



Fellowship of Catholic Scholars NEWSLETTER

Volume 14, Number 3

June 1991

Editorial: Why Mission?

By Kenneth Baker, S.J., President

Why Mission?

In January Pope John Paul II made public his eighth encyclical letter. It is entitled *Redemptoris Missio* and deals with the missionary activity of the Church. (For the complete text see *Origins*, Jan. 31, 1991, Vol. 20, No. 34, pp. 541-568.)

It is somewhat surprising to see the Pope publishing an encyclical on the missions, given the fact that Pope Paul VI convened the fourth Synod in Rome in 1974 on the subject of evangelization and followed up with a magnificent Apostolic Exhortation, *Evangelii Nuntiandi* in 1975. Evidently John Paul II thinks that the deep and prolonged crisis in missionary activity was not resolved by his predecessor and that he should reaffirm the Church's commitment to the conversion of the whole world to Christ.

Here I will not attempt to give a summary of the letter; instead, I urge you to study it for yourself, if you have not yet done so. For the letter abounds in profound theological insights that help to flush out the ecclesiology deriving from Vatican II. My main reservation about this letter is the same one I have had with all his encyclicals – it is too long. His most difficult letter and, as far as I can see, therefore rarely quoted, is the one on the Holy Spirit, *Dominum et Vivificantem* (1986). *I would like to see the Holy Father add to each of his encyclicals an Appendix of three pages containing an official summary, in his own words, of the main points. Such a summary could be more easily diffused throughout the world and so make his thoughts more accessible both to priests and to laity.*

The Pope is concerned about the crisis in the missions. There are several different reasons for the decline of Catholic missionary activity since the Council. The most important reasons, in my view, are theological. These include a widespread religious indifferentism, i.e., the false idea that all religions are equally valid in the eyes of God. Karl Rahner's theory about the so-called "anonymous Christian" contributed greatly to this indifferentism. If (as he theorized) most men are Christian in reality even though they are not conscious of it, then there is no urgency, such as St. Francis Xavier felt, to preach Christ to them and bring them to explicit or non-anonymous faith and so gather them into the Church. Why bother with the difficult life of a missionary if so-called pagans already have the

Contents of This Issue . . .

Around the Church in the 90's	p. 3
Public Morality in Liberal Democracy: "E Pluribus Due"	p. 5
<i>John A. Gueguen</i>	
Future Parishes and the Priest Shortage ..	p. 10
<i>Fr. Hendricks</i>	
Catholics/Birth Control/Early 90's	p. 12
<i>John F. Kippley</i>	
The Denver Convention	p. 15
Drums Along the Potomac	p. 19
<i>Fr. Keefe, S.J.</i>	
Restoring Sociology/ Social Sciences in Christ	p. 21
<i>Joseph A. Varacalli</i>	
Professor McInerney on Uta Ranke- Heinemann	p. 25

grace of Christ, even though they do not know it? Related to this are erroneous theories coming from some Catholic moral theologians about the "Fundamental Option" and the near-impossibility of committing a mortal sin. If mortal sin is practically impossible to commit, then everyone will be saved. So why bother with the missions? Similar ideas that have had a negative effect are contemporary secularism, relativism, and the emphasis on self-fulfillment and self-indulgence. All of these factors, and others, have led to a decline in Catholic commitment to missionary activity and to a drastic decline in vocations to missionary congregations like Maryknoll, Columbans, Oblates, White Fathers, and others.

The theological "meat," so to speak, of the letter is found in the first three chapters: 1) Jesus Christ, the Only Savior; 2) The Kingdom of God; 3) The Holy Spirit, Principal Agent of Mission. The Pope bases the Church's obligation and right to missionary activity in the whole world on the fact that God has revealed his definitive will for mankind in Jesus Christ who established the Catholic Church as the unique instrument of salvation for all. He states clearly that "Christ is the one savior of all...salvation can come only from Jesus Christ" (#5). "No one comes to the Father but by me" (John 14:6). The Church must proclaim the Gospel because it contains the definitive self-revelation of God; so "the Church is missionary by her very nature" (*ibid.*).

Jesus Christ is the only Savior of all because "there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus who gave himself as a ransom for all" (1 Tim. 2:5-6). The Pope repeats the ancient belief of the Church that all are called to the Catholic unity of the people of God. He offers a nuanced understanding of the principle, "extra ecclesiam nulla salus." While affirming the universal salvific will of God (cf. 1 Tim. 2:4), the Pope unites that truth with the necessity of belonging to the Church: "It is necessary to keep these two truths together, namely, the real possibility of salvation in Christ for all mankind and the necessity of the Church for salvation" (#9).

If God offers his grace to all men, then why should the Church be concerned about the missions? The Pope asks, "Why mission?" (#11). Since man is destined by God for liberation, the Pope answers his question by affirming that "true liberation consists in opening oneself to the love of Christ" (*ibid.*). Only in Christ do we find clarity of purpose for our existence and only in him are we freed from the slavery to sin and death. For, "Jesus came to bring integral salvation, one which embraces the whole person and all mankind, and opens up the wondrous prospect of divine filiation" (*ibid.*).

By the will of God all are called, through the ministry of the Church, to *explicit* faith in Jesus Christ. Why mission? St. Paul answers, "this grace was given to preach to the gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ" (Eph. 3:8; cf. also Matt. 28:18; Mark 16:15).

Back in the 1950's Karl Rahner saw that his theory about the "anonymous Christian" could do harm to missionary zeal. I was a student in Innsbruck, Austria, when he was proposing his new theory, and I remember clearly his answer to the objection that, if the pagans are anonymous Christians, there is no need to send missionaries to them. He replied: "God can save the pagans without my going to them as a missionary, but since he wills all to be explicit Christians, the question is whether or not I can save myself if I do not go to the missions." Here one might object that, since the assumption in the question is false, the answer is beside the point. However that may be, in *Redemptoris Missio* our Holy Father has some profound and enlightening things to say about the activity of the Holy Spirit in the world.

It is encouraging to hear Pope John Paul II repeat that Jesus Christ is the only Savior of all mankind, that all are called to belong to the Church, that we should go out to all the world, and that "Peoples everywhere [should] open the doors to Christ!" (#3). It is my fervent hope that this exhortation from our Holy Father, along with his good example as a world missionary, will infuse new life into the ailing missionary activity of the Catholic Church.

Around the Church in the 90's

- ✧ The Pope John Center in Braintree, Massachusetts 02184 publishes a Newsletter *Ethics and Medics*. The February 1991 issue contains two articles on the moral and canonical issues involved in the marriage of HIV infected persons and the so-called "right" of married couples to have a child. Authored by Professors John M. Haas and William May respectively.
- ✧ *Catholic International* (January 16, 1991), the bi-monthly English edition of *La Documentation Catholique*, used extensive excerpts from the Fellowship Board's Statement "Vatican II: Promise and Reality," issued during our 1990 Philadelphia Convention. The citations were selected, the magazine said, as a different view from that of Archbishop Rembert Weakland, whose conference on the "Future of the American Church" appears in the same issue. *Catholic International* is available at 3960 Laurel Canyon Blvd., Suite 442, Studio City, California 91609-9977.
- ✧ The office of Research and Planning of the Philadelphia Archdiocese counted 407,111 Catholics at Sunday Mass last fall - 33 percent of the estimated population, a high ratio by other diocesan standards. According to the *Catholic Standard and Times* (February 28, 1991) comparative studies show New York 25-30 percent, Boston 22-23, Pittsburgh 40, Rockville Center 22, Newark 26. There was no report on mass attendance by age or sex.
- ✧ Fellowship member F. F. Centori, philosophy professor at St. Jerome's College in the University of Waterloo, Canada, is the author of *Being and Becoming: A Critique of Post-Modernism*. It is available from the Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, 06881-9990, 320 pp. \$46.00.
- ✧ When Cardinal Bernardin appointed two OPUS DEI priests to take over a Puerto Rican/Polish parish in Chicago, his judgment was questioned by a number of Chicago priests who expressed shock. Msgr. Egan, a former Archdiocesan official, said that giving OPUS DEI a parish "may well be a decision which will affect the morale of the Diocesan clergy and be a divisive force." (*Chicago Tribune*, January 6, 1991).
- ✧ A survey conducted for the NCCB in November, 1990, by the Wirthlin Group indicates that at least 62 percent of Americans believe there are legal restrictions on abortion that in fact do not exist. Specifically, 34 percent believe abortions are restricted to the first trimester; another 13 percent believe abortions are available only through the second trimester; and 15 percent believe that abortion is either completely illegal, or legal only in cases of rape, incest, or danger to the mother's life. The survey also found that a plurality - 43 percent - believes that the unborn's right to life outweighs the "right" of a woman to choose an abortion "at the moment of conception."
- ✧ Gerald Arbuckle, recently the assistant general of the Marist Congregation, examining the situation of religious congregation in today's Church, opines that the new leadership must expect to become martyrs because they are prophets opposed to the "outdated power model of the priesthood." Said he: "Congregational refounding is thus not a search for more and more recruits. Rather the overriding thrust of refounding is that the Gospel be lived and preached, even if this means that the congregation itself must die in the fracas." (*London Tablet*, January 12, 1991).
- ✧ The Bishop of Brooklyn, Thomas V. Daily, has refused to lease two unused parochial school buildings to New York City's Board of Education because he objects to the sex education that would be taught in those public schools on diocesan property. The bishop also restricted the use of general absolution in the Brooklyn Diocese because of the presence of Churches in every neighborhood.
- ✧ The May-June issue of the SOCIAL JUSTICE REVIEW will be dedicated to the centennial of RERUM NOVARUM. The contents will include antecedents of the Encyclical by Rev. Matthew Habinger, O.S.B.; commentary on the Encyclical by Oswald von Nell-Breuning, S.J.; the word "Prole-

tariat" by Franz H. Mueller; effect of the Encyclical by Jean-Francois Orsini; reactions to RERUM NOVARUM, Dr. Alberto Piedra; RERUM NOVARUM and Recidivism, Dr. Rupert Ederer. Fr. Nell-Breuning actually wrote *Quadragesimo Anno* for Rius XI.

- ✧ On the 18th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, Fr. John W. Gouldrick, the Executive Director of the Bishop's Secretariat for Pro-Life Activities, asked the following question:

"Has abortion reduced child abuse, ended the phenomenon of the 'unwanted child,' promoted the status of women and minorities, or raised our standard of living?"

His answer:

"On the contrary: Child abuse and child abandonment have increased, drugs and violence stalk our streets, and experts speak of the feminization of poverty as women and children are abandoned by fathers unwilling to acknowledge their own responsibilities. Increasingly we hear that many of America's young people are growing up with no instinctive sense for the rights and interests of others."

- ✧ Patrick Reilly, a Fordham Senior, used the *Fordham Ram* (February 21, 1991) to ask why a "Catholic" university with a \$138.4 million dollar budget would have become non-sectarian simply to receive from New York State monies which covered only 2.9 percent of the university's annual outlay.

- ✧ Mortimer J. Adler's new book, *TRUTH IN RELIGION: The Plurality and the Unity of Truth* (Macmillan) deals with two central questions: whether any of the ten major world religions can rightly claim logical and factual truth for its articles of faith or religious beliefs; and if so, which has the greater right to make that claim. The principles and considerations people must bear in mind in their own attempt to answer these questions are explored in great detail (\$18.95).

- ✧ Fr. William R. Callahan, co-director of The Quixote Center, Mt. Rainier, Maryland, had this to say about the Gulf War:

"As the war with Iraq became inevitable, I prayed to God that it be brief. But as the censored news

delivered by enthusiasts for war began its controlled flow, I changed my prayer. I began praying for a "long" war..."

"Let it be long enough for casualties to be shared and mount for all the nations involved..."

"As U.S. bodies begin to return in human remains pouches, protests will mobilize and mount."

"Our nation will start to hear the weeping parents, the widowed spouses and the children mourning their parents." (National Catholic Reporter, February 15, 1990).

- ✧ Whatever else the criticism by CTSA of John Paul II's governance of the Church did, it prompted over two hundred requests from all over the country for a copy of the Fellowship's statement, "*VATICAN II: PROMISE AND REALITY*", issued last September.

- ✧ Magdalen College, a Roman Catholic liberal arts college in Bedford, New Hampshire, moved to a new campus in Warner, New Hampshire, on Friday, March 15, 1991.

For more information contact: Mr. Jeffrey J. Karls, Executive Vice President, Tory Hill Road, R.F.D. #2, Box 375, Warner, New Hampshire 03278, (603) 456-2656.

- ✧ ROMAN ATHENAEUM OF THE HOLY CROSS offers Academic Degrees to doctorates in Theology and Philosophy.

The Roman Athenaeum was approved by the Vatican's Congregation for Catholic Education on January 9, 1990. Its Rome Campus of the University of Navarre (Pamplona, Spain) offers degrees in Canon Law.

For further inquiries contact FCS member: Rev. C. John McCloskey III, S.T.D., 34 Mercer Street, Princeton, New Jersey 08540, Tel./FAX - 609 497-0906.

- ✧ Fr. Donald J. Keefe, S.J. has two monumental volumes published by the University Press of America - almost 1,200 pages in length, costing \$63.25 each. Title: *Covenantal Theology: The Eucharistic Order of History*. A restatement of the two major traditions in Catholic systematic theology - Thomism and Augustinianism. The volumes insist on the sacramental historicity of reality.

Public Morality in Liberal Democracy: “E Pluribus Due”

by John A. Gueguen

My task here is to explain why there is fundamental disagreement in our country over right and wrong.¹ It has always been puzzling to me why Americans do not or cannot agree that social evils like divorce, artificial contraception, abortion, homosexuality, and pornography are in fact evil and ought therefore to be condemned and extirpated.

