



Fellowship of Catholic Scholars NEWSLETTER

Volume 15, Number 1

December 1991

ET Alibi Aliorum Plurimorum Sanctorum

Ralph McInerney

In days gone by it was the somewhat lugubrious practice in religious houses and seminaries to have the Martyrology read at the beginning of the common meal. Accounts of boilings in oil, drawings and quarterings, beheadings, stonings, and other violent deaths made for an odd appetizer, perhaps, but there was something right about hearing of those heroes of the faith even as one sat down to meal. The Martyrologium Romanum named names, of course, but it would have been impossible for it to list everyone who had given his or her life for the faith on a given day. Thus each day's account ended with the memorable phrase whose opening words provide the title for this piece. "Elsewhere there were many other saints and martyrs unmentioned here . . ."

In his forthcoming retrospect of his fifty years as a priest – nicely entitled *Quinquagesimo Anno* – Monsignor George Kelly in little more than an aside contrasts the media hullabaloo over the handful of disciplined dissident theologians with the largely unnoticed army of men and women who have suffered within the Church for their fidelity to orthodoxy and the Magisterium. For every Charles Curran, rightly described as teaching things at variance with the Church's doctrine, there have been dozens, perhaps hundreds, who have been punished precisely because they taught and lived the teaching of the Church. The secular media took no notice, of course, but these victims went largely unchronicled even by Catholic publications.

Once at a meeting in Rome I had the great good fortune to dine with Father Kenneth Baker, now my predecessor as president of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars. We ate in a restaurant just off the Corso, near Via d'Umilta, and it was at the end of the meal rather than its beginning that Father Baker gave me a little impromptu martyrology of nuns and priests who had suffered within their orders or dioceses because they were true to the vocation to which they had been called. I think this was the first time I fully realized the sort of Sicilian Vespers that were being celebrated in many convents, religious houses, universities and seminaries. Someone has defined the fascist as a liberal with power. All over the country, little Hitlers were engaging in their version of Kristalnacht, wiping out the orthodox, making the scene safe for dissent.

Father Baker named names. It was a sad chronicle. Its resemblance to

Contents of This Issue . . .

Deconstructing the University –
Glenn Olsen p. 3

Around the Church p. 8

The 1991-1992 Fellowship
Conventions p. 11-15

John Paul II's Coup p. 16

Msgr. George Graham –
Catechetics p. 17

Dr. Eugene Diamond –
The Catholic Health
Association p. 23

the Martyrology was ironic. The early Christians had been persecuted by pagans; these contemporaries of ours had suffered at the hands of fellow Catholics. But there is a deeper similarity with the Martyrology.

Those accounts of death by violence suffered by early ultimate success. We were not being read lists of the defeated, but of the victors. How easy when we hear of or even perhaps witness such injustice to feel anger, how easy and how appropriate. The next step is often to lament the fact that someone does not *do* something. Why doesn't the Pope crack down on bishops and archbishops who foster dissenters and who punish the orthodox? Why doesn't the local bishop speak out about the theological outrages on campuses within his diocese? When dissenters are eventually dealt with there is much grousing about due process. But it is the undue length of the process that is striking. Charles Curran had been plea-bargaining with Rome for twenty years before a Jewish judge backed up the belated action of the Catholic University and put Curran out of business as a Catholic theologian. Hans Kung had been conning people in the Vatican for almost as long before the inevitable verdict came down. And the lack of due process, prompt or tardy, for the faithful victims of dissent cries out to heaven.

Perhaps it is our little martyrdom to witness the slow processes of redress. On the other hand, it can be persuasively argued that we owe it to these victims to insure that they did not suffer in vain.

We owe it to the faithful to publicize even the perfidies of some pastors. I have in mind their doctrinal errors. It is not that these are unknown, but we must never underestimate the strength people draw from the realization that they are not alone in being astounded and even outraged by what this or that pastor does.

Religious orders that deal unjustly with their members ought not to get a free ride. The institutions with which they are connected should be made to pay for such nonsense as giving campus privileges to homosexuals and advocates of abortion to say nothing of what is taught as Catholic theology there.

The scandal of pederasty among the clergy, in some cases seemingly countenanced by the bishop, has drawn the salacious interest of the secular media. But how could their shock compare with ours? Money meant for the Church should not be spent paying the damages exacted by suits against priests and bishops for such behavior.

I have seen an archbishop's letter to his clergy in which he compliments himself for having devised a policy to deal with such cases. But what is being done to insure that there will be no such cases in the future? What is needed is not damage control, but a serious no-nonsense look at the seminaries.

A quarter of a century ago, dissident moral theology might have seemed a hothouse affair, a tempest in campus theology departments, academics exhibiting the ecclesiastical equivalent of radical chic. Perhaps bishops then thought that no theologian really believed that a case could be made for infidelity, abortion, homosexuality - outside classroom discussions, that is. It began tentatively, full of qualifications, seeming to make room reluctantly for that rare case when, thanks to proportionalism, one might do what was generally evil. Dissent grew bold. Exceptions ceased to be exceptional. A spirit of antinomianism took hold. Dissident moral theology, too long tolerated, never really opposed, is now bearing its fruit.

It is said that the Catholic population of the United States is becoming more and more indistinguishable from the population at large so far as divorce, abortion, extramarital sex, and the rest of the lubricious litany of liberation goes. But how many have ever heard the teachings of the Church on sexual morality expressed, let alone explained and defended?

One wonders how many seminarians hear anything other than dissident moral theology during their years of training. Are they not schooled in a knowing disregard for the Magisterium, whatever that is? Pop psychology is the training for pastoral care. No wonder that guilt, rather than the evil action that entails it, is taken to be the problem, requiring therapy rather than repentance. Even prelates now make only errors of judgment, doing wrong being out of style.

