

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

Volume 12 Number 4

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

September 1989

Catholic Scholars and the Recovery of the Sacred

This issue of the Newsletter, the last that will appear during my term as President, will reach members shortly before we convene in Atlanta for our annual meeting. Since the theme of our convention this year is "Recovering the Sacred: Catholic Faith, Worship, and Practice", I thought it might be opportune to make some observations about the work of Catholic scholars relative to the "recovery of the sacred".

I think a useful starting point is provided by some remarks of Etienne Gilson in his essay, "The Intelligence in the Service of Christ the King," which appeared originally in his *Christianity and Philosophy* and which has been recently published in booklet form by Scepter Press. Gilson proceeds on the basic assumption that the Catholic scholar is one who has dedicated and consecrated his or her intelligence to the service of Christ and His redemptive mission. He notes that the Catholic scholar is aware (or should be aware) that piety never dispenses one from the discipline of study. One cannot become a scholar by osmosis or simple fiat. One becomes a scholar only by disciplined study and by the acquisition of the skills necessary to achieve learning in one's chosen field of inquiry. As Gilson puts the matter, "no one, nor anything, obliges the Christian to busy himself with science, art, or philosophy, for other ways of serving God are not wanting, but if that is the way of serving God that he has chosen, the end itself, which he proposed for himself in studying

(continued on page 2)

In This Issue

The President's Message.	p. 1
Msgr. Kelly on the Meeting of Pope John Paul II and the American Archbishops.	p. 3
Dr. May on Professor Gula on Natural Law and on Proportionalism.	p. 6
Father Perricone on The Bishops' Meeting, June 1988.	p. 9
Reviews of books written by George Kelly, Leo Sweeney, James O'Connor, Christopher Rengers, Douglas Morin, Eugene Diamond, and others.	p. 12
Msgr. Wrenn on a Special Note on Biblical Scholarship.	p. 17

them, binds him to excellence. He is bound, by the very intention which guides him, to become a good servant, a good philosopher, or a good artist. That is for him the only way of becoming a good servant. " It is indeed impossible, Gilson continues, "to place the intelligence in the service of God without respecting integrally the rights of the intelligence; otherwise, it would not be the intelligence that is put at his service."

Gilson's point here, of course, is obvious. But frequently the obvious is easily overlooked. I contend that Catholic scholars have an indispensable role to play in helping people today recover a sense of the sacred. But to carry out this work they must, as Gilson says, "respect integrally the rights of intelligence", and, I would add, the decent expectations of others that they will do so.

But Gilson's main point -- and here, I think, we touch on the indispensable role that Catholic scholars have in communicating a sense of the sacred -- is that for Catholic scholars the Catholic faith itself is the "secret core" animating their work. This is so because Catholic scholars approach their intellectual work with the conviction that the primary condition for attaining the truth -- and truth itself is a participation in the "sacred"-- is humility and the obedience of faith. Catholic scholars do not regard their faith as an obstacle to or restriction on intellectual freedom but rather as a wonderful gift from God that both opens the human mind to truths otherwise not accessible to it and enables the human mind to come to an ever deeper understanding of the truths it can discover by disciplined study. Faith both generates its own critique of the myths that compete with it and raises meaningful questions about what can be known by human inquiry.

I believe that Catholic scholars have an indispensable role to play in helping people today recover a sense of the sacred because Catholic scholars realize that existence itself is a great and inexplicable gift from God and that there are bonds linking being, truth, beauty, and goodness. Through their intellectual inquiry, research, and teaching they can, it seems to me, communicate to others the "awe-fulness" of existence. In my opinion, one of the major reasons why the sense of the sacred has been lost or at any rate obscured in our culture lies in the fact that existence today is considered as a "given" rather than as a "gift", a given that we are to manipulate through our technologizing and pragmatic intellects, precisely so that, as autonomous agents, we can satisfy our desires. Catholic scholars can do much, it seems to me, to restore to human consciousness an awareness that existence is a gift, one given us by the God who summons us to be, in Christ, fully the beings He wants us to be.

Dr. William E. May
Catholic University

Friends of the Fellowship

Archbishop Anthony J. Bevilacqua
Archbishop Leo Byrne
Bishop Charles J. Chaput
Bishop John S. Cummins
Bishop Thomas V. Daily
Bishop Nicholas D'Antonio
Bishop John F. Donoghue
Bishop Paul V. Dudley
Bishop Bernard J. Flanagan
Bishop Glennon P. Flavin
Bishop Harry Joseph Flynn
Bishop Marion F. Forst
Bishop Bernard J. Ganter
Bishop Odore J. Gendron
Bishop Eugene J. Gerber
Bishop Charles V. Grahmann
Bishop Lawrence P. Graves
Archbishop Philip M. Hannan
Bishop Charles R. Koester
Bishop George B. Lynch

Bishop Joseph F. Maguire
Bishop Adam J. Maida
Bishop John B. McDowell
Bishop Norman F. McFarland
Bishop Donald W. Montrose
Bishop John J. Myers
Bishop Joseph T. O'Keefe
Bishop John L. Paschang
Bishop Francis A. Quinn
Bishop Stanley G. Schlarman
Bishop Bernard Schmitt
Archbishop Daniel E. Sheehan
Bishop Michael J. Sheehan
Bishop Gilbert I. Sheldon
Bishop John J. Sullivan
Cardinal Edmund C. Szoka
Bishop Thomas J. Welsh
Archbishop John F. Whealon
Bishop Donald W. Wuerl

Evangelization in the Culture of the United States and the Bishop as Teacher of the Faith

(A Meeting of Pope John Paul II with the Archbishops of the United States (1))

On March 8-11, 1989, the active Cardinals and more than thirty other American archbishops met with Pope John Paul II and leading members of the Roman Curia to discuss ongoing problems of the Church in the United States. First requested by the NCCB president in 1986, then insisted upon by the Pope, the high level visit was intended by the Americans to help the Pope understand the Church of the United States better, and to offset the picture painted (so the leaders said) by homegrown "conservatives" of a sagging, divided and frequently rebellious Catholic body. Although an unfriendly Jesuit critic suggested that sitting archbishops were an easy audience for the Pope (he chose half of them) the more relevant fact is that under Church law (Cn. 436) archbishops are responsible for overseeing the faith and ecclesiastical discipline of dioceses within their Province. They are also obligated to inform the Pope of abuses if there are any, and to visit a suffragan See should it be neglected by the local bishop.

The summit Roman meeting seems to be what the participants called it – a success. The adjectives used to describe the discussions that followed ten archepiscopal presentations were "candor", "conviction", "kindness", and "cordiality". The announced euphoria resulted partially from the low expectations of both the American and Roman sides. Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, co-moderator for the visitors, made it clear that the conference was not designed to be action-oriented, merely a friendly discussion of the Catholic situation in the United States from two differing perspectives. He anticipated a better Roman understanding of the difficulties faced by bishops of the United States and a modicum of patience with their strategy for dealing with them. The calculated irenicism had to be one of the benefits to be derived from the sessions. John Paul II was relieved that no fireworks occurred to scandalize the faithful further. The Pope's confidence in the future apparently rests on his ability to choose the right bishops. As one wag on St. Peter's square summarized the meeting vis-a-vis the Americans: "If they're happy, fine, but wait till they see the next ten bishops."

Sideline observers of the Roman conference found most interesting the manner in which the bishops spoke of their local churches.

No one did this more enthusiastically than John Cardinal O'Connor, whose summary of American impediments to episcopal teaching was lucid and scholarly. O'Connor was forthright in pointing out the failure of the Church (here he could only mean hierarchy) to prepare the faithful for the meaning and sense of Vatican II, the four years waiting for *Humanae Vitae*, liturgical experiments run wild, and the rise of paratroopers for a new Church in the persons of Xavier Rynne, theological confounders, radical feminists, publishers of ambiguous catechetical texts, and distorters of Catholic college teaching. The controlling pragmatism of the secular culture, especially of the media, were not helpful either, the New York archbishop said; and as if that hindrance were not enough, a bishop had reason to worry whether his particular battles on behalf of authoritative teaching would enjoy the support of Rome or of the NCCB machinery. On this latter point Cardinal O'Connor did not provide specifics. Neither did he allude to differences some bishops have had with policies and definitions of the Holy See.

However, specifics were provided by Cardinal Joseph Bernardin in his summary of the results of the summit meeting. Without proposing a concrete solution for the differences, he listed a number of what he called "issues" that created controversy – the nature and conduct of religious life, first confession of children, inclusive liturgical language, altar girls, general absolution, fallen away Catholics, annulments, Catholic higher education, seminaries, clerical celibacy, and others. Cardinal Bernardin proposed as a response to these ongoing issues more dialogue, better arguments, further study, leaving "the issues" unresolved or open to anticipated future relaxation.⁽¹⁾

One interesting paragraph of the Bernardin summary concerned traditionalists:

Concern was expressed as to the rationale for placating a small but vocal number of people who side step the local bishop's authority and, at times, seek to undermine that authority. They would appear to present a distorted image of liturgical life in the U.S. and absorb a disproportional amount of time that could be better

given to other more urgent matters. In regard to the Tridentine Mass, it was made clear that the hesitation to permit its more frequent use is not with the Mass per se, which was the center of the Church's liturgical life for so many centuries. Rather, it is the attitude of some of those who request the Mass toward the local ecclesial authority, as well as toward many of the developments introduced by the Second Vatican Council.

No one who has ever run a parish or a diocesan agency or a catechetical center or a theology department would disagree with Cardinal Bernardin's view of traditionalists, particularly of Tridentines. Whether converted Lefebvrites or no, they are often self-righteous, hardnosed, bitter, and in pursuing their narrow religious interests frequently a nuisance. Why they think that Mass in an old Latin form with the priest facing the back wall of a Church is worth their anger or their pestiferous behavior is difficult to understand. Still, traditionalism, even of the Tridentine variety, is not a major problem for the Church in the United States or for bishops either. One is reminded of an old Depression adage among farmers, which went something like this: When wolves are ravaging your crops and wounding your children, it's no time to be worrying about gnats. Furthermore, the Tridentine Mass has been restored by the Holy See as a favor, and under normal Church rules, is to be permitted to those to whom it applies.

