

# Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

Volume 10, Number 3

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

June 1987

## Government Funding of Religiously-Affiliated Colleges and Universities

*Sister Brigid Driscoll — Dr. Kenneth Whitehead*

The question of the independence of Catholic colleges, accreditation and government funding has received increasing attention recently. Here are two views:

**Sister Brigid Driscoll**, President of Marymount College in Tarrytown, is quoted in *Education: Suburban People's Spring Supplement*, January 11, 1987:

"In the 1960's and early 1970's most Catholic colleges severed even tenuous ties to the Church...

"We became independent and named lay trustees because of accreditation, the increased sophistication of higher education as a major enterprise and because of the demands of growth...

"Those decisions meant a windfall for the schools a few years later when the federal government offered financial aid to independent colleges...

"I am sure that the legislators did not have us in mind when they approved that aid...

"But because we were independent, we qualified for it...

"Any indication that these schools were under ecclesiastical authority could cast doubt on their independence and thus jeopardize that aid..."

On the other hand, **Dr. Kenneth Whitehead**, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Higher Education Programs, of the U.S. Department of Education, made this statement in March 1987:

(Cont'd p. 2)

### WHAT TO EXPECT IN THIS ISSUE?

<i>Government Funding</i>	<i>p. 1</i>	<i>Exposition and Interpreting Liturgical Regulation</i>	<i>p. 6</i>
<b>Sister Driscoll:</b> "Because we were independent we qualified for federal aid..."; <b>Dr. Whitehead</b> of U.S. Department of Education: "Institutional Autonomy is not one of the requirements for federal aid to higher education."		"Using the imperfect language of judicial comparison, the recent instruction (of the USCC) is a form of strict constructionism."	
<i>The Catholic University</i>	<i>p. 3</i>	<i>Concerns About School-Based Health Clinics</i>	<i>p. 16</i>
"A Catholic college must be the source of pure Catholic teaching." Father Byron of Catholic University: "Baloney!"		"Those who are advocating the (school health) clinics are using the real medical needs of the poor as a hoax..."	
<i>In Vitro</i>	<i>p. 5</i>	<i>The Jesuits by Malachi Martin</i>	<i>p. 19</i>
"This <i>Instruction</i> is a welcome and much needed statement of the Holy See on the precious dignity of human life and the human meaning of procreation."		"If the Church were a democratic state and the alleged crimes against it were so widely reported in the media as Martin has succeeded in doing... the situation would call for a senate investigation at the very least..."	

## Government Funding (Cont'd.)

"Responding to his recent suspension as a professor of moral theology at Catholic University, the Rev. Charles E. Curran has asserted that Archbishop of Washington James A. Hickey, Chancellor of the University, would be setting a dangerous precedent by invoking a provision of Catholic canon law requiring theology professors to hold a "mandate from the competent ecclesiastical authority" in order to teach theology. Father Curran is reported to have said that invoking this provision of canon law posed a danger to the academic freedom and autonomy of Catholic colleges and universities and "would have serious consequences for academic accreditation, government funding and a host of other issues important to Catholic higher education." The idea seems to be that Catholic or other religiously affiliated institutions of higher education would not be eligible for federal aid if shown to be under the direct control of their sponsoring churches.

"This is not the case. Institutional autonomy is not one of the requirements for federal aid to higher education. Most federal aid, in fact, flows to students, and these students can be enrolled in religiously affiliated schools. Even students enrolled in religious seminaries or schools wholly owned and controlled by a wide variety of different organizations can and do receive federal student aid.

"It is true that legally defined 'schools of theology' of any denomination are ineligible for most federal institutional aid; some federal fellowships similarly exclude study at a divinity school or department. Religiously affiliated schools otherwise can and do receive even federal institutional aid, under those federal programs for which they are eligible and compete successfully.

"The federal government has imposed no general negative 'religious test' for benefiting from the federal aid paid for out of the tax monies of all citizens, religious or non-religious. In this respect, the situation as regards higher education is different from that of elementary and secondary education. Under current court interpretations of the First Amendment, no federal aid and, generally, no public aid can go to religiously affiliated schools for general operating purposes.

"This difference between higher education and elementary and secondary education has roots in our history. Higher education in the United States began with the foundation of private colleges, most of them originally religiously affiliated. To this day some 1600 schools, or more than half of the nation's total 3000-odd colleges and universities, are private; as many as 800 of these retain a religious affiliation.

"When federal aid first began to flow out massively in the form of student financial aid under World War II's G.I. Bill of Rights, no distinction was made about the possible religious character, if any, of the thousands of schools attended by veterans on the G.I. Bill. Nor was any such distinction made by the 1965 Higher Education Act under which federal student aid continues to flow to individual students today.

"Beyond the obvious and proper federal requirements that schools must comply with the civil rights laws of the United States if they or the student attending them are to be eligible for federal aid, the principal requirement for any such federal aid is mainly that a school be 'accredited.' Accreditation, under our system, is a private, voluntary process under which the quality of educational institutions is established by independent associations called accrediting agencies. It is a distinctive feature of our American higher education system that the development and maintenance of educational standards are the responsibility of those nongovernmental voluntary associations, not of the federal government.

"The federal government does, however, require accreditation as a condition of federal aid. For this purpose, the Secretary of Education 'recognizes' accrediting agencies and publishes a list of those he recognizes. But these accrediting agencies were accrediting religiously affiliated colleges and universities along with similar institutions long before the advent of any federal aid. They continue to do so today. And institutional autonomy, as such, is not generally a requirement of accrediting agencies; rather, they look at educational standards.

"If there ever were a problem of accreditation for a specific group of schools such as Catholic colleges — or Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, or Buddhist colleges or whatever — they could always form their own accrediting agencies and petition the Secretary of Education for independent recognition. It is hard to imagine on what grounds the Secretary would fail to recognize their accrediting agency provided educational standards were maintained, if we may judge by the variety and range of the accrediting agencies the Secretary already recognizes. The Secretary already recognizes, for example, an Association of Bible Colleges and an Association of Advanced Rabbinical and Talmudic Schools, and these accrediting associations currently accredit their members for purposes of receiving federal aid. 'Autonomy' is not a requirement for federal aid. Father Curran's fears on that score are groundless."

## The Catholic University - The Heart of the Matter

The Washington Post Magazine, in a Sunday supplement-type article on Charles Curran (March 27, 1987), contained the following question and answer:

"What was a Catholic College about, anyway?"

Priest: "A Catholic college must be the source of pure Catholic teaching. Anything else is consumer fraud."

To which Father William Byron, S.J. president of the Catholic University of America, delivered this answer:

"Baloney! A Catholic college is not a catechetical center, and catechism is not theology. We have never advertised that a student coming here is going to be indoctrinated. Just as a Catholic hospital is, first of all, a hospital, a Catholic university is, first of all, a university."

More than ten years ago, Father William Sullivan, S.J., then the recently-appointed president of Seattle University, stated the issue in more philosophical terms:

"I agree with Bishop William E. McManus of Chicago that it is of little use to approach this question of the role of an academic institution by reflecting on the 'essence' of a college or a university or a research institute." (*New Catholic World*, July-August, 1976, p. 164).

Both these statements, though different, maintain there is no intrinsic lifeline between the Catholic university and the Church. The Church may provide the patrimony, the students, the expectations, and its body may provide the social and economic supports necessary to sustain the college's life, but fundamentally the Church remains a customer in the undertaking, *not a partner*. According to this understanding, the Catholic college performs a service to the Catholic community on its own, not on the Church's terms, because the Church is not essential to its existence. Consequently, the college does not exist to be "a source of pure Catholic teaching" and the Church has no veto power over the product, even if the product is poisoning the lifeline of the Church.

Now, I have written elsewhere that we ought to "put a moratorium on abstract discussions on the nature of the Catholic college and take a look at what is actually happening on Catholic campuses." I have further maintained that "a fair case can be made that the Catholic college begins to die the day it abandons its formal institutional commitment to the teaching authority, or magisterium of the Church" (*Crisis*, March 1987, p. 15). Empirical data impress American audiences more than ratiocination. And data on separated Catholic colleges tend to substantiate the conclusion they are not serving the Catholicity of their students nor that of the Church. Why should they? In the words of Father Byron: "A Catholic college is not a catechetical center."

Such answers from Father Byron, Father Sullivan, or even from Father Theodore Hesburg, are post-Vatican II answers of academics who think that in modern times they can serve the Church best by conducting universities according to established secular rules. For so doing they receive special social and economic rewards reserved for institutions whose ties to the Church have been severed. Yet, these schools — the two hundred thirty-nine to which the name Catholic is still appended — are an important part of the Church's patrimony. Whatever they are in 1987 is due to what they were in 1947, Georgetown to the Church of 1834!

Different from the answer we receive now was the mind of Catholic educators then. Only two years before Vatican II opened, Jesuit George Bull gave this answer to the question, "Why a Catholic College?"

"To say, for instance, that the Catholic college exists to save souls or to spread the kingdom of God on earth, is as true as it is pious. But it is too general a reply. It gives what the philosophers call the ultimate end, not the immediate and specifying end. It seems to abolish any specific difference between the educator and the missionary. Above all, it takes it for granted that the exclusive purpose of the Catholic college is the formal teaching of the Catholic religion.

"This is not true. There is another function, and in the remarks that follow, I shall try to indicate what that other function is. I shall try to show that the function of the Catholic college is not merely to teach the formulas of the Catholic religion, but to impart in a thousand ways, which defy formularization, the Catholic attitude toward life as a whole. It is to graduate not merely students who have the "Catholic's ready answer" in all fields of knowledge, but students who are so steeped in the Catholic mood that it colors their every activity, and not their religious activity alone. In a word, the function of the Catholic college is not merely to send forth men and women who can repeat, however intelligently, the Catholic formula, in religion, in philosophy, or science, or the arts; but students who are stamped with certain traits that come into play and govern their approach to life in every sphere; students, therefore, who realize that Catholicism is not merely a creed, but a culture." (*America Press*, 1960).

