

# Newsletter

## Fellowship of Catholic Scholars

Volume 8, Number 3

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

June 1985

### Excerpts From Eighth Fellowship Convention

#### Msgr. Eugene V. Clark's Keynote Address:

##### "Magnetic Fields of Theology: An Historical Estimation"

The magnetic fields, to which I refer, are those endemic pressures that distract, even tear Catholic scholars from their proper work. Hardly an age has failed to produce them. Those pressures are created by a wide range of passions, high ones like love of the truth and the imitation of Christ; and fearful ones like love of place and power, venality and hatred of one's opponents. All these and other powerful human currents have swept honest scholars - not to mention the others - far from the harbors of unfettered research and disinterested reflection. Indeed, it is my thesis that most often, and especially when major issues rose within the Catholic community, it was extremely difficult for scholars not to be imperiously co-opted by the partisans.

Surely some scholars voluntarily abandoned the high ground and rejoiced in a party spirit the match of any street fighter. They are not the center of our interest this evening. We are interested in the fields themselves as destructive pressures on those who love the truth; and how difficult those pressures made it for scholars to shake off the passions of any age.

More often than not in Christian history it was extremely difficult for scholars to stay free of such magnetic pulls and, in many generations, only scholars of high vision and motivation rose above the importunings of honest partisans. Even more subtly, scholars some-

times succumbed to an estimable personal desire to solve the painful problems of the age. But in so far as they were problem-solvers, volunteers or not, they made it difficult for themselves to think and write with the detachment and freedom required of lovers of final truth.

Positively, we may put it this way. Since intellectual strife and partisan exchange among Christians never fade, and since it is extremely difficult for interested persons not to enter into such conflicts; and since great values are often the subject of such strife and the possible loss of those values alarms good men and women; and since the development of Christian doctrine has taken place, in no small measure, through the abrasions of such conflicts, we conclude that many fine scholars have either (a) been drawn into service in the conflicts and been lost in whole or in part to the search for objective Christian truth or (b) been so distracted by the furies of conflict that they lose their focus or (c) that they were so abused by partisans that they lost heart.

What can we conclude from that? That it takes something more than a fine mind and good intentions to serve the cause of truth - to make a positive contribution to the sound and universal development of Christian doctrine and the Christian self-image. No question, it requires a fine mind, deep education and a religious dedication to the truth; but beyond that, it requires considerable courage and strength of character to suffer the taunts of those who consider response to the spirit of the age a spiritual imperative; and who accuse those who respond to a higher love of truth, of being contemptuous

#### WHAT TO EXPECT IN THIS ISSUE?

##### *On Religious Life — p. 2*

"Truth alone is worthy of our entire devotion."

*Fr. Vincent McNabb, O.P.*

##### *On Cardinal Spellman — p. 8*

*Nihil de mortuis, nisi bonum.*

##### *On The Responsible Christian — p. 15*

"To discover and to teach are distinct functions; they are also distinct gifts, and are not commonly found united in the same person."

*Cardinal Newman*

## Excerpts From Eighth Fellowship Convention (*Cont'd*)

of the age and its human problems. That is a bitter charge and only men and women of virtue can bear it. Intellect is not safe without virtue as Newman never ceased to tell us.

And what rare balance of mind it takes to assist those who seek the truth in the flawed language of any age, and to respond to it without patronizing it or succumbing to it.

---

**Fr. Thomas Dubay, S.M.:  
"The Crisis in Religious Life"**

*Which institutes are attracting vocations and which are not?*

Now that we have partially explained why there has been a drastic reduction in candidates for religious life, we may turn our attention to a related question. What kind of institute is attracting the young who do enter and faithfully remain, and what kind attracts few or none? As I work both in our own country and abroad, I find the evidence overwhelming. Some congregations are attracting very large numbers. At last count the Missionaries of Charity had over 400 novices with 80 Americans in their formation program. An N.C. news account reported in the 70's that one congregation in New England with 300 professed members had 78 in formation, while another with 700 professed had only two novices. In my recent travels I have come across two provinces, of different institutes, one-half of whose membership was aged 35 or under. If you follow press releases carefully, you will find cases similar to these both in the United States and elsewhere. For example, a recent article tells us that, as of the writing, 1982, the Carmelite Sisters of the Sacred Heart had 135 professed with 11 novices and 8 postulants. The Daughters of St. Paul had 150 professed in the United States, 25 novices and 40 postulants. The Immaculate Heart of Mary Sisters in Nigeria had 352 professed, 81 novices and 179 postulants. The Oblates of the Virgin Mary had 135 priests and 20 brothers in the entire world and yet they had over 200 students studying for the priesthood. Of this number 75 were Americans. These are publicly known facts and they do not need further documentation here. What does need to be noted, indeed to be proclaimed, are the striking differences between institutes like these which do and others which do not attract the young. I shall summarize these differences under several captions.

1. Lifestyle. Young people are choosing communities that put prayer first, live a genuine frugality, still believe in obedience, and therefore have not abandoned the essentials of the religious life. They are avoiding groups that have conceived of renewal as a stripping

down operation, a gradual abandonment of one obligation after another, always of course in the name of updating. Institutes that have neglected or rejected essentials, that have embraced a whole series of mitigations, whose lifestyle is therefore anything but prophetic, have empty novitiates. Youth are voting with their feet.

2. Unity. Successful institutes are united, while the dying ones are polarized. Congregations whose main thrust has been toward secularization invariably have, in my experience, a large minority who reject what has been imposed upon them. They are sharply divided, a fact that is seldom noted any more in the press but is apparent to anyone who has grassroots contacts with the minorities. Their polarization bespeaks uncertainty, confusion and even conflict. They are not corporately attractive.

3. Visible witness. Most young men and women are drawn to communities that have retained a religious habit, while they tend to avoid those which have embraced secular dress. Every institute I know of which is attracting large numbers of candidates has a uniform garb. Once again, the young are voting with their feet.

4. Ecclesial obedience. Institutes which are gladly receptive of Catholic teaching and discipline are prospering, while those whose leadership reject this teaching and discipline or are selective in their responses are withering on the vine. The evidence is striking, indeed, unmistakable. It is not only that God rewards obedience with his blessing, it is also the simple fact that authenticity works. Congregations that accept all of Vatican Council II and the new canon law are the very ones that have retained the essentials of their life. Our young people are sharp enough to see this.

5. Theological validity. We may summarize the differences between vibrant communities and those in a moribund condition by saying that the former are following the only viable theology of the three counsels that we have, while the latter have no coherent theology at all. Secularized institutes are following a curious and selective admixture of some favored Gospel ideas together with what they call their lived experiences. The latter are sometimes at odds both with Scripture and with canon law.

6. Vocation vs. career. Young men and women are seeking admittance into communities which are pursuing a vocation; they are avoiding those which seem to be following careers. The life of the counsels is not first of all a job to be done, a career. It is a participation in the paschal mystery, a particular way of being in love with God — that is to say, it is a vocation. Youth may not know the theory behind this distinction, but they do have the acumen to grasp that men and women whose predominant concern is work to be done are not pursuing a

## Excerpts From Eighth Fellowship Convention (*Cont'd*)

vocation.

The answer to our question, therefore, "which institutes are succeeding?" may be summarized in simple terms: young men and women in impressive numbers are seeking authentic communities, that is, those which are deeply Gospel and fully obedient to those whom the Lord has sent to govern his Church.

---

### John A. Guegen: Public Morality in Liberal Democracy

Why is there fundamental disagreement in the United States over right and wrong, even among persons who seriously try to reason out matters of public morality?

A recurrence to the founding of our democratic republic has been recommended in order to end moral disorder, but this cannot produce the necessary consensus. The reason is that no essential harmony exists between that founding and the principles of Judeo-Christian moral theology. There is thus no one tradition that could be called both Christian and democratic in America. Rather, we are the witnesses of two foundings whose principles cannot be reconciled for they proceed from different views of human nature and God's law. The recent public debate over morality and policy provides an opportunity to clarify this fundamental divergence.

When we contrast Judeo-Christian moral theology and modern liberal democracy we see that each makes choices difficult for the other because of a tension between the demands of Christian sainthood and democratic citizenship. Christian morality respects the distinction in principle between religion and morality while making moral norms an integral part of religious teaching. Thus where there are different understandings of Christian religion (as in America) there will also be different understandings of Christian morality, and these will pass on into public life. When we admit that religion has thus had a great influence on public virtue in America, we must ask which religion and then go on to differentiate two opposed traditions — two spirits seeking to build two cities.

The dominant of the two may be called Protestant for it derives from the Puritan settlement and extends through the constitutional founding and Transcendentalism into Pragmatism. The other tradition may be called Catholic, for it derives from the Franciscan settlement in the Southwest and extends through the establishment of a church hierarchy at the time of independence and into 19th-century efforts to consciously identify itself. Contrasts between these two traditions are striking. In sum, the first tries to bring God's laws into

conformity with the sovereign people according to a principle of republican authority; the second tries to bring the people into conformity with God's sovereign laws according to a principle of hereditary authority. While the first bends moral norms to civic purposes, the second seeks to bring civil society into conformity with objective moral norms. Underlying this dichotomy is the fundamental clash between the social contract theory of society and the view that man is originally a social being.

It is necessary that we study these opposed traditions of Christian morality if we are to understand what gives rise to contemporary controversies over morality and policy, and beyond that to clarify future public discourse. We should be grateful to the recent presidential campaign for having provided this timely opportunity to become aware of the two spirits and to look ahead to a post-Protestant era in American public life, now that the old civil religion has proven unable to stem our slide into neopaganism. Together with this we can expect a realignment of Protestants and Catholics when thoughtful people come to realize what has brought us into this situation of conflict between two moral traditions. As Catholic scholars sensitive to objective moral truth, we are obliged to press for a Catholic Reformation of American morals and politics.

---

### Response to Prof. Guegen by Fr. Francis Canavan, S.J.

The tension between the Protestant and the Catholic traditions in America is a tension that has always existed within the Protestant tradition itself.

On the one hand, private judgment, the autonomy of the individual conscience, the responsibility of the individual directly to God without the mediation of the Church.

On the other hand, the supremacy of God's word revealed in the Bible, the objective law of God as revealed, the duty to bring society into conformity with God's will.

