they aren't that anymore. Often they simply deny certain aspects of the Church. And yet they are in positions of influence. That's the difficulty. Vatican II recommended new structures under the assumption that their members would be Catholic. That went without saying — but it is no longer true." (*National Catholic Register*, October 16, 1983 p. 6)

Pope Paul once asked: Where are the loyal sons and daughters? Obviously, everywhere in the Church, but living amidst great contradictions. The hurt of those determined to live in defiance of the Church receives a large amount of publicity. Less attention is paid to the hurt of Catholics who see their faith doubted or denied, and suffer with the effect of this on their young.

A regular reading of published works by Catholics, of their press or a catalogue of parish or school situations which rarely come to public attention, indicates that — from the viewpoint of what the Church actually teaches or expects in behavior — polarization is alive and well.

Conservative Catholics are being blamed for most of this, the argument being that they are really fighting the Second Vatican Council. But the numerous and often solemn pronouncements of recent Popes suggest, instead, that the authentic renewal initiated by the Council is being distorted.

Numerous reflections of the Sacred Congregations for Doctrine and Worship — on the average of at least once a year since 1965 — correct major errors which have taken root in the Church since then, errors pertaining to the Incarnation, the Trinity, the Sacraments, the nature of the Church, sexual morality, the right to life, the devil and eternal life. These errors cover almost the gamut of Christian

revelation. The very first bishops' Synod (October 28, 1967) dealt with "dangerous opinions and atheism" and its document — written by bishops, not by Rome — called for responsible action by hierarchy and theologians in teaching the Catholic faith.

Now, sixteen years later, many parish priests, some bishops, and more religious, pick and choose the doctrines they will or will not preach, at times suppressing the difficult doctrines which John Paul II insists be taught. Different seminaries, for example, offer different orthodoxies/orthopraxes to seminarians, making it certain that the U.S. Church of the 21st century is likely to be somewhat splintered after the fashion of Anglicanism (now withering away in Britain) and in various stages of dissonance with Rome.

While Vatican II's *Gaudium et Spes* receives the official and private attention it richly deserves, two major documents of the same Council are being downgraded or reinterpreted, not by the Holy See of course, but by Catholic publications and in college classrooms. *Dei Verbum* is, some argue, little more than *Verbum Hominum*; *Lumen Gentium* is said to have changed the Church into a congregation of believers searching for religious experience, less the Body of Christ leading believers to salvation by having the faithful "hear the Word of God and keep it." (Lk 11,28)

There is a common pattern developing. As the convictions of the Churchgoers about the supernatural aspects of their faith are being held up to doubt, when they are not denigrated, the doubters and the denigraters impress on Catholic consciences the humanity of Christ, his liberating role in freeing men from poverty and oppression, and the primacy of the good works of peace and justice.

The fundamental error in this inversion of priorities, besides any denials of Catholic faith involved, is the fact that the social apostolate of the Church finds its justification only in the truth of the Church's supernatural claims (the Church is not Christ's substitute for the State) and can survive only as an integral part of the Church's evangelizing mission to lead men to their eternal salvation. This inversion also neglects another fundamental Catholic truth: Works of peace and justice call first for personal goodness and piety, which among Christians flow out of their supernatural faith and are the result of God's activity in their lives, mostly the effect of their Eucharistic worship and the reception of the Church's sacraments.

That such distortions and inversions of Vatican II teaching are commonplace within the Church is the heart of the contemporary Catholic problem.

The ebb and flow of history makes corrections of such excess inevitable in any institution. John Paul II obviously has begun the process of restoring balance to the Church. Radical innovators, who have taken advantage of a wide range of freedom over two decades, are resisting the Pope's effort to insure that Catholic truth prevails in Catholic institutions. They warn against witch hunts, cry "we will not obey" (or "we will go to the media") in the hope that lesser Church authorities will whitewash or continue to overlook their excesses. Another tactic is to accuse defenders of John Paul II as narrow-minded and rigid, pre-Vatican II types, insufficiently pluralistic because they choose to contest those who doubt that Jesus founded the Church and who deny that the Catholic Church is the Church of Christ.

The Pope offers us a new opportunity to fulfill the dream of the Second Vatican Council. How the New Code of Canon Law fares in the houses of denial and disobedience will make the difference. Authentic reform and renewal will not come easily or quickly. But if the faithful sons and daughters of the Church, beginning with pastors, step by step, little by little, see that the New Code works, reform and renewal will come to Vatican II as once it came to Trent.

But we need "obedience, humility, forgetfulness of self and abnegation." So said Paul VI in *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (No. 76). Asking whether we believed what the Church preached, he warned that we cannot expect the world to hear the gospel, if the Church's preachers lack these virtues. And receiving a hearing for Christ and the Church from the world was what Vatican II was all about, was it not?

Fellowship members will continue to speak and write and teach, fully conscious that for awhile at least they will be put down as fundamentalist, like John Paul II.

But *Fellowship* members must also remember that some devils can be cast out only by prayer and fasting. So do penance, and pray.

Melchizedek

Habere non potest Deum patrem qui ecclesiam non habet matrem. *St. Cyprian*

Items of Interest

- Edward Schillebeeckx's book on Ministry has raised questions about the apostolicity of the Church, apostolic succession, the origins of the priesthood, the community's right to the Eucharist and to choose or commission its ministers. *The NCCB Committee on Doctrine* has put together three recent articles by Walter Kasper, Albert Van Hoya, SJ, and Henry Crouzel, SJ which criticize Schillebeeckx's work. Fr. Van Hoya, for example, speaking of the Dutch theologian's use of NT data points out how S. "gives priority to problematic reconstructions which he presents improperly as though they were certainties."

- The Student Government at St. John's University, New York refused to provide \$3,500 for a Student Union sponsored lecture by Fr. Andrew Greeley. It cited university procedures which stipulate that "any person is permitted to speak on campus provided that he does not advocate values contrary to Catholic faith or morals."

- They're picking on Mother Angelica again, the first Catholic in Big-Time TV business — (just a creative lady). She's being harassed by Washington pundits for being conservative, for being a rival, for a Network being controlled only by a nun. Mother Angelica's response: "Our interest is in evangelization, in spreading the good word. We want to remain spiritual in content and nonpolitical. The guy in the living room and the man in the pew don't have to be knocked on the head with social justice all of the time."

- On September 23, 1983, Pope John Paul II appointed Msgr. George A. Kelly a Consultor to the Sacred Congregation of the Clergy, whose prefect is Silvio Cardinal Oddi. This is the first time Consultors living outside of Rome have been so appointed to the Vatican dicastery in charge of matters pertaining to clerics in the pastoral ministry and the supervision of the Church's worldwide catechetical apostolate.

- An article in the December/January 1983 *Public Opinion* offers some hint to the value system of the nation's TV producers, writers and controllers. About 91 percent strongly affirmed a woman's right to abortion, 80 percent disagreed with the statement that "homosexual relations are wrong", with more than 50 percent seeing nothing wrong with adultery. Forty-four percent of the 104 network elite studied have no religion; 93 percent seldom or never attend religious services.

- *The Catholic Theological Society of America* at its 1983 Convention approved a statement about Agnes Mansour which reads in part:

"... Actions which seek to settle these differences simply by the administrative decision of Church officials violate both the theological meaning of authority in the Church and the sacredness of the consciences of Church members.

"We strongly support serious dialogue about the underlying issues raised by this case."