The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars is increasingly recognized as a rallying point for Catholics loyal to the magisterium. It is noteworthy that our enemies regard the Holy Father as a menace and obstacle to their plans. Among our members are many who have suffered for their loyalty to the Church. Perhaps, as a complement to our major effort which is to support the magisterium in those circles where scholars dwell, we should also celebrate our martyrs. The compilation of a *Martyrologium Americanum* would not be an admission of defeat but rather the celebration of some of the spiritual capital on which we can draw.

Deconstructing the University

By Glen W. Olsen

In what is perhaps the most profound treatment of the history of Western education written in the twentieth century, Christopher Dawson argued that at the heart of education in the West always has lain a deep tension between two goals, enculturation and the quest for truth or wisdom, what the Greeks meant by "philosophy."¹ The vast majority of the Greeks, especially in fifth century Athens, understood education as enculturation to the specific goals of training men to be citizens of the *polis*. Very different was a tradition that had begun much earlier, which we call pre-Socratic philosophy. Here the question had not been to discover some program of study which could bring one success in public life, but to inquire into the nature of things, simply to the end of gaining knowledge, useful or not. Such inquiry was foundational in the sense that it raised ultimate philosophical issues, whether these were convenient to the community or not. Socrates, as Plato describes, him marks the point at which these two traditions, the philosophical and the enculturating, came together in a poignant tension which has characterized Western thought and education ever since. The goal of the present essay is, in the Socratic tradition, to probe below the rhetoric of the contemporary university and the society in which it is located, to take a look at the construction of the most contemporary forms of the never-ending struggle of the claims of citizenship and philosophy against one another.

The origins of what has come to be called the canon, that is a relatively uniform list of readings every educated person should know, lie especially in the medieval and renaissance universities, the Jesuit colleges of the Counter-Reformation, and the Protestant academies of the Reformation.² It is of great importance to see the place of the so-called canon in the university ever since. It clearly has been the means both of enculturation and of the pursuit of truth. The reason that today there is a battle for control over its content is not that suddenly the university has become politicized, but that more people and views of the world now at least aspire to have some say in the definition of this so-called canon. The definition of some program of common study has always been an exercise in power, an attempt to have one's own views determine

the future. Where the difference lies between us and more placid times, in the latter of which it could be assumed that what a well educated person should know could easily be stated, is that a large component of the placidity of placid times was a dominant culture in which many were content, and those who were not were relatively powerless. That is, what seems to the older among us a change in tone in university life in the relatively recent past, only marks a new stage in the logic of pluralism.

In the United States the notion of a canon was probably expressed most comprehensively earlier in this century in the notion of a Great Books program. The greatness of the books to be defined as great commonly was seen to lie either in the fact that they had a great historical influence, or that they contained important or true ideas. Granted relatively common cultural assumptions formed by a dominant secularized form of Protestantism or Puritanism, which has been called the American civil religion, this made perfectly good sense.³ The criterion of "historical influence" was just another way of designating enculturation for, by reading the great books, one entered into the culture the books came from, and formed self-understanding. Likely one desired this experience, that is approved of association with and emplacement within this larger thing, commonly called Western Civilization. As a course of study this had itself been an invention of the World War I era, designed by an alliance of liberal Protestants and post-Protestants in the face of the decline of traditional Protestantism to find in the idea of a shared humane tradition a replacement for a more religiously centered curriculum.⁴ At least for a long time in America, many wished to be enculturated via such Western Civilization and Great Books courses. This was a kind of educational parallel to the quick abandonment, varying according to location and ethnic group, by so many immigrants of the language of their ancestors in order to embrace English, and with it a whole program of enculturation. Only retained were those forms of cultural diversity inoffensive to the larger culture, espresso, perhaps, or piñatas. The diversity left, at least for the older immigrant groups, was commonly what we might call a

diversity of mores, involving undoubtedly important things, but not the kind of diversity I wish to designate a clash of world-views which at the logical or philosophical level involves incompatibility. One can often be enriched by a diversity of mores, but a true diversity of world-views in which, say, on a question like abortion, irreconcilable views of what is right and involved, tends to place a society at war with itself.

By contrast, the Great Books criterion of "important or true" was another way of speaking of the philosophical goal of education, for virtually no one thought the past was to be retained unchanged: one was creatively to dialogue with the best it had been able to discover, and the Great Books were to be a vehicle for the criticism of the culture that had produced them. Such a notion, whether of a specific list of great books or more generally of certain courses or kinds of knowledge any educated person should possess, is as viable as the culture which produces it is uniform and has criteria for establishing truth. When there was a *de facto* Protestant cultural hegemony, and people thought they could tell the difference between truth and error, it was a principal means for giving the citizenry a common stock of texts for their shared public life. If some people, like Catholics, were the Other, and did not like what was taught in the so-called public schools which, of course, were an instrument of enculturation with a specific political agenda, they could build and go to their own schools. For the majority, uncritical of this arrangement, education for citizenship meant study of the shared history and ideals of the culture.