One could attribute the disagreement, I suppose, to orneriness or to the all-too-human face-saving device of rationalization. We are all good at that. But even people who seriously and sincerely sit down to reason out these matters of public morality seem to read the moral nature of man and hence the moral law of God differently. Why?

My immediate perception is that there is nothing wrong with human nature (given the metaphysical limitations of participated beings) nor with the moral law (given the perfection of its Author). In the abstract, man is all that he *can* be, and God is all that He *is*. The problem, I conclude, must therefore lie elsewhere. Could it be in the way Americans have been taught their morality – at home, in church, at school, and in a public forum that is itself divided on all these issues?

Many scholars, concerned over increasing signs of moral decay, have urged a recurrence to our national origins – whether as democratic society or as republican regime.² They assure us that our “tradition” holds the potential for recovery of a moral consensus which is in agreement with human nature and the moral law. Some even argue that the genius of the American Founding and Judeo-Christian ethics harmonize in principle. It is often alleged that America is a Christian nation.

My studies of American political thought, of the “tradition” to which these scholars appeal, lead me to a different conclusion. I find that such a harmony is largely, if not entirely, illusory.

Nine years ago in *Communio*, my good friend, Walter Nicgorski of Notre Dame, conducted a discussion of “Democracy and Moral-Religious Neutrality: American and Catholic Perspectives.”³ I wish to see if I can extend that discussion here. While he did distinguish between the principles of the American regime

and Catholic principles of morality, Dr. Nicgorski was looking for signs of convergence between them. If my persuasion is correct – that no single “tradition” exists in our country which could be called both American and Christian – then any convergence would at best be accidental.

I wish to suggest in these remarks that America has witnessed two foundings, that two traditions grow out of these foundings, and that they are irreconcilable in essentials (that is, in their premises about man’s nature and God’s law). In developing this argument, I want to show that the recent public debate over morality and policy can help to elucidate the truth about moral life and its connection with political life. When the 1984 campaign gave these topics more prominence than the media usually permit, many people were mortified at what they regarded as unseemly and even threatening exposure of matters they thought should remain private. But since the correctness or incorrectness of moral norms is bound to affect the good or ill fortunes of society, I believe that it is urgent for us to continue and extend that public discussion – without, I hope, its rancor and obfuscation.

More than fifty years ago Jacques Maritain wrote: “Certain essential principles seem to have been lost sight of by many people, and it is of the first importance that they be recalled.” He set about in **The Things That Are Not Caesar’s** to “tell the truth as it appears to me, without regard for any other consideration.”⁴ It is in that spirit that I proceed.

Maritain insisted that democracies cannot subsist without a Christian orientation, especially in an era when both have their backs against the wall. *He* was mortified, he said in **Christianity and Democracy**, because the modern democracies were “repudiating” the Gospel in the name of human liberty, while at the same time “motivating forces in the Christian social strata” were combatting democratic aspirations.⁵

Is this, perhaps, because of a fundamental discontinuity between the two, or is it due to circumstances that have occurred over the 300 years of our national existence?

To some extent the relationship between Judeo-Christian ethics and the morality implicit in modern liberal democracy contains the seeds of tensions and disagreements lately aired in our country, thus making it difficult to resolve them to the satisfaction of the one or of the other. This situation is complicated by historical developments peculiar to America, which seem to have converted the tension into an antithesis which must continue to trouble and divide the nation until one side succeeds in driving the other from the field.

In one of this great ironic utterances about Christianity and democracy, G. K. Chesterton remarked: "Christianity says that anyone can be a saint if he chooses; democracy says that anyone can be a citizen if he chooses,"⁶ This is ironic, I think, because Christianity makes the choosing difficult for the would-be citizen, and democracy makes the choosing difficult for the would-be saint. Why is this? The same Chesterton observed of Christianity that, even when it is watered down, it is still "hot enough to boil modern society to rags."⁷ And when he observed in America that our corporate ideal is citizenship in a multinational society,⁸ he implied that it is an ideal cold and deliberate enough to freeze aspirations to practice the Christian virtues heroically – the minimum condition for sainthood.

If Christian morality and liberal democracy are not easy companions and, in some sense, even threats to one another, what does this imply for our historical attempts to construct a society which is both Christian and democratic? Further, what do those attempts contribute to the moral disorders which, according to many reports, are propelling our society along toward dissolution?

In speaking of Christian morality, I do not wish to obscure the distinction between morality and religion. Certainly morality has a natural basis that makes its principles accessible to every thinking person. Morality is much broader than religion in that it includes principles drawn from sources other than those contained in a supernatural revelation. Nevertheless, morality can be and, in the case of Judeo-Christianity, has been brought within religion and made a part of it. For while the author of the first great treatise on ethics was not concerned with religion, the Author of the definitive sourcebook on religion surely was concerned with moral acts and had plenty to say about them. If Aristotle is therefore neutral on religion, the Bible is

surely not neutral on morality.

Now America has been, since its origins, a land of religious plurality. If every religion teaches morality, and if different expressions or interpretations of religion teach different things, then religious plurality must imply moral plurality. Different conclusions must arise from conflicting premises. Moreover, every moral teaching has political implications, just as every political theory contains moral implications. Consequently, students of American history are reminded in every textbook that "religion" has had a great influence on public life, a formative influence on our civic culture. But these texts seldom, if ever, go on to specify *which* religion they mean, nor do they differentiate between the two opposed religious traditions which I want now to discuss – two spirits, as it were, intent upon building two cities.

I must confess that, after many years of teaching American political thought, it has been a quite recent discovery that there have been these *two* traditions of political thought in America: the one everyone apparently understands by it (which is really Protestant and anthropocentric), and one which none of the commentators seem to be conscious of (which is Catholic and theocentric).

Here I have time to trace only the merest outline of the twin development of these two spirits since the days when Americans became conscious of themselves as distinct from their European forebears.

The Protestant ethic proceeds from the Puritan settlement in the Northeast through the period of the Constitutional founding and 19th-century Transcendentalism into the Pragmatism which has dominated our century. From the beginning, this tradition has tended to adapt Christian morality to the needs of civil society, as defined by its human builders, and to make moral principles serve republican interests.

The Catholic ethic proceeds from the Franciscan settlement in the Southwest through the period of the establishment of a church hierarchy at the time of national independence into the 19th century, when the first systematic efforts were made to bring it to consciousness as a different tradition. With the exception of Father John Courtney Murray,⁹ these efforts seem to have been submerged in our century by a desire to accommodate the Catholic minority to the Protestant majority. Or spokesmen have not appeared who are well enough formed in the Catholic tradition or suffi-

ciently accomplished as writers to promote it effectively. From the beginning the Catholic ethic tended to adapt secular situations to the promotion of a truth about man by making those situations serve the moral imperatives found in the Gospel.

The Protestant version of American public morality presumes the anthropocentrism of the social contract theory and reads it into democratic theory. It makes the individual autonomous and self-directing. It accepts God's law only to the extent that human objectives are well served. Human imperfections are excused or overlooked; moral truth is considered a matter of private opinion; freedom is made a subjective prerogative; politics is given the task of transforming the earth. It is a short step from there to "liberation theology."

In the recent debates, one can find a fundamental agreement within the Protestant tradition between the Old Left and the New Right that the Kingdom of God is (or must be) made *in* America, that it is a "dynamic process" (the words are H. Richard Niebuhr's) in quest of social liberation through the manipulation of political institutions, and not a creed, a discipline that transcends all nations as it strives to liberate all persons from their own infirmities before they can undertake to relieve man's estate.¹⁰

Thus the Catholic version of American public morality is the exact reverse of the one that now dominates our country. Founded on acceptance of the social nature of man, it expresses a theocentric ethic which subordinates every human objective to God's work of Redemption. Without diminishing the personal responsibility of every man for his own salvation, individual autonomy gives way to an ecclesial community whose assistance is essential in making our way to heaven. God's law makes demands for sacrifice, conversion, a constant struggle to improve one's life and to help others improve. Moral truth is a matter of fact, discoverable by reason and clarified by revelation. Free action is informed by objective norms. The glory of politics is to have no human glory but to provide an orderly passage through this radically imperfect and precarious world. There is no better recent summary of this doctrine than in the documents of Vatican II, especially the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World.

Compare the self-conscious and sombre legalism of Winthrop's Boston with the almost carefree political

minimalism of Serra's California missions.¹¹ Or compare the defensiveness of James Madison's federal republican principle with the unitary principle of hereditary authority which grounded John Carroll's aggressive apostolate.¹² Or compare the individualistic musings of Emerson with the communitarian conscience of Brownson in the period of our great national trauma.¹³ Whichever comparison you choose to develop, the contrast is striking and, I think, most instructive.

Is the moral purpose of America to bring God's laws into conformity with the sovereign people, or is it to bring the people into conformity with God's sovereign laws? Is the moral purpose of America to train people in virtue because of its usefulness to civil order, or is it to train civil institutions so that they will promote individual virtue? Should moral norms be bent to accommodate civil exigencies (such as an alleged pressure of population upon resources), or should civil norms be bent to accommodate moral exigencies (such as the innocence of children)? Public discourse is divided because there is precedent in America for both sides of each question.

An understanding of the relation between public morality and liberal democracy in the American context will continue to elude us, I believe, until we become more aware of the two traditions, and especially of the one which our studies, even in Catholic universities, have so much neglected. Unless its own roots, its own founding, and its own development are brought to full consciousness, we shall continue to be puzzled by the controversies over morality and policy that swirl over the landscape like a fog.

More regrettably, we shall continue to be scandalized by prominent Catholics who accept the Protestant tradition, and even defend and further it, because they are unaware or confused about their own tradition. We shall continue to be embarrassed, without knowing quite what to do about it, by colleagues of ours who are more intent upon telling the Magisterial Teacher of the Catholic ethic what America is all about¹⁴ than on telling Americans about the magisterial Teacher.

If my assessment of the underlying reason for a lack of moral consensus in our nation is correct, then the rhetoric about a struggle for its soul is hardly an exaggeration. But this struggle need not evoke fear or regret. During the 1984 presidential campaign, the bishops of New England (no longer Puritan but now

predominantly Catholic) said: "The moment in which we find ourselves, while it may be discomfiting for some, appears to us a splendid opportunity for clarifying some fundamental principles" concerning the interaction of morality and policy.¹⁵ We cannot clarify that interaction, however, as it seems to me, until we have understood the opposed traditions within the moral component.

In a late critique of the American "civil religion," an "artifact of the secularizing process," as he calls it, Professor George Armstrong Kelly proclaims the death of the Protestant era in America, its denominations having failed to exercise an authority capable of stemming the nation's slide into neopaganism.¹⁶ If his perception is correct, we have a new reason to entertain Maritain's vision of an America full of potential for a new Christian civilization, a society of citizen-saints. In his *Reflections of America* he could already see the unacceptable moral consequences of a civil religion which allows God's law to be "temporalized."¹⁷

An exciting time of realignment lies ahead, I believe, as we enter what may come to be the Catholic era in America – or better, the Catholic Reformation of American moral and political life. We need not fear (though we do lament) the loss of many Catholic leaders whose minds and lives have been Protestantized, for there are increasing indications that the minds and lives of many Protestant leaders have been Catholicized.

With Richard John Neuhaus, then, we can agree that the present confusion "can turn out to be a watershed moment in American political and cultural life."¹⁸ While its detailed elaboration cannot be foreseen, Father George Rutler has made one condition for the successful navigation of this watershed very clear. "The conscience of the public Catholic needs to embrace the Catholic conception of morality," and not as a cold formula "extrinsically imposed, but as intrinsic to the human condition."¹⁹ This can come to pass only if Catholic scholars do the hard work that is needed to recover and assert the true spiritual center of our culture, as Christopher Dawson used to put it. It remains to be seen whether this work can still be undertaken in Catholic universities, for reasons that are well known to us all. But I rejoice to report that it can go forward in the state schools where democracy permits everything to be pursued – even truth.

But wherever we do this work, as thinking people who strive to be faithful personally and professionally

to our patrimony, as people responsible to some extent for what goes on around us, we must take whatever initiatives we can with the assurance that study fortified by prayer is invincible – or should I say, prayer implemented by study.

In one of his remarkably prophetic utterances, Alexis de Tocqueville said that "the great problem of our time is the organization and establishment of democracy in Christian lands."²⁰ Having done quite a bit to convert that prospect into the shabby spectacle of a de-Christianized land, may we Americans dare to entertain an even more challenging prospect for the coming century: the re-organization and re-establishment of Christianity, of Christian morality, in democratic lands? With Belloc, Dawson, Maritain, and other prophets of a truly Christian democracy, I submit that our failure to do so will allow democracy to disappear from the land as well.²¹

Words of Orestes Brownson to the graduating class of Dartmouth in 1843 may inspire us to resume the work he so well began:

"Ask not what your age wants, but what it needs; not what it will reward, but what without which it cannot be saved; and that, go and do; do it well; do it thoroughly; and find your reward in the consciousness of having done your duty, and above all in the reflection that you have been accounted worthy to suffer somewhat for mankind."

(Professor Gueguen is a political scientist from Illinois State University)

FOOTNOTES

1. The theme of this paper received fresh attention in my graduate seminar on religion and politics at Illinois State. An earlier study, "The Kingdom of America versus the Kingdom of God: A Critique of the American Civil Religion" (1980), was published in part as "Modernity in the American Ideology," *Independent Journal of Philosophy*, 4 (1983) 79-87. This study grew out of an N.E.H. summer seminar at the University of California (Berkeley) in 1976 (Robert Bellah, director). The papers of Father James Schall have also been stimulating, especially *Christianity and Politics* (Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1981).
2. The following come to mind: Walter Berns, Martin Diamond, Morton Frisch, Harry Jaffa, and scholars associated with the Claremont Institute for Statesmanship and Political Philosophy.
3. *Communio* (Winter 1982), 292-320.
4. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931).
5. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947), p. 27.
6. **Charles Dickens, the Last of the Great Men**, p. 12.