- Georgetown's refusal to grant official recognition to two homosexual organizations (thus denying them university privileges, e.g. use of the campus mail system, funds etc.) was upheld by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals on October 14. Georgetown, which was described by the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (October 26) as "operated by the Roman Catholic Church", had argued that to recognize these organizations "would be inconsistent with Church normative teachings and with the basic obligation not to undermine the normative teachings of the Church." Judge Sylvia Bacon dismissed the suit in the university's favor arguing that, even though many of its secular activities were government funded, "the judiciary cannot probe the proper interpretation of applications of Roman Catholic beliefs or on the duties of the faithful." The First Amendment, she said, "prevents such an enquiry." Lawyer Ronald E. Bogard for the plaintiffs said the University's position was inconsistent — telling federal agencies, when applying for funds to build or renovate buildings, that they would not be used for sectarian purposes. "Georgetown's been straddling the line", he said. Mr. Bogard might have quoted Fr. Timothy Healy, S.J., Georgetown's president, who only four years ago said: "A university has a secular purpose. It is authorized by the State for that secular purpose, a perfectly honorable and good purpose. But it is, by its nature, not a religious beast." (*National Catholic Register*, May 6, 1979, p. 1).

As a result of this decision, questions are raised whether Catholic educators, who by and large succumbed to secular definitions as a law of life, have properly explored the outer limits of the First Amendment. Most secular educators, recognizing the value of religious institutions in the American system, would be cooperative in searching those outer limits. Contrariwise, one Catholic college president threatens to go independent, if Church authority attempts to enforce the new canon law on his college.

Questions Religious Women Ask

Mother Assumpta Long, O.P. of Nashville, Tennessee, expressed reservations (October 29th) about the way some American organizations of religious are addressed by official bodies. She asks: "Is it not possible and just that the Bishops' Conference should provide some form of representation to the *Consortium Perfectae Caritatis* and the *Institution on Religious Life*"? The Institute is composed of members affiliated with 121 religious communities.

The request followed the *Consortium Assembly* in St. Louis (October 14, 1983) at which the delegates were told that only the LCWR is an officially approved organization of religious women and so entitled to official representation at Bishops' meetings.

Other questions raised at the Consortium Assembly were the following:

- What does one do if, subsequent to the publication of official documents and communications from the Holy See, the Superior General informs the Sisters that, although published, there is no need for the Sisters to be concerned about them? If they wish to read them they can ask for the copy which is filed in the community archives or at the diocesan office.
- Why is it that the Sisters who follow the guidelines coming from Rome continue to be ignored, as a group, while the LCWR continues to enjoy official approval?
- What has happened to prayer? In many convents, chapels have been replaced by recreation rooms (or even smoking rooms) and the Sisters who wish to attend daily Mass must go to some parish church. Prayer in common, in community, is almost unknown.
- What do Sisters do, who having made their vows to God in a particular community, can no longer live those vows because of the secular interpretation of the vows as given by present administrations — POVERTY merely means availability, CHASTITY means celibacy (but does not rule out the safeguards to Chastity) OBEDIENCE means following the inspirations of the Holy Spirit as I RECEIVE THEM. . .

The *Consortium* reports that the corporate apostolates and charisms of the original foundresses no longer matter, being replaced by exclusive commitment to works of peace and justice. A number of communities are moving toward noncanonical status, a classification which will permit membership to all states of life, to merely common living and, in some cases open to all denominations.

CBS Radio on John Paul II

Sunday September 11, 1983 CBS Radio's network show "World of Religion" held interviews with Archbishop Rembert Weakland (then in Rome) and Fr. Richard McBrien, chairman of the theology department at the University of Notre Dame, about the address of Pope John Paul six days earlier to 25 American bishops during their ad limina visit in Vatican City. This was the talk in which he outlined some of the major problems he thought to be afflicting the apostolate of the Church in the U.S., which called for sound teaching by bishops: pre-marital sex, contraception and divorce, abortion and homosexuality. Archbishop Weakland, when asked about the Pope's remarks, expressed empathy with parish priests who deal with human beings who are suffering.

When asked whether American Catholics are going "to sit up and listen to the pope", Fr. McBrien said:

"The pope's address to bishops was an address to 25 bishops who happen to be in Rome for a Theological Education Program. It is not an official teaching, it is not an encyclical, it is not any sort of formal teaching. You see we have to be very careful not to relapse into the pre-Vatican II thinking that whatever a pope's opinion is that is per the official teaching of the Church."

Later the CBS announcer wondered whether the Pope had closed the door on women priests, to which Fr. McBrien replied:

"The pope cannot close the door on the discussion of anything, and including the ordination of women."

When asked whether the Pope was "trying to bring the Church back to the good old days," Fr. McBrien concluded with the following observations:

"There is no doubt that Pope John Paul II wants to bring the Catholic Church back to a position closer to what it was like before the Second Vatican Council. It does not mean that he was against the Council. On the contrary, he has some very positive things to say about the Council in a book he wrote about it when he was still an archbishop in Poland. But by and large Pope John Paul II represents a mentality in the Catholic Church, which is shared by many, which basically either does not understand or does not accept the major advances taken at Vatican II. That is, the whole Church is the people of God, not just the hierarchy and that, therefore, decisions have to be made in a way that represents the life and experience of the whole Church, and that moral norms have to be understood and applied in ways that take into account circumstances of those to whom they apply. So that I think that in the period before

(continued on page 15)

German Grisez on Neo-Gnosticism

After receiving the fifth annual Cardinal Wright Award of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars on September 18th, Germain Grisez told a Chicago audience that the current turmoil in the Catholic Church is ultimately the result of "a disease syndrome which is a single, unhealthy spiritual process." He identified this process as "Neo-Gnosticism" and said it arises from "pseudosex" — a disordered approach to sexual behavior which regards it as a means for self-gratification rather than for living out marital commitment.

The Award, given for outstanding service to the Church through Catholic scholarship, is named for the late Cardinal John Wright, Prefect of the Vatican's Congregation for the Clergy at the time of his death in 1979. Cardinal Wright was himself an eloquent proponent of Catholic teaching during his years in Rome and his prior service as Bishop of Worcester and of Pittsburgh.

Dr. Grisez is the Rev. Harry J. Flynn Professor of Christian Ethics at Mount Saint Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., and president of the American Catholic Philosophical Association. He is the author of many articles and books including *Abortion: The Myths, the Realities, and the Arguments*, *Beyond the New Morality: The Responsibilities of Freedom* (with Russell Shaw), and *The Way of the Lord Jesus: Christian Moral Principles* (to be published this fall).

Dr. Grisez said contemporary Neo-Gnosticism has many historical precedents including classical Gnosticism and Albigensianism. These are characterized by a view which reduces "the really real or the relevantly real" to individual consciousness and what affects it, while devaluing the objective autonomy of other persons and entities.

He identified six distinctive elements of Neo-Gnosticism impacting adversely on Catholic belief and practice at the present time:

"1. Rejection of received Christian moral teaching, especially absolutes in the area of sex morality;

"2. Denial that human beings really can live pure and holy lives;

"3. Assertion that God's grace and mercy are such that all will be saved — only those uncharitable enough to reject Neo-Gnosticism are in danger;

"4. Reinterpretation of all the elements of dogma which turn on bodiliness and historical fact, to reduce them to merely symbolic status;

"5. With this reduction, denial that the words of Scripture and defined doctrine have absolute significance, and identification of revelation and faith with some ineffable inner experience or

metaphysical factor, which cannot be encapsulated in mere human formulae;

"6. Rejection of the fact and/or the significance of the pope and other bishops as successors of the apostles in favor of ministries emerging from the community."

At present, Dr. Grisez said, Neo-Gnosticism appears to be "tremendously strong" but in fact it is "very weak."

"Neo-Gnosticism is a very unstable amalgam of pseudosex, pseudospirituality, and pseudotheology," he said. "It eases the way of people who are losing their faith and abandoning their vocational commitments, but it makes no converts from unbelief; it leads to empty cradles and broken marriages, to empty seminaries and novitiates, to violated vows and broken promises."