The critical special objective of any university, Bull affirms, is to impart culture. The secular university, organizes its education "on the assumption that it must be neutral on the matters of religion" (p. 9); the holistic Catholic university assumes the unity of its intellectual enterprise with religion. In the Catholic case this means with the Church.

## The Catholic University (Cont'd.)

Whether we like it or not, the entire question eventually comes back to "essence." What *is* a *Catholic University*?

A university (and its colleges) is not an abstraction, nor a separate entity. It is what Webster calls it: "An institution of the highest level," one level of a system. If the system is secular, the university/college is based on learning acquired by experimental methods whose truth is determined by a body of scholars for whom truth is always earthbound and relative. If the system is Catholic, then its institutions of higher learning, like the lower, are founded as much on the eternal verities contained in Revelation as on scientific learning and are, consequently, engaged in forming and developing those skills that will help students achieve their proper temporal *and eternal* destiny. Of necessity, these institutions relate institutionally to the Church, not to the State alone.

A free-floating college (no matter what religious adjective modifies the noun) is an institution based on autonomous private judgment, whether individual or corporate, about all things scholastic, including religious studies. Such an institution no longer unequivocally accepts an indubitable "given" regulating belief and conduct. It no longer formally and bindingly commits itself even to those teachings that can be identified as coming from Christ.

Corporate Catholic persons — be they universities, hospitals, or institutes, have no more moral right to compromise their confessed faith than individual Catholics, be they private persons or politicians. They, like the corporate bodies, obviously live more frequently than not in a hostile environment. Some will apostatize, but many more will find their faith strengthened by the effort to maintain it and their influence growing precisely because they have proved themselves to be men of integrity. This is precisely what happened when the Catholic community was a legitimate sub-culture in Protestant America, and when the Paul Blanshards were afraid of Catholics growing strong enough to dominate the American culture. The Church never acted out the Blanshard nightmare, but in or out of power the Church may not permit apostates, individual or corporate, to traffic on the Church's name or to manipulate the Church's people to the injury of the name and the people. If the Catholic hospital may not abort unborn living bodies, the Catholic university may

not abort the growth of living Christian minds.

We return once more to essence.

Yes, the Catholic University is, among many other things, a "catechetical center" at the highest level, the house of in-depth study of all those areas of learning appropriate to that level. The "matter" preoccupying the Catholic university and neighboring George Washington University will be the same; "the form and spirit" (provided by religious faith or its lack) will be different, as will its "product."

What Father Byron forgets is that the forerunners of our medieval universities were catechetical centers in cities like Alexandria. Third Century scholars, such as Pantanus, Origen, and Clement contributed as much to theology then as the typical modern Catholic university does today. From the patristic period onward none of the Church's outstanding minds — Augustine, Aquinas, More, Maritain — separated themselves from the Church's catechesis. Neither did they believe that composing learned *summas* was more important to the Church than providing correct catechesis for ordinary Catholics. When theology is at odds with the catechesis of the Church, or when it breaks its lifeline to that catechesis, it is no longer a faithful theology.

Hear George Bull again:

"Catholicism is a culture, not merely a creed; an attitude, a whole complex of things taken for granted, in every activity of life and not in the sphere of the strictly religious alone. And it is the business of Catholic education to impart that culture, just as it is the business of all other systems to communicate the culture which is theirs." (pp. 13-14)

As for Jesuit Byron's rejection of indoctrination, hear Jesuit Bull:

"If the Catholic college in this country has neglected even partially either of its two functions, it has not neglected the first. It has, thank God, sent forth from its halls generations of men and women who know their Catholic faith." (p. 14)

And why not? The Book of Revelations (3:15-16) conveys this final warning to the Church:

"I know your deeds: I know you are neither hot nor cold. But because you are lukewarm I will spew you out of my mouth."

—George A. Kelly

### Note

Fellowship members who are engaged in research and writing on any aspect of the Catholic higher education problem — canonical, legal, professional, etc. — are asked to be in touch with Msgr. Kelly.

## Fellowship on Recent Roman Document

The following statement was released by the Executive Committee of the Fellowship Board as a comment on the recent instruction of the Holy See concerning bio-ethical questions. The statement was approved by the five moral theologians on the Board - Dr. William May, Dr. Joseph Boyle, Father Richard Roach, S.J., Father Ronald Lawler, O.F.M. CAP., Msgr. William Smith:

"The *Instruction on Respect for Human Life in Its Origin and on the Dignity of Procreation: Replies to Certain Questions of the Day*, prepared by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and approved by our Holy Father, Pope John Paul II, is a carefully worded, clearly expressed, and exceptionally important statement of the Holy See on the dignity and sanctity of human life.

"The *Instruction*, firmly grounded in the teaching of Vatican Council II and, indeed, the centuries' old tradition of the Church, insists that the life of human persons, created in the image and likeness of God, must be respected from the moment of conception as an unsurpassable gift from God the Creator. The marvelous achievements of contemporary science and technology must, therefore, in their applications be at the service of human persons, respecting their inalienable rights and promoting their true and integral good according to the requirements of the moral order, an order that is ultimately rooted in God's 'divine law, eternal, objective, and universal, whereby He governs the entire universe and orders the human community according to a plan conceived in wisdom and in love.' (*Dignitatis Humanae*, N. 32)

"Thus experiments on human life, at any stage of its development, including the embryonic, must honor the dignity of this life. The *Instruction*, therefore, in company with the entire Catholic tradition, insists that any experiments on human embryos must be therapeutic in nature, that is, designed to be of benefit to them with reasonable hope of success. It strongly condemns experiments on these human lives designed simply to benefit others and increase human knowledge, inasmuch as such experiments are an affront to the dignity of human life.

"In addressing issues concerned with the procreation of human life the *Instruction* reminds us that the 'fundamental values... are two: the life of the human being called into existence and the special nature of the transmission of human life in marriage.' Since in

marriage a man and a woman give themselves exclusively to one another, faithfulness to their marital covenant precludes the use of artificial insemination by a third party, the employment of surrogate mothers, and similar procedures. The dignity of human life is violated in a particularly offensive way when several lives are deliberately brought into being in the laboratory only to be discarded or frozen or used as experimental tissue.

"In addition, the dignity of human life and the special links binding marriage, marital love, the marital act and the generation of human life require that human persons be given life only through the personal, one-flesh union of husband and wife. Human life, in short, is to be begotten, not made. Thus the *Instruction* rejects the use of *in vitro* fertilization and embryo transfer even in the 'simple case,' when the wife's ovum is fertilized outside her body by her husband's sperm and the resultant life is implanted within her womb. In such a procedure 'the generation of the human person is objectively deprived of its proper perfection, namely, that of being the result and fruit of a conjugal act which is specific to the love of husband and wife.' The *Instruction*, deeply sensitive to the anguish of involuntarily infertile couples, urges medical science to discover truly therapeutic ways for alleviating infertility and reminds couples that at times, with Christ, they must bear their cross.

"The document ends with an appeal to civil society to insure, through its laws, that the inviolable rights of human persons and the dignity of marriage be recognized and respected.

"This *Instruction* is a welcome and much needed statement by the Holy See on the precious dignity of human life and the human meaning of procreation. The Catholic people, lay and clergy alike, will find it a sure guide, based on a profound reverence for human life and respect for objective moral norms. Indeed, all people of good will will discover in it wise counsels on issues of grave importance to the human community."

- Half Truth Department:

From *National Conference of Diocesan Directors of Religious Education's* "The Relationship Between Evangelization and Catechesis" by Rev. Robert J. Hater (1982, p. 1).

"After Vatican II... We discovered the trauma of change, the demands of freedom, and the responsibilities of conscience. We found out that the Catholic Church is not the sole possessor of truth..."

"... We discovered anew that our Romanized form of Catholicism did not satisfy the needs of all cultures."

## Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament and Rules for Interpreting Liturgical Regulations

The Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy issued an instruction in 1986 regarding exposition of the Blessed Sacrament.

In commenting on the question of "Perpetual Exposition" of the Blessed Sacrament, the Bishops' Committee wrote also of exposition for extended periods of time. If we omit the sections on truly *perpetual* exposition, the text published in the June/July 1986 issue of the *Liturgy Newsletter* (the official publication of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy), pp. 24, 25 reads:

1. Because eucharistic worship is so important to the devotional and spiritual life of the Church, but also in order to avoid the abuses of the past, the Church today carefully and strictly regulates the exposition of this holy sacrament. The present discipline regarding all aspects of eucharistic worship and devotion is governed by the *Roman Ritual: Holy Communion and Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass*, promulgated by decree of the Congregation for Divine Worship, 21 June 1973, and also by the revised Code of Canon Law, canons 934-944.
2. The Church situates its traditional teaching on eucharistic worship and devotion in its doctrine on the Mass. This teaching is stated succinctly in the Congregation of Rites' 1967 instruction *Eucharisticum mysterium* and is repeated in the decree promulgating *Holy Communion and Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass*: 'the celebration of the eucharist in the sacrifice of the Mass is the true origin and purpose of the worship shown to the eucharist outside Mass.' Moreover, 'the principal reason for reserving the sacrament after Mass is to unite, through sacramental communion, the faithful unable to participate in the Mass, especially the sick and the aged, with Christ and the offering of his sacrifice.' The 'practice of adoring this sacrament and offering to it the worship which is due to God' resulted from eucharistic reservation, 'which became customary in order to permit the reception of communion.'
3. The decree also states: Once the sacrifice is offered and while the eucharist is reserved in churches and oratories, Christ Jesus is present; he is truly Emmanuel, God with us. He is in our midst day and night, full of grace and truth he dwells among us. Therefore, because 'the veneration and adoration which is due to God himself' is shown to this holy sacrament, 'as has always been customary in the Catholic Church,' the Church must strictly regulate the reservation of the eucharist..."
5. With regard to the length of time during which the

sacrament may be exposed, besides brief periods of exposition, *Holy Communion and Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass* permits and encourages lengthier periods of exposition and adoration in the following two cases only:

(a) exposition for an extended period of time once a year but with the consent of the local Ordinary and only if suitable numbers of the faithful are expected to be present (no. 86);

(b) exposition ordered by the local Ordinary for a grave and general necessity for a more extended period of supplication but where the faithful assemble in large numbers (no. 67)..."