This tension did not erode the basic consensus of American society as long as there was substantial agreement on the content of morality and on God's will that it be observed.

The strain began to produce the effects that Guegen points to as Protestant individualism became secularized.

Protestantism was always more nationalistic than Catholicism, hence more inclined to identify faith and culture.

## Excerpts From Eighth Fellowship Convention (*Cont'd*)

But for a long time it saw its task in the country as that of producing a Christian civilization.

Alexander Bickel, *The Morality of Consent*.

We operate in this country on the "liberal contractarian model" of society, which "rests on a vision of individual rights that have a clearly defined, independent existence predating society and are derived from nature and from a natural, if imagined, contract. Society must bend to these rights."

John H. Hallowell, *The Decline of Liberalism as an Ideology*.

The original "integral" liberalism saw society as a collection of autonomous individuals united by contract,

but endowed with reason, which would recognize an objectively valid moral law that provided society with its necessary basis for consensus.

As people came to doubt, not only divine revelation, but the power of reason to arrive at transcendent truth, the original liberalism disintegrated.

R. Bruce Douglass, "Liberalism as a Threat to Democracy," in Francis Canavan, ed., *The Ethical Dimension of Political Life*.

Liberalism is commonly supposed to be the necessary foundation of liberal democracy.

In fact, however, it constantly undermines democracy by making moral consensus impossible.

George Will, *Statecraft as Soulcraft*.

The policies adopted by government inevitably have moral effects in that they shape the character of the citizens.

Therefore, government should stop pretending to be morally neutral and take social morals into account in choosing its policies.

Will makes James Madison the villain of our morally-indifferent pluralistic society, not quite fairly.

## Is Christianity Really True?

● Anglican Priest Eric L. Mascall, writing in *The Times* (of London) October 13, 1984 asked this question: "Is Christianity really true?" In part Fr. Mascall said:

"That question can be quite simply stated as follows: Is the Christian religion derived from a revelation given by God in Christ and having an unconditional claim on our obedience or is it something to be constructed by us in response to our own desires and the pressures and assumptions of contemporary culture?"

"It is no valid objection to this formulation to point out that Christians have always tended to give way to their desires and to contemporary cultural influences and that these have colored the policies and even the doctrinal utterances of ecclesiastical institutions. What we have today is a situation in which from within the church itself, the former alternative is widely abandoned or even explicitly denied: and the church's official spokesmen only too often stand aside in an attitude of puzzled helplessness.

"And nowhere is this more strikingly and surprisingly exemplified than in the recent history of the Roman Catholic communion...

"And in the United States, where, in addition to every variety of protestantism from fundamentalism to radical scepticism, there are a number of extremely independent Roman Catholic biblical scholars and where respect for academic freedom has become the first of the commandments with veneration for democratic processes a close second...

"And the Anglican Church in spite of honorable pockets of resistance, has seemed only too ready to yield contentedly to the pressures of contemporary secularism and even to see itself as simply a forum for debate on themes of current religious interest.

"A welcome reaction against this climate of theological defeatism has come with the foundation in July 1981 at Ann Arbor, Michigan, of the Centre of Pastoral Renewal, largely as the result of a conference of 80 scholars and pastoral leaders from Evangelical Protestant and Roman Catholic sources with a sprinkling of Anglicans, to consider the challenge which contemporary society presents to Christians of all traditions.

"The two volumes which the centre has produced, *Christianity Confronts Modernity* and *Summons to Faith and Renewal* form in effect a reasoned answer to the question which at the beginning of this article I stated as the overreaching question for the Christian churches today."

## The President's Corner

Once again an annual meeting of the Fellowship, our eighth, March 22-24, has passed into history. It was a good meeting, probably our largest ever in general attendance but also with maximum attendance in individual sessions, where the quality of the papers was evidently the magnate.

Monsignor Eugene V. Clark opened the convention with an address showing by concrete examples in the history of the Church how often it is that elements really extraneous to doctrinal issues themselves bring it about that theological crises arise that rattle the ecclesial structures. It is a reminder to us that even faithful scholarship of the highest standard may not be of sufficient weight to hold things down in a storm.

The first plenary session, so well organized by Dr. Regis A. Factor, was a fruitful discussion of the bishops' economy draft that merged into the more general topic of Catholic political thought. Our past president Father William B. Smith capped the morning's work with a hilarious luncheon talk putting the proper perspective on a number of recent trends and events in the American scene.

Saturday afternoon Professor Elizabeth Anscombe and Dr. Germain Grisez, two of our philosopher moralists, held the close attention of the audience with their addresses, while in the evening Father Thomas Dubay directed his critique at practice in contemporary religious life. On Sunday morning Fr. R. V. Young Jr. gave an outstanding paper on Jacques Derrida—who, it so happened, was speaking that weekend at a well-known Catholic university on the other side of town.

Thanks are due to the speakers and all who contributed to the success of the convention—our genial founder, Msgr. George Kelly, Dr. Joseph Scottino, executive secretary-treasurer, Father Paul Quay (for his beautiful homily at Mass), to mention just a few by way of example. All of these people gave of themselves so generously that it was a pleasure to cooperate with them.

At the business meeting the most significant item discussed was the date of the 1986 convention. There was a consensus in favor of moving it from Spring to Fall, when academic calendars are less crowded, and so at the board of directors meeting Sunday noon it was determined to hold the next convention in September of 1986.

I appointed a committee to nominate candidates for election to the offices, including my own, that will be vacated this fall. The committee is made up of the former presidents and present president of the Fellowship along with our executive secretary-treasurer. You are invited to send your suggestions to the last mentioned, Dr. Scottino.

In my presidential address, I again went to my theme that the Fellowship will have to work hard to maintain its distinctive character and to avoid being absorbed by other organizations with, perhaps, related goals but quite different means. I also invoked words of our Holy Father that set before us the ideal of a Catholic scholar, who shows not only learning and loyalty but charity and the other virtues of a follower of Christ. I may be preaching to the saved—there seemed to be a lot of this ideal concretized in the people I saw at the convention.

Fr. Earl Weis, S.J.

## Item of Interest

- *On Demoralizing the Language* by John A. Hammes (*Pastoral Renewal*, November 1984 p. 55)

...It is not difficult to see that modern society wishes to remove moral judgment from various kinds of sexual behavior. Most of the current terms are couched in attractive garb. For example, being "sexually active" is far more appealing than being "sexually inactive," a phrase conveying a sense of being stagnant, or perhaps useless. Premarital chastity, formerly a positive trait, is thus viewed negatively. The significance is not lost on the teenager, who now has a rationalization for sexual indulgence, in an apparently legitimate "search for sexual identity."

In a related area, "abortion" was once a negative term. It is seen today in a positive light, such that the pro-life position is called an "antiabortion" movement, a frowned-upon reaction to pro-abortion views.

How this manipulation of language can influence people's judgment was illustrated in the phrasing of a public opinion poll question on a human life amendment. The same question was worded two ways, and given to the same respondent at different places in the questionnaire. When the question was worded, "Do you think there should be an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting abortions, or shouldn't there be such an amendment?" the responses were: Should Be—29 percent, Shouldn't Be—67 percent, with the remainder undecided. The key phrase in the question was "prohibiting abortions." However, when worded, "Do you believe there should be an amendment to the Constitution protecting the life of the unborn child, or shouldn't there be such an amendment?" the responses were: Should be—50 percent, Shouldn't Be—39 percent with the remainder undecided. The key phrase here was "protecting the life of the unborn child."

## Items of Interest

- J. Peter Grace, chairman of the President's Private Sector on Cost Control has an interesting booklet entitled "We can blow the Whistle on Government Waste!". Available from 1511 K. St. North West Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20005.
- St. Paul's Publishing Co., P.O. Box 772, Fort Scott, Kansas, 66701 publishes a *Children's Magazine*, designed as a journal of Christian culture with the objective of presenting the world under the aspect of wonder. The magazine is attractively printed. For further information write Alan J. Hicks, Managing Editor. Annual subscription \$7.00.
- The International Marian Research Institute (IMRI), affiliated with the Roman pontifical faculty *Marianum* will hold a Summer School (June 17-July 26, 1985) at the University of Dayton, Ohio 45469 (Tel. [513] 229-4214). Faculty includes Fr. Eamon R. Carroll, O. Carm., Fr. Fred Jelly, O.P., Fr. Lucio Pincus, OSM, and Fr. Rene Laurentin. The subjects: Mary and the Spirit, Vatican II, and the Feminine, in the Liturgy.
- Studio 60 is publishing two new books: *The Children's Book of Saints Illustrated* and *The Saints*, the latter containing the history, legends, and feast days of 100 patron saints. For information write to David Ross, 610 Canyon Road, Santa Fe, N.M. 87501, Tel. (505) 988-3133.
- *Ethics and Medics* is a monthly publication of the Pope John Center (4455 Woodson Road, St. Louis, MO 63134, \$12 per annum) worth having. The March issue deals with AIDs as contagion and the sterilization of the retarded women. The April issue contains Msgr. Carlo Caffara's address to the bishops on the Family.
- Msgr. Richard Malone of the USCC has co-authored the foreword and assisted in the translation of the English edition of *Contemporary Perspectives on Christian Marriage*, published by Loyola University Press, Chicago. He also served as general editor of the English translation of *Theology of the Priesthood*, written by Father Jean Galot, S.J., and published by Ignatius Press, San Francisco.  
The first book treats the New Testament's teaching on marriage, the indissolubility of marriage, and pastoral care of the divorced and civilly remarried Catholic. Msgr. Malone co-authored the book's foreword with Father John R. Connery, S.J.
- Fr. Paul Quay's article "Utilizing the Bodies of the Dead," (St. Louis U. Law Journ., vol. 28, 4, 1984 p. 889) seeks to show that the Uniform Anatomical Gift Act (now law everywhere in this country) is destructive not only of what is best in our law but also contrary to sound morality, sound theology, and is a further corruption of our culture. He also has an article on moral revisionism in the forthcoming June 1985 issue of *Theological Studies*. The title: "The Disvalue of Ontic."
- Rev. Jacques Monet, s.j., President of Regis College, Toronto, is happy to announce that Rev. John Hochban, S.J. is to become a Member of the Lonergan Research Institute in that city. The Institute is devoted to the study of the ideas of the noted theologian Rev. Bernard Lonergan, S.M. Fr. Hochban's expertise is in Greek, Latin, and Theology.
- The AFFIRMATION FOR CATHOLIC WOMEN with a list of over 4,000 signatures has been sent to Bishop Joseph L. Imesch, Chairman of the National Council of Catholic Bishops commission on the forthcoming Pastoral Letter on women's issues. The document affirms the teaching of the Catholic Church and support of Pope John Paul II, and is being circulated by WOMEN FOR FAITH AND FAMILY, a St. Louis based organization.  
This preliminary list was sent to the bishops for their hearings in Washington, D.C. March 4-5, and it will be sent to the Pope within the next few days. Helen Hull Hitchcock, a spokesman for the organization, says the collection of signatures will continue and future lists of names of women signing the statement will also be forwarded to the Bishops' commission and to the Vatican.  
"The overwhelming response of the past few weeks clearly indicates that there are many thousands of Catholic women all over the country who deeply desire to have an opportunity to express their faithfulness to the Church and to the Holy Father", Mrs. Hitchcock said.  
The AFFIRMATION has recently been translated into Spanish by women in Miami for use among Spanish-speaking Catholic women in this country. Signatures have also been received from India, Canada and Mexico, in addition to every State in the continental U.S.
- The new Roman Academic Center has been established to confer licentiates and doctorates in canon law and theology. It is affiliated with the University of Navarre in Spain. Those who are interested in this rather new ecclesiastical enterprise, which has the enthusiastic backing of John Paul II, may secure further information from: Fr. C. John McCloskey, 330 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10028 (212) 222-3285.