Selected Quotations from Dr. Grisez's Talk

1. On Pseudo-Sexual Behavior

". . . the specific factor which underlies contemporary Neo-Gnosticism is the acceptance of pseudosexual behavior in practice and the attempt to justify such behavior in theory. By 'pseudosexual behavior' I mean all those kinds of genital arousal, whether short of or to orgasm, which are engaged in for mere amusement, pleasure, distraction, or release of tension. Pseudosexual behavior must be contrasted with authentic sexual behavior, which carries out a real marital commitment in a common life, in which sexual intercourse is both truly love-giving and open to new life."

2. On Sin and Temptation

". . . one must bear in mind the difference between committing sins, recognizing them as such, and repenting; and doing things which really are sins, but trying to justify them, and not repenting. The former limits the impact of sin on one's self; the effects of the sin are blocked by repentance. But committing sin and trying to justify it integrates the sin with the self, and so enslaves the whole self to the sin.

Those who are trying to live a spiritual life — such as clerics and religious — ordinarily have a strong sense of realities beyond immediate experience. When such persons accept pseudosex and try to integrate it into their lives, they are likely to experience a temptation of faith. God and heavenly things begin to seem less real. If this temptation is resisted, another one arises: to develop the self-alienation involved in pseudosex into an ideological dualism."

3. On Doctrinal Change

". . . All the elements of Christian reality and

teaching which essentially involve the body have to be reinterpreted. Thus, the transmission of original sin by inheritance, the intactness of Mary's bodily virginity, the Incarnation of the Word, his bodily resurrection and ours, his bodily presence in the Eucharist, and so forth are now called into question. The bodily aspect is reduced to symbol.

4. On Catholic Turmoil

"... In the past twenty-five years many of the ordinary faithful, especially young people and those without deep faith, have embraced the sensate culture and lost their faith, while many of the more serious laity, religious, and clergy — including some bishops — have accepted pseudosex but tried to harmonize it with their faith, and in doing so have more or less consciously embraced Neo-Gnosticism.

Turmoil in the Church has focused on questions of sex morality and related issues. Vatican II, the Holy See, and faithful bishops and theologians have not been preoccupied with sex. However, those preoccupied with pseudosex have fought without letup to bring Catholic practice, teaching, and Church order into harmony with their disordered life style."

5. On Vatican II

"... the Council's documents have often been replaced by a so-called spirit of the Council which consists largely of the miasma spewed out by nonbelieving public-opinion makers."

6. On the Price of Fidelity

"Whenever the pope or any bishop makes it clear that his teaching is more than pro forma — for example, by admonishing those who hold views incompatible with it — he can expect severe criticism and even brutal personal attack. In some places Neo-Gnosticism has become established, while genuine Catholicism survives only in a remnant. In many places, those who reject Neo-Gnosticism are pressed to condone it and are considered 'uncharitable,' lacking in openness,' and 'pre-Vatican II' if they do not quietly join in a modus vivendi acceptable to Neo-Gnostic members of the community.

Thus, faithful Catholics are under tremendous pressure to compromise, and the inroads of Neo-Gnosticism are extremely hard to resist. That is why the movement continues to grow, and I do not expect to see a better situation in the Catholic Church in my lifetime. And yet there are good reasons for hope."

7. On the Catholic Future

"... As for the Church, when her present cultural form dies, the Neo-Gnosticism of this cycle of history also will die. But the Church herself will survive and arise in a fresh cultural form, much as she survived the fall of ancient civilization."

Miscellanea

● The *Association for the Rights of Catholics in the Church* is soliciting funds to publicize its new charter in the *National Catholic Reporter* at the cost of over \$1,000. That charter claims rights for Catholics against Church definitions and norms pertaining to homosexuality, contraception, remarriage after divorce, and so forth. Sample articles include the following:

8. All Catholics have the right to express publicly their dissent in regard to decisions made by Church authorities. (C.218; C. 212:3)
20. Catholic teachers of theology have a right to responsible academic freedom. The acceptability of their teaching is to be judged in dialogue with their peers, keeping in mind the legitimacy of responsible dissent and pluralism of belief. (C.218) . . .
27. All Catholic homosexuals have an equal right with heterosexuals to the resources and to the exercise of all the powers of the Church . . .
29. All married Catholics have the right to determine in conscience the size of their families and the appropriate methods of family planning . . .
31. All married Catholics have the right to withdraw from a marriage which has irretrievably broken down. All such Catholics retain the radical right to remarry.
32. All Catholics who are divorced and remarried have the right to the same ministries, including all sacraments, as do other Catholics.

● The *St. Anthony Messenger Press's* October 1983 *Update* has an article entitled "Birth Control and the Conscientious Catholic" making its way around the country. The author, Kenneth R. Overberg, S.J. of Cincinnati's Xavier University, explains John Paul II's counsel on conscience formation (re contraception in marriage) as follows:

"... The Pope is reminding us that we are not robots merely to be programmed and so to act. As human beings created in God's image, we have the right and responsibility to experience, to reflect, to pray and to decide. To say that, I realize, does not make it easy to do. The automatic following of a teaching or law can protect us from personal responsibility and involvement, can become merely a security blanket. On the other hand, making a mature conscience decision which conflicts with a given teaching can still cause guilt feelings. We will probably not change all this just by reading an article on conscience. The process of making mature moral decisions and living in peace with our decisions must be learned and practiced."

Things They Say

● Sr. Margaret Traxler of the School Sisters of Notre Dame on the Mansour Case:

"A bad press hits the jugular vein of the hierarchy. We realize the media is our only hope." (*Ms. Magazine*, September, 1983 p. 56)

● Cardinal Oddi on bad Catechetics:

"Persistence is important, but so is courtesy, understanding, patience. Sometimes there are reasons why Church authorities must tolerate a given situation for a time because of circumstances which it may be harmful to make public; and therefore a situation may remain unchanged and unexplained for an extended period. Parents should have confidence in their bishops in such a state of affairs, protecting their own children as best they can, while remaining peaceful in their own conscience that they have fulfilled their obligation to open their mind and heart to the proper authorities. We live in an imperfect world but are strengthened by the conviction that God knows all secrets, of everybody, and the deepest secrets will be eventually revealed." (Mt. 10:26)

● Anglican historian-theologian Eric Mascall on biblical criticism:

"Beneath a fig-tree once there sat
A very guileless Jew.
He had the firm conviction that
He was Bartholomew.

But then the Higher Critics came,
With L and M and Q
And if you ask him now his name
He hasn't got a clue.

So out upon these men of clay,
This unbelieving crew!
May others treat them just as they
Treated Bartholomew!"

(From his *Pi in the High*)

● Rosemary Radford Reuther who is advertised as "an outspoken Roman Catholic theologian" has a new book entitled *Sexism and God Talk*. One of her gems is the following:

"Theological reflections drawn from Judaeo-Christian or even the Near Eastern-Mediterranean-European tradition do not have a privileged relation to God, to truth, to authentic humanity over those that arise from Judaism, Islam, and Buddhims: Nor are they presumed to be the same."

● Richard John Neuhaus

". . . the Vatican Council exercised a self-denying ordinance that respected the difference between moral directions and policy directives. Today there is worry about whether Roman Catholic leadership in America is not imitating the pattern which has brought liberal Protestant social action into disrepute. The worry is not without foundation, yet I believe that the process of consultation and deliberation surrounding the current pastoral letter on nuclear arms, for example, is still far superior to that which produces most liberal Protestant statements. While the bishops might in the long run succumb to the overweening influence of a budding bureaucracy of presumed experts, they today still have an understanding of their teaching (magisterial) authority that is lacking in Protestantism. More than that, God has raised up in John Paul II a man who has a powerful and exquisitely nuanced understanding of the church's distinctive role in political change. . ." From *Center Journal*, Fall 1983 pp. 44-45.