Such a cultural hegemony is an advanced stage of decay. Although Protestantism still influences the culture at every step, it has lost almost all its symbols of occupying the center, and no one thing has replaced it, although in the university one form of liberalism has come closest. This liberalism is not, say, the kind of philosophic naturalism one might associate with Sidney Hook, but that common form of liberalism which expresses the denial of absolutes, particularly in ethics, and resists the notion of universal truth grounded in nature. It expresses an attitude more than some fixed content, and thus changes with the times, or accepts historical change rather than nature as the point of beginning for what is still called philosophy but no longer is a quest for truth. George Parkin Grant describes this liberalism as an historically accumulated

grab-bag of ideas like "person," inherited from revealed theology, and "rights," inherited from the collapse of the natural law tradition, and notes that because here the good no longer may be defined in the Aristotelian manner of drawing deductions from an examination of nature/history, that it is one's historical situation or predicament, that replaces nature as the given to be argued from or rationalized.⁵ That is, liberalism, as an increasingly dominant way of dealing with the disestablishment of fixed authority ever since the Wars of Religion showed Europe could no longer be held together by some single official view of reality, is a procedure of rationalizing historical change, of making whatever history has dealt one livable. This common form of liberalism, to repeat, is not a philosophy at all in the Greek sense of that word with which we began, but a pragmatic mode of obtaining certain residual virtues inherited from more certain times, decency, just procedure, and the like. Although it is not commonly put this way, this form of liberalism represents the death of philosophy understood as a quest for the truth about humans and human society. When we find this form of liberalism, we may suspect the presence of an exercise in power seeking to declare itself the playing field on which any reasonable and decent human being would want to play.

The Sixties were a decade in which psychological and cultural alternatives multiplied, and segments of society, hardly aware of themselves or, earlier, rather consistently dispossessed by the main-line culture, obtained a voice. In important ways, some of these segments did not identify with what had passed as "Western civilization." Growing pluralism increased doubt about the category of "truth." It is easy to believe some thing is true if most people believe the same. When, rather, one sees oneself as only the member of a "tribe," that is of some sub-culture competing with other tribes, each of which sees things differently, it is easy to conclude that truth is no more than something relative to culture.⁶

My argument is that, to the degree that pluralism, understood as a variety of incompatible worldviews, multiplies in a society, it renders the continued existence of that society problematic. Ways have always been found for reasserting commonality, among which not the least is liberalism itself. Liberalism, especially in the university, in one aspect is but a particularly effective means of, on the one hand, seemingly to

adjust to pluralism while, on the other hand, insisting that the university or society play by one's own rules. Such a view of life is schizophrenic, but a form of schizophrenia hard to self-diagnose. If one were aware of one's premises, of the way one was using the defense of pluralism to retain cultural hegemony, or at least gain greater power within a culture, the question of honesty might arise. But awareness of premises has never been one of liberalism's strong suits.

My large argument is that the American university merely has replicated the tensions and incoherencies of the larger society. As Jeffrey Stout has shown, the Wars of Religion were central to subsequent European intellectual development.⁷ They made visible the impossibility of returning Europe to some single form of Christianity, and thus showed that long-growing fissures in Christendom would likely deepen. The Treaty of Westphalia made clear that the future lay not with Christendom, but with the nation state. The latter would now dictate the agenda of enculturation, as well as, more often than not, in some measure control the formal institutions of education.

At about the same time in England, Hobbes had begun that great casting about for alternative authorities which was to dominate Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century thought, above all to result in the idea that it was a humanly constructed social contract, rather than authorization by God or nature, that founded human government. This was both a turning on traditional ideas of authority and, especially with Locke, the development of a tradition of thought about politics less rooted in nature, that is, in asking what form of government is most suited to human nature, than had been ancient or medieval theory. The concern was to make the present livable, that is, to use political thought as a problem solving tool to adjust to whatever lot history has dealt.⁸ Already the questions of truth and goodness were being displaced with what would become that very English question of "getting along" but, both in its origins and to the present, the liberal tradition would want things both ways. Locke, for instance, would retain an attenuated form of the old natural law idea that the good is fixed in his idea of natural rights. Thus the logically incompatible affirmations of, on the one hand, the social contract, which holds that the institutions of government are rooted in convention rather than nature, and of, on the other, the natural rights tradition, which holds that the

rights of man are rooted in human nature. Until the present, say in the thought of John Rawls, this branch of the liberal tradition will be unable clearly to decide whether what it offers is merely a game theory for getting along with no claim to truth, or a form of human society to which all should aspire.⁹

In the later Seventeenth Century, because religion was still at the center of life and for most people a part of the definition of one's self, and, in many ways, culture remained embodied religion, few wanted religion separated from public life. Across Europe the retreat made after the Wars of Religion was not immediately to private religion or the separation of Church and state, but to national religion. Provisions could be made for dissenters but, in spite of the implication of Protestant theology that humans are properly religious only by grace rather than by nature, the old pagan, and then Catholic, insight that humans are by nature religious animals and thus express their religion in their public life, was continued across Europe in all the countries.

All this influenced America from the beginning. Hardly anyone in the early years dreamt of separation of Church and state. Some dissenters in Europe, unable there to control the public forms of life, had come to America in effect to take charge, to change the fortune of what had been dissent into establishment in a way not possible in the old country. Others brought various forms of religion which had been established in Europe with the assumption that they could be established in America too. But in America, once again, the level of public expectation had to be adjusted downwards. Here one could speak of an established religion not on the level of Christendom or of a nation, but in one colony, a Massachusetts for instance.

When finally it was decided that union was wanted above all else, the logic of disestablishment of religion at the federal level, expressed in the First amendment to the Bill of Rights, was soon to follow. It had become clear that, because the individual colonies did not share a common form of Christianity among them, it would not be possible to establish for the United States a common religion. Although there was resistance to abandoning all privileging of one or another religion at the state level, over time religion was more and more conceived to be a voluntary and social matter, one in which government should not favor any of the parties.¹⁰ This was not an absolutely necessary logic of the

situation for elsewhere, in Germany or Canada, because more of the old notion that humans are by nature religious was retained, governments tried actively to promote the religious life of more than one religion.