## Books Received

### From the Ignatius Press

- Adrienne von Speyr, *Confession*, (262 pp., \$9.50)

The author discusses the moral and practical aspects of the sacrament of penance and reconciliation: scruples, imperfect contrition, laxity, frequency, confession for saints etc. She is a Swiss convert and a medical doctor. Fr. von Balthasar wrote the foreword.

- James Hitchcock, *Years of Crisis: Collected Essays 1970-1983* (285 pp. \$10.95)

A collection of essays on modern philosophies, current ecclesiastical trends, the family, the media, etc. The book attempts to go beyond events to the cultural forces underlying their meaning.

- Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Glory of the Lord: II Studies in Theological Style: Clerical Styles* (670 pp. \$35.00)

Fr. Balthasar in this volume shows how the Biblical vision of divine glory revealed in the crucified and risen Christ fulfills and transcends the perception of Being in Western metaphysics. We have here a series of monographs each of which illustrates the different ways in which theologians have shaped their works — Irenaeus, Augustine, Denys, Ambrose, Bonaventure, Anselm. This has been called an exercise in wisdom theology.

- Jean Galot, S.J. *Theology of the Priesthood*, (267 pp. \$15.95)

This is a comprehensive study of the nature and meaning of the Catholic priesthood. Galot reviews the scriptural, historical and theological questions raised today about Holy Orders. His synthesis ranks with the best in the tradition of authentic Catholic theology.

*Theology of the Priesthood*, also translated by Father Balducelli, is an updated treatment of origins of the priesthood, the emergence of the threefold distinction of orders, the issue of women's ordination, and the differences between the sacramental, ministerial priesthood and the general priesthood of all believers. The book, according to Msgr. Malone, "is thoroughly consistent with Vatican II's renewal of Catholic thought on the priestly ministry."

- Cardinal John Wright, *The Saints Always Belong to the Present*, (221 pp. \$8.95)

These reflections on seventeen saints cover such diverse personalities as Thomas More, Athanasius, Joan of Arc, Elizabeth Anne Seton and Francis of Assisi. Cardinal Wright was interested in the timelessness of timely saints and writes as well as he spoke.

- Michael Leary, *Questioned by Christ* (220 pp. \$8.95)

A new author, Michael Leary reflects here on the pointed questions Christ raised for various people in scripture and asks the same questions of moderns. The book deals with sacrifice, Christian Identity, Providence, the Eucharist, the Word of God, Resurrection and a dozen other subjects. Mr. Leary, the father of seven children, was for ten years a director of religious education.

- John F. Kippley, *Birth Control and Christian Discipleship* (Couple to Couple League, P.O. Box, 11084, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45211, \$2.00, Discounts available)

A popular summary of the history and consequences of the contraceptive movement with an important analysis of natural family planning and its relation to Christian discipleship.

- *The Harvard Ukrainian Studies Fund* has published a booklet on the formation of the Ukrainian nation called *From Kievan Rus' to Modern Ukraine*, to offset the presumption of many American academics that 1988 will mark the thousandth anniversary of the Russian nation and Russian Orthodoxy. The stress here is that the Ukrainian culture and people are direct heirs of Kievan Rus', not the Soviet State. A companion booklet by Bodham R. Bociurkiw is entitled *Ukrainian Churches Under Soviet Rule: Two Case Studies*. Both are available from Studies Fund at Harvard.

- Andre Godin, S.J., *The Psychology of Religious Vocations: Problems of Religious Life*, (Translated and Edited by LeRoy A. Wauck for the University of America, 103 pp No Price)

The crisis within the Church can in one sense be identified with the crisis experienced in recent years among religious men and women. In five short chapters; Fr. Godin (and LeRoy Wauck, a Fellowship member) explore the etiology of that crisis from the viewpoint of research psychology. Obviously this approach concentrates on the individual and on individual explanations of vocation choices and vocation breakdowns. Individual adaptation and individual dislocation are related to the presence or absence of social purpose and unity. Consequently sociological studies must complement psychological studies, although in either case the philosophical assumptions of researchers are factors tilting conclusions one way or another.

This is an interesting book which presents its modest conclusions with due respect for the complexity of the questions it raises.

## Book Reviews

John Cooney, *The American Pope* (Times Books 1985, pp. 365 \$19.95)

Serious students, and amateurs who like a well told tale that has the facts straight, will find this book unsatisfactory in every way and will regret that the author has failed to do justice to an important story. He is reticent about his own background, attainments and tastes, and does not tell us how long he worked on it, but if we take his bibliography at face value he has read widely though not always with insight. He lists 134 books, 114 articles and 14 archival sources plus, in a special category, the FBI and State Department documents now available under the Freedom of Information Act. All this is supplemented by numerous interviews with people in various walks of life and places. They included a number of priests who, significantly, demanded anonymity. Three others whom he quotes by name - Bishop Patrick V. Ahern and Msgrs. Eugene V. Clark and George A. Kelly, who were very close to the Cardinal, repudiate in *toto* the remarks attributed to them. There are 277 footnotes. The author was a feature writer for the Wall Street Journal and the book is published by a wholly owned subsidiary of the New York Times.

In spite of such respectable credentials and the elaborate scholarly apparatus the book is basically muck-raking adjusted to contemporary standards in some segments of the American publishing world. They seem to require, in biographies, at least the intimation, or better still the accusation, of sexual misconduct and if the author wishes to be thought to have reached the ultimate in sophistication he will bring in homosexuality. So for the first time the latter charge is brought against a high-ranking prelate of the Catholic Church in America - in this case Cardinal Spellman - and is used as part of a frontal assault on his character and policies. Authors and publishers know well that such charges often promote sales and that even if the charges may be dropped, or as in this case, toned down before publication, they are helpful with pre-release publicity.

Apart from this factitious scandal, which is its one claim to notice, the book is gravely defective in three major areas. They are: its deep and unexplained dislike of the Cardinal, which results in an almost comically distorted portrait; the great number of factual errors; and the failure to understand the terrain it covers in both the ecclesiastical and civil spheres. The author is like a man looking through a stained-glass window from the outside and missing much of the pattern. Beginning with a thesis and a conclusion and looking for evidence to sustain them, he has accumulated a mass of material, much of which he has not understood or absorbed.

Understandably many of his statements of fact are correct, but a surprisingly large number are not, and the conclusions he draws and the judgments he makes are

often quite wide of the mark.

The Cardinal emerges as an ecclesiastical adventurer, avid for power and money, who used or tried to use everyone who crossed his path. He is allowed an occasional kind gesture or generous act, but fundamentally he is portrayed as a one-dimensional man on the make. In reality he was an able, openly ambitious and aggressive man in whom there was much more than met the eye. He had a natural aptitude for administration and public affairs, a truly remarkable memory, apparently inexhaustible energy and supreme self-confidence. Understandably such a man sometimes found it hard to accept unsolicited advice, warning or opposition from subordinates on any level. He was a complicated and formidable man who knew what he wanted and went after it. Ever practical, when he needed money he went to the rich and when he needed help in other areas he went to those who could give it. Could or should it have been otherwise, or could he have asked Dorothy Day for money for a High School? Speaking of her, how could the author possibly know that Bishop McIntyre gave her money "almost superstitiously"? (P. 90).

The range of his interests brought the Cardinal an exceptionally large number of contacts with people of all kinds, and he touched many lives as he moved easily in the corridors of power in the Church at home and abroad, in public life and in the Armed Forces. No other American bishop ever had the same standing and influence at home and abroad, received so much publicity, or had so much information about him available in the public domain for so many years. Still there were limits the publicity often obscured. He was never all powerful, even in Church affairs in America under Pius XII. He had powerful opponents and even enemies in some of the other areas he moved in, and inspired quite different reactions. He had his share of defeats, at which the author rejoices. He failed to win justice for the Catholic schools, and to restrain commercialized pornography, but no one could have tried harder, and his effort was necessary even when there was no hope of success. He surely was not "the Twentieth Century Church's most prominent priest". (p. 9).

It is precisely this indifference to facts that destroys the book's pretension to scholarship or even to be a reasonably accurate potboiler. The carelessness is puzzling because almost all its mistakes could have been detected by any competent researcher or secretary willing to spend a few hours in a good reference library. Here malice has been blunted by indolence.

A few examples from the account of the Church in New York will show how the author uses the sources. The McGlynn case, on which a substantial amount of material is in print, is misrepresented seriously. He was excommunicated for public defiance of a papal order,



## Book Reviews

not for defending unions. His subsequent reconciliation is not mentioned. The Holy See questioned but did not oppose unions and when the case here had been studied carefully was guided by the opinion of the American Bishops. Henry George's books were never put on the Index. The Church never denied the State's right to educate. It did deny vigorously, and the U.S. Supreme Court agreed with it in the Oregon School Case in 1925, McGlynn's claim that the State had a monopoly in that area. (pp. 20-21).