● Bishop John O'Connor of Scranton to his priests:

"There can be no such thing as: 'I will not accept that assignment.' Nor may any pastor arbitrarily say: 'I will not accept that assistant.' The priest who will not accept an assignment could find himself without any assignment. The pastor who will not accept an assistant could find himself without any assistant. I do not mean to be or to sound harsh. But I must concern myself with the people. This does not mean ignoring or being callous towards the needs of priests. You will find me extremely sensitive to every legitimate need, making every effort to match a priest's needs to an assignment and vice versa. If I am given any evidence that a priest is being treated harshly, or that a move should not be made because of some personal problem, I will bend over backwards to correct the abuse and to accommodate the priest. But we must not baby ourselves in this regard. We were ordained for the people."

● Fr. Anthony Zimmerman, SVD (Tokyo)

"One survey indicates that about 11,600,000 sterilizations have occurred in the USA. A world figure of 90,000,000 has been estimated. The goal of family planners in the USA is to have 200,000,000 couples sterilized throughout the world, which is more than a quarter of the couples passing through the fertile years."

Books and Periodicals

IN THE MAGAZINES

● Two articles in the *Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics, 1983*, ed. Larry L. Rasmussen (Dallas, Texas: Society of Ethics, 1983) deserve notice; the first is by Marjorie Reiley Maguire called "Personhood, Covenant, and Abortion" (pp. 117-145) and the second is by Christine Gudorf Assistant Professor at Xavier University) entitled "On Teaching Christian Sexual Ethics". (pp. 265-268)

According to Maguire "personhood begins when the bearer of life, the mother makes a covenant of love with the developing life within her to bring it to birth" (p. 130), so that "the moment which begins personhood, then, is the moment when the mother accepts the pregnancy" (p. 131). Recognizing that her proposal "sounds preposterous" (p. 131), Maguire nonetheless insists that "the formal constitutive element of personhood is the mother's consent" (p. 134). She thinks that such consent ought to be presumed if the pregnancy has advanced to the point where there has been significant development of the brain and central nervous system (p. 136), but for her the constitutive element of personhood is the mother's consent to bring the life developing within her to term.

Gudorf says that she is obliged, because of the fact that she teaches in a Jesuit university with a largely Catholic student body, "to deal with the official Catholic teaching." But "as an active Catholic myself," she writes, "I know how dangerous such teaching can be for the commitment of the students. The reaction of many to reading and discussing official teaching on sexuality is that no Church with teaching like that could possibly have anything valid to impart to them" (p. 262).

To deal with this problem Gudorf spends some time teaching Catholic social ethics (with which she agrees) to show students that they can reject the method behind the teaching on sexuality while accepting a different method on social issues. She does not identify the method in question. But perhaps she sees a "proportional consequentialism" operative here, for she says that "proportional consequentialism is appealing to the majority of the students" (p. 266). In addition, she can counter the "official" teaching of the Church on sexual matters with that found in "a revisionist account of Catholic sexual morality" that she uses in the course.

● *Catholicism in Crisis* takes the measure of the Jesuit weekly *America* in its October 1983 issue, complaining about "their obedient recitation of the leftist doxology" on Central America, the Gender Gap, the Pope in Poland, Hunger, Soviet Union, Nicaragua, Mrs. Thatcher, etc. Says the reporter: "These opinions are indistinguishable from those repeatedly expressed in the secular press. If *America* is a reliable guide, Jesuits today are more interested in saving jobs than in saving souls." He judges the preoccupations of the Jesuit publication to be "worldly", a conclusion he reached after *America* published an article suggesting if Catholics don't want sacramental confession, they don't need it.

Tom Bethell could have pointed as further proof *America's* savaging (October 1st) Ralph Martin's *A Crisis of Truth* (Servant Publications), which details (from a lay missionary's point of view) the undermining of Christian faith going on within the Catholic Church. *America's* reviewer puts all this down as "right wing" fare, but takes particular umbrage at Martin attributing the present Catholic crisis to the devil. *America* does not seem to know that about ten years before Ralph Martin the storms and uncertainty within the Church were attributed to the devil by Pope Paul VI (English *L'Osservatore Romano* July 10, 1972).

Christianity and Crisis would do better to study *America's* doctrinal positions since 1972. A Study of *Theological Studies* over the same period would be equally interesting.

● *Primum Non Nocere* is a Newsletter of *Doctors Who Respect Human Life*, Box 508, Oak Park, Illinois 60303.

● The Spring/Summer 1983 issue of *This World* has a valuable section entitled "Economics and the Canadian Bishops".

● The Human Life Center of St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn. 56321 publishes — in addition to its journal *Natural Family Planning* — a 16 page newsletter entitled, *Human Life Issues* which regularly provides valuable information on matters pertaining to family life and sex education, even on mis-education going on in local schools and communities. Booklets and cassettes are available at modest prices.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Fellowship member Fr. Jordan Aumann, O.P. is the author of a series of books entitled *The English Mystics* (3 Vols. \$24.95), *St. John of the Cross* (\$21.95), *Teresa's Four Degrees of Prayer* (\$21.95), *Teresa's Interior Castle* (\$11.90). Available from Ave Maria Press, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556. Discounts available.
- Joseph W. Browne, C.M., *Personal Dignity*, (Philosophical Library, 164 pp. \$15.00). This philosophical essay on the nature of personality is divided into ten chapters covering metaphysics, existentialism and the supernatural. Written for the scholar and layman.
- William Kirk Kilpatrick, *Psychological Seduction*, (Thomas Nelson Publishers, 235 pp. \$5.95 paperback) The Boston College psychologist joins NYU professor Paul Vitz in dissecting psychology and Christianity as competing faiths.
- Austin Flannery O.P. (ed.) *Vatican Council II: More Post Conciliar Documents* (Costello Publishing Co., 990 pp. \$9.95). A second volume follow-up to the popular volume which re-translated the late Council's documents and made available early implementing documents of Paul VI's pontificate. This volume covers later Roman statements on liturgy, ecumenism, religious life, ministry, current problems, education, and synods. All important documents are here. Volumes III and IV of this series will compile major papal documents and those of the Roman Curia and Vatican Commissions.
- James Hitchcock is co-author, with the Protestant scholar Francis Schaeffer and the Soviet dissident Vladimir Bukovsky, of the newly published book, *Who Speaks for Peace?* The publisher is Thomas Nelson and Sons.
- Valentine Long OFM, *Upon This Rock*, (Franciscan Herald Press 255 pp. \$12.00).
A popular summary of controverted subjects, many of them dogmatic in content, such as original sin, process theology, Hegelian dialectic, angels, devils, papal infallibility, etc.

BOOK REVIEWS

- St. Augustine, *Opera Omnia*, Citta Nuova Editrice.

The complete works of St. Augustine are now distributed in the USA by Spina Press. Beginning in 1954 the Augustinianum (Rome), under the direction of Fr. Agostino Trape, O.S.A., undertook the monumental task of publishing the complete works of St. Augustine in a Latin-Italian edition, with the cooperation of the publishing house Città Nuova. The importance of having the original text in print again at a moderate price can hardly be overstated, if we consider that the *opera omnia* have not been on the market since the Migne edition (*Patrologia Latina*, Paris 1861). The edition directed by Fr. Trape follows the Migne edition of the *Corpus Christianorum*. Significant variants are reported. This edition is an irreplaceable tool for any serious study or discussion on St. Augustine; moreover, a readily accessible original should facilitate new English translations.

The collection will include 35 volumes. Various scholars associated with the Augustinianum contribute the translations and commentaries; the publisher is Città Nuova. 16 volumes are now in print, including the *Confessions*, *The City of God*, the *Letters*, etc. For further information and price list, contact Spina Press, POB 2653, New York, N.Y. 10185.