Bernard Cardinal Gantin, co-moderator of the summit meeting, gave no synthesis of "the issues" for the Roman side. Had Gantin, the Prefect of the Congregation for Bishops responsible for nominating all the bishops appointed by the Pope throughout the world, chosen to do so, his summation might have offered the chief reasons why John Paul II had the Archbishops come to Rome.

Others did speak:

1. Cardinal Ratzinger made the major point that bishops have to a large extent acquiesced in the reduction of their office to that of moderator of theological differences, becoming dispensers of pious advice rather than witnesses to binding truth.

2. Cardinal Antonio Innocenti, the Pope's chief catechist, asked bishops to guarantee that priests, especially teachers and seminary

professors, present Church doctrines without distortions or erroneous subjective interpretations.

3. Cardinal Jerome Hamer, who currently deals with religious institutes following his time with Ratzinger's Congregation, reminded the Archbishops that religious orders are not autonomous from bishops.

4. Cardinal Eduardo Gagnon, president of the Pope's Council on the Family, warned bishops against allowing programs of Natural Family Planning to be interfaced with methods of artificial contraception; about sex education guidelines which the Holy See wanted revised; about judges on marriage tribunals who do not believe in the indissolubility of marriage; of marriage preparation courses which do not reflect Familiaris Consortio; of the ordination of married deacons who have been sterilized; of ministries to the divorced which have degenerated into dating services for Catholics who are not free to marry; and of people on bishops' staffs who reject Humanae Vitae and are pro-choice on abortion.

5. Cardinal Martinez Somalo, who oversees divine worship, reminded the American prelates that they are the principal protectors of liturgical norms. He warned that failure to use their authority in a timely way creates difficulties — over, for example, the use of "exclusive language" (which "touches on biblical and theological questions"), the use of altar girls, modification of approved liturgical prayers that express the faith, the proper order of first confession and first communion for children, and so forth.

6. Whether Catholic colleges are really Catholic; whether the training of future priests is wholesome; whether professional accreditation of seminaries has not actually lowered theological standards; whether a generalized concept of ministry has replaced a specific concept of the ordained ministry; whether in dealing with priestly formation celibacy is treated as a problem — these were matters of concern when Cardinal William Baum, the Pope's man for Catholic education, analyzed the formation of future priests in the United States.

7. Cardinal Achille Silvestrini, the chief justice of the Church's Supreme Court, objected to the 37,538 annulments granted by the U.S. tribunals in 1985, 80 per cent of the world's total nullities. Of the American cases accepted, only three per cent of the decisions were negative. Silvestrini complained: "Various tribunals in the United States have introduced their own method

(of adjudication) not fully in conformity with the Code of Canon Law." Here the reference was to nullities based on the improper use of "psychic incapacity" as the reason for nullity (Canon 1095). The Cardinal made three particular charges: American judges were translating what modern psychologists call "immaturity" into the Church's "canonical immaturity", an entirely different concept; they were also confusing marital difficulty with incapacity for marriage; and equating the unhappy marriage with the invalid marriage. One of Silvestrini's indictments received little press comment: "grave violations of the right of defense." Historically under canon law procedures, the "Defender of the Bond" was an important officer of the tribunal. His job was to defend the indissolubility of what appeared to be sacramental marriage. Because Christ's clear words "what God has joined together let no man put asunder" (Mt. 19,6) represented a seemingly infallible and irreversible judgment, the Church has always placed the burden of proof against indissolubility on the plaintiff, with the "Defender of the Bond" named in Catholic law as the official adversary. The New Code of Canon Law (Canon 1432), for example, says he is "bound by office to propose and clarify everything which can be reasonably adduced against nullity or dissolution". Complaints have reached the Church's Court of Appeals in Rome (the Rota), often from spouses who object to attempts to declare null and void their long-established church marriages that the system which once stood for indissolubility, now stands for annulment. The burden of proof of indissolubility is now placed on defendants. And, while bishops subsidize at great expense their diocesan tribunals (and so the annulment process), spouses who choose to fight the dissolution of their marriage are often greeted with hostility from tribunal personnel (especially if they appeal to Rome), are denied access to appropriate documents, are forced to expend large amounts of their money to defend what once they thought the Church defended freely. Cardinal Silvestrini reminded his audience that "bishops even more than the officials who make up the tribunals, are responsible for the administration of justice", and so he counselled them to be "vigilant". The bishops defended their tribunals, pointing to the bad American family situation and their own caution in accepting cases for nullity assessment. After the Roman meeting Cardinal Bernardin invited Cardinal Silvestrini to visit the United States for an examination of the American Church's tribunal procedures.

The critical issue, however, is not procedure, but the substance of the Church's

Doctrine and law concerning consummated sacramental Catholic marriages.

What was not discussed in the Bernardin summation of "the issues" was doctrinal dissent or the extent of its influence on Catholic formation programs, including those under the direct control of bishops or within the family of the bishops itself. Cardinal O'Connor made several references to it, but Cardinal Bernardin did not, in his summary, list dissent as an "issue".

But the thoughts of John Paul II and millions of his flock go beyond those who merely wish to stem the current revolution at its present level. The fundamental issue for the Pope is the truth of revealed doctrine. As the archbishops of the United States were preparing to return home from the March meeting, the Pope, quoting one of their own, said in essence: We may not be successful, but we must be faithful. Continued John Paul:

We are the guardians of something given and given to the Church universal; something which is not the result of reflection, however competent, on cultural and social questions of the day, and is not merely the best path among many, but the one and only path to salvation.

We do live in a society saturated with personal and social values based on the unverified or dubious conclusions of experimental psychology and sociology. The deductions of these social sciences about human nature, about moral norms, about institutions and the function of the common good, about marriage and sex and religion itself, are often diametrically opposed to the teachings of a religion that is centered in God and derived from a revelation attributed to Jesus Christ. The taboos of modern society, largely created by social science theories, including notions of personal responsibility, self denial, directive authority, chastity in or out of marriage, obedience, sin, guilt or punishment, dogma, immortality, "the other world", etc. render the teachings of any respectable church especially a Catholic one, jejune, if not incredible or ridiculous.

One would think that after a quarter of a century bishops would be happy to take their problems to the Holy Father and seek his help in restoring authentic teaching and good order to the

(continued on page 19)

The Foundations of Faith

In his Apostolic Exhortation, Reconciliatio et Poenitentia, n. 17, Pope John Paul II spoke of a "doctrine, based on the Decalogue and on the preaching of the Old Testament, and assimilated into the kerygma of the Apostles and belonging to the earliest teaching of the Church; and constantly reaffirmed by her up to this day". The doctrine in question is that "there exist acts which per se and in themselves, independently of circumstances, are always seriously wrong by reason of their object". Correspondingly, as the Holy Father noted in his "Discourse to the International Congress of Moral Theology" on April 10, 1986, "there are moral norms that have a precise content which is immutable and unconditioned...for example, the norm...which forbids the direct killing of an innocent person".

This doctrine is rejected by Richard M. Gula, (1), professor of moral theology at St. Patrick's Seminary, Menlo Park, California, in this text of fundamental moral theology, one intended primarily for use in seminaries. In company with other moral theologians of what has come to be known as the "proportionalist" school of thought, Gula holds that "material" norms, which are concerned with specific sorts of human acts understood, according to him, in their materiality and thus independently of any intentions of the moral agent (cf. p 290), indeed "help us to recognize premoral goods and evils" and, "when stated negatively, point out the kind of conduct which ought to be avoided as far as possible" (p. 291, emphasis added). Nonetheless, such norms are not absolute or exceptionless insofar as they "ought to be interpreted as containing the implied qualifiers, 'if there were no further intervening factors', or 'unless there is a proportionate reason', or 'all things being equal'" (p. 291). Some norms of this kind, Gula holds, are "virtually exceptionless" or "practical absolutes" insofar as they "highlight values which, in the general course of events, will take precedence and, for all practical purposes, should be preferred". Among such "virtually exceptionless norms he includes the norm that would prohibit "cruel treatment of a child which is of no benefit to the child" (p. 294).

Gula is led to deny the existence of exceptionless or absolute specific moral norms ("material" norms in his terminology) because he accepts the "principle of proportionality". According to this principle "the key to determining the morality of an action...is the presence or absence of a proportionate reason" (p. 272). Gula, in company with other proportionalists, sharply

distinguishes between "pre-moral" or "ontic" evil and moral evil, and holds that one does moral evil only when one intends a "pre-moral" or "ontic" evil without a proportionate reason. When the agent intends and realizes through his action a proportionately greater "pre-moral" good, then the deliberate intending of a "pre-moral" or "ontic" evil, such as the death of an innocent person, is morally justifiable.

Gula, following Louis Janssens and others, claims that St. Thomas Aquinas "accepted proportionalism" (p. 265 ff). He likewise claims (pp. 223-228) that in his teaching on the natural law St. Thomas was inconsistent. In some texts, e.g., Summa Theologiae, I-2, 94, 2, St. Thomas, so Gula claims, accepted as normative the Ulpian understanding of natural law as "that which nature teaches all animals", that is, as a nonrational instinct. According to Gula, in this important text St. Thomas is saying that "practical reason perceives the natural inclinations in human persons in the form of moral imperatives which become the concrete conclusions of natural law" (p. 225, emphasis added). But in other texts, for instance Summa Theologiae, I-2, 91, 2 and 93, St. Thomas according to Gula, recognizes that the natural law is an order established by reason (p. 224). Gula holds that the second understanding of natural law, as an order established by reason, gives rise to the contemporary understanding of natural law which includes, as one of its primary features, the primacy of the principle of proportionate good (pp. 244-245). According to Gula the Ulpian understanding of natural law, which permeated Aquinas' teaching on sexual issues, gave rise to "physicalism" in morality, which sees as morally determinative the physical or material structure of human acts (p. 227). This physicalistic understanding of natural law (obviously an erroneous way of conceiving natural law) is, Gula holds, central to the teaching of the magisterium on sexual and medical issues and is reflected in such documents as Humanae Vitae, the 1975 Vatican Declaration on Certain Questions of Sexual Ethics, and the 1987 Instruction on Respect for Human Life in its Origin and on the Dignity of Procreation. The understanding of natural law as an intelligent ordering is reflected in documents concerned with social teachings, for instance Populorum Progressio and Octogesima Adveniens.