The estimated Catholic population of the Archdiocese in 1939 was one million, not two million. There were 7 Consultors, not 27. The dramatic scene depicted on page 87 in which the new Archbishop publicly demanded Bishop Donahue's resignation is pure fiction. During the vacancy of the See, Bishop Donahue held four posts. He was Administrator of the Archdiocese, the auxiliary bishop, a consultor and pastor of Holy Name Parish. His appointment as Administrator lapsed automatically the moment Archbishop Spellman took his oath of office. He remained a consultor until 1959 and was auxiliary bishop and pastor until Cardinal Cooke introduced mandatory retirement in 1969. He had not appointed pastors while Administrator but had, as the law allowed, appointed administrators, all of whom were confirmed, as is customary, by the new Archbishop. Some of them had been appointed pastors orally by Cardinal Hayes, who died before the letters of appointment could be signed. Had the Bishop offered his resignation from any of his posts before the new Archbishop was installed the Archbishop would have been canonically incapable of receiving it as he still had no authority in New York. Msgr. (not Father) Waring, Vicar General and Chancellor of the Military Ordinariate, was never a consultor. Msgr. Gaetano Arcese (not "Guglielmo Arcessi") was neither Roman trained nor a nephew of Cardinal Gasparri.

Cardinal O'Connell was not "glaringly absent" from the installation of Archbishop Spellman. (p. 85). Installing Archbishops is a function of the Apostolic Delegate (now the Pro-Nuncio) and the task fell properly to Archbishop Cicognani. At that time protocol here required that Cardinals not attend functions in which they would out-shine the hero of the day, so none of the American Cardinals appeared. The exception was if they had a specific task to perform, as Cardinal Dougherty had on March 12, 1940, when, substituting for Cardinal O'Connell, he conferred the Pallium on Archbishop Spellman. Father Henry Browne (p. 325) was assigned to and removed from the pastorate of St. Gregory's Parish by Cardinal Cooke, not Cardinal Spellman. There never was a throne in 452 Madison (p. 94). Cardinal Spellman did not detest unions. (p. 108). They usually have no trouble telling friend from foe and knew that all during his

administration of New York he insisted on union labor in the immense building programs he carried out. The Calvary strike was the one painful exception to his general attitude. At the same time, and unlike many other bishops, he was not afraid to play the role of candid and critical friend when he found it necessary to do so.

It would be hard to prove that New York is "the most important See in the world other than Rome". (p. 211). There was no link between Pat Scanlan's and The Brooklyn Tablet's support of most of the Spellman causes and Scanlan's three brothers- all priests, prelates and pastors in New York - none of whom ever worked in "the Powerhouse", (p. 220).

Mixed marriages were never "considered anathema in the church" or they could not be permitted. They were and are discouraged (p. 101). James Pike was not a bishop while he was Dean of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine (p. 232). On March 17, 1948, President Truman and the Cardinal spoke at the annual dinner of "The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick", one of the oldest public dinners in New York. Barring some truly exceptional circumstances it has been attended by the Archbishop of New York for many, many years. Yet we are told as an explanation of the warm welcome the Cardinal received that "the fact that a man of his office appeared at all was what the men found so inspiring". In fairness to Cardinal Hayes it should be said that the relative ease with which the financial problems he left his successor were solved suggests they were not as serious as is usually said. The second half of the Hayes administration coincided almost exactly with the Great Depression, the worst this country has ever seen.

The most widely publicized aspects of the Spellman era were his relations with the Vatican and the White House, and his work as Military Vicar and they could not be kept in watertight compartments. Here again we find the indifference to facts and the superficial grasp of major issues that mar the other sections of this book. Pius XI, to whom young Msgr. Spellman owed so much, and who was one of the strongest and most learned popes since the Reformation, is dismissed as "a cranky, bullheaded man who like his recent predecessors was intent upon merely preserving the papacy, not enhancing it". (p. 35). So much for the Pope of the Missions (including the native Chinese hierarchy), Catholic Action, the Lateran Treaty and the Vatican Radio - the man who said "The Church must always be healthily modern." His courageous and vigorous denunciation of Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini and of anti-semitism in any form brought him reluctant admiration even from many of the bitterly anti-Catholic Liberals in the West and filled the faithful children of the Church with pride.

Pius XII receives more extended coverage, partly because of his role in Cardinal Spellman's career and

## Book Reviews

partly because of the War. He was one of the great teaching popes, the Father of the Native African hierarchies and a great patron of Biblical studies and Liturgical reform. Regardless of who wrote it, the description of him attributed to Cardinal Roncalli without any source being cited, that he "saw only power, privilege and confrontation with Communism" is, in Cardinal Newman's classic phrase, a grave and gratuitous slander. (p. 26). As Nuncio in Germany, 1917-1929, Secretary of State, 1930-1939, and Pope since March 2, 1939, he had seen the storm clouds gathering over Europe, and the growing menace of Communism from the East. Hence his natural desire for relations with Washington as the only possible counter balance to Russian. His early concerns in dealing with Washington were diplomatic relations, the bombing of Rome and, the post-war erection of barriers to Communism, which Rome had first condemned in 1846.

As has happened so often in Rome the pendulum swung all the way over after the death of Pius XII and there could hardly have been a greater contrast than the one presented by John XXIII. Naturally the Pacelli-Spellman relationship could not be duplicated but the new Pope needed help the Cardinal was able and willing to give. The Pope's extraordinary personal popularity, enhanced by sympathy and respect for the magnificent way he met his death, obscured for many the simplicity of his views on politics. His program of universal, indiscriminate, and inexhaustible benevolence was not enough and the idea (p. 277) that under Khrushchev the Kremlin was interested in better relations with Rome was illusory. When he opened the Vatican Council and left it a largely free hand he unleashed forces that have not yet run their course.

Paul VI presented yet another study in contrast. He had known the Cardinal since the latter arrived in Rome in 1925 and they were both junior officials in the Secretariat of State. A man with all the private virtues, he was uncomfortable with authority and had in full measure the three classic defects in a chief executive: he hated to make up his mind, he was excessively timid, and often showed he was a poor judge of men. He had the very hard task of concluding Vatican II and trying to implement it properly. In many areas he needed help he was unwilling to accept. He was so averse to the use of force under any circumstances that he seemed not to care which side won a war or what they fought about, as long as the fighting stopped. More than once he explained that he abstained from public criticism of the Communist regimes and their persecution of the Church lest he provoke further repression he could do nothing to stop. Consequently he put all his trust in prayer, dialogue and diplomacy.

In the description of the Cardinal's dealings with Rome and of Roman affairs there are a number of minor

mistakes. If Monsignor Spellman had been appointed Bishop of Portland or Manchester he would not have had to report to Cardinal O'Connell (p. 54) and he was never 'given the right to succeed the Boston Cardinal' (p.55), though it was generally assumed he would do so. The smoke from the Sistine Chapel signaling the election of a Pope is white, not gray (p. 259). Cardinal Merry DelVal, as all who know anything of the reign of St. Pius X are aware, did not enter "the Church with the clear intention of holding high office" (p. 19). Cardinal Von Galen, whom the author rightly praises, was not a Bavarian (p. 151). Cardinal Spellman had no authority to order Msgr. Kaas to mark the length of St. Patrick's Cathedral on the floor of St. Peter's Basilica (p. 217). It is not true, as Harold Tittman, Myron Taylor's assistant in Rome, is quoted as telling Fr. Vincent McCormick, S.J. in Rome, that the Holy See had not condemned the bombing of the German cities (p. 153). The text of the Papal Letter to the Bishop of Berlin deploring the destruction of the Cathedral of Berlin in April 1943 is given in a book listed in the bibliography of this book. It is "Pius XII and the Third Reich" by Saul Friedlander, N.Y. 1966 (p. 35). If the newly elected John XXIII, having donned the papal costume, sat on a throne facing the altar of the Sistine Chapel while the Cardinals came up singly to pay homage they would have had to approach him from the rear. The rule is to place a chair on the predella so that his back is to the altar.

Three other items worthy of greater attention involve Pius XII and Paul VI. When he accepted his appointment to New York the new Archbishop knew he would receive the Red Hat in due time. He knew too that if he chose to remain in Boston he would receive it there. No other American bishop has ever had such a choice. As things turned out he received it in New York on the very day on which he would have received it in Boston, where Cardinal O'Connell had died in 1944. Therefore the suggestion (pp. 211-212) that having received the Hat he felt free to oppose the Pope who could no longer do anything for him or to him is quite unfounded.

The visit of Pope Paul VI on October 4, 1965, is misinterpreted in an attempt to make it seem that it was intended somehow to represent a snub to the Cardinal, who is described as having wished to accompany the Pope to his interview with President Johnson and to have served as his interpreter. In fact he did not belong at the interview and knew that. As etiquette required, the Pope was introduced to the President by the State Department's Chief of Protocol, and the same source supplied an interpreter. The Pope spent 14 hours in New York and his visit is described in great detail - almost minute by minute - in a 120 page book brought out later by The New York Times, which was on strike at the time of his visit. It is not listed in the bibliography. The elaborate

## Book Reviews

lunch in the Chancery during which the Pope sat on a throne is another of the author's flights of fancy, and never took place. The Pope and his private secretary had lunch alone with the Cardinal in his official residence. The visit was so short because the Pope was reluctant to be away longer from Rome while the Vatican Council was actually in session. Finally, on Rome, having overestimated the Cardinal's strength there earlier the author underestimated it at the end. The most convincing proof of his continued clout was his ability to pick his successor. He knew before his death that his request that Bishop Cooke succeed him had been granted. He did not have to watch the mail every day, he had been told directly by the Pope himself. When he himself sent letters with a small cross in front of his signature it did not mean he wanted to see the recipient; he was using an immemorial sign of his rank as a bishop. (p. 92).