6. With regard to all aspects of exposition, adoration, and benediction of the eucharist, the norms of *Holy Communion and Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass*, nos. 82-100, and canons 941-943 of the Code of Canon Law are to be observed diligently.

9. While pastors are to make every effort possible to enable the faithful to worship Christ present in the eucharist, this must be done according to the norms laid down by the Roman Ritual and the Code of Canon Law, as cited above." (1)

It seems clear that the Bishops mean this to be a change in liturgical practice. This point is made in their use of the phrases: "...the Church today carefully and strictly regulates the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament." Again: "the Church must strictly regulate the reservation of the Eucharist." Indeed, the Bishops interpret the regulations of the Holy See rather more conservatively than others might. The Roman document cited by the Bishops "recommended that (in churches where the eucharist is regularly reserved) solemn exposition of the Blessed Sacrament for an extended period should take place once a year..." (2). The *Liturgy Newsletter*, speaking for the Bishops, cites that regulation as *permitting such exposition only once a year*, rather than recommending an annual celebration which others might read as *not less than once a year*. It is a small point but, altogether, it and the phrases emphasizing the Church's strict regulation of exposition, underline the mind of the Bishops in 1986 that American Catholics should receive the regulation of the Holy See in this matter in a literal and binding way, reminding them that the stipulations of the *Ritual* (3) and *Code* (4) are "to be observed diligently," and that no exceptions to those regulations should be lightly permitted.

The statement is a thoughtful one since the Bishops of the Liturgy Committee gave it two full considerations on March 14 and June 7-8 in 1986 before publishing their views in the June-July newsletter.

## Liturgical Regulations (Cont'd.)

The revision or reform of practice which the Bishops' instruction will accomplish is important in itself. Their statement on the matter is also important as an authoritative interpretation of the norms established by the Holy See.

The statement appears to have a further significance. Precisely as an interpretation it is, relatively speaking, strict in its adherence to the cited documents and many people will be pleased with that approach. The strictness of the Bishops in this matter is underscored by their adherence to the literal phrases and requirements of the 1973 *Ritual* in the face of recent Papal practice and a major American custom. In 1981 Pope John Paul II directly ordered daily day-long exposition of the Blessed Sacrament in St. Peter's Basilica, (5) a practice that continues to this day. And in the United States the Nocturnal Adoration Society has enjoyed the privilege of this practice, much approved by indults of the Holy See and the American Bishops. Whether the Liturgy Committee finds that practice normative or not is uncertain. In the Bishops' newsletter on the liturgy, January 1987, the Bishops revised their interpretation of June-July 1986 to say that perpetual adoration was permitted not only in canonical religious communities but also among "other pious groups" which may include the Nocturnal Adoration Society. (6)

But the spirit and principles of interpretation here may be the most important aspect of the Bishops' instruction. Using the imperfect language of judicial comparison, the recent instruction is a form of strict constructionism. Even the exception for "other pious groups" was drawn from the original Papal documents and, in this, the Bishops tightened the exception saying that it did not apply to parish churches or to chapels. (7)

In view of all this, it seems appropriate and opportune to ask: has the thinking of the USCC Committee on the Liturgy undergone significant change?

Consider the immediate post-Vatican Council view of Father Frederick R. McManus, the Executive Secretary of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy from 1965 to 1975. What he wrote then was approved by the USCC Committee and his views were widely circulated. In *Worship* in 1974 he wrote extensively on the principles for interpreting liturgical regulation by the Holy See. (8)

He began citing the 1916 Code which reserved to the Holy See all regulation of the liturgy, and which required local Ordinaries to enforce Roman regulations. (9) Then, drawing on his experience as Secretary of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy for nine years, and writing ostensibly with the approval or general agreement of the Bishops, he established guidelines for implementing liturgical regulations from the Holy See. He saw four special problems which he thought needed

to be addressed in this context:

(1) Although the four Eucharistic Prayers of the Mass were firmly established by law (10), some celebrants wished to alter them for children and for the mentally handicapped.

(2) Although two Roman congregations had forbidden First Communion before First Confession (11), he and others believed that no one in Rome wished children who had not committed mortal sin to make a confession before First Communion.

(3) Although Communion in the hand was still forbidden, he thought this custom was reinforced only by "a right wing press" which considered communion in the hand "irreverent."

(4) Although spontaneous prayers were strictly forbidden in the liturgy, he found the authorized prayers so confusing and untheological that he was not surprised that some priests were making changes that pleased them.

To these dilemmas, Father McManus proposed the following solutions:

Those who desired liturgical alterations contrary to law might take into consideration the difference between preceptive and directive rubrics, the first demanded, the other recommended. Many ancient but trivial liturgical regulations, he said, had already been eliminated by the Holy See before, during and after Vatican Council II, and in so doing the Holy See seemed to be commending a flexibility in the application of new general law. There is, he told us, "a vast difference between formal decrees and any kind of supplementary documents of guidance, directories, instructions, and the like. These distinctions are especially applicable to liturgical legislation." Liturgical books contained many directive notes that were, he wrote, "useful and helpful" but surely not binding. (12)

*Obiter dicta*, Father McManus lamented a canonical theory that said the law maker's mind outranked the interpreted reasonableness of the law. He also regretted the need of forty years for a contrary custom to "abrogate" a law. Having expressed his regret about those limitations, he extended his principles of interpretation — which were widely received — into what many consider a utilitarian antinomianism regarding regulation of the liturgy. In his own words:

"But there is another facet to custom in the church, which is prior to and more significant than limited legal custom. It is the actual usage of the Spirit-guided community which canonists call factual custom. This kind of usage is considered as the best interpreter of Church law (Canon 29) because the way in which the Christian people behave should be the clearest sign of what is needed by way of church order and discipline. In addition the revised liturgical

## Liturgical Regulations (Cont'd.)

books refer frequently to customary usage. By this they do not mean, as the context shows, the kind of legal custom that satisfies all the demands of binding canonical custom. Rather, they show respect for the usage actually present and developing. Such usage *may not, perhaps, be of very long standing* but it is the practice of various local churches (i.e., diocese) or even in local congregations and parishes...

...In any event, those who are faced with the constraints or obstacles imposed by liturgical discipline may profitably explore the possibility of usage and custom. Its evaluation depends on many things — the objective goodness of the practice, the stability which it enjoys, the degree of variance with the prescribed liturgical norm, the significance of the matter involved. But Church law is never intended to be an end in itself or the highest goal. *It is possible to discern the workings of the Spirit in the actions, including the liturgical inspirations, of the smallest congregations and the least members of the community.*"(13). (All emphases ours.)

Father McManus then took up the question of dispensations:

"Dispensation is a traditional and valuable institute of Church order... Prior to the Second Vatican Council the received canonical doctrine was that the individual bishop in the local church could dispense from general church laws (for all practical purposes, papal law) only in certain cases of doubt and only when some clear concession of authority had been given to the bishop. For the most part, such concessions were embodied in faculties..."

... At Vatican II much of the discussion, derived from the preparatory stages of the Council, centered on the Bishops' desire to increase substantially the faculties and concessions which they already enjoyed...

Instead, the whole principle was reversed. The Conciliar decree *Christus Dominus* on the Bishops Pastoral Office in the Church (1965) recognizes that the Bishops, each one in his respective church, had the right to dispense the faithful, for their spiritual good and in particular cases, from the general law of the church — unless there is some clear intervention or exception to the rule made by the higher authority of pope or council (14). As yet, one could hardly say that the bishops have exhausted the opportunities afforded to them by this conciliar decision."(15)

He passed over lightly the restricting phrase "in particular cases." From these wide episcopal dispensations he moved to *epikeia* (In a concrete situation the individual invoking a higher law acts against the letter of an imperfect positive law." (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1967, 5, p. 476). He thought it should be exercised against restrictive liturgical law, exercised

"not... by Church authority but by those who are trying to observe the prescriptions of Church discipline, including liturgical discipline."

Continuing, Father McManus moved from *epikeia* to suggest an even wider freedom:

"Both canonists and moralists, again in very traditional ways, recognized *how often one may be 'excused' from the observance of Church law*. Their hesitance to pursue the principle far enough in the case of liturgical discipline does not detract from its importance..." (our emphasis).

"Writers — and church authorities — have been reluctant to draw the logical conclusions or to make a thorough application of the staid and abstract principles to liturgical situations."(16)

These principles, if generally applied to his four dilemmas, meant in practice that individuals drawing on "the Spirit" and on their own initiative were free to change very specific and reinforced demands of the law. Authority over the liturgy in such circumstances could pass almost entirely to liturgical innovation. Against clear law and even repeated Roman instruction, Father McManus summed up nicely his position on ways to avoid restricting regulations: "... the new rituals attempt and often achieve a pastoral balance between freedom and fixed order. Until the freedom is employed, it is hard to reject the fixed order... More important things than discipline and order call us: catechesis, creative growth. When there are grave inhibitions in the present rite, no one should hesitate to consider the several possibilities of relieve (above) for the good of the praying and worshipping people."(17)

Since there is no record of the Bishops of the Liturgy Committee (1974) disagreeing with Father McManus' views, it is reasonable to conclude that these views were at least acceptable. Historians and analysts of liturgical regulation will consider the published views of Bishops' Committee on extended exposition of the Blessed Sacrament (1986) a considerable change in their stated norms for the interpretation of liturgical regulation, and in their pointed mandate to pastors to follow the liturgical laws of the Holy See with diligence and obedience.