7. "Very Christian Democracy," in *Christianity in Dublin* (1933).
8. *What I Saw in America* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923), especially the opening essay, "What is America?"
9. *We Hold These Truths: Catholic Reflections on the American Proposition* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960).
10. For Niebuhr, see *The Kingdom of God in America* (New York: Harper & Row, 1937), p. 165 and passim. For the New Right, see Richard A. Viguier, *The New Right: We're Ready to Lead* (Falls Church, Va: The Viguier Co., 1980), chapter VIII. "The Born-Again Christian Discovers Politics."
11. A good selection of John Winthrop's speeches and diaries is in Perry Miller and Thomas Johnson, ed., *The Puritans*, Vol. I (New York: Harper & Row, 1963) pp. 195-209. For Junipero Serra, see documents 13 & 15 in John Tracy Ellis, ed., *Documents of American Catholic History*, Vol. I (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1967).
12. Madison's "Memorial and Remonstrance" (1785) and *Federalist* 51 (1788) are in Marvin Meyers, ed., *The Mind of the Founder* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973), pp. 8-16, 171-176. For Carroll, see documents 47, 48, 56 & 57 in Ellis, ed., Vol. I.
13. Emerson's essays are in many collections of his works; especially notable are those on "Nature" and "Democracy." Brownson's most relevant work is *The American Republic: Its Constitution, Tendencies, and Destiny* (1865), ed. Americo D. Lapati (New Haven: College and University Press, 1972).
14. I find this tendency especially evident in the writings of Michael Novak.
15. "Statement on the Responsibilities of Citizenship," Sept 5, 1984, para. 2.
16. *Politics and Religious Consciousness in America* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1984), p. 247. There is a perceptive review by Timothy Fuller in *(Political Theory*, 13/1 (Feb., 1985), 145-148.
17. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), p. 187 (in the section on "Religion and Civil Society").
18. *The Naked Public Square: Religion and Democracy in America* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1984). According to Neuhaus (as quoted by Philip F. Lawler in his review, *Catholicism in Crisis*, Oct, 1984, p. 63), "Catholics are uniquely poised to propose the American Proposition anew... by virtue of a rich tradition of social and democratic theory, and of Vatican II's theological internalization of the democratic idea..." The Catholic moment is now. It may be missed, however."
19. "The Conscience of the Public Catholic," *Catholicism in Crisis*, Oct., 1984, p. 51.
20. *Democracy in America*, Vol. I (1835) J.P. Mayer, ed. (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1969), p. 311.
21. For Belloc, see especially "The New Paganism," in *Essays of a Catholic Layman* (1931; Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries, 1967); For Dawson, "The Totalitarian State & the Christian Community," *Beyond Politics* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1939); "The Secularization of Western Culture." *The Judgment of the Nations* (1942). For Maritain, "The Gospel and the Pagan Empire." *The Twilight of Civilization* (1943).

The Little Known Virtue – Solertia

A well-known theologian suggested to the Fellowship office that President George Bush, in the pursuit of United Nations' objectives in Iraq, exercised the virtue of *Solertia*. When asked what that was he sent along the following paragraph from Joseph Pieper's Book *The Four Cardinal Virtues* (Notre Dame Press, 1966, p. 16):

"Solertia is a 'perfected ability,' by virtue of which man, when confronted with a sudden event, does not close his eyes by reflex and then blindly, though perhaps boisterously, take random action. Rather, with the aid of solertia he can swiftly, but with open eyes and clear-sighted vision, decide for the good, avoiding the pitfalls of injustice, cowardice, and intemperance. Without this virtue of 'objectivity in unexpected situations,' perfect prudence is not possible."

Future Parishes and the Priest Shortage

Fr. Donald Hendricks, Pastor
St. Anthony's Church, Nepera Park

When a Catholic considers the recent proposal of Archbishop Rembert Weakland, pondering the realities of Catholic life in his Milwaukee Archdiocese (see *Origins*, January 24, 1991), he or she may be reminded of the old saying: "There is less to this than meets the eye". As the number of baptized Catholics increases and the priest shortage remains acute, the Church in the United States can surely expect to encounter long term pastoral difficulties. However, the Catholic population explosion is not uniform throughout the nation or in his state, so the problems will vary in intensity. The priest-people ratio is higher than average in places like the Southwest, but has grown hardly at all in the Milwaukee Archdiocese where the numbers have been declining for thirty years, from 707,000 in 1981 to 587,000 in 1989. The steady decline in Sunday Mass attendance may reduce the numbers to be served even lower.

Archbishop Weakland began his analysis on an undeniable fact – that the life of the Church is centered around the Eucharist. He is also solicitous to provide parishioners ready access to the Eucharist well beyond 2000 A.D., when the number of active diocesan priests will have declined by twenty-six percent. He rejects the creation of "mega-parishes" in order to sustain the traditional familial or parochial atmosphere for faithful Church-goers and he is afraid that "circuit-rider" priests serving many churches will be subject to burn-out. After sturdy attempts to have his congregations function within present Church law, Milwaukee's shepherd now encourages, as a last resort, a proposal from the Catholic community to advance a qualified candidate for priesthood – even a married man – in the hope that the Pope would look favorably on such a suggestion. He calls upon priests to serve "larger numbers of faithful with fewer hands".

Now it is true, as the *New York Times* (January 9, 1991, A16) suggested in its report on the Weakland Proposal, that the number of active diocesan priests in the United States will likely have dropped by 40 percent, while the Catholic numbers will have grown between 24 and 38 percent. The question is, however, whether this is where the real Catholic problem lies. Granted, our population as reported in the Catholic Directory, has in recent years grown by about a third. Even so, this increase has not been evenly distributed. In the Southwest, the increases have been phenomenally greater than the national average; double in California and triple in Nevada. By contrast, in the East-North Central States growth has been less than the national average. The State of Wisconsin, for example, has grown less than 20 percent, Milwaukee sharing none of this growth. In the last thirty years that Archdiocese has actually lost ground population-wise.

Within Milwaukee, as in many other metropolitan areas, the center cities have declined while the suburbs have grown. The population has aged: far fewer baptisms and more funerals. In Wisconsin as a whole, the proportion of the population between 15 and 19 years of age has been projected to decline by 27 percent between 1970 and 1990. Mass attendance has probably declined in Milwaukee as elsewhere. It is difficult to see how some future Archbishop will find larger numbers to be served in the year 2000.

When one tries to pinpoint the source of the Church's general problem, two things immediately come to mind. First, the contraceptive practices of married Catholics. Twenty-five years ago, during the struggle over *Humanae Vitae*, one bishop was reported to have said that the encyclical would wreck his diocese. Whether the particular prelate said it or no, the present Cardinal Archbishop of Chicago might attribute in part the closing of many schools there to the drop in infant baptisms. If there are fewer Catholics born, in coming years, there will be need of fewer priests. Secondly, migration and the automobile have changed America, as the 1990 census has shown. Inner city and the vast areas of rural life have been affected thereby. The *New York Times* (Sunday Magazine, June 24, 1990, p. 41) reports: "Many rural Plains dwellers must now drive 50 miles for a quart of milk, 75 for a movie, 100 for a shopping mall". This type of movement is not entirely unattractive to moderns. Fans from the neighboring Green Bay think nothing of driving 100 miles to see the Milwaukee Braves. In an Archdiocese less than 70 miles square, where the glaciers smoothed the earth and super-highways cross the city, it is not surprising that central

parishes have emptied as more pleasant life in the suburbs is combined with city employment.

The word "parish" comes from two Greek words meaning "near home". If travel can bring home nearer in time, if not in distance, we must expect the shape of parishes to change. It is all very well to decry "mega-parishes" and to hope for liturgies and homilies from priests who share life with their own parishioners. One may ask how much shoulder rubbing characterized post-World War II parochial life and before the number of clergy declined. One Milwaukee parish formerly had eight priests prior to the exodus; now it has two. If an oil shortage somehow brings people back to the city, and if the immigrants swell the Catholic birth rate, it is still not likely that the parochial staff in our time will rise again to the old numbers. Another way of looking at liturgical celebrations by live-in priests only is to recall that years ago Sunday Mass in urban areas was offered frequently by visiting priests, full-time teachers during the week. One wonders how much they shared the life of the congregation to which they preached. This is not to praise that situation, simply to remember that "circuit riders" are an old Catholic phenomenon.

If a circuit-riding clergy are to be deplored, what about our present rural situation? Today the Extension Society appeals for monetary help to rural dioceses unable to assist the large number of diocesan seminarians which they must support. Lincoln, for example, one of the three dioceses in Nebraska, has a large number of parishes which lack a resident pastor. The size of the average congregation there is the smallest in the State. The Bishop does not have permanent deacons. Yet, Lincoln, with a population one-tenth of Omaha, has the same number of seminarians as the Archdiocese. "Burn-out" does not seem to be taking its toll everywhere. Furthermore, many Hispanic Catholics in the Southwest, scattered over great distances, constitute the real challenge for the Church of the 21st Century. How does the gradual approach suggested by Archbishop Weakland help bishops in those states?

No one can deny that the United States Church faces a crisis recruiting enough priests to serve the future needs of our people. The question this informal commentary asks is whether it is necessary to change the discipline of the Church, with its time tested results, in favor of experiments which at best meet only some local needs. The facts do not seem to make such a radical change necessary. The further question is: Does the proposal to ordain married men rest on demographics or on a different vision of the Church than the one John Paul II regularly addresses?

Catholics and Birth Control in the Early 90's

by John F. Kippley

Should we be concerned about the extent and depth of Catholic faith in the post-Christian West? If so, how may we measure that belief properly?

I would like to suggest that the sexual practices of married couples provide an excellent test of the influence of authentic Catholic Faith on their conjugal life style. I propose this for several reasons. First of all, what is involved in this teaching, as John Paul II makes clear frequently, is nothing less than the divine truth about human love. Secondly, it is a truth which should profoundly touch the everyday marital life of believers. Thirdly, independent surveys provide interested observers with a realistic view of the extent to which Catholic Faith does affect the practical life of Church members.

Beginning in 1965 a series of birth control surveys, undertaken by various agencies, provided a working picture of what has been going on in Catholic marriage ever since. However, this data may not be totally representative and for two reasons. First, the comparative statistics of the National Surveys of Family Growth (NSFG), to cite one example, are concerned only with women using some kind of birth control, including natural methods, not with the entire universe of Catholic married women. For example, if in 1962 almost two-thirds of Catholic married women were living by the Church's teaching, as is indicated by a Greeley report, the meaning could be that those two-thirds were allowing babies to come as they may or that they were using some kind of NFP, including calendar rhythm.

The NSFG figures, on the other hand, include only those who were using birth control, artificial or no. Secondly, while our primary interest is the practice of married couples, the NSFG data covers live-in couples as well. Keeping these reservations in mind, the quantitative basis of the NSFG study offers an inkling to what has been going on within Catholic marriages since the mid-Sixties. And since natural family planning is my special interest, I would like to summarize the NSFG data pertaining to the use of NFP by Catholic and Protestant family planners year by year:

	Catholic	Protestant
1965:	31.9%	4.5%
1973:	8.1%	2.6%
1976:	8.9%	3.7%
1982:	6.0%	3.0%
1988:	3.0%	2.0%

The 1982 and 1988 surveys included data about Jewish and non-religious-affiliated women. In 1982, 1 percent of Jewish and 2 percent of non-affiliated family planners used some form of NFP; by 1988, the figures dropped respectively to zero and 1 percent. Thus in 1988 (according to the NSFG) 3 percent of Catholic family planners, 2 percent of Protestants, and 1 percent of the non-affiliated were using NFP. Conversely, this means that among family planners, 97 percent of Catholics, 98 percent of Protestants, and 99 percent of Jewish and non-affiliated family planners were using unnatural methods of birth control. Some may think it is an improvement that the percentage of Catholics using NFP is three times greater than that of the non-affiliated and complete secularists, but in my judgment the more appropriate reference is the percentage not using NFP. Do these data not say that the overwhelming majority of those calling themselves Christian are equivalently identical in their sexual practices with those who are not by self-definition believers in Christ?

The NSFG data confirm the experience of the Couple to Couple League. The decade 1971-1980 was one of growth for CCL—from teaching 15 new couples in 1971 to 9094 new couples in 1980. Beginning in 1981 the League experienced a decline averaging roughly 8 percent every year 1981-1990. In 1990 CCL in the U.S.A. taught only 42 percent as many couples (3835) as it taught in 1980 despite having approximately twice as many teachers and classes.

A FEW REFLECTIONS

The huge drop in users of NFP from 1965 to 1973 can be attributed to the sexual revolution within the Church, motivated and organized by Bernard Haring, Charles Curran and their many cohorts during and after the Council. The slight upward variation between 1973 and 1976 may well reflect the work of the infant natural family planning movement, led in some measure by movements like CCL. Then after 1976, the percentage of Catholic family planners using NFP fell from 9 percent in 1976 to 6 percent in 1982, a drop of a third in six years. And in the subsequent six years it fell another 50 percent to only a 3 percent NFP usage in 1988.