The Cardinal's relations with the White House are easier to trace. They were closer than those his predecessors had or wanted or could have had, and were due largely to World War II and the problems it created. The Cardinal was an early and ardent supporter of Roosevelt's rearmament program and was one of the very few bishops who thought America should and would enter the War. He greatly admired the President, whose diplomatic skills and knowledge of world politics he overrated greatly in the beginning. He needed his help in his work as Military Vicar, and in the opening of diplomatic relations with the Vatican and always remained grateful for it. The President, in turn, was grateful for the support he received from the Cardinal. Naturally they did not always see eye to eye. When the Taylor mission to the Vatican was being discussed many wondered what the President's representative would do. Part of the answer came when Roosevelt attempted to have Bishop Sheil, a devoted follower of his, named to Chicago and was amazed when he failed. The author seems not to know that the refusal had nothing to do with the President. It was caused by Rome's knowledge that the bishop, a likeable man with a large following, was a notoriously poor administrator. He blames the Cardinal unfairly for wishing to weaken the separation of Church and State but does not criticize the President for wishing to pick bishops and for threatening to have the IRS examine the personal tax returns of all the Archbishops if Father Coughlin was not put off the air (p. 110). Bishop Michael Gallagher was not the Archbishop of Detroit (p. 58), a title first given to his successor, Archbishop Mooney, who did silence Father Coughlin.

Though their agreement on foreign policy was a strong link between Roosevelt and the Cardinal, it did not last. On October 24, 1939, after a session at the White House the Cardinal was convinced that "over the course of the next several decades the foreign policy

objectives of the United States and the Vatican were miles apart". The change was due to Russia's reluctant entry into the War which transformed the political situation here and in Europe, and to Roosevelt's reaction to it.

Roosevelt saw that Russian military aid was essential to the achievement of his goal - Unconditional Surrender - and was prepared to pay a very high price - at the expense of others - to obtain it. His plan, which included American withdrawal from Europe, the permanent partition and pauperization of Germany, and, as an inevitable consequence, Russian domination of all of Europe except England, was based on an almost incomprehensible failure to understand Communism. It alarmed the Holy See which had always seen Russia as a much greater menace than National Socialist Germany and it disillusioned the Cardinal who had not grasped its significance in the beginning.

The Cardinal's opposition to Communism was a strongly held conviction, based on religious and patriotic grounds and he held it to the end. He could not understand people who thought it was wrong in Europe, or here, but could be all right in Asia or even in Latin America. He supported anti-Communists here when incontrovertible evidence showed that the responsible public authorities were not fulfilling their obligation to defend the national interest by effective resistance to subversion and espionage. Had they been doing so the McCarthy movement and much of the activity of the House Committee on Un-American Activities would never have gotten off the ground. His anti-Communism, which the author derides consistently and almost always calls "rabid", was a major cause of much of the unfavorable attention he received from the press. He never thought of Senator McCarthy as a presidential candidate (p. 218). His relations with Roosevelt were warmer than those with his successor. Truman, a devout Southern Baptist and an ardent Mason, had very little contact with Catholics before he became President. The Cardinal supported Truman's attempt to save the Vatican Embassy, and one of the sillier statements in this book has the Cardinal undercut it because he feared the Embassy would undermine his own influence both in Rome and Washington. He knew from experience it had not undermined - or sought to undermine - it. The statement (p. 212) that he was beginning to pursue foreign policy interests that were opposed to those of the Holy See and that he was starting to break with Rome is false.

Understandably the author makes much of the Cardinal's well-known clash with Eleanor Roosevelt in which, by an unfortunate use of words against which he had been warned, he undermined a strong cause. His main charge, that she was anti-Catholic, was entirely justified, as the author, to his credit, admits (p. 113). It is an admission many, and perhaps most, Catholic Liber-

## Book Reviews

als find it practically impossible to make, because either of their admiration for her general stance or their dislike of the Cardinal. By background, training and conviction she was wholly unsympathetic to Catholic values and interests, and that was not surprising. What was surprising that so many who defended her right to be anti-Catholic did not recognize the Cardinal's right to say she was and to criticize her for it.

When the newly consecrated Bishop Fulton Sheen arrived in New York in 1951 to take up his post as National Director of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith some who knew and admired both men wondered if even New York was big enough to hold two such stars without friction or conflict. It was not: but when their one big conflict, which involved major policy decisions, was taken to Rome, both sides accepted the decision in favor of Bishop Sheen. The author over-dramatizes it.

The Kennedy Presidency presented a few minor problems that puzzle the author who thinks wrongly that the Cardinal's lack of enthusiasm for Kennedy was due to jealousy of a Catholic who outranked him here. (p. 272). It was based on his knowledge of the President's modest abilities and of his evident determination to distance himself from and even to oppose ordinary Catholic interests like School Aid. He knew, too, more of the President's character and private life than was then public knowledge.

The choice of Cardinal Cushing to give the Inaugural Invocation was entirely reasonable. It was an act of courtesy to a close and long-standing friend of the Kennedy family who was also the immensely popular Archbishop of Boston, their home base. It was not, in spite of the author, "a sign that Spellman's influence in the White House had disappeared overnight" (p. 271), as would become abundantly clear in the next Administration. After all that has been published about the private lives of the Kennedys it is surprising to read that Kathleen Kennedy's husband was "a son of the Duke of Cavendish" (p. 101). The Cardinal deeply regretted the Kennedy Administration's involvement in the plot that led to the overthrow and murder of President Diem in Saigon. He foresaw correctly that it would lead to very unpleasant consequences for the Church, for America herself and, most of all, for the unfortunate Vietnamese who had trusted America.

It is probable that the Cardinal found the work of Military Ordinariate the most satisfying of all the tasks he performed for the Church. He tried to become a Chaplain in February 1918 and his interest in both the chaplains and the Armed Forces lasted almost half a century. Only his sudden death prevented the Christmas trip to Vietnam that was already arranged when he died. The suggestion that his extensive travels were largely a cover for political activity is unworthy. Where it might be

useful he presented the American Government's point of view to neutral governments, but they were always governments with which we already had full diplomatic relations. No smaller European power entered the war voluntarily, and those who were able to escape involvement did not claim to be better or wiser than those who failed to do so. They knew they escaped because both belligerents decided separately that attacking them was not worth the effort. Had it been neither side would have hesitated. Very properly each neutral country put its own survival first.

The author seems surprised at the Cardinal's lack of sympathy for the Spanish Republic, in which, in three years about 7,000 priests were killed because they were priests. He does not tell us what the Cardinal could have hoped to gain from "his sycophantic support of Franco". (p. 176).

After mentioning the intrinsic defects of this book and giving some examples, it is necessary to mention an extrinsic defect that is a misfortune rather than a fault of the author. It is the ongoing and apparently long term change in public opinion here that makes many of the viewpoints he accepts as normative for all right thinking people look increasingly old-fashioned and out-dated. Many of the viewpoints he scorns in the Cardinal are now seen to have been vindicated by event. 1985 is a year rich in important anniversaries that will prompt and in some cases demand further reflection and reassessments.

Forty years after the Yalta Conference (February 1945) where Roosevelt so willingly signed on the dotted line for Stalin there is a broad national consensus (recognized even in New York) that the Soviet Union is indeed a menace to America and that the massive defense effort needed to meet it must be made. Cardinal Spellman's forebodings, which were those of the Holy See, were justified. Yalta was the child of Unconditional Surrender and led in July 1945 to the Potsdam Accord which provided among other things for the partition of Korea that has cost us so much. We are now spending about a billion dollars a working day - 90 billion annually in Western Europe alone - to prevent the situation created by those agreements from getting worse and no one has any idea when this will stop. Meantime nothing can be done for the millions of people in Central and Eastern Europe who were handed over to the Russians. Many Americans who watch sympathetically the ongoing agony of Poland have forgotten that the official reason for the outbreak of World War II on September 1939 was the necessity of preserving the freedom and integrity of Poland.

More surprising, and as yet unperceived by the author, is the revival, on a grand scale - as seen in the 1984 Election - of the patriotic pride in America the Cardinal

## Book Reviews

exemplified. It provides the necessary support for the defense effort.

Like most of the American bishops the Cardinal had serious reservations about the United Nations. They thought it was better than nothing, and could be helpful in some areas, but they knew that, like the League of Nations, it had inherent defects, for which it was not responsible, that would prevent it from fulfilling the grossly extravagant hopes with which it was launched in San Francisco in 1945. At that time those who thought it could not do everything were suspected quite unfairly of hoping it could do nothing.

The Cardinal had reservations too about Vatican II. He never believed that nothing had been done well in the Church between the original Pentecost and the opening of the Council. Once again his practical sense warned him that many of the promises made could not be fulfilled. All who share his misgivings will feel vindicated by the recent announcement from Rome that a special Synod has been called to weigh the pros and cons after twenty years. It came like a shot across the bow and is clearly an attempt to halt the decline of discipline that is, after the vernacular liturgy, the most conspicuous fruit of the Council as it has been implemented. The deep self-inflicted wounds that are a legacy of those exciting years may fester for years and leave long-lasting, if not permanent scars, but at least and at last an attempt is being made to cure them.

Though the author has the primary responsibility for his book his publishers, including The New York Times itself, have a major share too and in this case one must wonder about motives. Were they simply paying off old scores against the Cardinal or hoping to share, as a routine business transaction in the apparently growing market for books attacking authority in the Church? Could it be that those who read the manuscript for them knew or cared little about the subject matter? Is this book on a par with their other publications?

The late Rabbi Stephen S. Wise (1874-1949) was a prominent spokesman for the Jewish Community in New York for many years and as a leading Zionist had national and even international standing. He was also a brother-in-law of Adolph S. Ochs (1858-1935) the owner and publisher of The New York Times, a fact to which he owed at least some of his fame. What would the present owners of The New York Times (which still uses the slogan: "All the News That's Fit to Print"), and the Jewish Community in New York think if a publication under Church control published an attack on him that, admittedly it could not be proven and was denounced by those closest to him, continued to be spread by anonymous sources? Suppose, wishing to attract attention in a jaded city, it said he was an inveterate sodomitical necrophiliac a disorder to which in the nature of this

case there were not likely to be many witnesses? Since it helped to make the term a household word The New York Times has been foremost in the fight against "McCarthyism", which is usually understood to mean bringing grossly offensive charges against an innocent figure in public life. It has given us a fine sample of it in this book.