Undoubtedly, even in its early years, America had a more complex religious situation to deal with, and one can sympathize with those who saw no alternative to disestablishment, if there was to be a United States at all. I have already suggested that in fact there can be no such thing as religious neutrality, that in one way or another always one side or another is favored. Here, for instance, what was really done was to say that, henceforth, the desire of states like Massachusetts to have what seemed to them the one true religion established, so that this religion could fill all aspects of life, was not to be extended to the federal level. Ultimately it was to be revoked at the state level also. In America the religious life was to be attenuated for all who thought of it in terms of truth and public expression, as about something more than "God and the soul"; but also as about more than voluntarism, a pattern of life in which one can argue, missionize, and propagandize, but not ultimately ask government to create a climate of opinion favorable to one religion.

Luther, by his attack on Christendom and his encouragement of submission to princely authority, had already prepared a psychological adjustment for his followers to some degree of privatization of religion. Still in the late eighteenth century much of Protestantism thought religion was about much more than God and the soul. If what the First Amendment was ultimately to mean was that the explicitly universal forms of Christianity, like Roman Catholicism, could only have an attenuated life in America, so also any form of Protestantism which saw itself as a "shining city set on the hill," was going increasingly to have to give up the idea that Christianity could be a "city" in the sense of being part of the constitutional arrangements. Although we must treat the logic of the American predicament sympathetically, we must also stress, against the claims of some, that the disestablishment of religion did not form a government neutral in religious matters, but a system which allowed only an attenuated practice of the more public forms of religion. If I were to put the matter sharply, I would be tempted to say that the First Amendment meant that only a Protestant notion of voluntary religion may be practiced in the United States; that, ecclesiologically speaking, the

other religions, Catholicism, Judaism, etc., must adjust themselves to being ecclesiologically Protestant. But to put the matter this way would not be fair to Puritanism and other forms of eighteenth and nineteenth century Protestantism, which wanted a public life for Christianity. Perhaps the point should be reversed. Rather than licensing only "Protestant" forms of religion, the First Amendment is a motor which has historically been used to advance the privatization of religion, and thus has redefined a good part of Protestantism itself, while ruling traditional forms of Judaism and Catholicism *tout court* out of order. Thus Will Herberg's point that both Judaism and Christianity have lost their prophetic impact in America, where "historical logic" has pushed them from defense of their own "unAmerican" looking traditions to support of the civil religion of American patriotism and the American way of life.¹¹

Formal education was almost entirely in the hands of the churches, and was heavily an enculturating process.¹² With the founding of the public schools this continued, as witness nineteenth-century Catholic complaint about the use of the King James Bible in the public schools, a complaint based on the realization that the public schools were committed to a form of Protestant enculturation, and that if one wanted to pass on one's own view of life in some expansive way, one would have to build one's own school system. Being disadvantaged by the public school system was much more than a problem for some religions: discrimination, especially racial, could be practiced on other grounds. The so-called Storm Over the University today, although at one level a battle-royal between irreconcilable world-views, has resulted also in an obvious sense from those who were thus marginalized finding a voice.¹³

Where then are we now? I take it as a given that Dawson's traditional two goals of education must always be pursued. Let us turn first to enculturation. No society can preserve itself without passing on to its young a sense of the society's own history, literature, religion, scientific and philosophic discoveries, etc. To say that Western civilization or the liberal arts should no longer be taught, or should have even less a presence in the curriculum than they generally already have, is just another way of saying that our society does not deserve to survive, and one is prescribing the recipe for its self-destruction. Although I am among

that minority who think that the American experiment within Western Civilization was deeply flawed from the beginning, and is a working out of the logic of pluralism in a way that tends to reduce life to incoherence, there are grave reasons, even for one like myself, for not wanting to destroy the culture by dismantling the Western and liberal orientation of one or another form of the traditional curriculum. Chiefly, I see no reason to believe that dismantling enculturation in our own Western culture as a first goal of education will give us something that better responds to our predicament. Rather, we will be even less prepared to see how we got ourselves into this predicament, people with the historical insight of the characters in Steve Martin's *L.A. Story*. Yet we must see that the culture has and is changing, and that there are legitimate grievances against forms of past enculturation: requests that, say the black or the Catholic experience receive more consideration, or more intelligent consideration than they have, are not to be rejected out of hand.

Is there a place for the quest for truth in the contemporary university, especially outside the natural sciences, or is this itself an outmoded idea? First, some distinctions are in order. In a culture with a high degree of consensus or shared world view, it was possible to see enculturation fairly straight-forwardly as a substantial goal of education. As we move to deep pluralism, that is, a growing lack of consensus about the true, good, and beautiful, the question whose culture is being enculturated becomes agonizing. As societal consensus disintegrates, the question of who determines the canon, if I can put it that way, becomes increasingly a question of who can seize power. It is all very well to see the public schools, and also the public universities, as having as one goal the formation of good citizens, but what can this mean if we can no longer agree on the good, or on what is desirable in society? Why, for instance, should we privilege liberal and democratic ideas within the university? I doubt

that it is honest to say that particular views of the world are not being taught, but that only materials are being presented for students to clarify their own values. If we look at such schemas of clarification, say those of Lawrence Kohlberg, they are rigged from the beginning by a liberal definition of the ethically mature person.