-
- Giacomo M. Martinacci, *Un volto della santità: Rita da Cascia*, 302 pp. (Citta Nuova Editrice: Rome 1981)

A new biography of St. Rita is now being translated to English and will be published in 1984 by Spina Press, New York, with the title, *A Friend of God: Rita of Cascia*. One of the aims of the book, underlined by Cardinal Ballestrero in his introduction, is to establish a sound historical basis for what is too often downgraded as "popular devotion" or "pious legend". To this purpose, the book provides a scholarly and eminently readable reconstruction of St. Rita's cultural and historical environment, as well as a reaffirmation of what constitutes true holiness: the ever deeper understanding of Christ crucified.

Luciana Csaki

BOOK REVIEWS

- *Sociology Reinterpreted: An Essay On Method and Vocation* by Peter L. Berger and Hansfried Kellner, Anchor Press/Doubleday, 183 p. \$3.95 (paper) \$12.95 (hardcover)

The central aim of this work is to provide a phenomenological analysis defending Max Weber's position that sociology is and should be a "value-free" attempt at understanding the social world. Berger and Kellner argue that the sociologist can place himself/herself in a sort of scholarly sanctuary provided by the accumulated knowledge of the discipline of sociology, of the "republic of scholars" past and present, from which one can objectively interpret the thought and activity of the everyday individual.

There are two fundamental criticisms of Berger and Kellner's presentation. The first, and more basic, has to do with the supposed self-contained and self-evident nature of the existing body of sociological knowledge. There is, on the contrary, no unified and accepted body of sociological knowledge.

The second criticism involves the author's positing too sharp a cleavage between their imagined sociological fortress and those considerations that not only precede but follow it in the intellectual process of studying social reality. Not only do the values of the individual sociologist determine the choice of intellectual problem studied and influence the actual sociological analysis by providing a value-laden theoretical framework, but they are also crucial in interpreting the moral implications of the investigation.

Peter Berger's two major contributions to the sociology of religion are *The Social Construction of Reality* (written with Thomas Luckmann) and *The Heretical Imperative*. Let me suggest to the reader that Peter Berger's embracement of the methodology of Liberal Protestantism with its unthinking openness to secular humanistic and social scientific disciplines, his particular relativizing (and eventually debilitating) brand of the sociology of knowledge with its inability to address such questions as ultimate Truth or Beauty, his understanding of sociology as a "value-free" discipline, and his inability to take the religious "leap of faith" and accept a particular religious tradition (even in a selective, self-conscious manner) are characteristics inextricably intertwined throughout both the former "sociological" and the latter "theological" works. His sociology has helped bring about his own "inductive" theology that denies the necessary fusion of faith and reason; his theological construction has helped bring about a sociology that denies the anthropological inevitability of the unity of thought and action.

Peter Berger has, as of now at least, created a theology of agnosticism and a sociology of self-deception. For all his brilliance and for all of his undeniable accomplishments (as partial as they may be), the wager here is that he has not yet fulfilled his mission as a Christian layman "called there by God". (*Lumen Gentium*)

Joseph A. Varacalli

Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *Daughter Zion. Meditations on the Church's Marian Belief*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1983. 82 pp.

This small book is a work of great importance today. Marian doctrine is more and more assailed, even within the Church. Frequently, it is suggested that what faith teaches of Mary is of secondary importance, a late accretion to faith and grounded in dubious sources. This brief study by one of today's leading theologians provides a defense of the Church's beliefs about the Mother of God. Cardinal Ratzinger summarizes the scriptural basis of teaching on Mary and how inseparable Marian doctrine is from the most central teachings of the Church. Well translated by Father John McDermott, S.J., this study should make an excellent Christmas gift.

John Senior, *The Restoration of Christian Culture*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1983

John Senior has in past studies traced the sad decline of Christian culture in our time. This is a positive work: he points with authentic hope to the ways of restoring a living Catholic faith in our midst. This moving study is rich with awareness of the immense treasures of Christian culture of which even most educated Catholics of our time are deprived. He reminds us of how tragic is the loss of so much truth and beauty and goodness, and points to the paths we may take to heal our times. This is an essential book for all with pastoral concern for today's crisis of faith.

I-Man: An Outline of Philosophical Anthropology by M.A. Krapiec, trans. M. Lescoe, A. Woznicki, T. Sandok et al.. Pp. 526. . . . Hardcover \$13.95 plus \$1.00 postage. Mariel Publications, 196 Eddy Glover Blvd. New Britain, CT 06053 .

I-Man: combines the best of the *nova et vetera*: the realist metaphysics of St. Thomas Aquinas with the best insights of contemporary existentialism and the methodology of phenomenology.

This new philosophy — whose most widely known exponent is Pope John Paul II — is taught with great success in all the diocesan seminaries in Poland. It is the hope of the translators that these Lublin texts will be adapted for use in our American seminaries and colleges.

Msgr. Frederick McManus, The Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities and the New Code of Canon Law

The New Code of Canon Law has a chapter entitled "Catholic Universities and Institutes of Higher Studies" (Cns. 807-814). The pertinent new requirements (they do not apply retroactively) permits the name "Catholic" to a university only with the consent of "competent" ecclesiastical authority" (Cn. 808), the same authority having the duty to provide that teachers be named in Catholic universities who have doctrinal integrity/probity of life and that those who lack these requisites be removed from office; bishops, also, to see that the principles of Catholic doctrine be faithfully observed in these universities (Cn. 810), and that "those who teach theological disciplines in any kind of institute of higher studies should have a mandate from the competent ecclesiastical authority". (Cn. 812)

Msgr. Frederick McManus has prepared a commentary of these canons for ACCU which presently is circulating among the presidents of its 218 members.

Msgr. McManus, while accepting the purpose of the canons as desirable for American colleges/universities which consider themselves Catholic in character and mission, concludes overall that the canons as written "are not applicable in the circumstances of most American Catholic colleges and universities". If they are judged "in some instances" to be applicable, under no circumstances should ecclesiastical authority be allowed to interfere in the governance of the institutions. (He admits such external interventions are not uncommon by secular authority.) Indeed, he recommends that College Boards declare now that they are not subject to "canonical enforceable interference".

Msgr. McManus begins from the assumption that historically Catholic colleges in the U.S. are "church related" rather than "canonically Catholic", that at the present moment (without canonical ties) the "Catholic character of these colleges is not in question", that the present canons are designed for systems of higher education for situations considerably different from those in North America, that the purpose of the new law can be assured by the exercise of moral, not canonical, authority, that discussion and dialogue will safeguard Church interest in the Catholic integrity, doctrine and life of the colleges in question.

The McManus commentary calls for resistance to any effort to turn the canonical "mandate" for

those "who teach the theological disciplines" into an empowerment or a conferral by bishops of a right to teach. He would prefer the meaning of "mandate" to be a simple acknowledgement by Church authority that a given person is properly engaged in teaching theology — to be distinguished from someone who is deficient.

So that the academic community does not misconstrue the import of Canon 812, McManus makes a suggestion that the power to "mandate" be delegated to an academic official, maybe even to the local theology department. In the back of his mind is his wonder whether the very idea "mandate" belongs more correctly to those engaged in catechetics and religious education rather than pertaining to those in advanced academic studies or theological research in theology (e.g., the theological faculty at the Catholic University of America and similar institutions). He assures ACCU that a believing Catholic theologian cannot divorce his theology from his faith and commitment.

The McManus commentary proposes additional alternatives to bishops: confer the mandate by simply recognizing (informally) the Catholicity of the college itself; or by endorsing those approved by the college for theology classes; or by recognizing an STL or its American equivalent as satisfying the intent of the mandate; or by membership in *The Catholic Theological Society of America* or in the *Catholic Theology Society*.

Commentary on the Commentary

1. Historically, the canonical ties of Catholic colleges with Church authorities have been through religious superiors. College presidents were usually community superiors of the religious faculty, whose commitment, discipline, and orthodoxy set the tone for the institution and were in fact the "competent ecclesiastical authority."

2. Canons on Catholic higher education would not likely be found in the 1983 Code, if American religious, mainly Jesuits, did not lead a world-wide charge to declare their independence of Church authority. The present canons were inserted with the American situation specifically in mind — and after vigorous efforts by the *Canon Law Society of America* to eliminate or dilute their obvious intent and meaning.