Cardinal Spellman had a long, interesting and exceptionally active life. Long before the Council made collegiality almost a common term he was aware of his responsibility to the Universal Church. His career was unique not only in this country but in the contemporary Church and it deserves and will repay a serious full length study. When it comes it will not claim that he was a saint, or that he never made mistakes, or that all who opposed him had unworthy motives. Let us hope that, unlike this book, it will be written objectively, with genuine understanding, accuracy, balance, and perspective and will avoid a minor obsession with ecclesiastical finery and purple passages such as "The Pardo Palace smelled of centuries of court intrigues." (p. 125). Let us hope too the author will remember that like lesser mortals, both authors and publishers are bound by the Commandment against bearing false witness.

Msgr. Florence D. Cohalan

(Msgr. Cohalan is author of a *Popular History of the Archdiocese of New York*)

## Items of Interest

Ronald Lawler, O.F.M. Cap., Joseph Boyle, Jr., and William E. May, *Catholic Sexual Ethics: A Summary, Explanation, and Defense*. Huntington, Ind.: OSV 1985. This is a significant new book written by three members of the Fellowship. Wholly up to date, thoroughly documented, the book is based on the firm conviction that the teachings of the Catholic Church on sexual morality are true and liberating. The book would provide a very suitable textbook for seminaries and colleges; it could well be used for study in parishes as well. Facing all contemporary objections, it presents Catholic teaching in an attractive way. Cardinal Baum writes in the preface: "I am pleased to welcome this book, and to urge those who are concerned with teaching the Catholic vision of human sexuality to study it carefully."

## Book Reviews

Cardinal John J. Wright, *Mary Our Hope*, Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 1984, 227 pp. Soft-bound \$8.95.

Cardinal John J. Wright is remembered for many reasons, for example the post of Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy (from 1969), which crowned his career as a churchman. This Boston-born priest studied in Rome, was vice-rector at the North American College, served as secretary to Cardinal O'Connell (d. 1944), was auxiliary bishop in Boston (1947), first ordinary of Worcester, Mass. (1950), then bishop of Pittsburgh (1950). During an intensely active life he was a well-known speaker and author, as well as a gracious host and witty raconteur. His great collection of books on his heroine St. Joan of Arc is now in the Boston Public Library, in the Cheverus room, named for the city's first Catholic bishop.

Students of theology about the Blessed Virgin Mary are in Cardinal Wright's debt for his patronage of the Mariological Society of America, from its foundation in 1949, and first meeting in Washington in 1950. The Society had its second gathering in Worcester, 1951. In its early days Wright attended board meetings as well as annual conventions of the Society, and continued to provide funds for the "Mariological Award" to encourage scholarship. Not least thanks to the Cardinal's interest the Society is still in existence, meeting annually. The founder of the Mariological Society, Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M., now its president emeritus, contributes the 'Epilogue' in tribute to his friend, who served as the Society's episcopal chairman until his death in 1979.

The present volume is a sampling from the papers of the late Cardinal, fulfilling a hope the author himself had expressed to the editor, his literary executor, R. Stephen Almagno, O.F.M., the work was carried out at the School of Library and Information Science at the University of Pittsburgh, where the Cardinal's papers are deposited. The selection spans the years 1948-1975. Most of the seventeen entries were first printed in various periodicals, some academic (as *Marian Studies*), some for the general public (as *Our Lady's Digest*, to which the Cardinal was a particular friend). Careful notes explain the source of each chapter and provide valuable further information, as does the fascinating preface by Joseph E. Manton, C.S.S.R., of the Mission Church, Boston, site of the novena in honor of Our Mother of Perpetual Help.

Those who had the good fortune to hear Cardinal Wright preach will hear him again here; those who have read his brilliant essays will savor them anew in this book; newcomers will delight in his mastery of English and be inspired by the depths of doctrine and devotion to the Mother of God in these papers. A few examples must suffice. The opening chapter is a Boston sermon of August 5, 1948, for the feast of 'Our Lady of the Snow'

('Dedication of St. Mary Major' in the revised calendar). 'Mary the New Eve' was his address at the Zagreb, Yugoslavia, international Marian congress, August 18, 1971, a theme he touches on elsewhere also in this collection. Readers familiar with Rome, even occasional pilgrims, will treasure the three articles reprinted from the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, 1950, 'Some Street Shrines of Rome.' The notes quote Bishop Anthony G. Bosco to the effect that Wright was 'one of the most Italian Yankees' he ever knew, fluent in Italian, even dialects, albeit with a Bostonian accent, 'but his heart was Italian through and through.'

'Mary Immaculate, Patroness of the United States' was first published in 1954. Recalling how the American bishops saluted Mary under title of her Immaculate Conception in 1846, he wrote, "The universal Catholic people have taken Mary to themselves by their creed and their cult, but Catholic Americans have made her their special patroness by the deliberate and formal action of the special representatives of her Son in His Church in the United States" (p. 77).

Chapter two is the 1950 pastoral letter on the Assumption. Here is a sample: "Catholics have always remembered Mary with reverence whenever they have thought of Jesus with adoration; they never think of Mary with veneration but that they remember Jesus with worship. So it has always been: 'They found the Child (Jesus) with Mary His Mother and falling down they adored Him.'" (p. 45).

'Our Lady of Space,' first published the summer of 1958, has a prophetic message for a world now threatened by non-fictional star wars: 'Surely it is no accident that, as the world of science was preparing for its excursion beyond the familiar boundaries of the physical universe, the world of theology, headed by and speaking through the Vicar of Christ, should have been hailing the Blessed Mother as Queen of the Universe — no longer of France alone, nor of Montserrat, nor of Walsingham, nor of Lourdes merely, nor of Guadalupe, Loreto, Vilna, Kazan, or China, nor even of all mankind — but of the world, the sun, the moon, and all the stars, as well as the space between. Queen of the Universe, pray for us in this space age'" (pp. 91-92).

The motto on the cardinal's coat of arms was the Latin "resonare Christum," from St. Paulinus of Nola (d. 431). The full line is "resonare Christum corde Romano" — "make Christ's name resound from Roman hearts." A number of volumes of Wright's writings have already been published under the general title, *Resonare Christum*, as vol. one, *The Boston Years 1939-50*, and vol. two, *The Pittsburgh Years 1959-69*. Pope John Paul II's eulogy (printed at the head of this book) in his Angelus message of August 15, 1979 said that this motto summed up Cardinal Wright's life (d. August 10).

## Book Reviews

This attractive paperback is a production of Ignatius Press of San Francisco, in the pleasing typeface becoming more familiar in the growing list from this publishing house. The cover displays the title *Mary Our Hope*, superimposed on the coat of arms with its strong motto, 'Make Christ's name resound.' The felicitous conjunction captures Cardinal Wright, talented son of Mary, totally committed to Christ and the Church.

Eamon R. Carroll, O. Carm.

---

Vincent E. Rush, *The Responsible Christian. A Popular guide for Moral Decision Making according to Classical Tradition*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1984. \$9.95.

It is distressing to have to write so unfavorable a review as this. But the book is a bad one, filled with disturbing defects. Still, it *could* have been very good.

How many people would rejoice in a well-written handbook, showing them intelligently how to make their moral decisions "in a Christian and a Catholic way" (S. O'Riordan, in 'Foreword', p. ix,) warning them against secular misreadings of Christian ethics, bracing people to be faithful to the difficult but saving ways of the Gospel. How good it all could have been!

But this book happens to be fighting for the wrong side. It does speak many pious platitudes and proclaim some of the standard anti-legalistic and pro-personalistic things that virtually all moralists speak of today. But in the live questions of the time, questions about moral absolutes, about the importance of Scripture (as read in the Church), as a source in moral theology, about the power of faith to speak enduring doctrinal and moral truths in spite of cultural variations, about the presence of Jesus and his Spirit in the Church as a secure guide to our way of living, about the legitimate teaching role of the Church of Jesus Christ — in all these matters the book seems to deny or betray the strength of received Catholic teaching.

It would not be quite so bad if this were a book aimed at experts. But this book is consciously aimed at the very unsophisticated man wanting to live a pious Catholic moral life (and it talks down even to him). But it does not urge that he live in accord with the modes of moral reasoning implicit in the brilliant work of John Paul II, and of other popes, bishops, saints, and doctors. Rather it docilely accepts the dissent theology of people like Charles Curran as the pattern of moral thinking for the devout soul today. In doing so it presents a thoroughly unbalanced book, utterly unsuited for the pastoral purposes it proclaims it has.

Catholic moral teaching appeals to freedom, creativity, and intelligence in a multitude of ways. But it has also always taught the reality of "moral abso-

lutes". That is why the Church responded so hostilely to the recent attempt of some religious to suggest that the direct abortion of unborn babies could be legitimately defended in the Church. She has always taught that there are some kinds of acts that are so disordered, so opposed to what love requires, that none may ever deliberately and knowingly do such things, without grave fault. Rooted in Scripture (cf. Gal. 5, 19-21; Eph. 5,5, etc.) this teaching is found everywhere in the Fathers. When the moderate Fathers oppose the severe En-craticists, there was never any denial that every act of adultery, apostasy, or slaying the innocent is always gravely wrong. This teaching is common doctrine in the great schoolmen, in the modern theologians: in the whole voice of the Church through the centuries. The sect of dissenters today, holding the opposite, ought to be celebrating their originality, not pretending to speak "the classical tradition."

Thus American bishops, in their pastoral on peace, deny that it is ever right to deliberately and directly slay the innocent, even if so great a good as national security is at stake. With the teaching of the American bishops, and with the World Synod of Bishops (1980), Pope John Paul II teaches tirelessly that "*quilibet actus*" of contraception is objectively gravely immoral. The pagan Romans knew well that fornication and adultery were disastrous for human life in general; what characterized Christianity was its teaching that every deliberate act of fornication or adultery was gravely wrong, and separated one from the love of Christ. What has always scandalized the "moderate" and imperceptive unbeliever has been the standard Catholic claim that there are some deeds one should not do "whatever the circumstances." Does it really make sense to die as Thomas More did, rather than do the popular thing and swear falsely if so many human goods would otherwise be lost?

In his golden days of Catholic creativity Karl Rahner taught clearly the infallibility of the constant and insistent moral teachings of the Church on specific matters. (Cf. K. Rahner, *Nature and Grace. Dilemmas in the Modern Church*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1963. pp. 49-59.) These arguments have been refined by more recent moralists (e.g., J. Ford and G. Grisez, in *Theological Studies*, 39 (1978) 258-312 and M. Zalba, S.J. in *Renovatio* 14 (1979), 79-90. It is true that a dogmatician generally favoring dissenting moral positions (Francis Sullivan, S.J.) has recently given a strangely imperceptive critique of this standard view (*Magisterium: Teaching Authority in the Catholic Church* (New York: Paulist, 1983); a penetrating answer to him will be found by G. Grisez in the April 1985 *Thomist*.