It was during this period that the NCCB instituted its Diocesan Development Plan for Natural Family Planning (1981). While the proposal was good, if belated, one of its unintended side effects was the bureaucratization of NFP at the diocesan level. Responsibility for the diocesan managed NFP was given to a variety of officials, not all of whom were fully committed to *Humanae Vitae*. The reluctance at the diocesan level to insist upon acceptance of *Humanae Vitae* as a requirement for officials and teachers was a negative factor in the effective administration of NFP at that level. Whatever the explanation, NFP is scarcely a movement in the United States today. A quarter century after the Council, NFP is struggling for survival, with independent agencies such as the Couple to Couple League hoping that pastors soon start teaching marital chastity more fully so that couples will be motivated by their evangelistic fervor to learn about chaste Natural Family Planning.

The difficulties facing the Church are serious. At the 1980 Synod on the Family in Rome, Archbishop John Quinn cited a 1975 opinion survey which indicated that 70 percent of priests and 71 percent of laity disagreed with *Humanae Vitae*. It is generally understood that very few couples are simply letting the babies come as they may; there are hardly any large (7+) families anymore. Wide experience—both in CCL and in other programs—with pre-marriage couples suggests that 95 to 98 percent of newlyweds begin their marriages using methods of birth control considered by the Church to be gravely sinful. I suspect that the real percentage of post-puberty Catholics who accept the sexual teaching of the Church is no longer as high as the 30 percent projected by McCready-Greeley in

1975. I would conjecture that hardly more than 10 percent of Catholics today accept the sexual morals of the Church. The future of the Catholic family is not bright considering the evil affects of contraception on marriages so well delineated by Paul VI in 1968.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

The Apostle Paul assures us that faith comes from hearing. If this is true, then must not pastors take care that people hear the faith? What do engaged couples "hear" when they are not properly instructed in advance of marriage about NFP? What do they "hear" if they ask questions about NFP and it becomes painfully obvious that the instructor priest or couple has no convictions on the matter? What do students "hear" in religion courses when Catholic teaching on marital chastity is omitted? Or rejected? What do parishioners "hear" when the lectors, the Eucharistic Ministers or the parish leaders are known for their contraceptive use or their long standing sterilization?

If the Church in the United States is going to recover its traditional vitality, then zealous priests must reclaim the influence centers of the Church. The only practical way to do this without delay is to insist on a statement of full Catholic belief and practice prior to the assumption of status roles in the Church.

Some may object that a firm pursuit of the objectives of *Humanae Vitae* may result in leakage from the Church or from diocesan rosters. Is there not that leakage now? And in the best of times was it the policy of the Church to select lukewarm Catholics for leadership positions?

I have other questions still.

What can be expected from heterodox believers except heterodox teaching, at least by omission? Should Catholic schools from elementary to graduate schools justify their existence by a tepid embrace of a vibrant faith? The threats of further conflict should be looked upon as a great opportunity to start all over again as John Paul II has suggested.

To take such measures to teach marital chastity is to act with compassion for, as John Paul II has taught, "The compassionate bishop will proclaim the doctrine

of *Humanae Vitae* and *Familiaris Consortio* in its full beauty, not passing over in silence the unpopular truth that artificial birth control is against God's law," (*Ad limina* visit of U.S. Bishops, 5 September 1983). To take such steps is simply to begin to respond to the mandate of *Familiaris Consortio*, already ten years old and largely ignored: "The ecclesial community at the present time must take on the task of instilling conviction and offering practical help to those who wish to live out their parenthood in a truly responsible way," (n. 35).

INSTILLING CONVICTION

Pope John Paul II has certainly taken on the task of instilling conviction and has left no room for doubt that the doctrine of marital non-contraception reaffirmed by *Casti Connubii*, *Humanae Vitae*, and *Familiaris Consortio* must be believed and put into practice. He has taught:

- that to hold out for exceptions as if God's grace were not sufficient is a form of atheism (17 September 1983);
- that denying the doctrine of marital non-contraception is "equivalent to denying the Catholic concept of revelation" (10 April 1986);
- that it is a teaching whose truth is beyond discussion (5 June 1987);
- that it is a "teaching which belongs to the permanent patrimony of the Church's moral doctrine" and "a truth which cannot be questioned" (14 March 1988);
- that it is a teaching which is intrinsic to our human nature and that calling it into question "is equivalent to refusing God himself the obedience of our intelligence" (12 November 1988);
- and finally that "what is being questioned by rejecting that teaching...is the very idea of the holiness of God" (12 November 1988).

To instill conviction, John Paul II made this doctrine the central point of the first ten years of his pontificate. Should not the policies of dioceses and parishes reflect a similar conviction?

Our Sunday Visitor Press has informed the Fellowship that the third edition of *The Teaching of Christ*, revised and updated, is available. Called "the most popular and universally praised catechism since the Second Vatican Council", the book is co-authored by Fr. Ronald Lawler, Bishop Donald Wuerl and Thomas Comerford Lawler. New documents on euthanasia, RCIA programs and artificial insemination are included.

Fellowship Board Meeting – March 22-23, 1991

The following Board members were present in Pittsburgh:

Fr. Kenneth Baker, Msgr. Eugene V. Clark, Dean Michael Healy, Msgr. George A. Kelly, Fr. Ronald Lawler, Dr. Joseph Scottino, Dr. Janet Smith, Fr. Thomas Weinandy, Fr. Earl Weis, Msgr. Michael Wrenn.

Among the items discussed or actions taken were the following:

1. The announcement that Fr. Thomas Weinandy, OFM. Cap., Vice-President, will teach at Oxford University during the academic year 1991-1992.

2. Dr. Scottino, our Treasurer, reported that the Fellowship operated in the black last year, thanks in part to contributions from the United States Bishops which exceeded \$6,000.00.

The Foundation membership in the Fellowship is presently available for a one-time contribution of \$300.00, exempting the donor from annual dues paying thereafter.

Letters to Regular and Associate members concerning the payment of 1991-1992 \$25.00 annual dues will be mailed shortly.

3. Nominations for the annual Cardinal Wright Award, given to a scholar for outstanding service to the Church, and the exceptional Cardinal O'Boyle Award to a Catholic, not necessarily an academic, for an heroic defense of the Faith, were made. Announcements will be forthcoming in the September *Newsletter*.

4. Nominations for the Board of Directors were also considered, the terms of Professor Benestad and Msgr. Wrenn expiring. Among the candidates favored by the Board were Fr. Michael Miller, Fr. Cornelius Buckley, S.J., Msgr. George Graham. Professor Robert George, and Dean Carl Anderson.

Names placed in nomination for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency include Msgr. Michael Wrenn, Fr. Thomas Weinandy, and Professor Ralph McInerney.

Elections will follow a mailing at a date to be decided.

5. **Future of The Fellowship:** An extended discussion took place concerning the growth and admini-

stration of the Fellowship now that membership has passed the 1,000 mark, with more and more requests for information and assistance arriving each week. The quarterly *Newsletter*, the annual convention and regional meetings, publications such as *Proceedings*, now a *Fellowship Reader*, a *Directory of Scholars* are only part of on-going development. Requests for research material, assistance in writing dissertations, lecture demands, correspondence with ecclesial, civic, and leading academics, servicing the needs of new members, have placed a heavy burden on the staff at St. John's University, which has born the responsibility since 1976. Gannon University, through the good offices of its president (at the time) Dr. Joseph Scottino, assumed responsibility years ago for the Fellowship's financial affairs, a role which he still plays. The Pittsburgh meeting explored possible ways to decentralize the source of these activities, especially among those institutions which are totally committed to magisterium. Nothing of consequence was decided but the thinking process has begun.

6. **1992 Convention in Pittsburgh – September 25-27, 1992**

In a hotel still to be selected and as a result of the gracious invitation of Bishop Wuerl, the Board decided to hold its 15th Annual Convention there.

General theme (tentatively phrased):

"The Catechism" and "The Universal Church"

Fr. Ronald Lawler, who with Bishop Wuerl, is a co-author of the Church's most popular adult Catechism in English, was deputed to develop appropriate subject areas for possible analysis in 1991.

Fellowship members who are competent in this general area are invited to suggest topics, volunteer to give a paper (by submitting an abstract, in advance, even a paper, for review by a Fellowship Committee). Naturally, only eight major presentations can be made in a short weekend, so that volunteering is not a guarantee of presentation. Write to Msgr. George A. Kelly, St. John's University, Jamaica, New York 11439.

CONVENTION UPDATE

1. **THOSE INTENDING TO PARTICIPATE** are urged to register early in order that Fellowship members have access to the choice rooms. If you have any difficulty, call Msgr. Kelly (718) 945-4856.

The new contact person at the Warwick Hotel is Miss Edie Gould (303) 861-2000. (Lisa Sneddon, the previous intermediary, is no longer with the hotel.)

2. Mrs. Patricia Smith of the Denver Archdiocese has a committee of seven men and women to manage the in-house arrangements, convention registrations, name tags, banquet reservations, etc.
3. Gerkens Church Supplies of Denver has agreed to make available books and articles normally of interest to Fellowship members at convention time.

4. **SIGHTSEEING TOUR OF DENVER MOUNTAINS
SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 29TH**

After Mass, courtesy of Richard Moreno, Denver resident, and Travel Agent, Mark Fitzwater, plans are in process for a four-hour tour of the beautiful Denver surroundings – including Buffalo Bill Cody's burial place, a typical Colorado Mountain town – Evergreen, the artifacts of the Old West, geologic formations, etc. With a box lunch.

Information on this little excursion has already been sent to those already registered. If anyone wishes immediate information, call Msgr. Kelly at (718) 990-6394-5. The cost will be \$15-\$20 per person depending on the number applying.

The bus ride is planned to end in time for Fellowship conventioners to catch a 6:30 plane home, if that is the wish, or to stay overnight in Denver, if that is the preference.

5. **AIR TRAVEL TO DENVER**

Mark Fitzwater, who has served as travel agent for many Catholic groups, promises the best discounts available by September to Fellowship members. Contact:

AJA TRAVEL AND TOUR
1860 Black – Suite 760
Denver, Colorado 80202
(303) 296-6946

**FOURTEENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION
of
THE FELLOWSHIP OF CATHOLIC SCHOLARS**

SEPTEMBER 27-29, 1991

The Warwick Hotel
1776 Grant Street (Logan Adjoins)
Denver, Colorado 80203
(303) 861-2000

**Theme:
THE CULTURAL RESPONSE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH
TO
AMERICAN PLURALISTIC SOCIETY**

Most Reverend J. Francis Stafford
Archbishop of Denver, Presiding

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1991

11:00 A.M.

Meeting of the Fellowship Board of Directors
TABOR ROOM

12:00 Noon/Thereafter

Registration for Hotel and Convention
WARWICK LOBBY

◆◆◆◆All General Sessions Will Be Held in◆◆◆◆
THORNTON I AND II BALLROOMS

1:00-3:00 P.M.

**AMERICAN PLURALISM VS.
AMERICAN EGALITARIANISM
Unity in Authentic Pluralism or
Secular Sameness**

REV. ROBERT W. CROOKER, C.S.B.,
University of St. Thomas, Houston, Texas, *Chair*

REV. FRANCIS CANAVAN, S.J.
Fordham University, Bronx, New York
- and -

PROFESSOR JOYCE LITTLE
University of St. Thomas, Houston, Texas

3:00-4:00 P.M. – EXTENDED REGISTRATION

4:00-6:00 P.M.

**THE CULTURAL DIVIDE IN AMERICAN POLITICS
The Battleground Issues of the 90's and Beyond**
SISTER HANNA KLAUS, M.D.
Natural Family Planning Center, Washington, D.C., *Chair*

PROFESSOR JAMES HITCHOCK
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri
- and -

MSGR. EUGENE V. CLARK
St. John's University, Jamaica, New York

6:00-8:00 P.M. – Supper at will.

8:00 P.M.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS
**THE RELIGIOUS ESTABLISHMENT OF THE
STATE: THE CATHOLIC ESTABLISHMENT
OF THE FREE POLITY**

The Indispensability of Catholic Realism to a Free Society
PROFESSOR WILLIAM J. PARENTE
University of Scranton, Scranton, Pennsylvania, *Chair*

REV. DONALD J. KEEFE, S.J.
Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
- and -

SISTER SUSAN WOOD
St. Mary's College, Leavenworth, Kansas

9:30 P.M. and Later – Fellowship

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1991

6:45 A.M.

**MASS AT THE CATHEDRAL OF THE
IMMACULATE CONCEPTION**

(Three-block walk along Logan to Colfax and 15th Avenue)

9:00-10:45 A.M.

**HOW THE CATHOLIC CHURCH
SERVES THE COMMON GOOD**

What is Politically Correct in the United States?

REV. LEONARD A. KENNEDY, C.S.B.

St. Peter's Seminary, Ontario, Canada, *Chair*

PROFESSOR BRIAN BENESTAD

University of Scranton, Scranton, Pennsylvania

- and -

PROFESSOR ROBERT GEORGE

Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey

11:00-12:45 P.M.

**FREEDOM OF RELIGION, THE AMERICAN
CONSTITUTION AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH
(Church Institutions Have Wrongfully and Needlessly
Conceded Too Much of Their Religious Freedom in
Pursuit of Government Aid.)**

EDWARD B. HANIFY, ESQ.

Doctor of Law, Boston, Massachusetts, *Chair*

WILLIAM BENTLEY BALL, ESQ.

Constitutional Lawyer, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

- and -

DR. PATRICK RILEY

Catholic League for Religious and
Civil Rights Washington, D.C.

1:00 P.M. – Lunch at will

2:00-3:45 P.M.

**KULTURKAMPF AND CATHOLIC APPEASEMENT:
KEEPING (AND LOSING) THE FAITH IN
A PLURALIST STATE**

PROFESSOR BATES L. HOFFER

Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas, *Chair*

REV. PAUL MANKOWSKI, S.J.

Faber House, Cambridge, Massachusetts

- and -

PROFESSOR CARL ANDERSON

John Paul II Institute on Marriage and
the Family, Washington, D.C.