3. The assertion that moral authority alone is sufficient for Church authority to protect Catholic

interests in colleges which claim Catholic identity or who rely on the Catholic population for money and students, is surely to be seen as an attempt to evade the law. A laissez-faire principle of government, especially of Church government, is alien to Catholic social concepts. Civil or secular government bodies can interfere with college administration (and even teaching) where the respective well-beings or norms are so violated as to threaten a legitimate common good. Why not, then, a similar recognition of the rights of the Church authority, ultimately responsible for the Catholic common good, once the college which asserts or claims the identity or mission of the Church adversely affects the pastoral life of the Church, to say nothing of the salvation of souls.

4. If colleges do not wish to act "in the name of the Church", they have the freedom to alienate themselves as Harvard and Yale did when they foresook their Protestant roots. Church colleges cannot have it both ways — calling themselves Catholic but functioning exclusively by secular or civil rules, leaving the Church impotent to protect herself from abuses (e.g. of academic freedom) which undermine the Church's mission.

5. Recent experience makes it clear that "dialogue" has not moderated the claims theologians assert of an absolute right to academic freedom against Church magisterium, if need be. There is no instance of a theology department in the U.S. removing from office those who deny or reject important Catholic dogmatic or moral truths. Indeed, affirmative action seems to be mostly against defenders of magisterium.

Neither Catholic tradition, nor Vatican II, nor post-Vatican II documents define academic freedom in the secular American sense, a definition originally designed to keep civil government, not the university board, out of the internal affairs of the secular university. A Catholic college cannot be simply secular.

The fact that CUA contains on its faculties for theological disciplines more than a fair share of doctrinal dissidents is evidence enough that doctrinal vigilance is not securely exercised through persuasion.

6. While Catholic colleges, hitherto, rarely had a formal relationship with hierarchy, no Catholic college was ever established without the invitation or consent of the local bishop(s) and without being subject to his continued patronage and purview. The very formality now demanded by the New Code is an expression of Church authority's lack of confidence in the voluntary relationships presently preferred by McManus and Co. Membership in ACCU is no certain guarantee of the authentic Catholicity of a given college or university.

7. Neither is membership in contemporary theological societies a guarantee of theological competence, as understood by the Church's lawmaker. The proposal that the "competent ecclesiastical authority" be reduced to an internal university figure not only makes fun of the law, but is the classic case of proposing that the fox be placed in charge of the chicken coop.

8. Concern about misunderstanding by or disputes with accrediting agencies or civil courts is legitimate enough, as long as overconcern does not become the reason for subverting Catholic law governing institutions which wish to be considered Catholic.

9. It will serve the cause of the Church better if American canonists (and college presidents) accept the fact that the above canons do apply to American Catholic colleges. If anything is clear from the efforts of ACCU to have the canon on "mandatum" deleted or radically changed, it is that the Pope wants these canons applied to Catholic higher education in the U.S. Therefore, integrity demands that talent and energy be devoted toward finding means of applying both canon law, while protecting the right of Catholic colleges to receive government monies. Fear may exist about the loss of federal monies, but the Church must always retain its right to protect and guarantee the authentic teaching of the Catholic faith.

Does Anyone Remember?

How the Holy See dialogued for three years (1969-1972) with the International Federation of Catholic Universities (I.F.C.U.) —

Resulting in the Congress of Delegates of the Catholic Universities of the World (November 20-29, 1972)

And in

"The Catholic University in the Modern World", a document representing the worldwide views of Catholic University Presidents on Church related institutions.

Section 59 of which document reads:

"When bishops, after due consideration, are convinced that the orthodoxy of the people under their pastoral care is being endangered, they have the right and duty to intervene, by advising the person involved, informing the administration, and in an extreme case, declaring such a teaching incompatible with Catholic doctrine."

The paragraph concludes with the assertion that the Catholic University has the responsibility "to take the necessary and appropriate means to maintain its Catholic character."

A Disturbed Cardinal Garrone

Shortly after the return of American delegates from that 1972 Congress, the president of Georgetown University announced to a press conference that Rome agreed with the Americans on the autonomy of the Catholic University.

When Gabriel Cardinal Garrone, then prefect of the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, heard this, having dialogued tirelessly with American educators for three years, he wrote a letter to U.S. Catholic college presidents (April 25, 1973), telling them that the IFCU document required certain improvements. He then made two important demands:

1. Each Catholic university to set out "formally and without equivocation either in its statutes or in some other internal document, its character and commitment as 'Catholic'."
2. "To create within itself appropriate and efficacious instruments of self-regulation in the sectors of faith, morality, and discipline."

Ten years later Cardinal Garrone's letter remains a dead letter for most self-proclaimed Catholic colleges.

Some Catholic Colleges insert in faculty contracts the following clause, which they consider morally and legally binding.

"The Objectives of the University state that _____ is a Catholic institution of higher learning: it has an institutional commitment to be faithful to the Christian message as it comes to us through the Church. Accordingly, Catholic ideals and principles will penetrate and inform University activities wherever possible. Teacher hereby specifically recognizes his responsibility to adhere to this commitment and to other stated objectives of the University."

CBS RADIO ON JOHN PAUL II (*cont'd from page 6*)

the First Vatican Council (sic) things were very clear to the Catholic. Everything was right there in the catechism and, of course, if the pope spoke on anything he obviously was right and, of course, if you were having an argument with someone else at the time and if you found yourself on the pope's side, obviously you were right and, if the other person found himself against the pope, he was wrong, Well that is changed now. There are many Catholics who are unhappy and sad that those changes have taken place and would like as far as possible, they know they cannot restore it completely, to get back to the way it was before the Council. And it can't be done. And it won't be done. And anyone who tries will be wasting their time." [*World of Religion*, September 11, 1983 CBS News.]

Cardinal Newman on Faith

"... I may love by halves, I may obey by halves; I cannot believe by halves: either I have faith, or I have it not.

"And so again, when a man has become a Catholic, were he to set about following a doubt which has occurred to him, he has already disbelieved. I have not to warn him against losing his faith, he is not merely in danger of losing it, he has lost it; from the nature of the case he has already lost it; he fell from grace at the moment when he deliberately entertained and pursued his doubt. No one can determine to doubt what he is already sure of; but if he is not sure that the Church is from God, he does not believe it. It is not I who forbid him to doubt; he has taken the matter into his own hands when he determined on asking for leave; he has begun, not ended, in unbelief; his very wish, his purpose, in his sin. I do not make it so, it is such from the very state of the case. You sometimes hear, for example, of Catholics falling away, who will tell you it arose from reading the Scriptures, which opened their eyes to the "unscripturalness," so they speak, of the Church of the Living God. No; Scripture did not make them disbelieve (impossible!); they disbelieved *when* they opened the Bible; they opened it in an unbelieving spirit, and for an unbelieving purpose; they would not have opened it, had they not anticipated — I might say, hoped — that they should find things there inconsistent with Catholic teaching. They begin in self-will and disobedience, and they end in apostasy. This, then, is the direct and obvious reason why the Church cannot allow her children the liberty of doubting the truth of her word. He who really believes in it now, cannot imagine the future discovery of reasons to shake his faith; if he imagines it, he has not faith; and that so many Protestants think it a sort of tyranny in the Church to forbid any children of hers to doubt about her teaching, only shows they do not know what faith is — which is the case; it is a strange idea to them . . ." (From his *Discourses: Addresses to Mixed Congregations* 1909 pp. 216-218)

In the December 1980 edition of the World Council of Churches' monthly Journal, One World, there is an article denouncing the practice of providing prostitutes for businessmen visiting South East Asian cities. But the objections are not because of Biblical teaching about fornication; they are because the practices at issue are what the article called "sex imperialism." (p. 91)