Eugene V. Clark  
St. John's University, New York

### Footnotes

1. Newsletter of the Secretariat of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, June/July 1986.
2. *Eucharisticum Mysterium* #86, repeating the phrases of the Ritual's rubrics on "Holy Communion and Worship of the Eucharist Outside of Mass."
3. *Roman Ritual* #82, *Holy Communion and Worship of the Eucharist Outside of Mass*, Promulgated by the Congregation  
*Cont'd. on page 19*

## “Religious Education for Adults”

by Joseph Schwartz

The question of religious education for adults is a critical one for the Church. If Romano Guardini is correct in his belief that the days ahead are bleak for believers and that there will be fewer of them, it is vital that the “happy few” be formed in faith so firmly and rightly that they will be able to bear the burden of keeping the flame in the coming time of darkness. We have a number of great documents to guide us in this field, notably the great essay by Paul VI on evangelization, and it should be adapted in some way for those adults who will be converting and to those already in the Church who need their knowledge updated and enhanced. Recently the United States Catholic Conference endorsed a general statement about adult religious education, *Serving Life and Faith*.<sup>\*</sup> It is not, alas, much influenced by Paul VI’s fine work. It does, however, offer a perspective on adult religious education that has some kind of quasi-official status. It deserves critical examination, because it may have national influence. It is a well-intentioned pamphlet in some ways, and at times offers judicious advice and states some clear truths. It admits for example in at least two instances that we listen for God’s voice in the teaching of the Church and there is such a thing as the teaching authority of the Church, never mind that it is functional only as a guide and support. On the other hand, its shortcomings are serious and can prove damaging both in what it says and what it fails to say. A typical trendy document with all the popular buzz words, it has great difficulty with the concepts of authority and absolute truth. In contrast, it is quite at home with pluralism, plebianism, and individualism.

For a document concerned with evangelization the question of authority is central. And this one does make the point that the bishops bear the primary responsibility for coordinating and directing “the various functions of the ministry of the Word so that there is one clear message of salvation proclaimed.” Further, it

holds that “adult religious educators are committed to helping learners integrate, to the fullest extent possible, the Church’s teaching and tradition into their lives.” But even in these instances, one has misgivings. The Pope is never mentioned along with the bishops as a teacher in a special way, an omission that in these times one must take note of.

Much more significant, the tone of the document does not reflect a commitment to what appears above. Instead, “indoctrination,” clearly an evil (and an old cliché), and the pre-Vatican II way of doing things (a slightly newer cliché) have been replaced, happily, by a spirit of inquiry and critical examination. One must avoid “either indoctrination or mere value clarification.” (Why “mere.”) Indoctrination “infringes on religious freedom,” and value clarification “ignores the religious tradition and its criteria for discerning value,” whatever that can possibly mean (values change in the historical process?) Adults, the document not surprisingly holds, are different from children who see only black and white, wanting simple and neat answers to every question. Some adults “feel comfortable with pluralism in philosophical and theological systems” (as if they were the same), and adult religious education seeking maturity in faith “should respect the legitimacy of the theological pluralism.”

Whenever I encounter such examples of sentimentality, I think of G.K. Chesterton’s dying words, “One must choose sides.” Children, who yearn for black and white, know this; the faith that informs such knowledge is presented by Christ as necessary for salvation. Unless we are like them, He said, we will not enter the kingdom of heaven. Christ’s answers to questions, both theological and moral, were always fundamentally simple. It is in respect to such answers that Saul Bellow’s admirable Mr. Sammler says that through all the degraded clowning of life each man knows what the terms are. “For that is the truth of it — that we all know, God, that we know, that we know, we know, we know.” He did not create moral and theological labyrinths, but showed us with hithertofore unmatched clarity what the way, the truth, and the light was — and left holy Mother Church to teach us when we find ourselves in a dark place. He did not leave us orphans.

*Serving Life and Faith* holds instead that the Church is essentially pluralistic, embracing a wide variety of theologies. There is bound to be conflict. “To manage the conflict effectively, compromises will have to be made, other ways of doing things sought.” This is a given. This is also a far cry from Incarnational simplicity, the only adequate response to the

---

### Footnotes

1. *Serving Life and Faith: Adult Religious Education and the American Catholic Community*. The National Committee on Adult Religious Education. Department of Education, United States Catholic Conference, Washington, D.C., 1986. It is put together in a curious fashion: there are almost as many quotations as text, the text and quotations being arranged in parallel columns, the two resonating with each other rather than one being proof for the other. Since the perspective comes from text and quotations, I will not separate the two in my quotations from and reference to particular topics, the text having already endorsed the quoted matter.

## “Religious Education for Adults” (Cont’d.)

unquestionable complexity of the secular world. To be in but not of the world is our task, a task which *Serving Life and Faith*, however, describes as “the development of a kind of religious sectarianism.” We are commanded to serve life primarily in our serving faith and not the other way around, as the title of this document appears to have it. The reader is warned by this document that faith is not a thing like a treasure to be protected and prized. Tell that, I am tempted to counter, to the Poles, the Latvians, the Lithuanians, the underground Churches of the Soviet Union and China. Both experience and Scripture tell us faith is our treasure, the pearl without price.

The document summarizes both its plebianism and pluralism in a sentence which the authors regard as so significant that it is printed in italics. “*Two obstacles to effective adult learning in our Church are unquestioning attitudes toward authority on the part of some believers and certain absolutizing tendencies on the part of some teachers and learners.*” I am reminded of the incident in the Gospel of Matthew (4:18-22) in which Christ comes upon Peter, Andrew, James, and John at their work and calls them. They were, as the poet Roland Flint tells us in “Follow,” ordinary working men who “day after day after day” absolutely trusted the settled shape of their lives in ways that would make it utterly impossible for them to be just called away. But “straightaway” they left their nets. So much for unquestioning attitudes toward authority. What is the Church? The body of Christ. What does it teach? Precisely what Christ taught and with His expressed will and blessing.

As to the idea of the absolute in the second part of the key sentence above, one is compelled to ask if the truth and values taught by Christ/Church are to be regarded as anything less than absolute. *Serving Life and Faith* keeps urging the reader to be free, trusting and open. Yes, of course, but to what? To Christ and His Church is the obvious answer. *Serving Life and Faith* tells us instead that Church membership is “neither passive acceptance of a list of doctrines, nor abject submission to a set of precepts.” Prescinding from the loaded adjectives “passive” and “abject,” one must say simply that the document is dead wrong. The cherished part of our being Catholic, as Flannery O’Connor pointed out, is belief in dogma (doctrines) because dogma is “the gateway to contemplation and an instrument of freedom.” It “preserves mystery for the human mind.” Like dogma, precepts were given to us by Christ: the ten commandments, the beatitudes, all those other lists with which the Bible is full. Of course we follow Christ in new and changing situations, emphasized by this text, but we follow him precisely because He is positively and absolutely the one way and His doctrines and precepts are eternally true.

Infinitely more important than the bravery of the march (*pace* John Dewey *et. al.*) is its destination.

Why, one is inclined to ask, would the well-intentioned writers of *Serving Life and Faith* get into such a muddle. I think their problem stems from an uncalled for emphasis on only one aspect of the meaning of Church. Their plebian bias insists that Church is community, “a community of persons who strengthen and support one another.” The model of the Church is “a community of disciples.” God comes to us “in and through community.” In this “community of learners,” adults see the Church as “a community of persons who are trying to understand the message of Jesus...” In part this is true, but its truth, in contrast to the Rotarians for instance, depends upon a much larger, integrating idea — that the Church is the body of Christ, an idea nowhere stressed. We are, in fact, communified into Christ.

For a document concerned with education, *Serving Life and Faith* is strikingly anti-intellectual. That is to say, the subject — religion/theology — is to be done, not studied. Surely, the corruption of that approach is already evident from its use in grade school and high school where its complete failure should serve as a warning to those concerned with adult education. Since it is so evident that we must at all times *do* our religion, it should be just as evident that it would be a good idea to set aside time for the formal study of it. Since this is adult education, it must attend to the dogmas and precepts of the Church. It must have an intellectual center, a curriculum, which aims at knowing as the result of study. Teaching facts and learning reasons must be central. How can one be certain that the theology one *does* is worth doing unless one knows what it truly commands? Personal discernments cry out for the steadying force of the Church’s authentic teaching, or there is no unity or accountability. Without the common truth which come from dogma and precept, one invites all the chaos inherent in the dread argument of the individual case where one is subject to no tribunal but his own will. It is true, as the document emphasizes, that adults learn Catholic ways by experiencing the example of a specific Catholic community, by being a participant in liturgical activities, and through self-directed learning. But if these things are enough, why have adult education? If they are not enough, what more can adult education do? It can help us to *know* — to know who this Christ is to whom we give our lives fully, freely, and without reservation. It can teach us what He taught and why He taught it.

The quality most needed by the adult educator is training in religious studies/theology, a quality not attended to in this document. Most of the emphasis is on his need to be a model. But the concept of model is

*Cont’d. on page 19*

## Items of Interest

● Fellowship member **Paul Marx**, O.S.B. has published a delightful little booklet entitled "*Eight Reasons You Should Consider Having One More Child*." Did you know that among developed nations, "given the high rates of overcopulation," only Poland and Ireland are reproducing their populations? Our U.S. couples average only 1.8 children, a radical change in Catholic rates being part of the picture.

Those who believe in the Catholic value system will find this attractive twenty-one page booklet a good gift to Pre-Cana couples and for those attending marriage conferences. Available at Human Life International, 7845 E. Airpark Road, Gaithersburg, Maryland 20879, (301) 670-7884). 100 copies 75¢ each.