I cannot see that it is even intelligible to defend the proposition that there is no truth, for the proposition itself is a truth claim. But if faculty wish to hold such intellectually slothful positions, they should at least have the honesty – I must use conventional words, although of course no word can be used meaningfully if there is no truth, and the category of honesty also disappears – never to be morally indignant if things they want are rejected. That is, they must also give up speaking of rights, justice, and such things. Life choices become no more significant than preferences for vanilla or chocolate, and worlds like racism or sexism become merely descriptive, no vehicles for engendering indignation. That is, the logic of the abandonment of truth is a reduction of all questions to that of power. In my experience, many academics want it both ways. On the one hand, they wish to deny, at least outside the so-called hard sciences and mathematics which often remain privileged in these questions, that there are any permanent truths that one is under some obligation to teach. On the other hand they want to take ideas which in obvious senses are *a priori* rather than *a posteriori*, such as that all people are equal, and insist that these become a ground base from which all thought proceeds. This seems the most elementary form either of dishonesty or, more likely, of deep confusion. If there is no truth, there can be no such general propositions that people are equal: one can only have personal preferences for or against, the exercise of power for or against. In sum, the greatest question that faces us is whether the love of wisdom, as Socrates understood it, is dead.

Footnotes on page 14.

The *Personal Publication List* for members of the Fellowship is in the process. Many members have failed to return the printed list we sent them. Those still interested in having their *published books* (title, publisher, year) incorporated into the Fellowship catalogue are asked to send the results to Msgr. Kelly immediately.

Around the Church in the 90's

✧ *Origins*, the Bishops' Documentary Service, on the first page of its September 26, 1991 issue, reported the animadversions of Jesuit Francis Buckley concerning the relationship between modern catechesis and orthodoxy. He concludes that the future of the Christian message will flow from experience, especially as this has been expostulated since the 1970's by Karl Rahner, Edward Schillebeeckx, Bernard Haring and Richard McCormick. Their trend of thinking, he avers, will accelerate under the influence of Third World Theologians and the popularity of praxis.

Fr. Buckley's address was given to a symposium sponsored by the United States Catholic Conference Committee on Education, commemorating the 20th Anniversary of the U.S. bishops' 1972 document "To Teach as Jesus Did". The address deals with adaptation more than with specific doctrinal content. Magesterial documents are referred to, university professors are cited – even Martin Luther St. Augustine is quoted as reminding us that there never were any good old days, but not one word from John Paul II.

✧ During his visit to Poland, on June 3, 1991 at Kielce, John Paul II, preaching to the faithful, described the unborn as a human person. By mistake the English *L'Osservatore* (June 17, page 3) quoted him as saying of the unborn (para. 7 of the homily, words emphasized) "He is a human being." But he really said something stronger – "He is a human person." (in Polish: *Jest ludzka osoba*.) It appeared correctly translated in the Italian *L'Osservatore* of June 4, 1991, p. 4. The Pope there attributed personhood clearly and bluntly to an unborn human being, which goes further than *Donum Vitae* and supports those who have always argued that the unborn is a person at every stage of fetal development.

✧ *America Magazine Revisited*. On November 11, 1967 *America Magazine* published an article by Mario W. Cardullo, which predicted that the U.S. Catholic population, then 46 M (24 per cent), if it followed the presumed rate of high growth, could be 100 M. by 1990; but only 79 M. if the growth merely followed the national average. The Catholic Direc-

tor for 1991 reports a Catholic population of 58.5 M., still 24 percent of the nation. In the same issue Father Andrew Greeley opined that Catholic colleges would have an important role to play in the Catholic future, but only if they were headed by "creative and imaginative leaders": "There may not be many Leo McLaughlins or Timothy Healy in the American Church," he said, "but until such men and women are all in competent administrative positions, one is forced to say that the essential question for Catholic higher education is not lay deans or lay trustees or independence from chancery offices, but the recruitment of talented leadership."

In 1991 *America* and Fr. Greeley have a new report to make – about so-called Catholic conservatives. These are a small group, Greeley says. They are not winning. They are not winning. They are aging and fundamentally at odds on issues of race and gender with mainstream America and mainstream Catholic America. They may be increasingly influential on the ecclesiastical institution, but then have little impact on the life of the typical U.S. Catholic, not even a being the good Catholics they claim to be. (See *America* September 21, 1991.)

✧ This coming December is the tenth anniversary of *The Word Among Us*, a monthly magazine, published by the Mother of God Community in Gaithersburg, MD, which began with the sole purpose of helping the Catholic faithful to read daily the scriptures and to foster their life of prayer, both personal and liturgical. The monthly essays normally follow the themes of the liturgical year and the daily meditations are based on the Mass readings of the day.

From meager beginnings, the Community project, led by Fr. Thomas Weinandy, O.F.M., Cap., has grown to over 180,000 subscribers in close to 100 countries. The magazine is printed in five countries and published in six languages: English, Spanish, Japanese, Polish, Portuguese, and Dutch (Advent and Lent only). It has also, on occasion, been translated into Lithuanian and distributed in that country. Except for the Spanish edition, these for-

eign language editions were initiated by people who read *The Word Among Us* and desired to publish it in their own languages. Over ten percent of the parishes in the United States now make *The Word Among Us* available to their parishioners. They also have an extension outreach to people in prisons.

On a popular level they hope they are contributing to what Fr. Baker urged – the building up of faith in Jesus Christ through the prayerful reading and study of God’s sacred word.