St. Augustine and The Uses of Force

by

Professor Henry Paolucci

What can Roman Catholic intellectuals contribute to the debate over arms control and strategic nuclear deterrence to match the moral-philosophical "muscle" of the secular advocates of perpetual peace to be purchased at all costs? Those secular advocates, it has been noticed, have the magic name of Immanuel Kant to conjure with. In the academy, led by Professor Carl Friedrich, they have taught that a higher synthesis of Kant's abstract ideal of perpetual peace and of Karl Marx's humanist vision of the inevitable triumph of revolutionary social justice has already been forged intellectually; and Friedrich's chief disciples as Kantians — Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brezinski — have brought to the White House itself the notion that the Kantian-Marxist higher synthesis for a historically rooted permanent peace may actually need only broad institutional implementation by today's superpowers to become a reality.¹

How can Roman Catholic intellectuals hope to match the excitement and promise of all that in facing up to the challenge of war and peace in our time? Without breaking completely with their past — with the difficult *devoir* (as it used to be called) of defending the institutions of historical continuity against the incessant claims of the present — they certainly cannot play as freely with Kant or Marx as their secular counterparts, who know as well as they do that there is precious little in Kant, much less in Marx, that is the least compatible with the essence of Christianity. And beyond that, serious Roman Catholics can hardly permit themselves to forget, or pretend to forget, that Christianity has had long and continuous experience with war and peace, and with a variety of political environments. More particularly, it has had long and practical experience in dealing with questions of the use of force, or of threats of force, against civilian hostages, to deter aggression, or to discipline populations in occupied territories. Many times during her long history the Church has had to confront prospects of nominally Christian or Catholic armies venturing to sack and destroy entire cities. Who better than St. Augustine, for instance, knew the capacity of armies that have the will to bury even so great a city as ancient Carthage during the Third Punic War. As an eminent modern historian has put it:

"Out of this stately and beautiful city of over 300,000 inhabitants, no more than 50,000 lived to be sold into slavery. For seventeen days the city burned. Then Scipio Africanus the Younger leveled its ruins, and guided the plough over the place where the walls had stood, to signify that the place was accursed, and should never rise again from its ruins."²

The great Bishop Ambrose of Milan, whose preaching converted St. Augustine, had the ears of Roman emperors for decades during the time when Christianity was about to be declared the official religion of the Roman Empire (395 A.D.). No Roman Catholic bishop since has ever been more eager than Ambrose was to do the sort of thing the American bishops have lately undertaken to do with their pastoral letter. Ambrose had been a great optimist in that regard, allowing himself the hope (so movingly expressed in his oration on the death of Emperor Theodosius the Elder³) that the Roman Empire, because of the piety of its rulers, might ever reign in the world, together with the Church, each with authority from God to guarantee the safety and well-being of the others. But then Alaric's sack came, in 410 A.D., and the sort of optimism so many had come to share with St. Ambrose was shaken to its very foundations. The Milan Archbishop in his day had called upon professed Christians in high places to comport themselves in military affairs with care for the spiritual safety of their own souls, as well as of the souls of their soldiers and the civilian populations threatened by their deeds. How hostages ought to be treated, and what exactly are the moral limits of threats against innocent civilians as a means of deterrence were thoroughly discussed by him, in altogether practical terms; and, frequently, the emperors who rejected his admonitions or protests suffered excommunication, and were forced to go begging to him for pardon, when their Christian subjects instituted slow-downs, as we now call them, to show their disapproval.⁴

But, of course, it is not an optimist like St. Ambrose, but the great realist St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, Regius in North Africa, who counterposes the Kantian-Marxist vision of an allegedly ideal future of perpetual peace. St. Augustine's *City of God*, as we all know, was written at a time when Huns were pillaging much of Europe. Goths had already sacked Rome, while

Vandals were storming across North Africa to destroy his own See, even as he lay dying. What he raged most against in his great book were the sentimental pretensions of the ruling elite of his day. The opening sentences of *City of God* say in part:

"This is a great and difficult task. But God is my helper . . . I know what great powers are needed to persuade the proud leaders of this world that humility is a virtue . . . For proud earthly leaders like to boast, and like to hear it said of themselves, that their ideal is to 'uplift the lowly and put down the proud.' But that is God's prerogative; and it is against the leaders of the city of this world who boastfully claim it for themselves that the City of God needs to be defended."⁵

An enforceable world peace is a very attractive idea, St. Augustine goes on to say. It sounds good; but in fact it has inspired the bloodiest conflicts of history. Those who long to establish a regime of peace with one law enforced for the entire world are really saying:

"My will be done everywhere. Let God's prerogative be my prerogative, and let us self-righteously damn as enemies of mankind all who will not go along with the idea."

What does Jesus Christ, Jesus the Messiah, Jesus the anointed of God, say to the proponents of perpetual peace on earth of his day? Those peacemakers and peacekeepers of Rome in Jesus's time knew a lot about the exigencies of enforcing such a peace legally and militarily. There never was a more thoroughly thought-through system of enforceable world law than that of the Roman Principate of Caesar Augustus. Who can pretend to deny that the Romans were the legal people, the governing people par excellence? It is the Principate of Caesar Augustus that made the time of Jesus quite literally the fullness of time.

You cosmopolite Romans, with your genius for law, have perfected a system of world government. People poured into the system are at once made to bend their knees to your peace, and to love your bread and your circuses. What now that you have put an end to nationhood as it has been historically defined? Can you handle the latest Jewish crisis? The crisis of this Jewish upstart from Nazareth? Crucify him, crucify the trouble-maker! That's the answer isn't it, whenever the best and the brightest have an absolute monopoly of governing power in the world. So those Roman world leaders say to Jesus, "Do you know that I have power to crucify you and power to release you?" Acknowledging the truth of what Pilate had said, Jesus replies: "None of that power wouldst thou have

over me, were it not given thee from above." When Pilate asks Jesus whether he really claimed to be King of the Jews, all that Jesus in the three Synoptic gospels offers as reply is the cryptic "Thou sayest it." But in the Gospel of St. John we receive the grand elaboration which has ever since stood as the unshakeable central principle of all political thought that can so much as begin to pretend to be truly Christian.

"My kingdom is not of this world. If it were of this world, then would my followers have fought that I might not be delivered to the Jews. But, as it is, my Kingdom is not from here."⁶

Here we have the framework which ultimately distinguishes earthly kingdoms and states of this world from the Kingdom of God on Earth. The *Civitas Terrena*, whether it be Jewish or Islamic, French or German English or Spanish, Chinese or Japanese, American or Russian, atheist or God-fearing, comprises kingdoms whose reigning governments can call upon their people to take up arms for their defense against enemies foreign or domestic. Such earthly kingdoms, says St. Augustine, are by no means all alike. In some, the people by and large want one thing; in others they want something else, maybe pleasure at all cost, or freedom at all cost, or peace at all cost, or any of their myriad variations. In Book Nineteen of *The City of God* St. Augustine totals up 288 different possible sets of earthly values pursuable in earthly kingdoms.

But whatever the value of an earthly kingdom may be — peace, plenty, freedom — it is still a value of self-seeking, still an object of what St. Augustine calls *cupiditas* or *eros*.⁷ Whether the expression of these desires is vulgar or lofty, the end pursued is a self-gratifying and earthly end. And because it is self-gratifying the people associated in its pursuit need political organization, i.e. a state. They need it, first of all, to keep themselves in line domestically, for the pursuit of their common goals and, beyond that, to protect themselves as a community in their earthly pursuits against the depredations of equally selfish, or even more selfish, outsiders.