● Msgr. Michael Wrenn of the New York Archdiocesan Pontifical Catechetical Institute and Father Robert Levis of Gannon University have just returned from a speaking tour of Australia. Dr. Levis reports a situation comparable to that in Canada and the United States:

"Mr. B.A. Santamaria, veteran Catholic social activist, writes that only 25% of Australian Catholics practice their faith today while 54% did in the 60's. That practicing Catholics are reduced from 2 to 1 million. That 55% of third and fourth year students in Catholic secondary schools don't practice their faith, with a higher percentage not accepting its moral teaching. Vocations have almost dried up. Approximately 80% of the same graduates abandon the practice of the Faith within two years of graduation. Right before we arrived, Dr. Gideon Goosen, head of the Religion Department at the Catholic College of Education, North Sydney Campus, wrote that only 25% of future Catholic teachers accepted the Church's teaching on birth control; 35% believed it was acceptable to live together without marriage, and that only 52% of trainee teachers attended Mass weekly since they found such practice boring."

But:

"I have never met a finer body of priests anywhere — zealous, totally dedicated, informed, big-hearted. They wear their heart on their white-sleeved shirts and it was always opened for us. Msgr. Kevin M. Toomey described the Association as a forum for orthodoxy, as a vehicle to demonstrate the loyalty of the Australian clergy to the Church's Magisterium, and as a support group for its members. 'We are just ordinary priests doing our best to live out our priesthood in communion

with the Pope and our Bishops.' The men we met are not ordinary in the least. Fr. Brian McEwen, the Secretary, Fr. John Hayres, Treasurer, and the major-domo of it all; the Editor of the Association's clever newsletter, *The Priest*, is Fr. John Walter."

● *The Human Life Review* is the only national publication focusing directly on the "social-issues" of abortion, of "the Right to Die," of infanticide for "imperfect" newborns. Its serious and often scholarly level has led to it being widely read by all sides involved in these and related controversies. The HLR also publishes articles and documentation on family issues, sex education, and other life-oriented subjects. It is a full-sized quarterly that averages over one hundred pages per issue.

Published regularly since 1975, the *Review* has featured well-known writers like Clare Boothe Luce, Malcolm Muggeridge, Joseph Sobran, Ellen Wilson Fielding, and Francis Canavan, S.J. It has also published many recognized experts on human life issues — Professor (now Federal Judge) John T. Noonan, Jr., Germain Grisez, Paul Ramsey, James Hitchcock — as well as foreign experts like Dr. Jerome Lejeune and Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn.

The *Review* has also published a wide range of "appendices" — background articles and documents related to the featured articles. Writers and scholars will find such source material of special use and interest. Members of the Fellowship may wish their university libraries to subscribe.

The subscription rate is \$15.00 per year U.S. (Canada and all other foreign \$19.00). Sample copy available on request. Address all correspondence to: The Human Life Review, 150 East 35th Street, New York, NY 10016.

● **OPENING IN PSYCHOLOGY:** Permanent position, Fall 1987, Generalist. Assistant Professorship. For information contact: Dr. John Hittinger, College of St. Francis, Joliet, Illinois 60435, (815) 740-3457.

● Requests for information of the whereabouts of Msgr. Kelly's *Battle for the American Church* have turned up information that copies are still available from Our Blessed Lady of Victory, RR No. Box 25, Brouking, South Dakota; Attention: Father Ronald Taugen. \$12.50 plus \$2.00 postage and handling.

## Friends of the Fellowship

Bishop John A. Marshall

Bishop Charles G. Maloney

## An Insight Into Superior Catholic Education

A recent graduate saying it works.

Dr. Michael Waldstein offers an assessment of the value of his Thomas Aquinas College education in postgraduate studies. He spoke of this in November, 1985. He is married to the former Susan Burnham (1978). With their three children, they live in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

"...I am deeply grateful for the years I spent at Thomas Aquinas. In the eight years since I graduated from there, my gratitude has increased. Let me single out some of the reasons for this gratitude.

"...What Thomas Aquinas has given me is a certain vigor and directness of thinking. It is often easier for me than for much brighter students to go to the center of a text and to defend my reading. The reason lies, I think, in the tutorial method at Thomas Aquinas and in the use of primary texts rather than textbooks.

"...I was introduced in a disciplined way to some of the most basic questions, principles, and methods, which underlie the various branches of human knowledge.

"...My fellow students at Harvard were never as clearly confronted with the basic questions in their most articulate formulations. They battle with their echoes. This is why so much of their energy is spent in groping around instead of in digging straight down to the roots.

"...I am becoming more and more aware of the crucial importance of one aspect of the foundation I received at

Thomas Aquinas, namely, the study of the origins of the scientific revolution. At Thomas Aquinas, we closely read Bacon, Descartes, Galileo, Newton, Lavoisier, etc., and we confronted their philosophy of nature with that of the ancients and the medievals. This critical confrontation has made me much more aware of the grave problems of our modern scientific worldview.

"...Thomas Aquinas College introduced me to the Fathers of the Church and to St. Thomas Aquinas. It thereby gave me a little taste of what real wisdom might be like, and that the hope for wisdom is not completely fruitless. It began to show me that the intellectual tradition embodied by the Fathers and St. Thomas and continued by authors like Newman, de Lubac and von Balthasar, has a depth and strength which is unparalleled by anything else.

"...It is sometimes said that the College is weak in the humanities and the arts; that the emphasis is too abstract and conceptual, too Aristotelian, and not historical enough. When I was a student at the College, I sometimes repeated this criticism. But my experience in Rome gave me a different perspective.

"...At the Biblical Institute, I met students and teachers with tremendous culture and with a real sense for the Catholic tradition. Yet they often lacked the clarity of reflection necessary to defend their Catholic sense. Above all, they were cowed by natural science and too readily conceded ground to the scientific world view, even if it went against their Christian sense."

## Priestly Training

- A national meeting on "Excellence in Priestly Education Today" will be held on October 9-11 at St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Boston, Massachusetts.

Over the last years, at the request of the Holy Father, there has been a visitation of seminaries in this country to learn how well our seminaries are facing the challenges of our time. Clearly it is a first priority in the Church to provide excellent formation for its priests.

The meeting will consider the state of American seminaries, as this has been revealed in the recent papal visitations. It will consider many elements of priest-formation: how the commitment of faith is at home with serious and critical theological study; how moral theology is taught in an age of spiritual confusion and dissent; how pastoral and spiritual formation can be consistent with systematic education; how the fundamental principles and the forms of thinking supported in Christian philosophy are related to formation in faith.

Speakers will include some members of the American hierarchy: Cardinal Bernard Law, Bishop

John A. Marshall, Bishop Donald Wuerl. Scholars addressing the meeting will include: Rev. Robert Sokolowski and Dean Jude Dougherty, of Catholic University of America; Rev. John Michael McDermott, S.J., of the Gregorian University; Rev. Leonard Kennedy, C.S.B., of the University of St. Thomas; Very Rev. Charles Murphy, of St. John's Seminary, Boston, formerly Rector of the North American College.

Bishops of the country, and superiors of religious communities of priests will be invited to the meeting, as well as administrators and faculty members of seminaries, as well as those with other major interests in seminaries: as vocation directors, and those who plan the education of priests for diocesan seminaries and religious orders.

Plans for the meeting were originally begun by the Priestly Formation Committee of the American Catholic Philosophical Association. Many other groups concerned with priestly education gave their support and help in planning the sessions.

## A Catholic Educator's Concerns About School-Based Health Clinics:

*Excerpts from a paper by Monsignor Vincent D. Breen, delivered at National Meeting on School-Based Health Clinics sponsored by the NCCB, the USCC, and the NCCC—March 23 and 24, 1987:*

...From the very beginning let me be quite clear. I would not object to School Based Health Clinics if they had been designed to deal with the true medical needs of poor and minority youngsters. Were the advocates of the clinics actually concerned about immunizations, physical examinations, laboratory tests, First Aid or the treatment of certain illnesses, they would answer a need. They could be of social benefit to the needy who might not otherwise receive such services. Let me be absolutely blunt: those who are advocating the Clinics are using the real medical needs of the poor as a hoax to achieve their own sole purpose: to halt the spread of pregnancies among the teenage population and particularly among minorities. That, my friends, is reality.

Let me tell you how the clinic operates in the real situation that the student faces—it is very different from what we might imagine it to be. A student comes to the clinic for a specific reason—let us say a dental examination. Before that student is treated or serviced in any fashion, he or she is first given a psycho-social evaluation as part of his or her medical history. It is a casual thing: the student is interviewed but no form is filled out immediately. Much of the questioning deals with the sexual behavior and attitudes of the student. The students are told that all that they say is held in professional confidentiality, even from their parents. The student will be asked if any of his/her friends are sexually active even if he/she is not. Almost every kid has a friend who is sexually active but an affirmative response to this question qualifies that student for identification as at high risk for sexual activity. The use of contraceptives is then urged and made easily available. Remember, the clinic is not primarily intended by its advocates for basic medical needs. These are the subterfuges used to get at the teenage pregnancy problem or the AIDS issue which are the prime intent of the clinics...

Some well-meaning people may say: let us support the clinics but oppose those services which deal with the student's sexual activity.

Maybe there are some who want us to take this path. I will make my point very clear: the advocates of the clinics would lose all interest in them, indeed would oppose them, were they not tied to the teenage pregnancy problem. In addition, the clinics manipulate the client-patient relationship in such a manner as to obviate any naive attempt by opponents of the clinics to reach a good faith compromise. Sadly, the advocates of the clinics are not nearly as concerned about the poor as you and I are.

Parental consent forms are useless for the very same reason. The proponents of the clinics will agree gladly and eagerly to their use. Why? Not because they respect parents' rights but because they already are prepared to use the sacred patient-doctor relationship and its confidentiality as a ruse to by-pass the will of the parents. The parent consent form may prevent the student from coming to the clinic to seek contraceptives; it will not prevent the student from leaving the clinic with a prescription for contraceptives. This is the way it is intended to work.