But Rush does not even let his readers know that anyone has offered a case for the infallibility of the Church in specific moral questions. Rush further argues

## Book Reviews

that the Church *cannot* coherently or with respect for human freedom teach that every act of adultery or homosexuality is objectively immoral. He blandly pontificates: "While Church authority may speak out in moral generalities... such authority can never speak out infallibly and tell us what to do about a particular case in our own life." (p. 236). He does a typical bit of fudging here. He first makes the obvious and undisputed point that decisive Church teaching does not have the function of telling us what positive deeds we are to do next in our life (since ordinarily there are a variety of kinds of deeds or abstentions from actions that would not be sinful; and we have freedom to act in any good way we choose). But he confuses everything (apparently deliberately) by confusing this truth with the absurd implicit claim that God could not reveal, and the Church could not decisively teach, that there are a number of specific kinds of actions that are always wrong ones to engage in deliberately.

Thus, without suggesting for a moment to unsophisticated devout people that he is denying what is firmly insisted on in current Catholic documents (e.g., the *General Catechetical Directory*, the *National Catholic Directory*, the teaching of Canon law that the faithful have the duty to assent to and follow the insistent moral teaching of the Church in, e.g., encyclicals (which propose a number of moral absolutes: concerning abortion, slaying the innocent, sexual sins, and the like), he proposes modes of thinking that do not fit in with moral absolutes in specific matters.

He confuses matters much more than this. Whether or not the constant insistent moral teaching of the Church (telling us that behavior of certain kinds excludes us from friendship with Christ and the hope for heaven) is strictly infallible, it is certainly authoritative. And the Catholic who wishes to form his conscience as Vatican II (cf. DH14), and more recent papal and episcopal teaching has insisted, must form his conscience in ways that exclude doing the kinds of deeds faith says we must never do. From Rush one gets the impression that this would be a childish way to act. When he presents the positions of those moralists who support authentic Catholic teaching — that it is always wrong to act directly against the most important human values — he fails to give the well known reasons the Church has regularly had for saying this, and refuses even to state why the Church has always felt, e.g., that direct killing or direct abortion is worse than indirect or unintended. (He holds the views that Cambridge professor Bernard Williams has shown to be so demoralizing: that we are responsible in essentially the same way for all foreseen evil effects of our acts, whether the effects are intended by us or not (*Utilitarianism: For and Against*, Cambridge, 1973, p. 109 ff). The devastating critiques so many have made of his position he neglects to refer to.

He confuses further other questions. St. Thomas, for example, taught that each of the three moral determinants: the nature of the act, the purpose of the agent, and the circumstances must be good for the act to be a good one. Hence, Thomas concluded, it is always wrong to do a bad kind of act (like deliberately slaying the innocent) in any case whatever. Rush seeks to leave the impression that it is barbaric to hold that one can judge the morality of a concrete act simply by observing the kind of act it is (e.g., a deliberate act of perjury). The motive and the circumstances must first be considered. (True, he adds to the confusion of his position by speaking of "kinds of acts" in purely physical descriptions like "moving the finger" or "having intercourse," not in the properly moral descriptions the classical tradition used [like "killing an innocent person" or "committing adultery."] merely the end the agent expresses by deliberately choosing to do a kind of act that is always opposed to what love demands, but without considering the contingent motive of the agent for doing it, and the expected circumstances. (One half expects an apology for Richard III, who claimed he had superb reasons for killing the royal twins: all he really wanted to do was stop a revolution. In all this he confuses two obviously different kinds of questions: [a] can we determine how good or evil an act is altogether, if we do not also know the motive and circumstances; and [b] can we know that an act of rape is objectively wicked, even without investigating the peculiar motive or circumstances?)

Following the cue of some other dissenters, Rush adopts a "proof text" technique to suggest that Saint Thomas held that there are no specific kinds of acts (as adultery, homosexual acts) that are always objectively immoral. Now it is true enough that Thomas taught that "secondary precepts" of the natural law have exceptions. (He gave this example: natural law normally requires one to return borrowed property at the assigned time; but one ought not return now a weapon to a man resolved to commit a grave crime with it.) Various Thomists have different explanations of what this Thomistic saying means (e.g., some specific acts that are generally evil may include directly acting against the basic values which are first principles in morality, and others may not). Some have other views; and others think Thomas simply had not made his own position entirely clear. But everyone who reads Thomas knows that he holds that the deliberate choice on one's own authority to break any of the ten commandments, properly understood (NOT in the formalist mode — every "impure" act of adultery is wrong; but in the realistic mode: every act of directly slaying the innocent, every deliberate act of intercourse with the spouse of another) is always wrong (I-II, q. 100, esp. a.8); and in the II-II he goes one by one over a number of kinds of acts that are wrong by their very object, and hence make every free and know-



## Book Reviews

ing performance of such deeds, for whatever ends or circumstances, wrong.

Now it is true that a few dissenting theologians have written hasty papers to show that St. Thomas really was of the mind of the dissenters of the 1960's — a thought that had occurred to none for seven centuries, but was very convenient to modern dissent. The devastating refutation of these articles by scholars like William May, Patrick Lee, Germain Grisez and others have never been answered by dissenters. Rush does not even let his unsophisticated audience know that there is a case for the position of the Holy Father and other pastoral leaders have made in this matter.

He speaks of himself as a Thomist. I certainly have never known a serious Thomist who holds a view of natural law like Rush's. He seems to think that since (as all know) human natures do not exist except in individuated forms, that the inclinations due to the nature of man and the inclinations that follow from defective genes or other material factors are equally determinants of natural law for the individual. If one must pursue truth because "abstract" human nature is ordered to truth, (*and* because *every* man can, aided by synderis, know that truth is a good that fulfills man and is always to be honored in activity), then perhaps it is right for the homosexual to seek a sex partner of the same sex because he is so inclined. But Thomistic natural laws, with their sophisticated epistemology and ontology, never believed anything is morally good simply because one is inclined to it. Our inclinations show us what is good by the mediation of reflective intelligence: we can know that the use of sex should never act against the basic goods sex is essentially ordered to, because we are able to see how this flows from the first principles of human morality. The homosexual can know that he is mightily inclined toward homosexual acts, as the alcoholic can know he is mightily inclined toward very heavy drinking; but neither can know that yielding to these inclinations is yielding to that which authentically fulfills his nature. It is nominalism, not the moderate realism of Aquinas, that Rush propounds. Not even the more debatable forms of natural law (such as Suarez's which led to some regrettable legalism and physicalism in modern moral theology), led to a physicalism as gross as Rush's theory.

His legalism shines, and horrifies, also in his treatment of "probabilism." He does not hesitate to tell the unsophisticated reader: "as long as there is a good, solid, probable argument for the decision you have made [even if there is a more probable argument for the contrary], *any probable decision* may be followed safely even if it is the less probable opinion." (p. 231). But he knows very well that the great probabilists always taught that this holds only for debates among moral theologians in matters *legitimately debated* in the Church. All

in the era of probabilism conceded: once the Holy See made a firm decision, the fight was over. There are no probable opinions, in this sense, against the judgment of the Holy See.

Three sorts of persons are deeply hurt by this book. (1) It is offensive to scholars really devoted to the classical tradition, and to the received teaching of the Catholic Church. (2) It is offensive to the Holy Father and the Bishops, whose implicit moral methodologies, and conclusions, are mocked by such a representation. (3) Most of all, the unsophisticated people for whom this book was written, who wish to live in truly Catholic ways, in ways that their bishops, and the saints and doctors of the church have called secure and necessary, are most hurt. The book doubtless has noble intentions; and some of what it says is very sensible. But its flaws are simply too tragic. The book has no *imprimatur* but is published by a generally reliable firm. Bishops should read books like these, and judge whether they think it right to indoctrinate the simple faithful in such radical forms of dissent.

The author may complain that he is presenting in good faith a moral theory taught publicly in many Catholic universities. But that is not a sufficient response. One must recognize that the moral principles proposed here differ so much from those of the authentic magisterium that they virtually propose a "form of life" radically opposed to that which has commonly been identified with Roman Catholicism. Is it inadequate to have some preach such teaching to the unsophisticated, while bishops and other scholars preach the contradictory? Too much, in fact, the salvation of human persons, is at stake. Questions of this kind need to be vigorously debated in more public ways, perhaps preferably under the sponsorship of bishops. And the faithful deserve to be given sound answers to the questions so raised.

Ronald Lawler, O.F.M. Cap.  
St. John's University

Russ Braley, *Bad News: The Foreign Policy of The New York Times* (Regnery-Gateway 679 pp. \$22.50)

"All the news that is fit to print" may not be "news" (i.e. facts, at any rate), nor "fit to print", if that is meant to suggest that readers are receiving objective reporting. Forty-years ago people accused *The Times* of being anti-labor, but then they had Louis Stark to blur that image. Thirty years ago it seemed obvious to those affected that *The Times* was anti-Catholic, but then the Editor hired John Cogley and John Leo to give the impression that it really was open-minded about Catholics. (Recently, the family of Cardinal Spellman and friends of Archbishop O'Connor might have new reasons to believe the old charges are true.) In any event, Russ Braley, long-time foreign correspondent of *The N.Y.*

## Book Reviews

*Daily News*, now says *The Times* is "bad news" on matters of U.S. foreign policy. He has written a blockbuster.

Mr. Braley does not underestimate the seriousness or the competency of *The Times*. He thinks it is "the best," the paper of record, and a power for the amount of effort it puts into news collecting and reporting, for its pervasive influence over other papers' reporting. But he does not believe the "news" printed or power exercised represents truth or the common good of American society.