4:00-5:45 P.M.

**THE 'LIFE ISSUES' IN A PLURALISTIC SOCIETY:
HOW TO MEET THEM**

**A Panel Discussion on the North American
Response to the Life Controversies**

MRS. RITA MARKER

University of Steubenville, Steubenville, Ohio, *Chair*

PROFESSOR DONALD DE MARCO

St. Jerome's College, Ontario, Canada

PROFESSOR PATRICK DERR

Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts

PROFESSOR JANET SMITH

University of Dallas, Irving, Texas

6:00 P.M. – RECEPTION

6:30 P.M. – BANQUET

**PRESENTATION OF THE
CARDINAL WRIGHT AWARD**

8:30 P.M. – SOCIAL HOUR

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1991

8:30 A.M.

Membership Meeting of the Fellowship:

Report of the Board

10:30 A.M.

**Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception
Archbishop Stafford, Chief Concelebrant and Homilist**

1:00 P.M. OPENING SESSION – IMPORTANT CHANGE

On Friday, September 27th, our Convention will open *one hour early*.

This important change is necessary for those making airline arrangements.

The reason for the earlier starting point is hotel traffic. Rooms are not universally ready until 3:00 P.M. The early hour gives us freedom to open the convention from 1:00 to 3:00 P.M. – Father Canavan being the leadoff – and then between 3:00 P.M. and 4:00 P.M. complete the registration that was not possible in the morning.

A special room will be reserved for luggage until full registration is possible.

Freedom In the Antipodes: Academic and Episcopal

Wagga Wagga is an unlikely place for a bishop to be stoned, or be made to eat crow for that matter. Still, this outpost in the antipodes of Australia is the scene of a brouhaha over the bishop's freedom to contemplate, let alone legislate, a new religious education curriculum for his schools, one consistent with Rome's 1971 General Catechetical Directory. His teachers' union and a large number of his priest population do not think he enjoys such freedom. When four months ago the bishop released for discussion a draft of a proposed curriculum (already used by another bishop) protest meetings developed overnight calling the document "fundamentalist", "too negative", "pre-Vatican II", "abstract", "anti-ecumenical", "psychologically unsound" and so forth. The Independent Teachers Association resolved to ban any teaching of the draft curriculum and called upon the National Episcopal Conference to intervene. One of the Bishop's own pastors called the draft a throwback of the Dark Ages, an effort to indoctrinate, not educate. A local editorialist opined that the bishop was trying "to return the Church in this area to the rigidity and punishment-based teachings of the 1950's." "Thinking Catholics believe", the paper alleged, the bishop is "too steeped in past Church dogma."

What about the bishop? William Brennan came to a diocese, whose native name means "Stone of the Crows", prepared to fend off some rockthrowing. Apparently he was also determined to reform the diocese on Catholic terms. Early on he set about to create his own seminary, to fashion a new kind of priest and, as it turned out, do this over the opposition of certain Catholics, including some of his own clergy, who thought there were more pressing issues on which to spend their money. At present he only has forty active priests, of whom seventeen are part of the opposition. But *mirabile dictu* Bishop Brennan won the seminary battle and today has more than thirty candidates on a waiting list – from all over Australia! Having been outclassed on that one, "the opposition", with the help of the secular media, now is determined to demonstrate this time that they have "the votes", that they are in charge of the catechetical establishment".

Bishop Brennan, however, seems like a prelate who knows how to deal with entrenched but errant

bureaucracy. Demonstrating remarkable patience, he has kept his cool as well as his counsel, leaving the public disputation to his Director of Religious Education, who turned out to be a pretty good debater. To the charge that his curriculum was of the "hell and brimstone" variety, this layman countered: "The word love is mentioned two-hundred-forty-four times, "hell" only eleven".

Eventually the bishop, realizing that his opposition was led by some of the very teachers and priests he had consulted, decided to publish the document in the diocesan paper for the benefit of parents. He also invited "persons who are generally concerned" to ventilate their views, asserting nonetheless his right and duty to preserve Catholic teaching in its entirety. He took the newspaper editors to task for their collusion with the diocese's "anti-bishop faction". Following these moves public support for the bishop began to gather. The local papers subsequently reported the complaint of one father as follows: "Nearly all students graduating from Catholic schools cease to practice their religion." A youngish grandmother also countered. "I have reared a family of thirteen children all going through Catholic primary schools between the years 1959 and 1985. The end result of these years leave a great deal to be desired".

Bishop Brennan has a no-nonsense approach to his own close advisors. One member of the diocesan education committee publicly questioned the qualifications of the bishop to produce a religious education curriculum. When confronted at a public meeting by the press account, the layman reasserted his conviction about the bishop's lack of competence. At which point the bishop terminated the gentleman's appointment, declaring him ineligible to hold diocesan office in the future. "Do you want me to leave?", enquired the critic. To which the bishop replied, "Yes, now, please".

The contest is not yet over but Bishop Brennan has created a small committee of educators from other parts of Australia to evaluate opposing views, making Mr. Tom Daly, one-time officer of the regional episcopal conference, the committee's secretary.

From Down Under

Drums Along the Potomac

by Fr. Donald J. Keefe, S.J. (with permission of his superiors)

Catholics have become accustomed to the spate of political advice to the President and to Congress that has been emanating from their supposedly religious organizations based in Washington over the past quarter century. There seems to be something about occupying an office within the D. C. Beltway that at once provides the members of such associations with joint insights of a startling intuitive clarity, and endows them with a charismatic leadership of the Catholic proles. This syndrome, which we may here dub acumenism, deserves some closer examination.

Of late the Jesuit version of this acumen has been brought to bear upon the war with Iraq. A recent letter from the national Jesuit Conference informs the President of the stance taken by its officials as "leaders" of the 4,700+ American Jesuits—evidently all "followers"—with respect to certain questions of national policy arising out of the current crisis in the Persian Gulf area. The letter insinuates the possession by the Jesuit Conference of a political leadership responsibility in the Society of Jesus. Of course, it has none, nor does any other Jesuit or combination of Jesuits. The Society of Jesus is governed not by self-styled "leaders" but by a General, by the provincials under him, and the rectors under their provincials and under the General. All of these govern under a rule of law, in subordination to the Pope. The U.S. Jesuit Conference has no authority, religious or political, to govern or to speak for the American Jesuits. The same may be said for Church Bureaucracies such as Leadership Conference of Religious Women, and so on and so on.

Only canonically constituted superiors—his rector, his provincial, the General—can invoke a Jesuit's vow of obedience, but their authority is limited and constitutional; as religious, it is directed only to the service of the Church. In political issues they have no authority whatever, although over the past twenty years too many of them, finding themselves in the national capital, have ignored that fact, intruding into matters of politics and attempting to be seen to speak for American Jesuits.

Catholic leaders, including the duly established general, provincials and rectors of the Society of Jesus, and their counterparts in the other religious orders, have a public function and responsibility: summarily,

it is to preach the Gospel in and out of season and to oversee the worship of the Church and the Church's public mission, for the service of which the Society of Jesus exists. This religious responsibility does not and cannot entail the diminution of the political responsibility of individual Jesuits or other Catholics, who as baptized adults are morally responsible for their own decisions, most particularly including those bearing upon their participation in the political life of the nation. This responsibility is subject to no one's oversight.

The letter from the Jesuit Conference which prompts these remarks manifests a currently common theological error, which travels under a variety of names; it is specified by a professed inability to make moral judgments apart from determinations of their socio-political context; such determinations of the "situation" are inevitably political; they must relativize and render negotiable even those evils which are always and everywhere wrong, which the Catholic tradition has condemned perennially as abominations before God. At the same time, issues which are properly political, practical decisions upon which are not foreclosed by the Church's moral tradition, are resolved *ex parte* by the same self-constituted elites whose policy statements— for the most part as ignorant as arrogant— are elevated by them to the standing of moral absolutes. Such elites are invariably careless of consulting their "followers" with respect to the subject of their punditry. In consequence such "leaders," unable to distinguish moral from political issues, attempt yet again that merger of Church and State which a rather better representative of Jesuit scholarship, John Courtney Murray, so such detested.

The Jesuit Conference's political reaction to the brutal killing of six Jesuits and their two household servants during the rebel assault on the capital of El Salvador a year ago well illustrates this confusion of moral absolutes with politics. The Conference would punish the freely elected officials of that nation for their allegedly laggard prosecution of the accused killers by depriving the Salvadorian government of all American military support. Thus the Conference contemplates with equanimity, even complaisance, the turning of the people of that country over to the mercies of

a rebel army notoriously intent on replacing their freely elected government with the avowedly Communist regime rejected by some four-fifths of the voters in an election whose honesty had been underwritten by an international scrutiny. By reason of the same confusion, the Conference has shown no public concern over the far greater number of innocents slaughtered daily and in cold blood by the abortion mills of Washington, D.C. and in every other city in this coun-

try. The six Jesuits killed in obscure circumstances demand vindication, while twenty-five million aborted infants have not prompted any correspondence from the Jesuit Conference.

It may be in place to suggest that advice on issues of war and peace by obtained from sources whose condemnation of the killing of the innocent, whether in war or peace, is less nuanced.

HOT OFF THE PRESS

- ❖ *CHALLENGE*, The Canadian Magazine, (March 1991), compares the differing reviews of the state of the Church twenty-five years after Vatican Two; one provided recently by the Catholic Theological Society of America and the other issued in September 1990 by the Fellowship. J.E. Edwards, a contributor to Vatican theological journals, concludes his summary with this line: "We should be grateful that the Fellowship was organized in 1977. At least one major academic association is supportive of the magisterium."
- ❖ CHRISTENDOM COLLEGE is offering a Summer Institute on Apologetics for the 90's: "Defending the Faith in the Post-Modern Age." June 17-July 12, 1991. Faculty will include Rev. John Hardon, S.J., Rev. Stanley Jaki, Professor Peter Kreeft. Telephone Mr. Marck McShurley (703) 636-2900.
- ❖ THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS and the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights have recently published a ninety-three page study by S. Robert Lichter, et. al., entitled "Media Coverage of the Catholic Church," which concluded: "News coverage during the post-Vatican II era found the Church on the losing side of the battle of ideas, an institution depicted as conservative, oppressive, and out of touch with the modern world." Details of their data and the report itself are available from either of the above-mentioned organizations.
- ❖ FATHER JOSEPH FESSIO, S.J., publisher of the English language *30 Days*, has informed the International Editorial Institute in Rome that (1) they must internationalize their editorial staff, or (2) "Ignatius Press will join with the publishers of other disaffected national editions to produce an international Catholic news magazine that will correspond to the intentions and aspirations of the original *30 Days*." The reason for the disaffection – and ultimatum – is the anti-American bite that has characterized material coming out of the Rome office. Many letters of complaint can be found in the April, 1991 issue.
- ❖ Professor Ricardo Peter has created an International Foundation for Foreign Policy Studies of the Holy See. He will be in touch with 45 political scientist members of the Fellowship from his home – Viale Glorioso, 18 Rome, Italy 00153.

“RENEWING THE BATTLE TO RESTORE SOCIOLOGY AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CHRIST”

by Joseph A. Varacalli, Ph.D.

To Restore All Things in Christ

It is, of course, true that sociology and the other social sciences did not exist as professions during the colonial period of American Catholic history. In a real sense, however, our tale of the rise, fall, and possible resurrection of the idea of “Catholic sociology” and Catholic “social sciences” (or, perhaps, less ostentatiously, of “Catholic perspectives” in sociology and the social sciences) starts in this period. This is so because the attempt, in the early-to-mid-twentieth century, to construct distinctive Catholic intellectual approaches and to create professional associations of Catholic scholars was just some of the many consequences of the calculated and reasonable reaction of the Catholic Church in America to overcome its less than auspicious beginning in the American colonies and nation. American Catholics, a small and disparaged minority in an overwhelmingly Protestant country, — lacking priests, parishes, regular communication with Rome and standardization in doctrine and religious practice, — were converting in large numbers to Protestantism or to the lapsed condition of the unchurched. The early answer to Gerald Shaughnessy’s classic question, “Has the immigrant kept the faith?” was often a simple “no.”

The series of Provincial and Plenary Councils held in Baltimore from 1829 to 1884 provided the organizational blueprint and the stimulus for the American Catholic Church to start building what the contemporary sociologist, Peter L. Berger, would later call its “plausibility structure.” By this he meant the system of interlocking social institutions (i.e., parishes, families, seminaries, schools, hospitals, newspapers, publishing houses, bookstores, professional associations, ethnic associations, charitable organizations, etc.) that assists the Church in socializing its members. The social science argument behind the concept of a plausibility structure is that *any* belief system requires a structural base that reaffirms, through constant social interaction and exposure, its “realness” to the individual. During

the pre-Reformation period of Christendom in Europe, one can say that the total society constituted a plausibility structure for Catholicism as most social institutions reinforced the presence of God and God’s Church to the individual through his/her daily biographical existence. Historically, the Church found herself in a fundamentally different situation in the United States marked variously by either a Protestant or secular hegemony and/or a radical religious pluralism. In any event, the lack of a common Catholic culture in the United States necessitates that the Church continually build and maintain a plausibility structure. The American Catholic plausibility structure started to take shape after World War I and hit full stride in the 1940’s and 1950’s only to be severely weakened by both external and internal forces in the post-Vatican II period.

A significant part of this attempt entailed the construction of a Catholic educational network from the elementary to the graduate level. The Church’s alternative higher education system (Salvaterra 1988, Varacalli 1989) mirrored secular developments in bureaucratization and professionalization but provided a distinctive and decisive twist through the effort to ground all study through the unifying force of neo-Thomism and Neo-Scholasticism with its God-centered teleological focus. Simply put, the Catholic intellectual attempt, in the felicitous phrase of Pope Pius X, was “to restore all things in Christ” (Salvaterra, 1988:201).