I think that it is essential that we look very carefully into the attitudes of the pro-clinic advocates and their *rationale* in order to achieve a better insight into the problems we face. This is a very important task for us. Clinic advocates are very clearly people of good intent—not at all desirous of harming children...

But they have a very different attitude about the nature of the human person, the value of human life and the meaning of human sexuality. And in the last analysis it is this attitude which they are forcing onto the young people in the schools.

It is becoming more and more clear that government is using its power to subsidize both social as well as educational programs in order to foster a set of values that is at great variance with the Judaic-Christian principles of the last 5,000 years as well as the traditions of Western Civilization. It is all done in an apparently democratic context. We are not told, as in a totalitarian society, that we cannot hold or teach our values to the young. The approach is far more subtle—and probably more sinister. We are simply placed in a position where we have to make a choice between not having the resources to run our own programs—which with increased costs is the reality of the situation—or accepting government funds subject to the unacceptable proviso attached to it—namely, operate our program out of a philosophy that is totally contrary to our religious beliefs.

And in the weird climate of our times, we are the ones told that we are trying to force our religious beliefs on others. The truth is that what we are demanding is that others not force their secular beliefs on us...

The parent is required by the law to send his/her child to school. If the parent refuses to do so, the parent violates the law and is subject to its penalties. Yet it is in this very institution to which the parent is required by law to send the child that that child is subjected to values that are contrary to the religious beliefs of the parents...

The institution of the school holds a venerable

## School Based Clinics (Cont'd.)

place in American tradition. Generation after generation has considered the school to be the *locus* of first growth and value formation. It is its very nature to teach values to the students—not only by what the teacher says or does but even more through the approbation that the school gives to certain activities. The very presence in the school of a clinic, which tells some children that extra-marital sex is acceptable as long as pregnancy and disease are avoided, inevitably presents that same message to all children—even if they have never been to the clinic...

We who oppose the Clinics do not hold the Manichean attitude that condemns the body and sex. We value the body and sex as they have been intended in God's design. Indeed both are related in marriage to the free self-giving and self-commitment which man and woman make of themselves to each other in imitation of God's creative and redemptive love for us all.

I have spoken at some length about the differences between ourselves and the advocates of the health clinics. Yet I think that it is essential for us to see precisely the differences and the source of our disagreements, if we are ever to confront the issue intelligently. Our differences with our opponents are basically three: the nature of the human person, the value of human life and the meaning of human sexuality.

At the beginning of this talk I spoke of this question in terms of a madness that we are imposing on our children. Many have already become sexually active; some have contracted AIDS or some form of venereal disease...

But before we turn to that, there are other points I want to make. I think that it is critical that we develop better programs for sex education for our own use in our Schools and CCD than we have so far done. None of what I am about to say should be taken as a criticism of those who have worked very hard to produce materials and curricula for sex education programs. All of them have their value; all of them have their limitations. I will say this once and then let you discuss it as you see fit: I have yet to find the sex education program for use in Catholic Schools or CCD that I find fully satisfactory. To say otherwise would be dishonest of my part. I will be frank—even if this is controversial—I recommend to the Bishops that they take charge through their staff for the development of new Sex Education programs and take the issue out of the hands of the publishers...

My second set of recommendations deals with Public School Programs and relates to our dialogue with public school officials. In the area of counseling for abortions and prescribing or distributing contraceptives, there is no compromise that we can make. We must oppose these whether we are successful or not. It is necessary both to teach our people our moral positions

and to witness to Gospel values—even when we fail to remove the programs.

In the area of Public School sex education programs, we must constantly push for new programs that are moral and reflect values that are acceptable to the vast majority of American people. These programs must stress the value and worth of the self and of others, the appreciation of sexuality as the intimate expression of married love and commitment, the importance of beginning sexual activity only at the time of marriage, the responsibilities that sexual activity brings, the importance of family and a host of others.

Let me return now to something that I have already made reference to. School Based Health Clinics are seen by their advocaes as the solution to the serious problems of teenage pregnancies and the potential of an AIDS epidemic in our society. These problems are real and those of us who oppose the clinics cannot pretend that a large percentage of our teenagers are not sexually active... We must address the needs of these kids and not act as though they do not exist...

Both the government and the Church must put money and personnel at the service of this problem. There must be sustained efforts at direct intervention to get sexually active youngsters the proper counseling that will lead them to develop a healthy self-image and a respect for their own sexuality that leads them to change their behavioral patterns. It can be done, if society considers that it is a responsibility for us all. The Church together with government has to serve the victim of AIDS...

There are other recommendations that I think we should make to our leadership. For one thing, we seem to have gotten away from programs for youth in our parishes—and I mean by that for those young who are most in need of help. We have retreat programs for those who are already active in Church programs and these should continue. But Youth Ministry must be extended to those who are on the street corners and never in the Churches. A century or more ago the Bishops of the country were very anxious about the youth who had come here from Europe as immigrants and they concentrated their efforts on meeting their needs. Half a century ago, Bishop Sheil in Chicago began the Catholic Youth Organization to tend to the needs of the Depression children. Our challenge today is to find a new Bishop Sheil.

The television networks bear a large measure of responsibility for this problem.

Let us challenge the leadership of the communications industries of this nation to raise their moral standards and change their programming policies.

## Book Reviews

Malachi Martin, *The Jesuits: The Society of Jesus and the Betrayal of the Roman Catholic Church* (Simon and Schuster, 514 pp., \$19.95).

Malachi Martin may well be the wrong man to accuse the modern Jesuit leadership of betraying the Church. As an ex-Jesuit he suffers the handicap of all "exes" who write about what they once exed. Furthermore, he has an uncanny knack of publishing books with more than a reasonable share of factual errors. Simon and Schuster are equally careless in letting them stand, even if good copy editors are not readily available at a reasonable price. Finally, Martin is an Irish romanticist who cannot report a 16th Century event without making it sound as if was there with his tape recorder. He is accused of fictionalizing fact, merely to make the story come alive. The results are not always reliable history. However, Martin's storytelling is not necessarily untruthful, as when in *Jesuits* he fabulizes accurately the actual political views of the well-known Roman prelates. All in all, he fascinates while he annoys, simultaneously. In fifteen years Martin has gone from criticizing the Holy See in his *Three Popes and a Cardinal* to defending it in *Jesuits*.

On whatever side of *Jesuits* a reader finds himself, and regardless of how often his critics call Malachi Martin a liar, this book is worth reading for the questions it raises about religious life. Jesuits are eating it up, either to digest its meat or to spew out its poison. Their rabid interest is evidence of its importance if only as the cutting edge of dialogue, something at which modern Jesuits say they are good.

What has Martin done to exacerbate his relationships with the reigning Jesuit leaders? He argues through 514 pages that they have distorted the supernatural content of Vatican II, abandoned St. Ignatius' solemn commitment to the Papacy as well as their Founder's ascetical exercises, "traumogrified" (his word) the Church and her ancient doctrines, undermined the faith of "the little ones" by the public dissent of their prominent academics and, instead of being "saviors" of the world in the Church's sense, have become a corps of sociologists, building contractors, political manipulators and guerilla fighters. The revolution Jesuit leadership has accomplished within the Society and wishes to impose on the world is in Martin's view a deterioration of Christianity (commonplace in Western and Russian Society), not the renewal of Christianity and the salvation of the world contemplated by Vatican II.

What does this Irish-born author offer to support these allegations? He offers a panorama of activities and events in which Jesuits (Fourth Vow or no), encouraged by their superiors, made their chief post-Vatican II accomplishment to be the separation of the processes of spiritual formation — teaching, catechizing, moralizing, spiritual counselling, seminary life, and the institutions which manage these formative processes — from the

controlling authority of the *magisterium*, including that of the Pope. As commentary on this in-house Jesuit story, Martin draws heavily on what four popes from Pius XII to John Paul II have said about and to Jesuits.

Does Malachi Martin have a case?

When he stays with the papal criticisms, he has a *prima facie* case, even if one finds inexcusable the so-called forty factual errors and the hyperbolic language used against Jesuits like Pedro Arrupe and Vincent O'Keefe (who did as much to lose Fordham University to the Church as anyone).

If one adds to the controlled papal criticisms what leading Jesuits (mainly) have done (1) to separate Catholic higher education in the U.S., and many religious communities, from Church authority (2) to spread the notion that the "People of God's Church" and "the second magisterium" are independent realities within the Church, (3) to sanction sexual behavior and medical conduct among the faithful which deviates from Church norms; and (4) to exhaust passionately the Christian gospel in social activism and/or revolution — then one must say the Martin case against the Jesuits calls for further investigation.

If the Church were a democratic state and the alleged crimes against it were so widely reported in the media as Martin has succeeded in doing (let's call him the latter-day John Dean), the situation would call for a Senate investigation at the very least, and likely a Special Prosecutor (Archibald Cox?). Instead, Martin's charges are being greeted with "stonewalling" and "cover-up." The Jesuits are not to be on trial, Malachi Martin is.

*Jesuits*, says *America*, is fiction, a potboiler "dedicated to the enrichment of its author" (February 21, 1987). A semi-official Jesuit response came from Father John Padberg, S.J. (well-known for his role in the secularization of Jesuit colleges and seminaries) in a thirty-page recapitulation of Martin's "misrepresentation, falsehood, and imagination gone berserk." Padberg points to *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* to cite how non-materialist the contemporary Company really is, seemingly unmindful that many monthly publications like *Studies* have turned the Church and the Jesuit tradition up-side down. In the May 1986 issue, for example, Richard McCormick contributed to Catholic spiritual life by arguing in favor of public anti-Roman dissent from Church norms.