Some of Braley's stuff is "old hat" but becomes new in the assembly of the massive details accumulated in one place. He recalls how Herbert Matthews, originally a *Times*' reporter for the Loyalist side of the 1936 Spanish War, became one generation later a partisan of Fidel Castro, claiming he was not a Communist, assuring readers that the Cuban revolution was *a fait accompli* before it was, explaining it as a popular uprising when it was not. Matthews even went so far as to assert authoritatively that Castro's was the "first great social revolution in Latin America since the Mexican Revolution of 1910" and "there are no reds in the (Cuban) cabinet." Later, *The Times* blamed Eisenhower's trade cut-off for placing Cuba in the Soviet camp. If John F. Kennedy could joke that "I got my job through *The New York Times*", there was truth in a 1959 cartoon which sat Castro on a map of Cuba saying "I got my job through *The New York Times*". Anti-Castro Cubans derided the paper as *The New York Tass*.

Braley obviously is no fan of James Reston — for his support of Alger Hiss, for his anti-Nixonism which he traces back to Nixon's 1948 role in Hiss' downfall, for his opposition to an anti-Cuban invasion, for his power over influential politicians up to and including a president such as JFK.

But it is for *The New York Times*' involvement in the Vietnam War that Braley reserves his most pointed barbs, especially for the role played by its young correspondent David Halberstam whom he contrasts with the *Herald-Tribune's* veteran reporter of foreign wars — Marguerite Higgins. Higgins consistently contradicted the anti-Diem propaganda being put out by the "young Turks" writing for *The Times*, *Washington Post*, *Time* and *UPI*. She said they sounded like Pravda: "Reporters here would like to lose the war to prove they're right." Even JFK once complained to Arthur Sulzberger: "Who elected David Halberstam to run the foreign policy of the U.S.?"

An allied diplomat later said (1963) to Marguerite Higgins: "American policy is friendly to the neutrals, neutral to the enemy and hostile to its friends." Although *The New York Times Book Review* evaluated 33 anti-Vietnam books which featured American war guilt, American cruelty, etc., Marguerite Higgins' book on the same subject was ignored outright. Braley measured

*The Times'* power by its ability to challenge President Nixon to call off the Vietnamese War or else.

*Bad News* is a large book which takes great delight in serving up a diet of venom against *The Times* for its support during the '60s of California student strikes and race riots, for romanticizing diplomats (like George Ball) who are oversolicitous about the Soviet Union, (while tending to disregard U.S. allies) who regularly favored shows of weakness in contests over the Berlin Wall, Cuba, etc.

*Bad News* would have benefited from occasional historical synopses as background to his description of quickly moving events and subheadings in lengthy chapters would also have been helpful. Nonetheless, it is an easy book to read and makes some telling points against sanctimonious editors who intermittently sermonize about who "the best and the brightest" Catholic leaders really are. Maybe Russ Braley can be importuned to write about *The New York Times* and the Catholic Church.

---

Andre Feuillet, *Jesus and His Mother*, (St. Bede's Publications 290 pp. \$19.95)

Msgr. Richard Malone and John R. Connery, S.J., (eds.) *Contemporary Perspectives on Christian Marriage* (Loyola University Press 385 pp., \$19.95)

These are two important books if only because debunking Mary, Matrimony, and Motherhood seem to go hand and hand in our time. Scholarly support for the Catholic tradition on all three subjects is welcome, indeed.

Fr. Feuillet in his Introduction prays:

"May these pages contribute to the rediscovery of the Infancy Narratives of St. Luke which from the purely literary point of view alone are one of the jewels of the N.T."

The work is divided into three parts: The Luke I-II and the Johannine tradition; the problem of historicity; the role of woman and Mary in the Christian economy. This is a careful exegetical work. As for those political questions recently raised with a view to finding suitable biblical answers, Feuillet says no to the ordination of women priests.

He adds, however: The mother role of women in a renewed Christian world is as necessary as a ministerial priesthood composed of men. He does not consider scientific at all certain new biblical theories, e.g. that St. Paul's Churches were more charismatic than hierarchic:

"To draw conclusions of this kind is to go quite beyond what the Pauline text themselves, objectively integrated, would allow us to advance... Those who formulate them do so only because they are reading scripture in terms of preconceived theories they are anxious to justify." (cont'd p. 19)

## Miscellanea

### Grisez and His Critics

In an article in the December 1984 issue of *Theological Studies*, Richard A. McCormick, S.J. attacked Fellowship member Germain Grisez for his criticism of McCormick's and Charles Curran's attempts to justify abortion funding and dissent on abortion. The article which provoked McCormick's attack was in *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, July 1984: "A Critique of Two Theological Papers." The June 1985 issue of the *Review* will carry Grisez's answer to McCormick: "Public Funding of Abortion: A Reply to Richard A. McCormick, S.J."

In this exchange, as he has previously, McCormick invoked the support of Francis A. Sullivan, S.J. Sullivan, in his book, *Magisterium: Teaching Authority in the Catholic Church* (New York: Paulist, 1983), had sharply criticized the work of Grisez and John C. Ford, S.J. on the infallibility of the ordinary magisterium. Sullivan claims that the Church cannot teach infallibly on any specific moral question whatsoever.

Grisez is publishing a separate reply to Sullivan: "Infallibility and Specific Moral Norms: A Reply to Francis A. Sullivan, S.J." This thorough-going reply, an article of major significance, is in the April 1985 *Thomist*.

At the end of his reply to McCormick, Grisez recalls that in his book, *The Way of the Lord Jesus: Christian Moral Principles* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1984), he dealt with the Church's teaching authority and the attempts of McCormick and his party to justify their dissent. Grisez observes: "Perhaps there is a 'common conviction of theologians' that the less said about my critique in *The Way of the Lord Jesus*, the better. Thus far, none of the theological parties whose views McCormick shares has replied to it."

### Cardinal Ratzinger on Leonard Boff

*B: ... What is Christianity? We do not know. We only know what is shown in the historical process" (p. 79).*

*R:* This relativizing concept of the church stands at the basis of the radical criticisms directed at the hierarchic structure of the Catholic Church. In order to justify it, L. Boff appeals to the constitution *Lumen Gentium* (No. 8) of the Second Vatican Council. From the council's famous statement, "Haec ecclesia (sc. unica Christi ecclesia)...subsistit in ecclesia Catholica" ("this church [that is, the sole church of Christ]...subsists in the Catholic Church"), he derives a thesis which is exactly the contrary to the authentic meaning of the council text, for he affirms: "In fact it (sc. the sole church of Christ) may also be present in other Christian churches" (p. w75). But the council had chosen the word *subsistit*—subsists—exactly in order to make clear that one sole "subsistence" of the true church exists, whereas outside her

visible structure only *elementa ecclesiae*—elements of church—exist; these—being elements of the same church—tend and conduct toward the Catholic Church (*Lumen Gentium*, 8). The decree on ecumenism expresses the same doctrine (*Unitatis Redintegratio*, 3-4), and it was restated precisely in the declaration *Mysterium Ecclesiae* (No. 1, AAS LXV [1973], pp. 396-398).

Turning upside down the meaning of the council text on the church's subsistence lies at the base of L. Boff's ecclesiological relativism, which is outlined above; a profound misunderstanding of the Catholic faith on the Church of God in the world is developed and made explicit. (*Origins*, April 4, 1985 Vol. 14: No. 42).

### Peter Hebblethwaite On Cardinal Ratzinger

"... Prominent people had been making statements well to the right of anything Pope John Paul II had said. One wonders why.

"The chief offender is Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF). Unlike his predecessors who maintained a poker-faced silence in all that was not the official line of duty, Ratzinger seems to enjoy giving interviews.

"When he speaks in his own name, his opinions carry no more weight than anyone else's. He cannot expect the afterglow of the *magisterium* to rub off on his off-the-cuff remarks. Once he descends from the CDF chair, he has to justify his opinions as any theologian does. Mere assertion is not enough. He has to produce evidence." (NCR April 12, 1985 p. 19).

### Feuillet Review (from p. 18)

Msgr. Malone and Fr. Connery have also done the Church a favor by making available the propositions and papers of the International Theological Commission on Christian Marriage. These papers will interest more than the expert. Matrimony is covered here by various theologians under several titles: As Institution, as Sacrament, as Indissolubility. Corollary questions of intention, faith, mystery, civil marriage, divorce and remarriage receive evaluation. The editors explain the importance of the compilation: "Our nine theologians, representatives of different schools and cultures, summarize a great deal of the theological reflection that developed in the creative post-conciliar period. In their syntheses they present a mosaic of the major trends in the theology of marriage and will provide an updated enrichment of Catholic pastoral and theological reflection on this most basic of all human institutions, Christian marriage."

George A. Kelly

# Items of Interest

- The preliminary report of the US bishops on ERA contains this paragraph:

"There are two ways in which ERA could adversely affect the tax-exempt status of churches and their institutions and organizations. First, ERA could be used to support an extension of the reasoning in *Bob Jones University v. United States* to deny tax-exempt status under section 501(c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code to organizations that discriminate "on account of sex." Second, ERA could be interpreted as independently prohibiting the government from providing tax benefits to or-

ganizations that discriminate on the basis of sex. The first is a matter of statutory construction, the second of constitutional construction." (*Origins*, January 3, 1985, p. 486)

## Nominations

Nominations of officers for the Fellowship 1985-1987 and for the recipient of the 1985 Cardinal Wright Award are in order. Members are invited to send such proposals to Dr. Joseph Scottino, Gannon University, Erie, Pennsylvania 16541.

Friend of the Fellowship  
Bishop William J. McDonald.

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

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

# Correction

- Father Ronald Lawler made certain factual mistakes in calling attention to readers two recent publications of the Pope John Center. In briefly reviewing the two books (*Technological Powers and the Person* and *Sex and Gender: A Theological and Scientific Inquiry*) he said that each of the works were proceedings of workshops held for the Bishops of the United States in Dallas, Texas. This is wrong: only the first of the books had such an origin. The second book had its origin in a two-day symposium attended by professionals only; no Bishops were present at this symposium, though some Bishops had asked that it be held. Those attending included some leading minds among those sympathetic

to the "gay revolution"; their positions received excellent critiques from philosophers, theologians and pastoral counsellors who wished to make this study useful for moral theologians and pastoral advisors.

Secondly, Father Lawler expressed an opinion that some of the papers given at the 1982 Dallas meeting were not printed in this volume of the proceedings (*Technological Powers...*). He was mistaken in this: all of the papers are included in the volume. Father Lawler wishes to express his regrets for these errors. They were called to his attention most graciously; and this gives him an opportunity to express his admiration for the work of the Pope John Center.