- ✧ Christopher John Noble, finishing his doctorate at Duquesne University in Systematic Theology, is seeking a position in an appropriate department of theology. He is Summa Cum Laude from Steubenville, has done graduate work in Austria and Germany. He specializes in evangelization procedures, missiology (experience in Singapore), apologetics and spirituality. He is married, the father of five children. Home address: 603 Belleview Blvd., Steubenville, Ohio 43952. Telephone: (614) 282-9673.
- ✧ Fr. Donald Keefe’s new two-volume *Covental Theology – The Eucharistic Order of History* (University Press), may make him the most expensive theologian in the country, but the footnotes in this 1000 plus page set, themselves voluminous, are worth the price of the books.
- ✧ Fans of Frank Sheed will be delighted to know that Fr. James W. McLucas, S.T.D. of Christendom College has a book on that famous convert, entitled *Frank Sheed: Apologist*. The volume covers his early life, his apologetic style, and the content of his theology.
- ✧ *The Family in America* (September 1991) has an in-depth study of twenty years on no-fault divorce in California, which indicates that marital vows there have been robbed of legal meaning without accomplishing its proposed benefits to spouses and children (published by the Rockford Institute).
- ✧ The June 12-15 1991 Catholic Theological Society of America brought about the election of Michael Buckley, S.J. as president for 1991-1992 and Lisa Sowle Cahill as president elect. Outgoing president is Walter Principe.

✧ *Crisis Magazine* (September 1991) reports that in *Watching America*, S. Robert Lichter, Linda S. Lichter, and Stanley Rothman interviewed 104 television producers, executives, and industry moguls and found some worrisome results. Among the findings:

- 93 percent say they seldom or never attend religious services.
- 75 percent describe themselves as “left of center” politically.
- 82 percent voted for Democratic presidential candidate George McGovern in the 1972 election.
- 97 percent believe “a woman has the right to decide for herself” whether to have an abortion.
- 80 percent do not regard homosexual relations as wrong, while 51 percent don’t even regard adultery as wrong.

The results corroborate the suspicion that the television elite in this country is disdainful of organized religion.

- ✧ FISPESS is the acronym used for a new foundation established in Rome (1990) to study the relations between the Vatican and other States or International Organizations. The English equivalent title is: International Foundation for Foreign Policy Studies of the Holy See. The term “foreign policy studies” in the title emphasizes that FISPESS is interested primarily in studying the international role of the Holy See. The political-diplomatic side of the Vatican’s activity merits close analysis because it is virtually unique in basing its foreign policy firmly on a specific religious ethic. FISPESS, appreciative of the role played by the Holy See on the international scene, has taken this sometimes neglected aspect of diplomatic history as its point of departure and intends to initiate a series of studies, seminars, and conferences, as well as a program of preparatory and postgraduate courses. Research grants, scholarships and prizes are envisaged. For additional information on FISPESS membership and formalities, write to:

FISPESS
Secretary-General Dr. Ricardo Peter,
Via delle Carrozze 3,
00187 Rome, Italy.

- ❖ The American Catholic Studies has issued a call for papers dealing with marriage and Hispanic Catholics. Two conferences are planned for 1992; one Marriage in Scripture and Canon Law, family ethics, feminism, and the dynamics of covenant relationships. C.T.A. will meet in Allentown, PA, May 28-31, 1992. Proposals are due before December 1, 1991.
The second meeting will treat Hispanic American Catholics, their cultural identity and social/religious integration. Will be held in Pittsburgh, PA, August 18-20, 1992.
For information contact Pierre Hegy, Sociology, Adelphi University, Garden City, NY 11530. Telephone: (516) 674-9324.
- ❖ The Couple to Couple League (CCL) of Cincinnati, OH, has announced that the 1992 National CCL Convention will be held at Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan. The Couple to Couple League is an interfaith organization whose charter is to promote Natural Family Planning, family-sustaining lifestyles, and Christ-centered moral development. The 1992 National Convention will begin Sunday, July 5th, and run through Thursday, July 9. The convention was dated to coincide with family vacation plans – a beautiful way to add learning and development to any family trip.
For free information regarding Michigan travel plans, call the Michigan Travel Bureau at 1-800-543-2937. For questions regarding the Convention, call registration couple Jerry and Lee Zimmer at (616) 363-1046.
- ❖ Steubenville's University President, Father Michael Scanlan, T.O.R., was awarded the Cross Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice, a special honor bestowed by Pope John Paul II, at the request of Bishop Albert Ottenweller of the Diocese of Steubenville.
- ❖ The Newsletter of the St. Antoninus Institute for Catholic Education in Business (Spring 1991) reports on its study of the 1600 largest corporations, 539 of whom (34 per cent) contributed to pro-abortion government officials. The Pro-Abort legislators who received the most: Rockefeller, Jay; Martin, Lynn; Bradley, Bill; Levin, Carl; Dingell, John; Cranston, Alan; Simon, Paul; Gephardt, Richard; Gore, Albert; Hollings, Ernest; Rangel, Charles; Pell, Claiborne; Sanford, Terry.
- ❖ A new journal published by graduate students out of Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge prints reviews and cultural criticism with the intent of defending Christian Culture. Entitled *Faith & Culture*, its focus is the Catholic intellectual and cultural tradition, bringing both Catholics and conservative Protestants together to counter the intellectual challenges to orthodoxy within the academy and popular culture. Catholic scholars and graduate students are eagerly invited to submit articles and opinion pieces on a wide range of topics. All correspondence including subscription inquiries should be sent to: *Faith & Culture*, P.O. Box 21586, Baton Rouge, LA 70894.
- ❖ A Vietnam War novel which is a hymn to Christianity and the people who propagate it will be published shortly by Walker & Co. The book, called *Zero Casualties*, and written by Thomas Jagninski, a former war correspondent, looks at religion as an instrument of Third World development.
- ❖ Retired political science professor holding adjunct position seeks full time visiting appointment. Extensive publications in international relations. Current research and publishing relates to the politics of international economic cooperation and problems of governance in industrialized democracies. Current manuscripts under contract to publishers in London and New York. Hospitality of host institution would be acknowledged in forewords.
- ❖ *Teaching positions in Liturgy, Moral, and Scripture*. Available in a M.Div. Program. Applicants must have masters or doctoral degree, or equivalent, from a Catholic institution. The Josephinum, member of Columbus Cluster of Theological Schools, is a four-year major seminary, directly under the Holy See, preparing men for Catholic priesthood. Send resume and five references to: Dean, School of Theology, Pontifical College Josephinum, 7625 North High Street, Columbus, OH 43235. Phone (614) 885-7916.