Gula believes that some very general moral principles pertain to the core of faith and have

been infallibly proposed by the magisterium and therefore require the assent of faith. Among such moral teachings he includes the teaching of the Church on the twofold command to love God and neighbor (p. 158, cf. p. 209). Since he denies that any specific moral norms ("material norms" in his terminology) are exceptionless or absolute, he obviously must regard as false or insufficiently articulated those moral teachings of the magisterium that absolutely proscribe such specific sorts of action as the deliberate killing of the innocent, sexual union outside of marriage, and the like. He nowhere considers the possibility that these norms and, indeed, the precepts of the Decalogue, as traditionally understood within the Church, have been infallibly proposed in accordance with the criteria set forth in Lumen Gentium, n. 25. He observes, in footnote 12 of chapter 11, p. 162, that some theologians, e.g., Germain Grisez and John Ford, have argued that the magisterial teaching on contraception has been infallibly proposed. However, he then refers his readers to Francis Sullivan's "critical response to this position", and it is evident that he agrees with Sullivan. He neglects, however, to inform his readers that Grisez replied extensively to Sullivan's response and that Sullivan has not as yet attempted to reply to Grisez.

Obviously, according to Gula, the specific moral norms regarding the direct killing of the innocent, sexual union outside of marriage, and so forth that the magisterium proposes are not infallibly proposed. Rather, they pertain to the "official" teaching authoritatively proposed by the magisterium and require the internal religious assent of mind and will. But, Gula holds, responsible dissent from such teaching is both necessary and legitimate (pp. 207-217). I will not here note all the reasons that Gula offers to support such responsible dissent. He claims (p. 208) that the manuals of moral theology in use prior to Vatican Council II recognized the legitimacy of "internal and private dissent", and to support this claim he refers to an article of his own (p. 218, note 9). He also says that "Vatican II admitted to loyal dissent not specifically in any of its decrees but implicitly in the very process by which it adopted its decrees" (p. 208).

I believe that in the foregoing paragraphs I have summarized some of the major positions taken by Gula. The pastoral implications of his work should be obvious. If not, they can be illustrated by the following passage, which appears in the section of the work where he denies that any "material" norms are absolute or exceptionless. Gula writes: "take the case of the married couple

who have all the children for whom they can care in a reasonable way. They cannot enlarge their family without compromising the well-being of their present children. At the same time, the couple feels that fairly regular sexual expression is necessary for the growth and development of their marriage. They do not feel that they can respond adequately to both values and follow the proscription of contraception in Humanae Vitae. What do they do?" (p. 290). Gula does not give an answer to his question. Yet readers will conclude, I am sure, that in this instance the couple could rightly choose to contracept, for by so doing they would be acting for a proportionately greater good and they would be acting contrary only to a "material norm" that must, after all, be interpreted as "containing the implied qualifier, 'unless there is a proportionate reason'" (p. 291). In my opinion, this is the conclusion that readers of Gula will draw. Since the work is intended primarily as a textbook in fundamental moral theology for seminarians, future priests will be among these readers. I believe that this illustrates the type of impact that Gula's work, so remarkably reminiscent in many ways of Timothy O'Connell's 1978 treatise, Principles for a Catholic Morality, will have on pastoral ministry.

But what of the claims made by Gula? I want, first of all, to note how Gula and other members of the proportionalist school of thought prejudice matters by referring to the exceptionless moral norms or moral absolutes proposed by the magisterium as "material" norms. According to Gula and his associates, these norms identify "material" or "physical" acts independently of any intent or purpose of the agent. But Catholic theologians who today defend the truth of moral absolutes (e.g., Pope John Paul II in Reconciliatio et Poenitentia, n. 17) and those who affirmed their truth in the tradition (as did St. Thomas, as shall soon be noted) offer a much different account of these norms, which they never call "material" or "behavioral" norms. According to these theologians, the human acts identified and morally excluded by such norms are not specified independently of the agent's will. Rather, they are specified "by the object", and by "object" is meant exactly what the agent chooses, either as an end (finis or finis remotus) or as a means (finis proximus). The "form", intelligibility, of such acts is not given by their nature as physical events in abstraction from the agent's understanding and willing, but from their intelligibly chosen objects.

Second, I think it should be noted that Gula's interpretation of St. Thomas is egregiously flawed, both with respect to St. Thomas'

understanding of natural law and with respect to his teaching on moral absolutes and the sources of the morality of a human act. In Summa Theologiae, 1-2, 94, 2, Thomas in no way says that our natural inclinations are "moral imperatives which become concrete conclusions of natural law". In this article he is dealing with the first principles of practical reasoning, principles analogous, in the practical order, to the first nondemonstrable principles of knowledge in the speculative order. He holds that these principles are based on the concept of the good, just as speculative principles are based on the concept of being. The foundational principle is that good is to be done and pursued and its opposite, evil, is to be avoided. Aquinas then says that our reason naturally grasps at good, and hence at what is to be done and pursued, those aspects of human flourishing to which we are naturally inclined. Gula's interpretation of this passage flies in the face of its reading. (For further analysis of this important Thomistic text, I refer readers to Germain Grisez's essay, "The First Principle of Practical Reason: A Commentary on the Summa Theologiae, 1-2, Question 94, Article 2", Natural Law Forum (V. 10 1965) 168-201 and to Martin Rhonheimer's recent Natur als Grundlage der Moral (Innsbruck/Wien: Tyrolia Verlag, 1987), pp 76-83).

Likewise Gula's contention (following Janssens) that Aquinas was a proportionalist insofar as he saw the end intended by the agent as the "formal" determinant of the morality of human acts is a terribly flawed interpretation of St. Thomas. According to the Common Doctor human acts receive their "forms" not from nature but from human intelligence, which places them in their moral species by discerning their "ends", "objects", and "circumstances". Aquinas insists that all these factors must be good or in accordance with natural law precepts if the whole human act is to be good (Summa Theologiae, 1-2, 18). He holds that the end and the object are the primary factors giving a human act its moral species. The end for whose sake an action is done is a primary source of an act's moral species because humans, as intelligent beings, act in the first place only for the sake of an end (1-2, 18, 1-3). He regards the end as the forma magis universalis of the whole human act in the same sense in which a genus is said to be the forma magis universalis with respect to its diverse species (1-2, 18, 7c and ad 3). Nonetheless, the "object" of the external act chosen and commanded by the will is also a primary source of the moral species of the whole human act, precisely because this object is the object of an act of will or of choice. It is the

"proximate" end that the acting person intends (1-2, 1, 3, ad 3) and must therefore be good if the whole human act is to be good. As Thomas says, "it is not enough that the external act (willed and chosen by the person) be good by reason of the goodness of the will which comes from the intention of the end; but if the will is bad either by reason of the end intended or by reason of the act that is willed, the external act will be bad" (1-2, 20, 2). For Aquinas, the goodness of the whole human act depends on the goodness of the act in its integrity (bonum ex integra causa), and this integrity of goodness means that all the elements of the act, namely, the end intended, the object chosen, and the circumstances in which the act is chosen, must be good. If any of these elements is bad, the entire act is bad (malum ex quocumque defectu). Further details of Aquinas' teaching on this matter are provided in my essay, "Aquinas and Janssens on the Moral Meaning of Human Acts", Thomist 48 (1984) 566-606, and in my Moral Absolutes: Catholic Tradition, Current Trends, and the Truth (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1989), pp. 58-65.

Third, I believe that Gula's discussion of "responsible dissent" is woefully inadequate. Despite his claim to the contrary, the manuals prior to Vatican Council II did not "justify internal and private dissent". They spoke rather of the possibility of not assenting to a given teaching, or of non-assent. But non-assent is not the same as dissent (on this see the texts cited in detail by Germain Grisez in The Way of the Lord Jesus, Vol. 1, Christian Moral Principles, Ch. 36). Nor did Vatican II in any way legitimate dissent (cf. Grisez, *ibid.*, for details).

Much more could be said about the very serious problems of Gula's work, but I think that the most serious are those noted here. The book, unfortunately, will probably be used widely in seminaries and in some colleges and universities as a basic text in Catholic moral theology. I think this unfortunate, for it is a seriously flawed work, one that denies the truth set forth as a doctrine by Pope John Paul II in the passage from Reconciliatio et Poenitentia with which I began this review.

- (1) Reason Informed by Faith: Foundations of Catholic Morality by Richard M. Gula, S.S. New York, Paulist Press, 1989. 334 pp. Paperback \$12.95.

William E. May
Professor of Moral Theology
The Catholic University of America

The Bishops' Meeting

Newcomers to a general meeting of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (June 1989) must have been struck by its multi-layered bureaucracy and parliamentary efficiency. Oftentimes, however, one was left with a feeling of swallowing camels and straining at gnats. That impression may be a surface one but anyone who attended the recent June 16-19 meeting of the bishops at South Orange might have had the feeling. The American bishops assembled at Seton Hall University enjoyed such a pacific meeting that not a few of them napped, disguised yawns and made discreet exits. Their discussions seemed mainly opportunities for concord and bonhomie.

A potentially contentious moment was the review of Doctrinal Responsibilities: Approaches to Promoting Cooperation and Resolving Misunderstandings between Bishops and Theologians. But the Bishops' Doctrinal Committee had so airbrushed the phraseology of the document that it was accepted by the bishops (255-5) with just a murmur of dissent.

Their Excellencies sailed through a policy statement on relations with Vietnam. It was overwhelmingly applauded despite the pleas of a few hundred Vietnamese boat people who had earlier met with some of the bishops hoping to derail the statement which they believed would facilitate persecution of Vietnamese Catholics, especially imprisoned priests.