Associated with the development of an alternate Catholic educational fortress was the creation of distinctive Catholic social science perspectives and the establishment of separate Catholic scholarly organizations founded on specific premises: that Catholics 1) bring distinctive philosophical presuppositions and metaphysical starting points into their intellectual approaches but 2) should appropriate anything of worth in secular intellectual approaches for the benefit of the faith. As Jeffrey Burns has noted, American Catholic social science initially developed around the

turn-of-the-century through the pioneering efforts of the sociologist William Kerby, the economist John A. Ryan, the psychologist Thomas Verner Moore and the anthropologist John M. Cooper (1988:10). Mention should also be made of the vital role played by the historian Peter Guilday in attempting to counter secular misconceptions and faulty interpretations concerning the history of the Church (Salvaterra, 1988:237). David Salvaterra reports that the American Catholic Historical Association was founded in 1919, the Catholic Anthropological Conference and the American Catholic Philosophical Association in 1926, the Catholic Biblical Association of America in 1936, the American Catholic Sociological Society in 1938, the Canon Law Society of America in 1939, the Catholic Economic Association in 1941, the Catholic Theological Society in 1946, the American Catholic Psychological Association in 1947, and the Albertus Magnus Guild, an organization for Catholics in science, in 1953 (1988:79-80).

In the wake of the Second Vatican Council, and referring once again to the conceptual corpus of Peter L. Berger, many of the various Catholic professional associations fell victim either to a "secularization from without," i.e., dissolved as specifically "Catholic" organizations, or a "secularization from within," i.e., internally transformed into shells of their once authentically Catholic selves while still formally keeping the Catholic label. Predictably enough, these secularizing developments – at least according to the subsequent progressivist or Americanist leadership wings of these organizations – were legitimated by Vatican II. The requirements of "ecumenism," "academic freedom," "critical thinking," and "individual conscience" were used to make the case that distinctive Catholic academic perspectives and separate (but, again, not isolated) Catholic professional associations were provincial at best or contradictory at worst. The latent and unintended function of the Council was to permit many Catholic intellectuals to find a comfortable home within the frame of reference of the outer secular professional societies. The sociological truism of the classical American sociologist, W. I. Thomas, to the effect that "what is defined as real is real in its consequences" can easily be applied to the case of the *actual* (as compared to the *intended*) impact of Vatican II. Vatican II actually affirmed the need for Catholics to engage in public dialogue about what their religion had to offer both to the world-at-large and to the

various intellectual disciplines. Many influential post-Vatican II Catholic intellectuals rather than dialoguing with their secular counterparts capitulated to their mindset instead. Vatican II was hardly a declaration that distinctive Catholic intellectual approaches and professional associations were obsolescent. In truth it was a call for an open-minded but evangelistic thrust into the temporal sphere of academia.

A Case in Point:

The American Catholic Sociological Society

There were many reasons for the attempt in the United States, between 1938 and 1970, to construct a Catholic sociology and to maintain a professional organization of Catholic sociologists. The idea of a Catholic sociology first developed "negatively," i.e., in reaction to the pervasive non-Catholic elements influencing the discipline (whether of Comteian, Spencerian, positivistic, behavioristic, socialistic, communistic, other secular, or liberal Protestant origin) (Williams, 1950). The idea also developed "positively" in response to the developing tradition of social Catholicism. Initiated in a scholarly way with the "just war" writings of St. Augustine and by the natural law perspective of St. Thomas, Catholic social thought grew to a corpus in modern times with the publication of *Rerum Novarum* (1891) and *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931) (Williams, 1950). Contributing historical factors also included the virulent anti-Catholic attitudes that pervaded the sociological profession and the intellectual/moral demands for reconstructing the social order in light of the Great Depression. The crystallizing Catholic plausibility structure, with its neo-scholastic base, was now in place and a Catholic attempt to interpret social facts within a Thomistic framework was possible. What was needed was a charismatic individual to set off the necessary organizational spark. He appeared in the figure of a Chicago priest, Ralph Gallagher.

The effort to construct a Catholic sociology lasted little less than three decades and the perceived need for a specifically Catholic organization of sociologists only a little longer. The American Catholic Sociological Society was founded in 1938 and its journal, the *American Catholic Sociological Review*, two years later. In 1963, the *Review's* name was changed to *Sociological Analysis* and the organization's name to *the Association for the Sociology of Religion* in 1970.

Why this transformation occurred is a complex question whose answer is multi-faceted (Varacalli, 1989a). The lack of moral and financial support to

social science efforts by the institutional Church facilitated secularization. Church leaders felt secure that truth could be satisfactorily approached through the traditional deductive disciplines of philosophy and theology. In short, sociology was suspect because of its non-Catholic founders and non-Catholic biases assumed, incorrectly, to be intrinsic to the discipline. Dialectically related to this was (and is) the Catholic Church's relatively weak tradition in sociology (Baum, 1989:721). Catholic thinkers who could or did systematically counter and respond to secular and Protestant sociologists were few. Paul Hanly Furfey was an exception in this regard. The relative sparseness of Catholic giants in sociology was compounded by the incomplete training of the rank and file who often equated the social content of moral theology with the sociological discipline. As Peter Kivisto (1989:358) has noted, most early Catholic sociologists were not either theorists or empiricists but specialists in other areas with a strong bent to social reform. Add to this the typically heavy teaching and administrative workload assigned to sociologist in Catholic colleges – many of whom were also active parochial ministers – which left little time for deeper study and pure research in the field. Some commentators have charged that the typical Catholic stress on character development precluded a scholarly concern for the “what is” (as compared to the “what should be”). Another view was that Catholic sociology was doomed because Catholic censorship prohibited a necessary and frank exchange with non-Catholic ideas, authors, and methods.

Despite these admitted handicaps, the elements of what could have been developed into a fully articulated Catholic sociology did emerge. In the 1950's, John J. Kane's dream that the American Catholic Sociological Society could become a vital and necessary bridge between the outer sociological profession and the world of Catholicism was still alive (1953). The energy of individual Catholic sociologists kept Kane's vision viable, at least until a “new generation” of his peers abandoned the bridge to seculars. The killing blow to the Kane idea came, ironically, when Church leadership decided to send their best and brightest to prestigious but secular institutions of higher education like Harvard University and the University of Chicago. Priests and religious sent there to learn the “latest” in sociology were to come back to Catholic environs sharing the fruits of their secular training and newly acquired insights with the Catholic faithful. (It

would be interesting to find out how many never came back *either* as clergy or as members of “the People of God.”) By the 1960's, secularized sociologists who were Catholic had accepted the false notion that narrowly empirical and highly mathematical versions of sociology were “true” sociology, whereas the “Catholic sociology” of Paul Hanly Furfey (1942), concerned with the “deep knowledge of God's purpose in human society,” was not. In the words of Jeffrey Burns (1988:104), the “new generation” was “chomping at the bit” to win acceptance from the secular professionals. However, the “price” of acceptance was assent to the positivistic claim that values – including religious values – had no constructive role to play in *any* aspect of the sociological enterprise, including the development of sociological theory (Varacalli, 1987, 1988, 1990). Here I reject the claim made by Gregory Baum (1989:722) that Talcott Parsons, the premier mainstream American sociologist of the 1950's, provided an intellectually defensible “detente” between religion and sociology, one which enabled Catholics “to join the dominant sociology without compromising their religious convictions.” At best, Parsons' work provided a convenient rationalization for ignoring the possible Catholic interface with sociology. The transformation of *The American Catholic Sociological Society* into *The Association for the Sociology of Religion* was simply another indicator of the increased strength of the “Americanist” interpreters of things Catholic.

In the post-Vatican II period, almost overnight, the American Catholic hierarchy's historic suspicion of, or at least its indifference to, secular sociology reversed itself. In light of the selective misinterpretation of the Council by “reformers,” the cultural and social chaos of the 1960's and 1970's, and the acquiescence of leading bishops to “Americanist” tendencies, it is not surprising that secular sociologists, situated in Catholic college departments and Church bureaucracies, became popular conduits of non-Catholic ideas within the Catholic body. In spite of its growing popularity, secular sociological research has often-times been partisan along progressive lines, thus betraying its variously associated claims representing “professionalism,” “value-neutrality,” and “objectivity.”

The situation of sociology vis-a-vis the Catholic Church in the United States is further complicated by the relatively recent emergence of a convoluted form of Catholic sociology, i.e., the synthesis of Marxism and Christianity entitled the “theology of liberation”

(Varacalli, 1989b). On the one hand, legitimate Church authority has made it clear through the publication of certain important statements that much of what today passes as liberation theology includes not only false theological concepts but also a deficient mode of integrating Catholic theology and the social sciences. These statements include, foremost, both the Congregation for Doctrine of the Faith's "Instruction on Certain Aspects of the 'Theology of Liberation'" (1984) and "Instruction on Christian Freedom and Liberation" (1986) as well as the Congregation for Catholic Education's "Guidelines for the Study and Teaching of the Church's Social Doctrine in the Formation of Priests" (1989). Despite such authoritative statements and despite the fact that it produces a Catholic sociology that is both religiously heterodox and sociologically unscientific, liberation theology remains an influential force in the Church. Writing in the middle of the last decade, Gregory Baum (1986), for instance, has explicitly argued the case that the *only* acceptable sociological paradigm for the Christian sociologist is that of Marxism. The resurrection of the idea of Catholic sociology in the United States is, thus, off to a disastrous start.

While a "theology of liberation" sociology may be starting to edge its way into some mainstream Catholic college departments of sociology, it is more likely to be

gaining wider acceptance in departments of theology and religious studies. From the orthodox Catholic perspective, then, the contemporary situation of sociology vis-a-vis the faith is desperately bad. Today the forms of sociology empirically available to the faithful are either secularistic or more openly biased along theology of liberation lines.

What Is To Be Done?

A first step in renewing the battle to restore sociology and the social sciences in Christ might be in the forming of a Society of Catholic Social Scientists. Since the defining goal of this proposed scholarly organization is to produce objective knowledge in the service of the Catholic Church and not, conversely, to promote any specific school of thought, there ought to be much room for honest disagreement about the nature and extent of the linkage between Catholicism and social science in general or any specific social science discipline in particular. Again, as always, St. Augustine's phrase should be operative: "in necessary things, unity; in doubtful things, liberty; in all things, charity." All S.C.S.S. members, because they are involved in some way with the integration of profession with the Catholic faith as defined by magisterial authority, should be required to take the recently promulgated Oath of Catholic allegiance.

Bibliography

- Baum, Gregory. 1986. "Three Theses on Contextual Theology," *The Ecumenist* (Volume 24, Number 4)
- Baum, Gregory. 1989. "Sociology and Salvation: Do We Need A Catholic Sociology?" *Theological Studies* (Volume 50, Number 4)
- Burns, Jeffrey M. 1988. *American Catholics and the Family Crisis, 1930-1962: An Ideological and Organizational Response* (New York and London: Garland Publishing)
- Furfey, Paul Hanly. 1942. "The Lesson of Plato's Republic," *American Catholic Sociological Review* (Volume 3, Number 2)
- Kane, John J. 1953. "Are Catholic Sociologists a Minority Group?," *American Catholic Sociological Review* (Volume 14, Number 1)
- Kivisto, Peter. 1989. "The Brief Career of Catholic Sociology," *Sociological Analysis* (Volume 50, Number 4, Special Issue)
- Salvaterra, David L. 1988. *American Catholicism and the Intellectual Life* (New York and London: Garland Publishing)
- Varacalli, Joseph A. 1987. "The Resurrection of 'Catholic Sociologies': Toward a Catholic Center," *Social Justice Review* (Volume 78, Numbers 5-6)
- Varacalli, Joseph A. 1988. "Book Review of Jeffrey M. Burns' *American Catholics and the Family Crisis, 1930-1962: An Ideological and Organizational Response* (1988)," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* (Volume LXXXIX, Numbers 11-12)
- Varacalli, Joseph A. 1989. "Book Review of David L. Salvaterra's *American Catholicism and the Intellectual Life* (1988)," *Sociological Analysis* (Volume 50, Number 4, Special Issue)
- Varacalli, Joseph A. 1989a. "Toward the History and Promise of Roman Catholic Sociologies" (Unpublished paper)
- Varacalli, Joseph A. 1989b. "Recovering the Sacred: A 'Catholic Sociological' Critique of Gustavo Gutierrez' *A Theology of Liberation*," (Unpublished paper)
- Varacalli, Joseph A. 1990. "Catholic Sociology in America: A Comment on the Fiftieth Anniversary Issue of *Sociological Analysis*," *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* (Volume 4, Number 2)
- Williams, Melvin J. 1950. *Catholic Social Thought: Its Approach to Contemporary Problems* (New York: The Ronald Press)

Book Reviews

Eunuchs For the Kingdom of Heaven: Women, Sexuality and the Catholic Church,

By Uta Ranke-Heinemann.

Doubleday, New York, 1990. 360 pp.

The implicit thesis of this book is easily granted. The Roman Catholic Church does not subscribe to the sexual revolution nor to radical feminism. It does not regard sex as primarily recreational and procreational only when condoms fail. It regards sexual intercourse outside of marriage as seriously sinful, it has always taught that homosexuality, bestiality and necrophilia are bad for you, morally and doubtless physically as well. The vows of religion – chastity, obedience and poverty – are freely undertaken in order to direct oneself more surely to God. Poverty does not entail the judgment that worldly goods are evil. Obedience does not suggest that following one's own judgment is bad. And chastity does not mean that sex is naughty, evil, or an abomination it is better to avoid. Is there anybody who does not know this to be the teaching of the Catholic Church?