The Fourteenth Convention in Denver - September 27-29, 1991

By all accounts the Denver Convention satisfied almost all of the two hundred twenty-five attendees, in spite of the fact that academics by professional status alone are known to be critics. A large part of the credit goes to Archbishop J. Francis Stafford, his close advisors and the diocesans who helped perfect the arrangements in a hotel, like the Warwick, which already had superb facilities and good management going for it. Archbishop Stafford's homily on Sunday with its call for an end to priest-bashing within the church was inspirational, to say the least. The two liturgies on the weekend in the lovely Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception were also the kind of worship and dutiful praying one should expect of academics committed to the Church as that is defined by the Magisterium. The sixty-plus concelebrants alone were fitting exemplars for the many scores of lay academics who in their worship, as in their weighty discussions, renewed their fellowship with Christ, the Church, and with each other. The single sessions, too, more than the split sessions heretofore in use, provided greater opportunity for fellowship and intense communal discussion.

The Saturday night banquet was not bad either. The Cardinal O'Boyle Award helped the mood. Mother Angelica, its recipient, was alternately funny and thoughtful, taking her place alongside Father John Ford, S.J., as the other rarely appreciated defender of the Faith in recent times. Her message to the Fellowship about its responsibility to her media apostolate was strongly stated and well received.

Few in the audience took Father Frank Canavan, S.J. at his word, declaring his seeming unworthiness for the Cardinal Wright Award for exceptional service to the Church. His reticence, so characteristic of his public service to the Church, on the staff of *America*, at Fordham University, to the Archdiocese in New York, and to Catholic apologists of our day, was in character. Still, his scholarly mind and pen – one of the few writers who can translate a complicated proposition

into understandable English or Latin – have consistently demonstrated rare intellectual talent, not simply journalistic skill.

Professor Ralph McInerney, in his first action as President, was far more classical, if droll, in his presentation of the Fellowship's vision of what it means to be a Catholic scholar in and away from Notre Dame. He was certainly clearer than his creature, the mysterious Father Dowling, whom he foists on us weekly in the TV show of the same name.

The hit of the night turned out to be an added starter, Francis E. King, S.J., of the University of San Francisco who over the objections of a president emeritus became a "fifth" actor on the banquet circuit, to send his audience into paroxysms of laughter, not the least bent over being Archbishop Stafford. (Father King's permitted presence only shows that Father Fessio is sometimes right.) Rich Little could not have done better imitating John Paul II in pigeon Polish and unaxiomatic Swahili saying hello to his flock on two continents, or threatening to send a hesitant bishop back to the boondocks from which once upon a time he ascended higher.

Incidentally, the papers were pretty good, too, but since they are already on their way to publications we will say no more about them here.

A final *hymn of praise* for the following unsung architects of the happy Denver experience: the Archbishop's Vice Chancellor, Father Edward Buelt, and his secretary, Mrs. Patricia McDonald, Father Christopher Hellstrom of the Cathedral, Mrs. Patricia Smith and Mr. Richard Moreno and their corps of dedicated assistants too numerous to mention by name, Mr. Mark Fitzwater of AJA Travel, who took our heroes mountain climbing, Father J. Anthony McDaid whose choiristers were outstanding, John and Eileen Farrell – again, and the unsung management heroes of the Warwick Hotel.

Random Convention Thoughts

Carl Anderson

Fr. Greeley suggests that before the bishop's credibility is completely eroded they must return to "dialogue" on such issues as contraception, abortion, and women's ordination. According to him, "the 'restoration' strategy that the ecclesiastical institution is currently following does not seem to work and may even be counterproductive Instead of commands, the leadership must turn to persuasion, an art at which historically it has never been very adroit."

The first thing that might be pointed out in regard to this view of things is that even the "turn to persuasion" and "dialogue" that Fr. Greeley proposes requires as a premise the admission that it does make a difference in one's life in the Church just what one believes and what one does. Unfortunately, it is precisely the rejection of this premise which forms the foundation of Fr. Greeley's statistical analysis. If all those who no longer find God or the Eucharist "meaningful", but nonetheless still insist on being counted as "Catholics", are no longer included among the "faithful" by such as Fr. Greeley, then the statistical fortunes of the "restoration" may be quite different than what Fr. Greeley suggests. If the notion of Church as voluntary association must not be permitted to inform an individual's perception of his or her Catholic identity, it is equally important that Church leaders not accept such notions as determining their response to the pastoral problem of "baptized non-believers" or the secular culture at large.

William Bentley Ball, Esq.

As to the early future, then, we may hope that the Court will soon get an Establishment Clause case, with good facts, relating to aiding parents to choose religious education. The ruling in such a case can have application not only in terms of breaking down the public school monopoly but in other areas of religious endeavor in fields of health and welfare. A good decision in such case would indeed be helpful to religious liberty. But as to the Free Exercise Clause, where the urgency is far greater, the outlook is not encouraging.

Francis Canavan, S.J.