Microscopic sparks were visible for a split-second when the conference took up discussion of the Fifth Centennial Observance of the Introduction of Christianity into America chaired by Archbishop McCarthy of Miami. After the Florida Ordinary sought approval of "Evangelization" as an appropriate theme for the celebration, Archbishop Weakland demurred. He contended that the theme was too "churchy", unduly "inner-directed", and thought that such a "Catholic" emphasis would offend "minorities, persons of color and native Americans". Some bishops politely distanced themselves by citing similar ambitious programs of Protestant denominations. Cardinal Law quietly suggested that "doctrinal illiteracy" in some patches of the American Catholic Church might justify an evangelizing thrust. Though evangelization won in this gentle skirmish, one was left wondering how differences of such importance could be addressed without more substantial views emerging.

The presentation and discussion on the Pastoral Plan for Black Catholics was amply reported in both secular and Catholic press. Wheelchair-ridden Sister Thea Bowman addressed the bishops with the coruscating oratory of a classic black preacher. The bishops fastened themselves to her presentation like chicks waiting for food. Her spell was powerful. Ordinarily reserved prelates shouted "Amen" at her suggestion and rose to their feet, hands clasped, swaying back and forth to the strains of "We Shall Overcome". Effective as she was, it was sad that this spirited, carefully spoken religious felt required to speak a message of racial resentment; even more disconcerting to see bishops accept it uncritically - or apparently so. Rather than asking the bishops for programs facilitating a more dynamic unity within the Church through sound doctrine, effective catechesis and liturgy, this most attractive lady turned to a political phraseology of the Church as a sociological unit where differences (Black Catholics, gay Catholics, Hispanic Catholics, etc.) become critical axes for lobbying for "rights" and increased power. This presentation and document could have been auspicious steps for moving beyond the spent ideology of "accredited victim status" - with the Catholic bishops boldly leading the way. Regrettably, vision dimmed and emotion won.

Members of the Fellowship will want a more focused description of the Doctrinal Responsibilities debate which for many promised to be an engaging climax to this document's stormy three-year past. Alas, there was no debate. There were a few comments, but no substantive discussion. At the November meeting of 1988, the Conference received an eleventh hour letter from the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith expressing serious concerns regarding Doctrinal Responsibilities. This CDF intervention capped years of scholarly critiques of the initial drafts of the proposal, one of the more adroit ones in this Newsletter only a few months ago. (1) The CDF intervention occasioned a March (1989) meeting between Archbishop Lipscomb and his Doctrinal Committee, with Cardinal Ratzinger and CDF staff. This reported amicable dialogue resulted in a letter by the Cardinal (appended to the official NCCB document) thanking Archbishop Lipscomb's committee for "considering the observations previously expressed by this Congregation". Ratzinger's letter concluded with gentlemanly deference sans precise approval or

enthusiasms. "At this time, it (the CDF) can only express its satisfaction with the way in which the Bishops' conference has chosen to deal with this matter." Archbishop Lipscomb's committee was kind to include the critical observations of the CDF as Appendix 2 of the finally approved document. As a consequence of the March Rome meeting, the Lipscomb committee decided to make no less than 46 modifications to its earlier draft. Though the Roman discussions persuaded the committee to correct the more dangerous parts of the document, the general direction and tone of the final document remains undisturbed by the CDF's criticisms.

The document is divided roughly into two sections - (a) the rights and responsibilities of bishops and theologians, and (b), a paradigm of formal doctrinal dialogue between them. After taking note that "dialogue between bishops and theologians is, of course, an excellent thing", CDF punctures the very heart of the project: "One wonders, however, what good may be gained by unduly juridicizing the dialogue." This is the old problem of the man at sea who tries to slake his thirst by drinking the salt water: the more water the more thirst. Any empirical observation of the last twenty years of theological dissent shows clearly that the theological deviations riddling the Church today have not resulted because of too little dialogue - but too little exercise of legitimate authority. Prescribing more dialogue to remedy disputes between dissenting theologians and their bishops is offering more salt water.

Conspicuously absent from the text and tone of the document is the whole *raison d'être* of this theological enterprise - to support and clarify the Faith for its adherents. Ratzinger elaborated this point: "Doctrinal disputes, however, cannot be reduced solely to an issue between a bishop and a theologian. The interests of the Church as a whole and the rights of the faithful enter here as well. The question of the teaching itself, its content, does not receive its due consideration in these proposed procedures" (Appendix #2, p. 5). The bishops' document suggests that the Church suffers from scores of aggrieved, statute-bound theologians muzzled from any self-expression. This hardly seems to be the contemporary problem.

An even more serious question is raised by the CDF on "the way in which bishops and theologians are treated at times in the document"; and the CDF notes that "the practicalities of the proposed procedure do indeed give the impression that the two are in some way on an

equal footing" (Appendix 2, p. 2). In spite of the amended final document, the criticism of the CDF persists. Any number of examples of subtle melding of the work of bishops and theologians can be adduced from the Bishops' document. Consider:

"Thus, diverse gifts, ministries, and authority exist for the full development of the Church's unity in life and mission. They require an ecclesiological application of shared responsibility, legitimate diversity and subsidiarity. Upon the bishops devolves the responsibility to encourage this diversity and to unify the various contributions of the members of the church (p. 10).

"Briefly stated, the purpose of formal doctrinal dialogue is to determine the nature and gravity of the issue at dispute as well as its pastoral significance, and to achieve an agreement between the parties...(p. 34).

"As they fulfill their distinctive but complimentary duties, both bishops and theologians are sustained by the faith of the Church..." (p. 6).

CDF sifted through this elliptical language and identified a dangerous error: "By attaching the derivation of the theologian's authority directly to his faith in communion with the Church guided by the Holy Spirit, there arises a magisterium parallel to that which derives from the Sacrament of Order" (Appendix 2, p. 3).

Having immunized the theologian from bishops' pressure the NCCB document proceeds to protect the theologian further by shielding him from the lay critic:

Although bishops and theologians teach in very different ways, nevertheless the position of either can become the target of complaints and charges which have no substance or merit. Although the accusers might be well-intentioned, these situations are potentially volatile and enervating for everyone involved. In some dioceses, it may prove desirable to the diocesan bishop to establish a procedure which prevents groundless charges from occupying more time and attention than they deserve. (p. 25).

Something approaching an apotheosis of the theologian happens here. Previously, the hard shell of the theological elite and the busy day

of an Ordinary were pierced occasionally by the sincere petitions of the devout, educated layman. Even this opening seems blocked now beneath the heavy hand of the 'dialogue' process as both theologians and bishops drift out of easy reach of the laity who cannot remain indifferent to this censorship. CDF said: "This proposal undoubtedly corresponds to the experience of crisis which marks the contemporary situation. This same experience, however, calls forth another observation as well. With such a structure, there is also the danger of erecting a barrier which, while insulating the body of theologians from criticism, hinders the faithful from bringing to the bishops their legitimate concerns concerning particular teachings" (Appendix 2, p. 3).

Bishop Vaughn posed the only serious question during the brief review. It was in response to the part of the document regarding "theological advisors". It reads: "The bishop is always free to choose his own advisors, but the competence of theologians who serve in any consultative capacity should be recognized by their peers. They should be selected from as many segments as possible on the spectrum of acceptable theological opinion..." (p. 29). The ambiguity in this passage prompted Bishop Vaughn to ask, "Would it be acceptable for a bishop to select theologians who (a) favor the ordination of women, (b) deny the perpetual virginity of Mary, (c) dissent from the Church's teaching on the sinfulness of artificial contraception, or (d) favor selective abortion?" Archbishop Lipscomb attempted to assuage Bishop Vaughn's concerns by assuring him that no bishop would ever appoint theological consultants dissenting from the Church's stated positions. End of debate. In view of the episcopal theological consultants of the last 20 years, we may ask - are we here confronting ingenuousness or simple stonewalling? With no other hesitation the Bishops gave a near unanimous approval to Doctrinal Responsibilities.

Over and over it was stressed by Archbishop Lipscomb (as well as in the document itself) that this whole doctrinal dialogue is optional. The CDF begged to differ, and vigorously, "If a theologian should request it, it would seem almost impossible for a Bishop to refuse, even if he would have good reasons for doing so. He would be cast as the 'villain' by public opinion. Indeed the moral pressure which the guidelines...exert...is little consonant with the freedom of authority he should enjoy in doctrinal matters" (Appendix 2, p. 4). Ratzinger trenchantly concluded: "the ambiguity inherent in (this) proposed process becomes

evident: a 'doctrinal response' should be the responsibility of the Bishop acting on his own authority, if one really intends to respect the 'proper roles'.

Archbishop Lipscomb remarked at a news conference that if this dialogue had been in place a decade ago, the Curran case would never have come up. The Archbishop is absolutely right. And that's exactly what many fear.

Nuncio Pio Laghi's talk each year to the meeting has achieved stature for its carefully selected subject and his succinct presentation. Last year's presentation on the Hispanic dimension of the Church in the United States is remembered. This year he spoke on the priesthood (2). He paid the traditional and sincere Papal compliment to the "faith and generosity, vision and courage" of our priests, but situated them empathetically in the middle of "bewildering change". He noted that they "must directly bear the burden of the factors in your culture which clash with their mission to teach and evangelize". And that they fear for their people in a secular and immoral age; and that an indulgent world oddly leaps at the least foible of a priest. He invoked the "rich theology" of the priesthood to help priests be both faithful and creative.

But stability and productivity come, the Archbishop reminded us, from the priesthood as a "specialized, permanent participation in the Life of Christ". And that in practice centers on the Eucharist.

He addressed priests loneliness and distinguished it from an important solitude with God.

A very fine talk, continuing a high standard.

- (1) "Formal Doctrinal Dialogue: A Proposal for Bishops and Theologians." Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter, March, 1988, Volume 11, No. 2.
- (2) "Growing Challenges Facing the Priesthood." Origins, July 6, 1989, Vol. 19, No. 8, pp. 125-126.

Rev. John Perricone
St. John's University

Book Reviews

Inside My Father's House by Msgr. George A. Kelly, Doubleday, New York, 1989, \$19.95.