In such an imperfect world what about those who are true Christians? Here St. Augustine warns: Don't imagine you can gather together to form the perfect state, a truly Christian state. There is no such thing, and there can never be. If all human beings lived as true Christians, day and night, loving God, and their neighbors for God's sake (which means returning good for evil and loving one's enemies), the result would be, not a perfect state, but no state at all — just as, if human beings

were always physically well and free from injury, there would be no hospital. Worldly political regimes, St. Augustine holds emphatically, exist not only for mutual benefit but also for mutual restraint of the wicked. Coercive power is used to restrain coercive power, public violence is used to check private violence, and military violence tries to check the military violence of foreign aggressors.

In their much-celebrated "Six Day War" of 1967, the Jews of modern Israel started the righting with pre-emptive air attacks that crippled the Egyptian air force. Later, the Israelis made a pre-emptive attack on a nuclear energy plant in Iraq because it might eventually have been converted into a nuclear-bomb producing plant. More recently they invaded Southern Lebanon to wage pre-emptive war against the P.L.O. fighters, whether the Lebanese liked the idea or not. All of that, from St. Augustine's vantage point, was to be expected (not justified, mind you) because the State of Israel is a kingdom of this world. High or low in purpose, that is how such kingdoms act, when necessary, to defend themselves. The alternative, to let one's self be crucified, though a King, rather than wage war, was the act of a King whose Kingdom is not of this world.

For that reason, St. Augustine concludes,⁸ Christians should never moralize in simple terms about the use of force on earth, only about its unreasonable or excessive use. St. Augustine admonishes the Christians of his time to heed the words of St. Peter:

"For the sake of the Lord accept the authority of every social institution; the emperor has supreme authority and the governors as commissioners by him to punish criminals." (1 Peter 2:13)

and he adds St. Paul's counsel to the same effect:

"You must obey governing authorities — Anyone who resists authority is rebelling against God's decision — only criminals have anything to fear." (Rom 13:1 ff)

Without justifying tyranny or rendering citizens helpless, Augustine stresses the general religious obligation of Christians to cooperate with governments — not obstruct them — in their provisions to insure domestic tranquility and provide for the common defense, both of which involve the employment of force, or apparent force, to check violence. The public order that they try to keep is clearly a true Christian good.

It is in this spirit that St. Augustine urges his Christian readers, the way the American Bishops are urging American Catholics, to make government their business. In heaven, true Christians will have a true kingdom of Peace. But while they are earthbound, living like captives and strangers, like

pilgrims called to Christ out of every nation, they are obliged for Christ's sake to respect the "diversity in the manners, laws, and institutions whereby earthly order is secured and maintained"; and when they cannot help to see that the power which is from God is exercised rightly, the example of Jesus confronting Pilate remains: Christians are not a terror to their rulers, any more than they are to their neighbors. Their true peace is not of this world, to be fought for as the world fights; theirs is the peace of heaven which passeth all understanding.

FOOTNOTES

¹See H. Paolucci, "From Kant to Kissinger and Brezezinski," in *Kissinger's War: 1957-1975* (Griffon House, New York, 1980), pp. 103-118. Also H. Paolucci, *War Peace and the Presidency* (New York, McGraw-Hill 1968), Dr. Paolucci is Professor of Government and Politics at St. John's University, New York City.

²William L. Westermann, *The Story of the Ancient Nations*, Appleton, New York 1912, p. 320.

³*Santi Ambrosii Oratio de obitu Theodosii*, ed. and tr. Sister M.D. Mannix, Washington, D.C. 1925.

⁴The most thorough account of St. Ambrose's views on such matters is to be found in the Columbia University doctoral dissertation of Richard C. Clark, *St. Ambrose's Theory of Church-State Relations*, New York, 1971, especially "Chapter VI. Church-State Relations II: The Conflicts With the Emperor Theodosius over the 'Immoral' Exercise of Sovereign Power" (pp. 150-191), which focuses on the once-notorious "Synagogue Affair" and the "Thessalonica Massacre." But see also Erich Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft*, Vol. I, J.C.B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1930, pp. 257-295.

⁵*De Civitate Dei*, I, Pref. 1. Quotations from St. Augustine that follow are all revised in some measure in accordance with the Latin texts in the *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (CLEL), Vienna, 1866ff., and in Migne, *Patrologie cursus completus, series Latina* (PL), Paris, 1844-1864. But the reader is also referred in each instance to the pages covering the passage in *The Political Writings of St. Augustine*, H. Paolucci, ed., Gateway, Chicago, 1962. For this first quotation, see p. 44.

⁶In *Joannis Evangelium*, CXV, 2. See *The Political Writings*, p. xix, and pp. 292-305.

⁷For a discussion of the parallels between the virtues of Divine Love (amor dei) and those of natural or erotic love (amor sui) as expounded by Aristotle, see *St. Augustine: Enchiridion on Faith, Hope and Love*, H. Paolucci, ed., Gateway, Chicago, 1961, pp. ix-xxi.

⁸See detail in *The Political Writings*, pp. xx-xxi, and the chapters titled "V. Ecclesiastical Intervention in Civil Affairs" (pp. 241-291) and "VI. Captivity in Babylon" (pp. 292-342).

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
1983 – 1985

President

Rev. Earl A. Weis, S.J.
Department of Theology
Loyola University
Chicago, IL 60626

Rev. Ronald Lawler, OFM Cap.
Director, Institute for Advanced
Studies in Catholic Doctrine
St. John's University
Jamaica, New York 11439

Vice President

Dr. Joseph Boyle
Department of Philosophy
University of St. Thomas
3812 Montrose Blvd.
Houston, TX 77006

Dr. William E. May
Catholic University of America
Department of Theology
Washington, D.C. 20064

Executive Secretary & Treasurer

Dr. Joseph P. Scottino
President
Gannon University
Erie, PA 16541

Prof. Ralph McInerny
University of Notre Dame
715 Memorial Library
Notre Dame, IN 46556

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

Directors:

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

Rev. James Schall, S.J.
37th & O Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20057

Dr. Anne CarsonDaly
1208 Enchanted Forest
South Bend, IN 46637

Rev. William Smith
St. Joseph's Seminary
Dunwoodie
Yonkers, N.Y. 10704

Dr. Raymond L. Dennehy
University of San Francisco
Campion Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

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

Dr. James Hitchcock
Department of History
St. Louis University
St. Louis, MO 63103

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

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

Listening: Journal of Religion and Culture devotes the Fall, 1983 issue to the subject area "Medicine and Morality." Major papers are the work of Fellowship members Dr. Herbert Ratner, Fr. Charles Corcoran, O.P., Fr. Paul Quay, S.J. and Fr. Robert Brungs, S.J. *Listening*, published three times a year is available at 3642 Lindell Blvd., St. Louis, Mo. 63108. Annual subscription \$7.00.

The *Young Catholic Committee*, has been established in St. Louis, its founders including Fellowship members James Hitchcock and Frs. Paul Quay and Richard Roach. The organization is open to Catholics from college age to age 40 and aims to provide a supportive and inspirational environment for young people seriously interested in living their faith in the modern world. Those interested in membership or further information should contact: Mr. Edward Peters, 539 W. 9th Street, Claremont, CA 91711.

REQUISCAT IN PACE: CARDINALS COOKE AND MEDEIROS

The two Cardinals of New York and Boston were among the earliest friends of the Fellowship and, over the years, among our most generous benefactors. Their death — at least to the general public — were surprising, but their lives contained no surprises if their faith, personal goodness, dedicated service to the Church, its people, and commitment to the Holy See are measuring rods. These eminent prelates did not forget us in life. Let us not forget them in death or in prayer.

FRIENDS FRIEND OF THE FELLOWSHIP

Rev. David E. Burns

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter
Published by St. John's University
Jamaica, New York 11439

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

3

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON FELLOWSHIP MEMBERSHIP

I am interested in information concerning the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars.

Name _____

Institution _____

Address _____

City & State _____ Zip Code _____

Send request to Dr. Joseph P. Scottino, Executive Secretary and Treasurer, Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, Gannon University, Erie, Pennsylvania 16541.