The man being called a Jesuit hit-man, George G. Higgins, was brought in to put the stake in Martin's heart (*America*, March 21, 1987) without that Monsignor alluding to anything any pope ever said about Jesuits — and Higgins is very good at quoting popes. He is also good at bullying. He scared Ernest Lefever from printing Jim Hitchcock's *The Pope and the Jesuits* threatening to "publicly challenge their (Lefever's group) commitment to interfaith cooperation and to do everything within my

## Book Reviews

limited power to discourage Catholic support of and participation in the work of the (Lefever's Ethics and Public Policy) Center." He now has Martin down as a Lefebvrite, although the author of *Jesuits* has said more than once in public that the French Archbishop is on the wrong track. Incidentally, Higgins is one who thinks that Richard McCormick's disagreement with magisterium "only concerns those issues" which are "properly open to dissent" (*Commonweal*, February 26, 1982).

It is a matter of public record that the first modern pope to point his finger at modern Jesuits was Pius XII (September 10, 1957) when he addressed their 30th General Congregation, five years before Vatican II. Pius was talking to and about European Jesuits in general and Teilhard Chardin in particular. (U.S. Jesuits in 1957 were superb practitioners of the faith.) The great theologian pope (prior to John Paul II) had *four major complaints about Jesuits*: (1) the "heterodox mentality" in their midst, (2) the predilection of some for "norms of action" and for eternal salvation from what is actually done rather than from what should be done, (3) the flouting of obedience to superiors, even to the Apostolic See; (4) their neglect of Society discipline, the "anxious desire for novelty," and "expensive pleasure trips." As far as the Jesuits are concerned the only thing they want to remember about the 1957 address is that Pius told them to stop smoking. Not even Malachi Martin exploits fully this analysis which anticipated almost by ten years the post-Vatican II problems of Paul with Jesuits (*The Pope Speaks*, Spring 1958).

Pius XII did not make these complaints out of whole cloth. He was the repository of reports coming out of the Jesuit world, in an era when priests were good, lukewarm, or bad, not conservative or liberal. Today these reports are being bottled up and their charges "stonewalled." Neither *America*, Padberg, nor Higgins take notice. Professor Hitchcock's book on the Jesuits contains better documented evidence of on-going abuses. Father Hans Kolvenbach recently assured a bishop that he would look into the "unacceptable thinking about the Church" which was publicly expressed by a Jesuit who distinguished between "the essential creed of Catholicism and the particular cultural baggage in which these beliefs are carried," i.e., "the norms and beliefs they experience in their local church." The Father General's intervention is awaited.

But why speak of complaints by individual Jesuits in the ranks?

Only recently a major Jesuit Acting Provincial polled (February 13, 1987) "each member of the Province" on ten postulates (propositions) with a request that he vote yes or no on the acceptability of the assertions and the suitability of presenting them to the Father General. All of the postulates, save one, concerned worldly interests (the poor, global awareness, base communities, peace, etc.) and their institutionalization within the Society. Postulate

Ten requests increased devotion to the Sacred of Heart of Jesus and Mary's Immaculate Heart, but no mention is made of Mass or the Sacraments, spiritual exercises, certainly nothing about the Fourth Vow or Magisterium. However, Postulate Eight is offered as a breakthrough calling for a yea or nay vote. It reads as follows with the accompanying reasons underlying the proposals:

"8. It is requested that the whole issue of homosexuality amongst religious begin to be examined and reflected upon in at least a semi-public manner within the Society." The reasons were two:

(1) "the prevalence of homosexual men in the Society (keeping such things in the dark does not bode well),"

(2) "in the light of the official Church teachings in this area — regardless of my own feelings about the truth of those teachings."

Peace to the shades of Wilfred Parsons and Robert Gannon! St. Ignatius Loyola aside, can anyone reconcile this Jesuit's observations and the mind of Christianity's founder? Would Jesus ever conceivably have had to say: "If any man looks lustfully at another man, etc." (CF Mt. 5:28)! Not even Malachi Martin had nerve enough to explore this side of the Jesuit coin.

Malachi Martin's mistakes are there for all to see. He does not document where he should and his flights of rhetoric might profitably have been moderated, even when they are based on interviews with anyone of the forty Jesuits he claims spoke to him freely. But it ill behooves Martin's Jesuit critics, who never defend the Pope against McCormick, Burghardt, Fuchs, Segundo, etc. to object to Martin's criticism of Karl Rahner or Pedro Arrupe. Toward the end of his life, Rahner lined up with dissenters, prompting John Paul II to refuse to have his picture taken with Rahner on the occasion of the latter's golden jubilee (Rahner told that story himself). Nor is Arrupe a sacred cow either. He was known to return to Gesu saying the Pope supports me, after Paul VI had just bawled him out!

Other devoted religious confess that their own communities of men and women are in no better shape than the Jesuits. Rome has already chastised many of the abuses Martin mentioned, but reform still remains invisible. One veteran Jesuit academic summed up the feelings of many of his confreres in a March 3, 1987 letter to the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars:

"You will have read about the "blast" against Malachi Martin, issued from the Jesuit Conference. Each of our communities received advance copies of this screed. The *ad hominem* is seldom an effective response to supposed or asserted errors. Quite truthfully, I am delighted with and engrossed in Martin's book. Unfortunately, he makes several relatively minor mistakes, such as repeatedly confusing our Curia with the Gesu, our principal

## Book Reviews

Jesuit church in Rome. Also, he is admittedly wrong in assigning Gustavo Gutierrez to the Society of Jesus. So what? These are gnats in amber!

"I am one of the *majority* in the S.J., gradually side-tracked, effectively "silenced," cleverly excluded from administrative positions and from ever voting in even a province congregation, much less in a general congregation in Rome. We in the majority have had to watch what those Martin writes about were doing to our beloved S.J., unchecked by the last three Fathers General. Martin could have painted a darker picture than he does. *Entre nous*, most of us trained according to Ignatian principles pray that God will spare and strengthen Pope John Paul II to turn us around!"

In contradiction, John Padberg says: "A very small minority of Jesuits, perhaps not as many as two hundred out of twenty-five thousand, was unalterably convinced that the Society was betraying itself and the Church. It is their viewpoint which is often measured in this book."

The full truth about "the facts" is well hidden. The "majority" of Jesuits are likely to be loyal men caught in the crossfire of opposing and warring factions within the Company. As Jesuits more or less still faithful to the Company they likely object to Martin's book, even if they allow some of it is right. They do not want to go backward but neither are they comfortable with the direction and dissent or excesses of the present leadership. The tragedy is that the book is being favored by those who do not particularly favor "preferential option for the poor," while it is attacked by religious, ex-religious and their allies who are not noticeable exponents of the Church's sacred offerings. Martin is discredited with many Jesuits who would like to see the cockle in their Society separated from the wheat.

But we will never know the good from the bad unless we get a special prosecutor with the power to grant immunity from expulsion to those Jesuits willing to give public testimony. If Rome can face up to an Archbishop, it can face up to the ministry of the Jesuits. In the meantime, Jesuits who speak devotedly of John Paul II are saying privately that the present leadership is leading the Society to extinction, at least in the United States.

The prophet Malachi of Old Testament fame was not a very important person (even his name was not his own), but he is remembered for the reproaches he leveled against the priests and people of Jewry five centuries before Christ. And he used some strong language against offenders (Chapter 2):

"You have turned aside from the way and have caused many to falter by your instruction;  
You have made void the covenant of Levi, says the Lord of Hosts.

I, therefore, have made you contemptible and base before all the people."

Stern speech, the kind frequently used today by religious against pope and bishops. Malachi the Martin may be less important, and more savage than Malachi the Prophet, but then the opening lines of the prophet's book offer hope and consolation: "An oracle - the word of the Lord to Israel through Malachi."

—Charles J. Leonard

### Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J.

To European Jesuit Mission Workers, August 7, 1986: "La justice nous pousse dans le domaine de la réalité socio-économique de l'homme ou seule l'idéologie marxiste semble parler le mot juste."

*The New Biology: Discovering the Wisdom in Nature* by Robert Augros and George Stanciu, Boston: New Science Library - Shambhala. \$19.95.

New Science Library, an imprint of Shambhala Publications of Boston, has added to its offerings a new series of works in non-reductionist science, including some by prestigious authors. *The New Biology* is their latest and one of their most intriguing additions. The authors, lucid and gifted writers, make the best in modern biology accessible to humanists, presenting with unity and coherence the philosophical significance of the great discoveries of our time in ecology, molecular biology, evolution, and animal behavior. Among the issues brilliantly and sometimes movingly treated are the autonomy of biology as a science, how living things are distinct from machines, the nature of consciousness in animals, whether apes are capable of language, and the role of purpose in the life sciences. The authors are to be congratulated on the singular concreteness of their text, replete with illustrations and fascinating animal stories. Meticulous scholarship also characterizes *The New Biology*. Hundreds of direct quotations from leading biologists are woven into the text which reads like a dialogue among the experts: Gould, Monod, Crick, Waddington, Lorenz...

Darwin, who is currently under attack, sometimes acrimonious, in many books and articles by scientists and others, is criticized here but receives fair treatment. The advantage of this book over others of its type is that Augros and Stanciu present a rigorously documented alternative to natural selection, an alternative which is shown not to conflict with revelation or creation. And how refreshing it is to see an account where evolution is part of the picture but does not devour the whole of biology.

## Books Received

On the back cover, Nobel Prize winning neuroscientist Sir John Eccles remarks: "A distinguishing feature of this fine book is the emphasis on new ideas in biology... The authors... build up a story of creative thinking in key aspects of biology, and discredit reductionist materialism. It is of great importance that the new revolutionary ideas in evolutionary biology run as a strand through the many themes of the successive chapters. The text is very well written and the book is highly recommended to the wide audience of all thinking people, young and old."

Anyone with a love for nature, or an interest in science, or an intellectual curiosity about man and the world he inhabits will not be able to put this book down. Its introduction promises the reader a better understanding of what science is and a new sense of nature, promises that are, for the most part, made good by the end of the book. Apart from its appeal to general readership, *The New Biology* would make an excellent textbook for courses in biology, history of science, humanities, and philosophy. This book may well prove to be an important influence in renovating and rectifying the life sciences. In any event it deserves to become an authoritative resource in biology for many years to come.