Msgr. George Kelly, an inside observer of Catholic change for several decades, has already enriched our perception of what happened to the institutional Church over 30 years. (1) His talent and gift to us has been to avoid unhinged theory and personal interest. He described the how, why and who of real motions within the Church whether hierarchic or lay, academic or popular, political or sociological. He attended to the effect of those motions on the general spiritual health and personal sanity of the Catholic people. This was no slight accomplishment in a twenty year flood of Catholic publication that often created moral theory without Christian anchors, disguised elite demands as popular, and forced a "development of Christian doctrine" - speculations that rarely touch the ground of reality or popular need. Msgr. Kelly's feet are always on the ground.

He is, of course, the bete noire of those who are uncomfortable with the ordinary magisterium of the Church and who dismiss Christian history as irrelevant. Msgr. Kelly's love of the Church and his assumption of Catholic sense regarding the creed, the ten commandments, the sacraments, prayer, incorrupt Scripture and the Christian purposes of Catholic institutions have made him a well read annoyance to those of other views. Real partisans, like Msgr. George Higgins, become very unpleasant.

Reflecting a Catholic historian's love of truth, Msgr. Kelly now offers us an early historical view of the Church in New York during its administration by two archbishops, Cardinals Spellman and Cooke.

The issues are of course not local but national and international.

The frame of the book is a personal memoir but it is crammed with details of those two Cardinals' work and circumstances. It offers new and arresting information on both Cardinals' plans, problems and resolutions in education, priestly practice, attention to marriage, moral-political questions like homosexual legislation, reactions to Humanae Vitae and many other important subjects.

The importance of Msgr. Kelly's book is that it is the first empathetic book-length study of the two mid-century Archbishops. Both Cardinals

were men of consequence in the Church and the book establishes a needed benchmark of serious personal witness to their work. Father Robert Gannon's biography of Cardinal Spellman (2) is undervalued because it was written in the subject's lifetime and is non-judgmental. Large parts of it were dictated by the subject and thereby constitute a primary source. Msgr. Florence Cohalan's Popular History of the Archdiocese of New York (3) had to restrict the work of Cardinal Spellman to one chapter. John Cooney's biography of Cardinal Spellman (4) is rubbish from beginning to end. It is almost totally unaware of ecclesiastical life, of its procedures and purposes; is replete with grim misquotations from witnesses; and is written like a homosexual daydream. Msgr. Kelly, suffering none of those disqualifications, has set a course to uncover what these two ranking clergymen wanted to do, tried to do and actually accomplished, 1939-1983.

Beyond offering a portrait of the interesting person of Francis J. Spellman and offering it with the detail known to him as one of his important aides, Msgr. Kelly describes the assumptions of his subjects, namely, that both Cardinals were focused churchmen. They were different from each other as churchmen are, different as all Catholics are, generation to generation, but their common denominator was a long term interest in the welfare of the mass of the Catholic people, in the volunteers and institutions that served students and the sick especially, and their concern for the larger community that Catholics hoped to serve. Both Cardinals attended carefully to the Black community and each decade's new immigrants. No slight accomplishment was their notable cooperation with Jewish leadership in these interests. Most prelates of Cardinal Spellman's era and the majority of prelates of Cardinal Cooke's early years shared their concentrations. Cardinal Spellman's much misunderstood political sense, and Cardinal Cooke's ecumenism can mislead casual observers. These were never the first interest of either man. Nor did either allow his many second interests to diminish his work to sustain the Catholic community as a devout, commandment-keeping, virtue-pursuing people. They also encouraged their people to generosity toward whatever was good in both Church and nation. As the Catholic people rose to prosperity the two Cardinals burdened them successfully not to forget the poor behind them. The administrative side of all this was a wearying business of planning and guiding, rescuing and funding the institutions of people

and brick that had, earlier, created a first-ever comprehensive Catholic school system for the working class. They also enlarged a formidable health system.

This book is good reading in 1989 when an ascertainable number of bishops in the nation are grappling with similar questions but often approaching them from different vectors.

Some bishops will not be empathetic toward these two Cardinals who were so sure of their ideals and piety, so keen on Catholic education, vocations and charity; and who were relatively undisturbed by what hostile critics said about the Church or about them. Readers may sense the difference between the agendas of these goal-oriented prelates and the agendas of many contemporary bishops. A number of the latter, with equally honest convictions, seem embarrassed to appear interested more in Catholics than in non-Catholics; to sustain distinctly Catholic institutions; to police their clergy; to deal with parochial questions; or attend openly to the requirements of the Catholic middle class, now the largest sector of non-Hispanic Catholics in the United States. Cardinals Spellman and Cooke would have been appalled at such hesitations, without necessarily disagreeing with many of the Bishops' second concentrations, today.

This difference was neatly touched upon by Archbishop Rembert Weakland at the NCCB/USCC bishops' conference in June of this year. He criticized a plan to mark 1992 with a Catholic evangelical campaign as "too churchy...so Catholic it might offend minorities, persons of color and native Americans". A counter reason for the drive was offered noting the Protestant evangelical membership campaigns among Hispanics. It was a good reason but carried with it a subtle note of apology for shoring up Catholics - suggesting that, in a better world, evangelization might remain suspended on both sides. Spellman would have thought that nonsense; Cooke would have understood it but would have voted for the campaign. Msgr. Kelly's information throws light on these questions of shifting episcopal interests and values.

This is rich and rewarding reading for anyone who cares about the Church, the Catholic people and the impact of religion on our society.

- (1) His earlier works: Catholics and the Practice of the Faith, Part I Catholic Youth; Part II Catholic Parents, St. John's University Press, New York, 1967 and 1971. Government Aid to Non Public Schools:

Yes or No? (Editor), St. John's University Press, New York, 1972. The Parish, St. John's University Press, New York, 1973. The Catholic Church and the American Poor, Alba House, New York, 1976. Who Should Run the Catholic Church?, Our Sunday Visitor, Chicago, 1976. The Battle for the American Church, Doubleday, New York, 1980. The Crisis of Authority: John Paul II, Regnery-Gateway, New York, 1982
Et cetera.

- (2) The Cardinal Spellman Story by Robert Gannon, Doubleday, New York, 1962
(3) A Popular History of the Archdiocese of New York by Msgr. Florence D. Cohalan, United States Catholic Historical Society, New York, 1983
(4) American Pope by John Cooney, Times Books, New York, 1984

Msgr. Eugene V. Clark
St. John's University

* * *

Authentic Metaphysics in an Age of Unreality by Leo Sweeney, S.J. (with William J. Carroll and John J. Furlong), Peter Lang, New York, 419 pp., \$39.80.

In 1965, Father Sweeney published an excellent textbook in metaphysics, Metaphysics of Authentic Existentialism. It was something rare: a metaphysics textbook that was actually interesting, one that was clearly involved in the living questions of our time.

Everyone knows how much Christian philosophy has suffered in our universities and seminaries over the last few decades. Many of our educational leaders have forgotten what Christian philosophy is. Many, abandoning any efforts to offer a coherent form of education with a realism compatible with faith, began to forget what it could possibly mean to have a vision of life that is true or a faith that gives joy in making known to us what really is so.

After all, did not Vatican II teach that we all ought to be relativists, and that one philosophy or one religion is just as good (or bad) as any other?

But Father Sweeney's new textbook, Authentic Metaphysics in an Age of Unreality, shows that he has not lost heart. He has rudely refused to become a convert to cultural relativism, when everyone else is trimming Catholicism down

hoping to make it a version of that meta-everything.

This book may seem expensive for a textbook, but it is worth more than it costs. It is an interesting and a solid introduction to the central questions of philosophy. And it will give serious students intelligent reasons for rejecting Sartrean existentialism, process philosophy, and the dogmatic relativism or skepticism so frequently served with phenomenology, popular forms of hermeneutics, and deconstructionism.

And it is fun to teach with this book.

Ronald D. Lawler, O.F.M. Cap.
Holy Apostles Seminary
Connecticut

* * *

Building Unity. (Ecumenical Documents IV.) Ecumenical Dialogues with Roman Catholic Participation in the United States, Edited by Joseph A. Burgess and Brother Jeffrey Gros, F.S.C., Paulist Press, New York, 1988, pp. xii, 499, \$14.95, Paper.

This book gathers documents from the bilateral ecumenical conversations between the Catholic Church and a number of other religious communities: Anglicans, Baptists, Disciples of Christ, Lutherans, Methodists, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox (especially Coptic and Syrian) Presbyterian and Reformed. There are also a few documents from the Faith and Order Dialogue of the National Council of Churches.

There is no effort at completeness. Only a modest number of documents have been selected from the vast literature these conversations have generated. However, bibliographical notes offer guides toward other documents.

The quality of the documents is very different in the various dialogues. By far the largest amount of space in this volume is given to Lutheran-Catholic papers, and these papers tend to be more rigorously worked out than most of the others.

The documents often reveal the enthusiasm of the participants in the dialogues. Frequently there are announcements that "we have reached a consensus" in important areas

long a source of tension between the Churches. Yet, as the editors note (p.5) these are not agreements between Churches, but among members of the groups conducting the dialogue. Entire Churches could confirm the statements: but often the statement that a consensus has been reached is an expression of hope rather than a clear record of fact.

One wonders whether it is significant that only 4 of the 31 documents printed here were published after 1983. The great hopes for unity among Christians are traced out here. But the problems that have long surrounded our ecumenical discussions can be found here too – in the texts, and between the lines. Often there are signs of great hope: profound and realistic, shared appreciation of points important in our journey toward unity. But often too there are the signs of human failure: the unwillingness to probe deep enough when agreement is only superficial, the haste to declare agreement when anyone familiar with the depth of the problems at hand knows that major questions yet remain.

Ecumenical dialogue reveals not only the differences between Churches, but also the profound divisions within Churches. They require great labor and great patience, a will to be entirely straightforward and to be as charitable as possible. It costs very much, but the good it longs for is worth all the trials.