Uta Ranke-Heinemann seems surprised to learn that the Church's moral teaching, as it concerns sexual matters, the only ones that interest her, is in radical conflict with the views she has picked up God knows where. The history of the Church as she sees it is one long sad story of sexual repression and the subjugation of women. What may loosely be called her "research" is undertaken to illustrate that caricature of Church history. But what permeates the book is an unexamined attitude toward the meaning of sexual differentiation (it has no real meaning, she suggests, because heterosexual and homosexual unions are equally sanctionable), sexual activity (there is a joyless championing of the joys of sex which one must characterize as puellane, not to say puerile) and marriage (sometimes she claims to be defending it from celibate idiots, but what she defends has nothing to do with Christian marriage).

If this book were submitted as a dissertation in any reputable university, it would be turned down. Nor would it be necessary to read very far in it to pass a negative judgement. It aspires to be scholarly, but a random testing of it shows that this is merely a pretense. Consider, for example, Chapter XVI, which

professes to give us the thought of Thomas Aquinas on the matters that interest Ranke-Heinemann. I shall mention fifteen of the points she attempts to make – they make up an adequate sample.

1. "Basically, Thomas Aquinas (d. 1272) did no more than weave together, in a systematic fashion, the views of the High Scholastics as a group" (p. 183). It is difficult to imagine any competent medieval intellectual historian making such a statement. That Thomas were merely a spokesman for the group would have come as a surprise to Etienne Tempier, bishop of Paris, and the two committees that produced the condemnations of 1270 and 1277.

2. [p. 184] Reference to *Summa theologiae*, IIaIIae, q.86, a.4, of which she quotes the end of the body of the article – which cites Jerome's condemnation of Jovinian for equating matrimony and virginity.

The article asks whether perpetual continence is required for the perfection of the religious life. And, on the basis [1] of Aristotle and Augustine argues that frequent sexual activity augments concupiscence and weakens the soul's perfect intention of tending to God and of [2] I Corinthians 7,32 on the absorbing effect of wife and children, answers Yes. "And therefore perpetual continence is required for the perfection of religion, just as voluntary poverty is. Hence, just as Vigilantius was condemned (by St. Jerome) for equating wealth and poverty, so Jovinian was condemned (by St. Jerome) for equating matrimony and virginity."

Ranke-Heinemann does not inveigh against what should strike her, by parity of reasoning, as a benightedly negative attitude toward wealth. Of course the negation is contextual – the requirements for perfection of religion.

3. [p. 184] Thomas repeats several times Jerome's calculation that virgins receive a 100% reward, widows and widowers 60% and married people 30%: IIaIIae, q. 152, a. 5, ad 2m.

The reference, of course, is to St. Matthew, 13,23: "As for what was sown on good soil, this is he who hears the word and understands it; he indeed bears fruit, and yields in one case a hundredfold, in another sixty, and in another thirty."

The Thomistic text in question occurs in an article which asks if virginity is the highest of the virtues. The answer is Yes and No. Yes, in a given genus, namely that of chastity, for it transcends the chastity of the

widowed and the married. No, if we mean the best without qualification. The end always ranks higher than that which is for the sake of the end; but the end or point of virginity is to free oneself for divine things. Thus the theological virtues and even the virtue of religion itself, whose act is precisely occupation with divine things, rank higher than virginity. Moreover, martyrs rank higher than virgins as do those who in monasteries sacrifice their own wills in obedience.

Ranke-Heinemann quotes the answer to the second objection in which Thomas notes that Jerome applies the text of Matthew. If it is this calibration that bothers our author, her quarrel is with Matthew and, in this case, with Our Lord, whom Matthew is quoting, allotting the evangelical percentages as she states. Augustine on the other hand, assigned a hundredfold fruitfulness to martyrs, sixty to virgins, and thirty to spouses. St. Thomas: "It follows, therefore, that virginity is not simply speaking the highest of virtues, but only greater than the other forms of chastity."

To quote the whole of the text she cites would have undercut Ranke-Heinemann's Augustine-bashing. She adds this heated remark: "Anyone who tries nowadays to raise marriage to the same rank as virginity will be viewed, as he or she would have been back then, as dragging virginity down to the lowly level of marriage and as slandering the Virgin Mary herself." Ranke-Heinemann seems to thirst for martyrdom, if not for chastity. But of course, when one discerns her conception of marriage, it is scarcely Christian marriage whose rank she would be raising.

4. [p. 185] As if bothered by the fact that the Thomistic text she cites has Augustine ranking martyrdom above virginity, Ranke-Heinemann veers into a wild attack on the Bishop of Hippo, characterized as blaming all the trouble in the world on Eve (*City of God* XIV,11). Her Comment: "Love of woman brings man to ruin."

Well, let's look at Book Fourteen of *The City of God*. Chapter 1 argues that "the disobedience of the first man would have involved all mankind in the second, everlasting death, had not God's grace rescued man"; Chapter 2 notes that the carnal life depends on defects of mind as well as of the body. And, observing that Scripture uses 'flesh' in so many ways there is little point in enumerating them all, goes on: "Our present purpose is to track down the meanings of 'living by the rule of the flesh' (which is clearly a bad thing [and which Augustine opposes to 'living by the rule of the

spirit' – these being the basis for the Two Cities], though the natural substance of the flesh is not an evil in itself)..." Augustine locates the genesis of sin in soul, not flesh, and calls the corruption following from sin a punishment and not itself the sin. The book continues marvelously, developing the relation between soul and body, the relation of the will to the emotions, the scriptural terms for love, the Stoic view of the emotions of the wise, and the laudable agitations of mind in the righteous. Augustine then asks what the emotional life of the first humans was prior to sin. Now we come to Chapter 11 which Ranke-Heinemann, uninterested in the rich context of the work, sees simply as a putdown of women generally. Actually, she might have cited a passage in the paragraph prior to the one she did where Augustine says that the devil tempted Eve "no doubt starting with the inferior of the human pair so as to arrive at the whole by stages, supposing that the man would not be so easily gullible, and could not be trapped by a false move on his own part, but only if he yielded to another's mistake." What she does cite is Augustine's remark that Adam, "although he knew his wife was deceived, refused to be separated from her, even if it involved sharing her sin." This is worse than gullibility, of course, but Ranke-Heinemann trivializes the discussion by seeing it as a skirmish in the war between the sexes.

5. Hildegard of Bingen (d. 1179), *mirabile dictu*, is listed with the male chauvinists for accepting what Augustine taught, namely that Adam fell out of disordered love of Eve rather than by being deceived.

It is difficult to know what Ranke-Heinemann's complaint is. Does she wish to deny that any man has ever been led astray by a woman? Does she imagine her opponent holding that every man is led astray by some woman? Actually she seems to believe the latter. "...woman is the metaphorical Enemy of all celibate theology, and women themselves all too often accepted the notion of their sex as a divinely chosen plague" (p. 185). Why not the literal enemy?

6. Ranke-Heinemann is correct to note that Thomas accepted Aristotle's biological theory that the seed is the principal agent of generation, that it comes from the male and seeks to produce another male, and that the production of a female falls short of the natural telos of generation, making the female a failed male (*mas occasionatus*). She quotes with amusement, though without noting its provenance, Thomas's citing of Aristotle on the effect of climactic conditions on con-

ception (*Summa theologiae*, Ia, q. 92, a. 1, ad 1m.). Of course she stops there, her purpose having been served. But Thomas goes on immediately to say: "With respect to universal nature, the female is not an accident, but is intended by nature for the work of generation. The intention of universal nature depends upon God who is the universal author of nature. Therefore in instituting nature He produced not just man, but woman too."

7. [p. 187] She takes the humid weather mentioned in the Aristotelian text to have as its consequence a higher water content in women than in men, which makes them more easily seduced by sexual pleasure. She cites *Summa theologiae*, III, q. 42, a. 4, ad 5. There is no such text. She cites to the same effect *IIaIIae*, q. 49, a. 4, which says nothing at all about either sexual pleasure or women.

8. [p. 188] Ranke-Heinemann cites *Summa theologiae*, Ia, q. 99, a. 2, ad 2 as if it did something more than quote again the Aristotelian text about the influence of climactic conditions on generation. If she were interested in the text, she would have noticed that the question asked is this: if the production of a female child is a failure of the seed to achieve its goal, how would it have been if man had not sinned and nature been unaffected? Would not then only males have been born? Thomas replies that the production of the female is not only due to a defect in the active principle of in the receiving matter, but also to extrinsic causes, e.g., the weather. He goes on to suggest that in the state of innocence mind would have had such influence over matter than the sex of the child could have been determined by the will of the generator. Ranke-Heinemann interprets Aristotle to be saying that "woman is a product of environmental pollution, a miscarriage," (p. 188). Of course the reader has long since become aware that Ranke-Heinemann is not at all interested in what the texts she cites mean, but only what she can, by misreading, take them to mean.

9. [p. 188] She suggests that woman is linked to decay, deformity and the weakness of age by Thomas. She cites *Summa theologiae*, Ia, q. 52, a. 1, ad 2. No such text exists, but it scarcely seems to matter since Ranke-Heinemann's thesis was obviously formulated before she did any of the "research" that issued in the "enormous erudition" admired by Anthony Burgess on the jacket of the book. In her dust jacket puff, Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza refers to Ranke-Heinemann's "carefully researched arguments." Ah yes.

10. [p. 188] Now our author notices that woman is

indeed intended by nature, for purposes of generation, in *Summa theologiae*, Ia, q. 92, a. 1. "But from Thomas's monkish standpoint that exhausts woman's usefulness." Apparently she has forgotten all the talk about virginity that so enrages her on other occasions.

11. [p. 188] Thomas quotes Augustine on the power of feminine blandishments to turn the soul to earthly, one might say country, matters. *IIaIIae*, q. 151, a. 3, ad 2. Thomas himself says that venereal pleasures are far more potent than the pleasure associated with food in affecting reason. Thus such desires require more discipline than the desire for food. What's the beef? Would Ranke-Heinemann prefer the counter-intuitive claim that men are generally unaffected by the attractions of female flesh, always think clearly when attracted by it, remain quite uninfluenced by it? Ranke-Heinemann's quarrel is not with the Church or theologians, but with human nature. In this passage, Thomas is not speaking of men alone, but of human beings. Ranke-Heinemann, like many cheerleaders of the sexual revolution, paradoxically wishes to deny the power of lust even as she celebrates it.

12. [p. 188] She attributes to Thomas this: "The husband has the nobler part of the marital act, and hence it is natural that he needs to blush less when he requests the debt of marriage than when his wife does." We are referred to *Supplementum*, q. 64, a. 5, ad 2 where Thomas says, irrelevantly to her purposes, "In reply to the second it would be said that while one is not held to pray at every hour, he should hold himself ready to pray throughout the day." Just another slip in her "careful scholarship" no doubt but the sentiment she objects to sounds remarkably like that of Ranke-Heinemann's fellow feminist, Susan Brownmiller, for whom all heterosexual sex is rape, given the demeaning and subservient role of the woman.

13. [p. 189] Attributing to Thomas the view that we are held to love father more than mother, she refers us to *IIaIIae*, q. 56, a. 1 which asks whether there should have been in the decalogue a precept concerning prudence and says nothing at all to the point she wishes to make. More careful scholarship.

14. [p. 190] Ranke-Heinemann doesn't know quite what to say about the claim that men are stronger than women and that thus a woman can look to her husband for protection. She seems to want to deny it. On the other hand, she sees in it the origin of the tyranny of the strong over the weak. Which is it to be? Apparently both if a reader's logical demands are not too

strong and he is willing to see a dead horse beat with any club at all.

15. [p. 191] Thomas is blamed for accepting Aristotle's view that sexual pleasure clouds the mind. Does Ranke-Heinemann doubt this? It would seem to be part of the lore of the race, male and female. It is the stuff of tragedy and comedy. It is anything but a theory, let alone a sinister one.

In just a few pages, then, Uta Ranke-Heinemann is revealed as a zealot whose mind is clouded by ideology, who cannot read a text and, as often as not gives citations which are bogus. She is a charlatan or maybe just dumb. One need not be St. Jerome to withhold from her a hundredfold, or 60%, even 30%, on any reputable scale of scholarship. Ironically, she provides ammunition for those who would argue that women are incapable of ordered thinking, and that their writing turns into screeds and emotional outbursts. But why saddle womankind with the faults of such radicals feminists as Uta Ranke-Heinemann?

I am not in the least surprised by the absence of any reference to Regine Pernoud, one of the most distinguished of medievalists. Pernoud has written much that is pertinent about the status of women in the Middle Ages. A chapter in *Pour en finir avec le moyen age* of 1977, "La femme sans ame" is a prelude to her 1980 book *La Femme au temps des cathedrales*. Anyone seriously interested in this topic should read Pernoud. Measured by such scholarship, the book of Ranke-Heinemann is revealed for what it is, an attack on the Church by a disgruntled woman whose bizarre pseudo-scholarship has gotten her into academic trouble before and who is now foisted on the United States by the absentee owners of Doubleday and Company as if she were deserving of an audience. One must go to a true scholar like Pernoud to learn that it is a matter of simple fact that the free choice of one's spouse everywhere followed on the spread of Christianity, that it was not until the 17th century that a woman was obliged to take the name of her husband, and that medieval married women often acted in legal matters in their own names. Pernoud is an historian, not a romantic, and it is no part of her claim that life was just a bowl of cherries for women in the Middle Ages. But neither was it for men. What she does suggest is that women were more women in the Middle Ages than they are now when too many seem intent on imitating just those masculine traits at which they are doomed to come out second. This is a question, she suggests, a woman

might put to herself.