John Meehan

- Weldon M. Hardenbrook, *Missing From Action: Vanishing Manhood in America* (Thomas Nelson Publishers, 192 pp., \$14.95)

Thirty years ago psychologists were pointing to Momism as a major affliction of American society, the domination of the formation of the young by mothers. Then came feminism and vanishing motherhood (fatherhood of necessity) by means of abortifacients or just plain abortion. Now comes this member of the Evangelical Orthodox Church and a Protestant publishing house to take up a subject which one would have thought might have been analyzed earlier by a Catholic, given the Church's strong tradition on differentiated family roles. In any event, this delightful book, nicely written, takes up the four fabrications of American manhood; the Macho-Maniac (Dirty Harry), the Great Pretender (Archie Bunker), the Wimp (Dagwood), and the Gender Blender (Boy George). All these men are missing from action, not only in the family but in the Church. God, who was once our Father, has become in the process God our Neuter.

Fellowship member Paul Vitz is perfectly correct when he says the crisis of manhood is major in our society, for Christianity particularly. A good book.

- Dennis M. Helming, *Footprints in the Snow: A Pictorial Biography of Josemaria Escriva — Founder of Opus Dei* (Scepter Press, New Rochelle, New York 10801, \$6.95, 79 pp.).

Anyone so successful in establishing and maintaining a growing religious society deserves momentos as well as kudos. Dennis Helming met Msgr. Escriva in the 1950's and was impressed, obviously. The story itself is a fascinating saga.

- Christopher Wolfe *Essays on Faith and Liberal Democracy* (University Press, 202 pp., \$12.95).

Fellowship member Chris Wolfe tackles what will be an increasingly hot subject by the end of the century — the relationship of religious faith and liberal democracy. Seven chapters delve into history, civil and religious, and into the meaning of the First Amendment. His last chapter "The Vatican as Nobody's Ally" is required reading for those who think the Church is a captive of political extremists.

- Michael Finch, *G.K. Chesterton: A Biography* (Harper and Row, 369 pp., \$18.95).

For those who thought G.K. was finally buried once and for all, the recent rash of books about him and his sayings is delightful to anyone who heard him in the flesh, or is old enough to have been party to his great era of English Catholic apologists, — the era of Belloc, Dawson, Hollis, Knox, Lunn, McNabb, Noyes, Maisie Ward and by adoption Frank Sheed.

At all events here are twenty easily-read chapters about a believing *litteratus* from a world of literate unbelievers. *The Chesterton Quarterly* gave the book mixed reviews, but friends of the Great Man will find ample rewards in this handsomely bound book. (Incidentally, G.K. was a good looking young man, his later physiognomy to the contrary notwithstanding).

- Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *Behold the Pierced One*, (128 pp., \$7.95).

At a time in the history of the Church when "the Cross" is often underplayed and undefined in catechesis, sometimes not very visible in churches professing to be Christian, these spiritual meditations by a prelate of deep learning are valuable to retreatants and retreat masters.

- *Will it Liberate?*, Michael Novak, Paulist Press, 311 pp. \$14.95.

The noted Conservative theologian and thinker addresses critical issues in the theology of Liberation. Special attention is given to the leading figures in Latin American Liberation Theology and the Pope's reaction against its Marxist roots.

## Book Reviews

Most, Wm. G., *Catholic Apologetics Today* (Tan Books, Box 424, Rockford, Illinois, 272 pp.)

Why such a book? Because everyone should be able to give a rational basis why he/she believes. One does not just decide to believe by willing it so.

Some specific reasons for Christian apologetics are (1) its recent neglect, (2) its disdain by historicists, and (3) concern about offending non-Catholics.

Yet, charges today that the Church has changed her teaching or has been wrong in her claims are many. Father Most takes up these claims of errors of all kinds, especially in Scripture, and answers each charge.

Russell Shaw, *Renewal*, (Ignatius Pres, 328 pp., \$12.95).

Russell Shaw's novel, *Renewal*, puts flesh and blood onto the raw nerves of the Post-Vatican II Catholic Church in the United States. Shaw's characters parallel-contrast conservative and liberal bishops, conservative and liberal diocesan-paper editors, conservative and liberal priests - and people who will shift allegiance to whoever ascends to power contrasted with those whose principles are non-negotiable. Characters we have all met — or been — since Vatican II.

Conflict revolves around the question: What

### **Msgr. Clark, Cont'd. from page 8**

of Divine Worship 21 June 1973.

4. Code of Canon Law, Canons, 941-943

The *Liturgy Newsletter*, June/July 1986, p. 25, in citing the requirement of the bishop's consent for lengthy exposition in the *Roman Ritual*, 1973, does not note that the new Code, Canon 942, alluding to the same situation, omits the need for the Bishop's consent.

5. *Osservatore Romano* (English) Dec. 14, 1981

6. Newsletter of the Secretariat of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, January 1987, p. 2.

7. *Ibidem*.

8. *Worship*, Vol. 48, #6 (1974)

9. Code of Canon Law (1917) canons 1257 and 1261

### **Religious Education, Cont'd. from page 10**

given a prominence and a definition which could be harmful. The document argues, for instance, that modeling rescues students from formalism, restraint, and ritualism. Nothing is better than example, but example does not war with knowledge. It can be instead the result of knowledge put in action. If the model (the teacher) does in fact repudiate form, restraint, and ritual with respect to religion and religious life, he makes a great mistake since they are absolutely essential to the religious life. Without them, religious emotion does not know where to fix its energy and soon becomes mere enthusiasm.

Finally, there is in *Serving Life and Faith* a disconcerting emphasis on the need for adult Catholic

constitutes real renewal in the Catholic Church? And one of the key lines comes from one of the editors, "We needed conversion, and all we got was change."

Dialogue is Shaw's outstanding skill as a novelist. All his conversations ring as authentic human talk — often with deep emotion. His characters are created chiefly by what they say and how they say it, and conversations draw the reader into the gripping plot and move it to its unusual *denouement*. One can see the book transformed easily into a TV drama.

Irony in the conversations grows as the reader becomes aware of truths the speakers do not yet know. Next to excellent dialogue, irony is a sharp element of Mr. Shaw's craftsmanship.

The "revolution" in Religious Institutes - especially women's Religious Institutes — is about the only facet of Post Vatican II turmoil that Shaw misses. There are no Sister characters in the book. There are also very few pray-ers. God really lives for only one of the main characters, though others grope toward Him.

*Renewal* is a poignant novel which captures the pain, struggle, and hopes of Catholics living through the changes of the past twenty-five years. Once you get into the story, you won't want to stop until you see how it all ends.

10. Congregation for Divine Worship, Nov. 1, 1973 (AAS 1974, 66, 30-46)

11. Congregation for the Clergy, April 11, 1971, (AAS. 64, 1972, 173-176 and the Congregation for the Clergy with the Congregation for the Discipline of the Sacraments, May 24, 1973 (AAS. 65, 1973, 410)

12. *Worship*, op., cit., p. 355

13. *Worship*, cit. p. 357

14. *Christus Dominus*, #401 (Abbott)

15. *Worship*, op. cit., p. 359

16. *Worship*, op. cit., p. 364

17. *Worship*, op. cit., p. 366

education to pay significant attention to political, economic and military matters. That these are apt concerns for the adult citizen no one would question, but they are more appropriately handled by those most equipped to deal with them. If, instead, the educator successfully teaches dogma, precept, and moral behaviour, the Catholic citizen will be well equipped to apply his religious and moral knowledge, as needed, to the complex secular world of the probable, thus making a specific valuable contribution as citizen.

*Dr. Joseph Schwartz*  
Department of English  
Marquette University

## Nominations for Office 1987-1989 Terms

### FOR PRESIDENT

Dr. William May

### FOR VICE PRESIDENT

Fr. Thomas Weinandy, OFM, CAP

### FOR MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

Choose one from each pair.

1. Dr. Brian Benestad (Scranton)  
Dr. John Hittinger (St. Francis)
2. Dr. Maura Daly (Virginia)  
Dr. Hanna Klaus (Baltimore)

3. Dr. Joseph Schwartz (Marquette)  
Dr. Christopher Wolfe (Marquette)
4. Dr. Janet Smith (Notre Dame)  
Fr. Robert Levis (Gannon)

### VOTING FOR OFFICERS IS RESTRICTED TO REGULAR MEMBERS

*(If you have not received a ballot in the mail, call us)*

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

Non-Profit Org. U.S. Postage PAID Jamaica, NY 11439 Permit No. 451
--

## 1987 Fellowship Convention

Shortly formal invitations will be mailed to all Fellowship members and friends concerning our 10th National Convention scheduled for Los Angeles September 25, 26, 27 at the New Otani Hotel.

The general theme of the Convention is "The Catholic Church's Message to U.S. Citizens of the 21st Century."

Feature speakers include Archbishop Roger Mahoney, Fr. Benedict Ashley, O.P., Attorney William Ball, Esq., Msgr. George A. Kelly, sociologist Joseph Varacalli.

Specific subjects to be treated include Church and Science, Church and economics, Church and family, Church and politics, Church and ministry, etc.

Approximately 100 Fellowship members have already registered for this Convention. With the new

mailings all members will have the opportunity to register for the Convention early. Those who stay at the hotel will have the choice of single, double or twin bed rooms. You may arrange your own twin or ask headquarters to arrange for a partner. In the former case, inform us of your partner's name.

Registration for the Convention is \$20.00. The banquet cost is \$40.00. If you pay for both in advance the total cost is only \$50.00.

For further information call Msgr. Eugene V. Clark at (718) 990-6394.

✧ ✧ ✧

## 1988 Fellowship Convention

The 1988 Fellowship Convention will be held September 23, 24, 25, 1988 at the Park Plaza Hotel in Boston. Cardinal Law will be a featured participant. The general theme will be "Catholic Higher Education."