Ronald D. Lawler, O.F.M. Cap.
Holy Apostles Seminary

* * *

The Hidden Manna: A Theology of the Eucharist by Father James T. O'Connor, Ignatius Press, 376 pp., \$17.98.

Dunwoodie's professor of dogmatic theology has written a gem of a book. Not only because in most people's minds the celebration of Mass is the distinguishing mark of Catholic Christianity, but because Father O'Connor, writing on the history of the Eucharist, provides an intelligent and accurate compendium of Catholic truth about Christ, the Church, the Priesthood and the Sensus Fidei.

For the first thousand years of Christianity (more or less) the Eucharist was the peaceful possession of the Church. Christians believed that Christ was really present under the appearances of bread and wine. Docetists and Gnostics, the first heretics (second century), did

not think that Christ had a real body so there was no need for them to worry about the reality of His presence in the Eucharist. Modern heretics deny that Christ ever intended to institute the Eucharist, maintaining that Jesus' Last Supper was nothing more than a goodbye meal, so they too, see it as little more than a man-made religious rite. Most Christians, however, including Martin Luther, believed in the Real Presence, arguing only over how this occurred. Catholics further hold that the Mass is the continuation of Christ's sacrifice for us on the cross and Christ's on-going way of having us share in our redemption.

Father O'Connor's chapters unfold like a Christian drama - with a prelude, various acts, and a smashing finale. The prelude contains the story of how the apologists of the Church's first century interpreted the Last Supper. Then follow various acts, the ways in which the great Church Fathers developed Eucharistic doctrine and how the doubts of the ninth and tenth centuries became the Protestant denials of the sixteenth. The climax is reached when the author compiles the manner in which the truths about the Mass and the Sacrament were formalized by the popes from Leo the Great in the fifth century to John Paul II who only this year called the Eucharistic Liturgy "the privileged place for the encounter of Christians with God and the one whom he has sent, Jesus Christ". The book's finale is entitled "Mysterium Fidei" more than eighty pages of explication in simple declarative language of how the Eucharist is to be understood as Real Presence, Foretaste of Heaven, Sacrifice, Sacrament, its importance to the Church, and the relationship of Our Lady to the Eucharistic devotion of Catholics.

Who will profit from this book? Scholars, of course, priests and religious, too, who seek a clear and handy source book for their preaching and teaching on Eucharistic subjects - all the above and the laity whose devotional life will profit from the assembled readings, and apologists who in the midst of contemporary doctrinal confusion seek authentic guidance.

Father O'Connor is fast becoming recognized as a scholar of substance. His recent trilogy on Christology (The Father's Son, 1984, The Gift of Infallibility 1986), and now this 1988 treatise on the Eucharist, are relevant to the needs of the post-Vatican II Church. At all times today it is urgent for Catholics to remember that however famous the world's cathedrals are for their architectural beauty, their chief significance lies in the fact that they enshrine the altar of Eucharistic Sacrifice. Even Napoleon Bonaparte was

importuned to declare at the end of his days that the greatest day in his life was not December 2, 1804 when he crowned himself Emperor of France, but the day of his First Holy Communion.

Msgr. George A. Kelly

* * *

Mary of the Americas, Our Lady of Guadalupe by Christopher Rengers, O.F.M. Cap., Alba House, New York, 1989, 154 pp., \$8.95.

The appearance of Father Renger's book on Our Lady of Guadalupe seems opportune in the history of the Church in this country. At its November 1987 plenary meeting, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops approved a change in rank of the commemoration of Our Lady of Guadalupe from a memorial to that of feast in the United States. At the November 1988 meeting, the bishops approved the texts for the Liturgy of the Hours for the new U.S. feast.

Recognition of the importance of, and devotion to, the apparition of the Holy Virgin on Tepeyac Hill on December 12, 1531, has grown in the United States. This has obviously resulted from the rapidly growing Hispanic community in the Catholic Church in this country.

What is startling about Father Rengers' book on Our Lady of Guadalupe is the extent to which he plays down the Hispanic character of the devotion to her under that title. He does so out of a true devotion to Our Lady of Guadalupe, however, and with a desire to promote the apparition on Tepeyac Hill as the appearance of Mary par excellence throughout the long history of the Church.

The book in no way denigrates the Hispanic character of devotion to Guadalupe. In fact, it is held up as a beautiful example of profound love for the Mother of God. The clear purpose of the book, however, is to promote devotion to the Virgin of Guadalupe by all of us not just Hispanics.

Father Rengers makes the point repeatedly that Mary appeared at the central spot of the entire American landmass before there were any national or cultural boundaries. Furthermore, Our Lady made her appearance not for a parochial purpose but to be present "at the birth of a new era in western civilization" (p. 22). She did not arrive for just one nation. Cortes and the Spaniards

joined the Indians to whom, through the Aztec Juan Diego, Mary had shown herself. Together they formed a happy procession the day after Christmas to the small chapel where the precious image of the Virgin would hang and be venerated.

It is often pointed out that the image of Mary on the Aztec tilma, or cloak, looks very much like an Indian and may have contributed to the many conversions after the conquest. However, Father Rengers insists that face on the tilma looks far more Semitic than Indian. He also claims that many of the Indian characteristics of dress, such as the "Aztec fold" at the feet, were added later. Her attire on the original image, revealed through infra-red photography, is supposedly more characteristic of a Semitic woman at the time of Our Lord than of an Indian.

Other indications of the intention of Father Rengers to present Our Lady of Guadalupe as the patroness for all the Americas and not just Hispanics is the fact that the National Shrine of Our Lady of Guadalupe is not in an Hispanic region of the country, but in Allentown, Pennsylvania, of all places! Rengers also links the appearance of Mary on Tepeyac with the decision of the bishops in the United States in 1846 to place this country under the patronage of the Immaculate Conception since she had referred to herself as "the perfect and perpetual Virgin, Mother of the true God". In fact, he recommends that the Guadalupe image serve as the ordinary representation of the National Patroness of the United States.

Father Rengers does not doubt the miraculous, supernatural origins of the image. However, he may draw too much from certain beliefs about it. There has been speculation that three figures can be seen reflected in the pupil of Mary's eye when the painting is enlarged. If they are indeed the reflection of Juan Diego, the bishop and the interpreter present when the cloak was opened with the miraculous image, then, Father Rengers suggests, "the tilma of Juan Diego also may offer proof of her Assumption into heaven". (p. 87) This apparently because images could be reflected only from the eyes of a body!

Zeal also leads to theological carelessness when a statement is attributed to Mary on Tepeyac that could never have come from her lips. She is quoted as saying, "I am Holy Mary, Mother of the Triune God..." (p. 3) The same quote (I think) is presented later in the book in unobjectionable form: "I am holy Mary, Mother of the true God." (p.

116). Father Rengers admits in a footnote (p. 25) that the early chronicles of the event and of the wording of the exchange between Juan Diego and the Virgin do indeed differ and that he has taken some liberties with them. It is a shame the egregious mistake of the first quote was not caught since it expresses the very error of which many Protestants falsely accuse the Catholic Church with regard to her Marian doctrine.

An intriguing proposal of the book is that Juan Diego be canonized and designated Patron of the Laity since he as a layman was so trusting and faithful in carrying out the commands of the Blessed Mother. His Cause has been introduced and a Postulator designated in Mexico City.

There is a useful bibliography on Our Lady of Guadalupe at the end of the book.

John M. Haas
Pontifical College
Josephinum

* * *

I Have Called You Friends: Sacramental, Theological and Existential Aspects of Priestly Fraternity by Carlo Bertola, Alba House, New York, 1989, 125 pp., \$7.95.

Father Bertola presents in this small work, as the title states, the sacramental and theological basis for priestly fraternity, primarily among secular clergy, though what he says is applicable to religious as well. Likewise, he is concerned with the contemporary problems that undermine this priestly brotherhood.

Father Bertola finds the ultimate foundation for priestly fraternity within the Trinity. All brotherhood mirrors the love within the trinity of divine persons. More immediate, priests find their brotherly unity in Christ in whose ministry they especially share. "To become a priest is to enter into a brotherly, intimate, and sacramental communion which strictly binds ministers together because they are vitally united to Christ" (p. 121). Father Bertola is excellent in presenting the vision of this priestly fraternity in Christ as it is championed by the Fathers of Vatican II and expounded in the conciliar documents.

However, while the grace of ordination necessarily binds priests together in Christ, this fraternity obviously must be promoted and lived out. Father Bertola realizes that pious, or even solid theological exhortation to priestly brotherhood is not enough. "Real fraternity has some very basic requirements: above all, reciprocal awareness which must not be limited to occasional get-togethers or, worse, to superficial and gossipy chattering. It should be fruitful and treasured...Nothing is more disturbing...than negative criticism, backbiting, willfulness or stubbornness in relationships among priests who are called to announce to the world the message of Christ's love" (pp. 56-57). Father Bertola also clearly, and rightly, perceives that priestly fraternity is essential for a healthy life of celibacy.

Even though Father Bertola is very good in presenting the solid biblical and theological justification for priestly fraternity as expressed in Vatican II's vision for a renewed priesthood, and while he is attentive to the problems confronting priestly fraternity today, he is unable to translate adequately the theory into living reality for priests. Thus one can be left frustrated, having clearly seen what priest are called to be, yet knowing that in reality the situation so often falls short. Is there an answer or are we merely left with pietistic rhetoric? I believe that there is, but it does not lie in a better understanding of the priesthood, nor just in priestly fraternity – though the proper type of priestly fraternity can be immensely helpful – but in something even more fundamental.

The place where the priestly vision and ideal meets the tangible everyday lives of priests is in a renewed awareness that they are primarily and fundamentally called to live converted Christian lives. They must be men of mature faith who have given their lives entirely to Jesus Christ.

Briefly stated, priests must recognize their own sinfulness and their need for repentance. As priests, who call others to repentance, they must first experience the Father's healing love made manifest in Christ. United to Christ the great High Priest, priests must also live disciplined lives of fruitful daily prayer (more than routinely saying the Office and presiding over the Eucharist) where they are in touch with God's presence and experience the work of the Spirit in their lives. Likewise, as Christ taught His apostles, so he must speak continually to his priests through his living word in Scripture. These and similar simple truths of the Christian life may seem cliches, yet if they are practiced daily, they allow the gospel to renew

a priest's life and in turn provide a solid basis for true priestly fraternity.