À se demander si elle n'est pas mue par une admiration inconsciente, et qu'on peut trouver excessive, d'un monde masculin qu'elle croit nécessaire et suffisant de copier avec autant d'exactitude que possible, fût-ce en perdant elle-même son identité, en niant d'avance son originalité. (*Pour en finir...*, p. 98.

That a woman can excel at scholarship is proved by Regine Pernoud; that a woman can fail miserably at it is demonstrated to a fare-thee-well by Uta Ranke-Heinemann. Shame on Doubleday.

Ralph McInerney

The Michael P. Grace Professor of Medieval Studies
University of Notre Dame

Sexuality: Theological Voices

By Kevin T. McMahon, STD.

Braintree, MA, Pope John Center, 1987

Fr. McMahon renders an invaluable contribution in identifying and comparing different moral methodologies which have emerged since Vatican II.

McMahon divides his work, not unlike Caesar's Gaul, into three parts. He surveys the battlefield of reactions to *Humanae Vitae* not from the perspective of popular adherence to church teaching, but from the standpoint of moral analysis. How do different moral methodologies lead to radically divergent conclusions about ethical options, church teaching and sexual lifestyles? This work, eminently suitable for classroom use, provides important answers by combining scholarly precision with readable prose.

Part One examines postconciliar approaches to Catholic teaching that recast scholastic formulations of natural law. The contributions of Germain Grisez, William E. May, John Finnis and Robert and Mary Joyce are presented in a systematic and comprehensive way. Each of the authors tackles fundamental issues such as the meaning of the person as a sexual being, the role of human understanding in the natural law tradition, and the significance of basic human goods in which the person participates. Grisez's *Way of the Lord Jesus* is an especially helpful reformulation of natural law ethics; it is the fruit of many scholars collaborating to bring forth the best of the tradition in dialogue with the best of contemporary biblical, philosophical and theological efforts. While these authors are in agreement with Catholic teaching on sexual

ethics, they do not rely upon an appeal to magisterial authority for their conclusions. Their premises and arguments bear the mark both of reflection and the promise of future development. Taken as a whole, the work of these authors signals that creative theology in harmony with magisterial teaching is neither kneejerk nor monolithic. Their overall agreement does not preclude lively differences on questions of method interpretation.

Part Two studies the work chiefly of Richard A. McCormick and Charles E. Curran. The major focus is on the underpinnings of their dissent from church teaching on issues such as divorce, premarital sexual relations, masturbation, adultery and homosexual practices. As with the authors considered in Part One there are significant differences in the approaches taken by McCormick and Curran, but a common thread of proportionalist thinking mars the contributions that they endeavor to make. The charges of physicalism (the view that the physical structure of an act accounts for its entire meaning), biologism (specifying finality from a faculty as the purpose of an act), and lack of historical consciousness levelled against church teaching, have pointed up areas where new perspectives are necessary. The manuals, for instance, hardly reflected the breadth and development of the tradition on virtue, grace and human striving by the person considered as *imago Dei*. But dissenting criticism is also flawed by its reliance on a proportionalist methodology that lacks either internal coherence or practical feasibility. When originating from a proportionalist perspective, the notion of the fundamental option tends to split human choices either into an important or marginal column, hardly a design for holistic decision-making. The unwitting adoption of a person/body dualism traceable to the narrow prism of Descartes and Enlightenment rationalism undercuts the claims made by the dissenters that their approach develops the rich meaning of the person as moral agent.

In addition to McCormick and Curran, the works of John G. Milhaven, Philip S. Keane and the CTSA study on sexuality edited by Anthony Kosnik are analyzed. It is very doubtful that their approach of weighing good and evil on shifting scales calibrated by subjectivist determinations (e.g. premoral, ontic, non-moral) is an improvement over the act-centered morality that they fiercely oppose.

Part Three responds to the critics of church teaching considered in Part Two by demonstrating that their

notions of the theological anthropology and moral methodology utilized by the tradition suffer in key areas from oversimplification and distortion. Vatican II admonished theologians (*Optatam Totius* 16) to reform moral theology. There is universal agreement that reform was and continues to be critical, but a scorched earth policy of dissent against the tradition clouds rather than reveals genuine areas of development (e.g. the affirmation of an inseparable connection of unitive and procreative meanings of conjugal union).

I had the occasion to use this text in a course on sexual ethics. It provided a very useful distillation of opposing positions; students remarked that the work clarified the issues involved. A solid contribution to the ongoing debate, *Sexuality: Theological Voices* cannot but help enlighten the student of theology on the moral issues which lay just beneath, and perhaps partially account for the sexual revolution.

Rev. Stephen F. Brett, SSJ
DeSales School of Theology,
Washington, D.C.

A Definition of Moral Virtue

By Yves Simon

Vukan Kuic, Ed. (Fordham University Press 1986, 137pp.)

As Vukan Huic declares in his preface to *The Definition of Moral Virtue*, Yves Simon devoted his lifetime to "show how much better contemporary problems can be understood, and their proper solutions evaluated, if they are approached in the light of the great teachings of the past." Central among these great philosophies is Aristotle and St. Thomas. This slim volume begins with a careful and pointed survey of the popular substitutes for virtue today. He identifies three: the 'natural goodness' model of Rousseau and Emerson; the 'social-engineering' framework of Marx; and, finally the most recent trend of 'psycho-technology' whose roots are traced to Freud. Simon sidesteps polemical diatribe for a sympathetic approach that finds itself able to extract elements of truth in a position that might be otherwise too readily censured. In isolating the benefits of these systems he escapes the accusation of blindly preempting positions not sufficiently appreciated. As Simon states, "Modern approaches (substitutes for morality) appear to want to assume human dependability with least cost to individuals. In

the Aristotelian tradition becoming good and true is primarily a personal achievement." (Pg. 117).

Simon launches the rest of this singular book by establishing two important facts. One is a principle, the other is an exigency. The principle is derived from Aristotle, "...Even though in his philosophy Aristotle (and the same goes for Plato) did not work out fully a theory of knowledge of the right and wrong, this knowledge in his philosophy is plainly related to reality and to the finality of things. To know what to do, one must consider the nature of things" (pg. 107). Simon sees no way out of the contemporary deadends of the fact/value debates, except in rescuing that common-sense insight that we discover our values from the facts of reality. He is aware that much current moral discourse takes place in the framework of an idealistic, mechanistic philosophy whose vision of the world excludes finality," with the result of "existential despair" occupying the space where artificially manufactured subjective value eventually collapses. "By contrast, in a world of nature, value resides in the nature of things. Thus, if man has a nature, he also has a destiny, and we can relate what is right and wrong for him to do to his nature and to his end objectively" (p. 107).

From this steady base of reality (nature) Simon raises the question of virtue by casting it in terms of 'dependability' in human affairs. Not only does man possess the power to know the good things to do through his nature, he also has the exigency to act good consistently and in a regular manner. Enter virtue. It is not merely a "knowledge (scientia)" or a "habit," but a unique wedding of the two. Simon contents himself with simply citing Aristotle himself in *Nicomachean Ethics*: (2, 6, 1107a) "Moral virtue is a state of character concerned with choice, lying in mean, i.e., the mean

relative to us, this being determined by a principle by which the man of practical wisdom would determine it."

The author deftly steers the argument to the intrinsic subjectivity of moral decision, while carefully veering away from any suggestion of subjectivism. The human agent chooses the good for himself in accord with the situation in its actual reality. What immunizes the agent from subjectivism is the stable dispositions of his character, viz., moral virtue: "If ...subjectivity is shaped by moral virtues, (a man) will arrive at the objective right decision. If they are absolutely determined to do the right thing, if they are not blinded by passion, and if they are ready to face all the possible difficulties one way or the other, they will make the right choice. Possessed of justice, temperance and fortitude, their decision will be prudently objective" (Pg. 112).

A Definition of Moral Virtue covers all the conventional topics: cardinal virtues, the nature of virtue as habit/disposition, the interdependence of virtue and the natural law. Old subjects, surely. Yet after Simon is finished with them they radiate a new luster. His style of direct expression, his pointed examples and conversational voice (at times you almost hear Simon clear his throat), brings a spirited penetration that is rare in philosophical tracts. Professors will certainly find this book an easy brush for those cobwebs which inevitably appear over our best presentations. Students will find Simon offering clarity, vibrancy, and complex subjects joyfully assimilable. General readers will find Simon gripping as he conveys the excitement of uncovering moral philosophy at the feet of The Marvelous Realist Tradition.

Fr. John Perricone

The National Catholic Educational Association's Seminary Department has published "A Study of Priests Ordained Five to Nine Years" which, among other things, indicates that diocesan priests favor upholding the Church's tradition, more than religious priests; both groups prefer to live in "self-chosen groups" rather than "assignment groups". Available from NCEA \$6.00.

Books In Brief

St. Thomas Aquinas, *The Three Greatest Prayers*, Sophia Institute Press (190 pp., \$16.95).

In 1273, the last full year of his life, at the Dominican church in Naples, St. Thomas Aquinas gave a series of fifty-nine sermons in the Neapolitan dialect. These sermons were reported in Latin by one of Aquinas's secretaries, and this book contains the English translation of the Latin text. The 1937 translation by Laurence Shapcote, O.P., has been revised for this. The sermons were given on the Apostles' Creed, the Our Father, and the Hail Mary.

One is struck by the wealth of Scriptural quotations. Like the *Imitation of Christ*, the text contains almost as much Scripture as other material, and the Scripture texts are carefully chosen to corroborate the author's statements. As Ralph McNerny points out in his forward to the book, the medievals knew the Bible by heart.

The second main characteristic of the sermons is the wonderful organization of the points, so typical of Aquinas. And, as is usual with Aquinas, the organization is not forced or distracting.

Besides being a famous theologian, Aquinas was a saint. And it was probably the latter rather than the former that accounted for the immense popularity of his sermons in 1273. They can be used by anyone for spiritual reading, and priests could easily base a year's sermons on them. They contain a summary of our faith which all our congregations would delight to hear.

Leonard A. Kennedy, C.S.B.

Henry Paolucci, *Iran, Israel, and the United States*, (Griffon Publications, P.O. Box 81, Whitestone, New York 11357, 404 pp., \$29.95).

If ever a book was timely, Henry Paolucci, one of the country's brilliant political minds, has written it. Iran (once Persia) and Israel have co-existed in what is called "the navel of the earth" since biblical times. Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews*, reports how Cyrus permitted the exodus of the Jews so that they could build a temple in Jerusalem to their

God. Fourteen chapters unfold this ancient relationship, a number analyzing the Johnny-come-lately role in their life by the United States. The author's exposition of the ideology that has driven the thought patterns of modern think-tankers is fascinating (e.g., Henry Kissinger).

After the Ayatollah deposed the Shah, one U.S. State Department official was heard to remark, about the Islamic takeover, "Whoever took religion seriously?" Thinking how foolish Stalin had been posing a similar question about the Pope, Paolucci observes: "Although the Israeli-Arab struggle in its many phases from 1948 to 1973 seemed so obviously to have been pitting the Messianic zeal of biblical Judaism against an Islamic fierceness worthy of the Koran, it did not appear to Western observers that religion as such, however zealous or fierce, could prove to be politically decisive in the long run" (p. 16). *O tempora O mora.*

Renascence: John Cardinal Newman 1890-1990.

Renascence, a scholarly journal published by Marquette University Press and edited by Fellowship member Joseph Schwartz, devotes the Fall 1990/Winter 1991 to a review of Newman's impact on Catholic life as appreciated one century later. The issue features Ian Ker, author of a new biography of the English convert, and eight other experts in the field.

Ignatius Press

Martin Bialas, *Mysticism of the Passion in St. Paul of the Cross*, 365 pp., \$14.95.

Cardinal Ratzinger, et al, *Priest's Role as Moral Teacher and Guide*, 161 pp., \$12.95.

A Roman Symposium involving William May, Germain Grisez, and John Haas.

Christian Cochini, S.J., *The Apostolic Origins of Priestly Celibacy*, 500 pp., \$29.95.

Father Cochini, a Fellowship member from Sophia

Continued on back cover

Books In Brief continued from previous page

University, Tokyo, has here a book of monumental proportions and most timely.

Peter Kreeft (Ed.), *Summa of the Summa*, 55 pp., \$24.95. Another Fellowship member, this time from Boston College, has put together in one place the essential philosophical passages of St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, edited and explained for beginners.

Ignatius St. Lawrence, *Ignatius: Founder of the Jesuits*, 154 pp.

George W. Rutler, *The Seven Ages of Man*, 151 pp., \$8.95. Meditations on the Last Words of Christ.

The late Msgr. George W. Shea's last scholarly performance—an exegesis of the biblical texts dealing with the burial of Jesus—will be published in the May 1991 issue of *Faith and Reason* (Front Royal, Va. 22630). Msgr. Shea, one-time president of the CTSA, was an early member of the Fellowship and a Newark pastor.

R.I.P.

Fr. Charles Magsan, M.M., longtime member of the Fellowship from Corpus Christi, Texas, died August 27, 1990. Pray for him.

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

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
P A I D
Jamaica, NY
11439
Permit No. 451

Against The Power of Intellectuals

Writing in *30 Days* (March 1991) Cardinal Ratzinger made the following observation: "The highly cultured are not the men who determine the truth of the baptismal faith but it is the baptismal faith which determines what is valid in cultured interpretations. The intellectuals do not put the faithful to the test. It is the faithful who put intellectuals to the test. Baptismal faith is not measured by intellectual explanations but, ingenuously literal, it is the baptismal faith which measures all theology. The baptized, he who lives in the faith of baptism, does not need to be instructed. He has received the definitive truth and he carries it with him with the faith."