Thomas Weinandy, O.F.M., Cap.
Mother of God Community
Gaithersburg, Maryland

* * *

New Trends in Biblical Scholarship

If some of our members visit Paris' foremost Catholic bookstore, Le Procure, (diagonally across from the Church of St. Sulpice) they should ask to see the French editions of Laurentin's, The Gospels of the Infancy of Christ, Carmignac's The Birth of the Synoptics, and the whole corpus of Claude Tresmontant, The Hebrew Christ, and his retroversion of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John and the Apocalypse from Greek into Hebrew then into French.

You will be in for a surprise. During a recent trip to France, I asked for assistance in locating these titles. The salesperson looked at me as though I were totally out of it and with an audible sigh led me to a section of the store dedicated to Scripture. I was beginning to feel like Inspector Clouseau. With a wave of her hand, she told me that these books were piled together in a cubicle (cave) at the very bottom of the stacks.

I had to crouch down to find the works. Interestingly enough, this same salesperson, about ten minutes later, escorted another person to the same below-the-knees bin. It was obvious that the clerk was not amused and the potential customer got the message. He gave me one of those typically French shrugs that means - what gives?

All the works I mentioned raise serious interesting questions about the validity of a unilateral application of the historical critical method to the Gospels. Carmignac and Tresmontant, in their works, hold for an original Semitic, probably Hebrew redaction of the Gospels and that they were redacted in this original language (before being translated into Greek) much earlier than we have been allowed to understand. And since the people of Jesus' time employed a myriad of memory-building techniques, we may be much closer to the ipsissima Verba Christi than we have been given to understand.

Incidentally, Tresmontant's Hebrew Christ has sold 15,000 copies in France and Carmignac's work has gone through three French editions.

Franciscan Herald Press has brought out my translation of Carmignac, and we hope Kenneth Whitehead's translation of The Hebrew Christ will soon appear in Franciscan Herald's listings.

All of these works have been savagely attacked in France by one of the nation's foremost scripture scholars, Father Grelot. This is not surprising when we consider that well accepted hypotheses may be about to fall like a house of cards.

For several centuries, the history of the sciences has been replete with just such unexpected happenings. The histories of cosmology, physics, chemistry, biology and medicine are filled with errors that are hardly believable today. And these errors had been solemnly taught for generations. An entire history of science could be written from the point of view of the tremendous errors that were so persistently proposed. The human mind is very passive.

It takes a great deal of courage to admit that, given new evidence, what has been proposed for so long a time may, in fact, be erroneous. Perhaps, by the year 2000 these authors - Laurentin, Carmignac and Tresmontant - will have been vindicated and a major reconciliation between faith and exegesis finally achieved.

Msgr. Michael Wrenn
New York

Instrument of Peace: Personal and Spiritual Goal of the Priest by Rev. Douglas J. Morin, Alba House, New York, 1989.

Father Morin has written a brief primer on the priesthood. In the introduction he tells us these pages are written for his fellow priests, and indeed the topics covered such as Prayer, Celibacy, Preaching and Teaching, and Spiritual Exercises will be of help to diocesan priests, particularly those at the beginning of their priesthood. The writing is clear and straightforward, the tone is intimate, and the faith expressed is solidly grounded in orthodoxy.

However, I would not recommend this book for a variety of reasons. Father Morin would have done better to have waited several more years to gain more pastoral experience in places more varied than a single assignment. His pages do not reflect the experience that comes with time and often as a consequence of suffering. In addition, there are numerous rich theological

resources that could have been used to enrich this volume, enabling it to be personal, contemporary, and magisterial at the same time. Only think of the treasure trove of the present Holy Father's Holy Thursday Letters to his priests.

Finally, two essential elements for a book on the priesthood are missing. One, there is no mention of the fundamental necessity of personal spiritual direction in order to put the ideas expressed in the book into practical effect in the day-to-day life of the priest. Second, although there is no doubt of the author's commitment to personal holiness, I did not pick up a strong sense of an apostolic zeal that must flow from this commitment. Today we may need the priest more as "Evangelizer of the People" than as an "Instrument of Peace".

A second edition of this book - with the passage of time - longer, deeper, more thoroughly researched, and more apostolically oriented would be of great benefit for the younger clergy. To end with a personal quibble: we do not need any more book covers with sunsets, glasses of wine, and baskets of bread. Religiosity is the enemy of true religion.

Rev. C. John McCloskey, III

* * *

Passion of a Believer by Eugene F. Diamond, Liferose Press, Chicago, \$7.95.

Not too long ago, some priest authors, sensing that straight religious instruction books were often ignored, started writing novels that emphasized religious truths and values. In this day of the laity, Dr. Diamond - medical practitioner, professor, eloquent advocate for life - also turns to fiction.

Passion of a Believer is about seminarian Joe Dalton whose penchant for challenging a few trendy teachers (in barnyard, but never boudoir language) results in his being sent to St. Stephen's to get his rough edges smoothed.

Besides the kindly pastor, Father Burke, St. Stephen's is home to school superior Sister Huberta who opts for the "changing Church"; young Sister Susie who lusts but repents; Father "Ace" Hubbel who lusts and doesn't repent; and Mrs. Gorski, the pious, nosy housekeeper. Also on hand are Joe's sister who tries "the pill" and has

a stroke; another sister who flirts with abortion; a raffish young brother who gets a girl pregnant and then receives an offer he'd better not refuse; and Msgr. Dunlap, the Cardinal's secretary.

When Father Hubbel, sulking under Joe's dislike, alerts Dunlap to some (false) accusations, Joe is summoned downtown. Dunlap wants to be fair but after Joe sounds off, the seminary ousts him.

Thereafter, the book races on to a resolution that is plausible, if a bit neat. That's a lot of ground to cover in a book of modest size, so perhaps characters are more types than typical. And perhaps the grave problems happen too quickly and to too small a group of people. However, in today's Church the types are real and the problems are too prevalent.

From the opening pages when Joe is nearly killed by an ugly ruse of the Cong in Vietnam, to a plot twister near the end, the story is interesting and informative--quick and good reading.

John J. Farrell

* * *

(continued from page 5) **Evangelization in the Culture of the United States...**

Church. To visit Rome seeking understanding of our deficiencies and to leave without a program of active remedy reminds one of the faulty wisdom of another day another society -- "Prosperity is just around the corner." Only the most irresponsible critics expect the hierarchy to wash the Church's dirty linen in public, or to satisfy the media's lust for ecclesiastical fisticuffs. John Paul II told the Archbishops he came to listen and he did, to ponder in the aftermath where he shall go from there.

Is there a plan to reform the Church in accordance with the real intent of Vatican II? Are bishops prepared to unite with John Paul II in the effort? Are they prepared to reclaim and to exercise properly the authority which belongs to them alone, and to follow the lead of the Pope, in restoring obedience as well as faith in the churches they govern? The faithful may not require all the details, but they can use assurance from Christ's vicars that appropriate reforms are in the making. The credibility of the Church for those who sacrifice their lives to its gospel deserves no less.

(1) USCC Publication No. 278-0

Msgr. George A. Kelly
St. John's University

Fellowship Member Distinguished

Dr. Thomas Patrick Melady, former President of Sacred Heart University, Bridgeport, has been appointed Ambassador of the United States of America to the Holy See.

Books in Brief

American Catholics and the Family Crisis, 1930-1962 by Jeffrey M. Burns, Garland, New York, 1988, \$60.00.

This volume is the published version of a University of Notre Dame doctoral dissertation written under the directorship of Jay P. Dolan. The subject matter is fascinating, dealing as it does with the Roman Catholic intellectual and organizational response to a perceived crisis in American family life from 1930 to the second Vatican Council. The intellectual response was led by Catholic sociologists like Paul H. Furfey, Edgar Schmiedeler, Jacques Leclercq, John J. Kane, John L. Thomas, and Alphonse H. Clemens. The organizational response centered on the formation of the Family Life Bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Integrity magazine group, the Cana Conference, and the Christian Family Movement.

Unsurprisingly, Burns' historical interpretation is often marred by Americanist assumptions and judgments. His tale has heroes and villains. Charles Curran, Jack Egan, and Pat and Patricia Crowley are some of the "good guys" with George A. Kelly representing the "worst kind of conservative paranoia" (p. 257). Implicit throughout his analysis is the perception that the intellectual approach of a distinctive "Catholic sociology" was wrong-headed and that the Catholic organizational response was, at best, of limited effectiveness. Implicit also is the judgment that today's secular sociology and the contemporary non-religious professional organizational responses to the weakening of the family represent an evolutionary advance over previous Catholic thought and activity. Burns' volume is yet another example of the present-day progressivist attempt to revise American Catholic history.

Joseph A. Varacalli
Department of Sociology
Nassau Community College

Critical Voices in American Catholic Economic Thought by John J. Mitchell, Paulist Press, 200 pp., no price.

This is a nice little book about very interesting Catholic people - Orestes Brownson, Edward McGlynn, Peter Dietz, Virgil Michel, Peter

Maurin, Paul Hanly Furfey, Dorothy Day, Cesar Chavez. According to the author, it was written to provide some background for the bishops' recent emphasis on social reconstruction. Short biographies and commentary provide insights to the long Catholic preoccupation in this country with this subject area. The book contains useful information, although it is not offered as a serious critical assessment of the causes these personalities represented.

John Cardinal O'Connor by Nat Hentoff, Scribner's, 290 pp., \$19.95.

Cardinal O'Connor, a good friend of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, is the country's best known American prelate. John Paul II once referred to him as "Archbishop of the Capital City of the World". A member of "the Proud and Ancient Order of Stiff-Necked Jewish Atheists", a title Nat Hentoff gives himself, has written a book with two basic chapters - the author's reading of the New York Cardinal and a compilation of significant statements by the Archbishop himself. A reviewer of this book, writing for the National Catholic Reporter, was unhappy with Hentoff because he did not explain John O'Connor to her satisfaction. Perhaps. But this much is surely true. Hentoff explains soundly why the Cardinal is instant news.

Kourion: The Search for Lost Roman City by David Soren and Jamie James, Doubleday Archer Press, New York, 214 pp., index and good illustrations, (no price indicated - only uncommunicative striations).

For archeology buffs and those interested in the special science of seismic archeology or in Christian Crete, this is an engaging, informative and pleasingly written book. The coast of Crete was destroyed more than once. This book concentrates on the earthquake of July 21, 365 A.D. The science that has studied the nature and effects of shock waves leads to intriguing enlightenment about the story of the people just before and during the earthquake. That Christians were involved and that Kourion was an identifiable Christian city make it all the more interesting. Sweet stories of parents covering their children with their bodies and a teen age girl who rushed to comfort her donkey, add a nice pathos.

Parental Rights: The Contemporary Assault on Traditional Liberties, edited by Stephen Krason and Robert D'Agostino, Christendom College, Front Royal, VA, 1988, 206 pages and index, \$9.95.

One of the intellectually enriching communication modes of our time is the publication of excellent, dove-tailed papers on subjects of special interest. Since so many religious and family subjects are banned from the media, burlesqued in entertainment, and shunned in most universities, they especially require the publication of papers from carefully designed seminars.

This volume on Parental Rights may be the first to review the subject in this form. If so it is a valuable first and ought to be in every college library and on the shelves of those concerned for eroding parental liberties.

Reliable writers like Kenneth Whitehead and Charles Rice lead the way for uniformly perceptive writers in nine excellent papers.

God bless someone: there is a fine index.

* * *

Creative Love: The Ethics of Human Reproduction, edited by John F. Boyle, Christendom Press, Front Royal, VA, 252 pp., \$11.95.

Ditto from the review above of Parental Rights, except this book is hardly a first. But it is happily a clear headed, unprejudiced review of its subject following the Vatican's 1987 Instruction in Respect for Human Life. The Instruction was greeted by neurotic hoots from predictable writers. But its critics are faced with a terrible problem: science, now deep in amoral mind sets, is about to terrorize the world, or at very least, disrupt normal married sex and the principled protection of life new and old. Disconcerted or not by these alarms, most secular reviewers attacked the Vatican for speaking on such a subject in terms of principle. Despite the patent need for norms, secularists still resist reliable principles of any kind as tending toward intellectual fascism.

Here is an excellent review of sound Christian principles by thoughtful, trustworthy and objective writers like Ralph McInerney, Joseph Boyle, Damian Fedoryka, John Crosby, Daniel Smith, Ronda Chervin and other fine thinkers.

What a treat to have this subject spoken of with taste, clarity, openness, objectivity and a sense of high mindedness. The fact that it is a treat, chills us with the thought of how subjective and emotive so much writing on this subject has become. It could lead a Catholic to become a snob of sorts.

More than a venial sin: no index!

* * *

Three From Ignatius Press:

Collected Works, Vol. XI, Collected Plays and Chesterton on Shaw by G.K. Chesterton, 610 pp., \$19.95.

Among his plays included here are: "The Knight", "Magic", "The Judgement of Dr. Johnson", "The Turkey and the Turk", and "The Surprise". Among his writings on Shaw included here are: "Do We Agree?" (a debate), "How I Found the Superman", "Sorry, I'm Shaw", and "A Salute to the Last Socialist".

The Illustrated London News, Vol. XXXI, (1917-1919).

Many Chesterton buffs feel these include some of Chesterton's finest writings. Some of the topics of the one hundred and thirty columns in this volume include "The Poetry of the Commonplace Things", "The Rhetoric of Pacifism", "Socialism and Individualism", "Despotism and Democracies", "The Fury of America", "Relativity against Reason" and "Controlling the Common Man".

Cardinal Newman's Prayers, Verses, and Devotions, introduction by Louis Bouyer, 742 pp., \$29.95.

This beautifully bound, "Bible paper" volume of Cardinal Newman's most profound devotional writings contains his meditations on the Litany and on the Stations of the Cross. And in his meditations on Christian doctrine Newman shows that the source of true piety is sound teaching.

Items of Interest

Recent Information on the Pill:

In research published in the prestigious English medical journal, The Lancet, one of the researchers, Clair Chilvers of the Institute of Cancer Research in London, said that among women younger than 36, research found a **43% increase in the risk of breast cancer after four years of pill use and a 74% increase after eight years.**

"This study presents us with another opportunity," said John F. Kippley, President and co-founder of the Couple to Couple League, "to appreciate the wisdom of the encyclical Humanae Vitae."

He also noted: "This study, along with others, continues to bring into focus the harmful consequences of accepting marital contraception." He emphasized that this should be a time to increase efforts to support and promote contemporary natural family planning as a viable alternative to unnatural methods of birth control. "With Natural Family Planning" stated Mr. Kippley, "couples are not faced with the health risks or the abortifacient risks associated with the pill." "Furthermore," he continued, "research has shown the Sympto-Thermal Method of **Natural Family Planning can be used at the 99% level of effectiveness** - right up there with the Pill." "Another benefit," Kippley added, "is that NFP is immediately reversible."

Conservative estimates about the rate of "breakthrough ovulation", consequent conceptions and early abortions yield a U.S. pill-abortion rate of about 1.4 million per year, roughly equal to the number of surgical abortions, and an annual IUD abortion rate of 2.2 for every IUD user.

The Sympto-Thermal Method is a 100% natural, safe, easy-to-learn, economical and highly effective form of birth regulation. It can also be

used by the marginally fertile couple to achieve pregnancy.

For more information about the Sympto-Thermal Method of Natural Family Planning, contact the Couple to Couple League, P.O. Box 111184, Dept. 59, Cincinnati, OH 45211, 513-661-7612.

* * *

On October 12-15, 1989 at Franciscan University of Steubenville **A Centennial Celebration** will be held in honor of two eminent Catholic thinkers of the twentieth century: **Christopher Dawson and Dietrich von Hildebrand**, both of whom were born October 12, 1889. Pope Pius XII once referred to von Hildebrand as "a twentieth century Doctor of the Church", and many modern scholars have identified Dawson as our greatest historian of religious culture.

The symposium will feature Dr. Alice von Hildebrand, Dr. Josef Seifert, John J. Mulloy, Dr. James Hitchcock, and other scholars. The topics discussed will span the fields of theology, philosophy, history and Christian culture in the light of Dawson's and von Hildebrand's thought, lives and works.

If you would like more information about A Centennial Celebration, please write:

"A Centennial Celebration"
Franciscan University of Steubenville
Steubenville, OH 43952

* * *

Franciscan University of Steubenville took a historic step during its recent baccalaureate service. The University's entire full-time theology faculty pledged to uphold Catholic doctrine and Church teaching by making the **newly formulated Profession of Faith** and taking the Oath of Fidelity, as it is called for in the Church's New Code of Canon Law.

The new form for the Profession of Faith and Oath of Fidelity was announced by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in Rome in February and published in the March 13, 1989 issue of the English edition of L'Osservatore Romano.

* * *

Spelman College, Atlanta, is looking for an individual as **Provost** with an outstanding record of teaching and scholarship, preferably a scientist, who has had, as well, substantial administrative experience in an appropriate academic setting.

At the same time the college is looking to fill the position of **Dean of the College**. Under the direction of the Provost, the Dean will have primary administrative responsibility for all academic matters directly affecting the educational progress of students. The Dean will be expected to provide leadership. Contact:

Search Committee for Provost
or
Search Committee for Dean
Office of the President
Spelman College
Atlanta, GA 30314

* * *

A Call for Papers: A Conference on Vatican II and the Post-Conciliar Church, Washington, D.C., September 28-30, 1990. The Organizing Committee seeks your contribution on a variety of topics: Ecclesiology, Moral Theology, Systematic Theology, Canon Law, Religious Life since Vatican II, the Laity, Empirical Studies on the Catholic Church, Biblical Studies, Ecumenical Studies, etc.

Contact:

Professor Pierre Hegy
Conference Coordinator
Sociology Department
Adelphi University
Garden City, NY 11530

* * *

First Meeting of Coetus Set for F.C.S. Convention

The first regular meeting of the Coetus on Canon Law will take place during the annual convention of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, September 22-24 in Atlanta, Georgia.

Father Vincent Rigdon, JCL, Defender of the Bond for the Tribunal of the Archdiocese of Washington, D.C, will address the topic "Canon Law and the Sacred" as part of the convention's general theme.

* * *

This Fall, the Pontifical John Paul II Institute for Studies on Marriage and Family begins a new and unique program of studies leading to the Master of Theological Studies in Marriage and Family. Complementing the Institute's existing Licentiate in Sacred Theology program, the specialized M.T.S. program, primarily in academic theology, combines both a general understanding of and competence in moral theology with specific attention to contemporary questions of marriage and family life. The program is shaped by the teaching of Vatican Council II and that of Paul VI and John Paul II. Courses include: Philosophical and Theological Foundations of Humanae Vitae, Biblical Theology of Marriage and Family, Marriage and Family in the Teaching of the Church.

Inquiries should be directed to Miss Barbara Wynne, Director of Admissions, John Paul II Institute, 487 Michigan Avenue, N. E., Washington D.C. 20017 or call: 202-526-3799.

The Institute also announces that the 1989 Michael J. McGivney Lectures (jointly sponsored with the Knights of Columbus) will be delivered by G.E.M. Anscombe on the topic: "Sin, Negligence, Omission, Mortal and Venial", October 3, 5, 10, 11 in Washington, D.C.

The 1989 Fellowship Convention

September 22 - 24, 1989
Holiday Inn Buckhead
3340 Peachtree Road, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30026
404-261-2950
(Flat room rate \$69.00, single or double)

"THE RECOVERY OF THE SACRED: CATHOLIC FAITH, WORSHIP, PRACTICE"

For further information, write or call:
Terry Archer, Bent Hall, Room 375
St. John's University
Jamaica, N.Y. 11439
718-990-6394

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