If we look upon man as a naturally social being, a creature to whom community is as natural as individuality, we shall conceive of the pluralistic society as a community of communities, and not primarily as a collection of individuals. Pluralism will therefore mean that we recognize and protect the right of each community to create its own institutions and to establish its own norms of belief and morals: thus, for example, American courts traditionally understood the free exercise of religion to include the right of churches to define and enforce their own doctrine and discipline against the claims of dissenters.

From the beginning of our republic, however, a strong current in American thought has conceived of the pluralistic society in more individualistic terms. Civil society, in this view, is an aggregation of individuals bound together by a social contract to which they have freely consented for the protection of their individual rights and private interests.

Msgr. Eugene V. Clark

The value of the vote has been sharply modified when the two major parties put forward candidates so similar and *both* inimical to the goals of your community. You wind up voting year after year, perhaps decade after decade, for the marginally lesser evil of two candidates; and therein perpetuate a political philosophy you do not want and did not want to vote for. The parties do this often enough when they realize that a given constituency is so unorganized and unfocused that neither party need attend to its stated requirements.

Donald DeMarco

In the first chapter of his *Summa Contra Gentiles*, St. Thomas remarks that "it belongs to the wise man to meditate and disseminate truth" and also "to refute contrary falsehood." The latter may be the easier task since the contradictions and inconsistencies of a particular position are relatively easier to expose. With regard to the meditation and dissemination of truth,

however, much more is required. In the interest of such activities within the framework of a truly pluralistic society, it would seem that three things are necessary: 1) affirming a common reality; 2) recognizing the primacy of the person; 3) accepting the need for complementarity and cooperation in working for the common good. A pluralistic society should be a community of humanized persons working together for greater realizations of the common good.

James Hitchcock

Although the election of John F. Kennedy to the presidency was supposed to have laid to rest the spirit of anti-Catholicism in America, this most privileged form of bigotry is in some ways stronger than ever, now treated almost as self-evident truth rather than as a passionate prejudice. Those committed to the modernist agenda – politicians, educators, journalists, social workers in the broadest sense – see the Catholic Church as perhaps the greatest single obstacle to radical cultural change, the embodiment of the old absolutist conscience which they have taken such pains to excise from the Western mind. Conservative Protestants are, from this point of view, even more dangerous, and often attract even more obloquy, but are also deemed to be less institutionally potent than Catholics.

Donald Keefe, S.J.

The basic public responsibility of the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church is for the public worship of the Church; it is met through their insistent preaching of the faith, their ministry of the sacraments (especially of Orders, Marriage and Penance), and their oversight of the Church's sacramental worship. The Church's worship objectively frees the world by the grace of Christ, not by the cleverness of men, for the sacramental symbols of this public worship objectively realize and offer, for free personal appropriation, the one free social order the world has known, the maritally-ordered covenantal free community that is given mankind only in Christ our Lord.

Joyce A. Little

It should not surprise us that, as Reiff rightly observes, "For more than a century, theologians have been screening psychologists in the hope of finding

one who could rescue theology for them." But no psychologist, not even Jung, can do this, because psychology is the very thing from which theology requires rescuing. Hence, when we speak today of the apathy of Catholics, of the enormous encroachments of government into our lives, of the penchant of people to appeal to Church and government at every turn to solve every problem, the fact is that things are this way because the American people, to so large an extent, would have it that way. Government is regarded as a therapeutic resource, perhaps the primary therapeutic resource. And the Church is not far behind, since, in a therapeutic view of things, religion is nothing more than a form of private therapy embraced by the individual to enhance his own personal sense of well-being.

Paul Mankowski, S.J.

The contention of this paper is that Catholics are losing the *Kulturkampf*, and that we are doing so precisely because we have unwittingly made theological common cause with our adversaries. My thesis is this: the battle over the place of religion in public life is almost wholly preoccupied with the meaning and function of public life; yet the disputes which rage in this arena are moot to the extent that we have come to a fatal agreement on the meaning and function of religion. In Church-State conflict, it is the nature of the universal Church, not the fabric of the contingent State, which ought to guide our deliberations. While Catholics continue to dispute the boundaries of the State with secularists, we have permitted them to set the boundaries of the Church.

Patrick Riley

Lincoln's entire presidency can be seen as one long and agonizing effort to carry out his sworn duty to "preserve, protect, and defend" the Constitution and the Union that it created. And far from accepting the Supreme Court as the final arbiter "upon vital questions affecting the whole people," Lincoln defied the Court's *Dred Scott* decision, led the Congress to outlaw slavery in all Territories of the United States, and signed that legislation into law. He showed that if he was required by the Constitution to "preserve, protect, and defend" it, he was *empowered* by the Constitution

to "preserve, protect, and defend" it.

Only after his death did the Supreme Court dare move back, however stealthily, toward the position of dominance it first tried to seize with *Dred Scott*, and which it has enjoyed virtually without challenge for the past century and more. This country has repudiated Lincoln. We are the heirs not of Abraham Lincoln but of Stephen A. Douglas.

Janet Smith

Optimism regarding the Catholic community in its temporary post-political period centers, I think, on several ascertainable factors, namely, the robustness and good sense of the currently-being-established Catholic middle class focusing on family, moral and cultural identity; the desire of believers to step back, as an elementary measure of safety, from an American

world of secularists and positivists in which marital fidelity, sexual sanity, protection from crime and from disease are melting away before our eyes. The signs of Spring are ever there and beg for cultivation: the rise of clear-headed lay organizations with a mission; young priests serious about the Creed and their vocations; parents attending to catechetics; a mounting moral resolution on abortion; thoughtful new publications and much more to cheer us as we recall that Catholic confidence has much deeper roots than, God help us, success in politics.

Sister Susan Wood

Since the time of Bellarmine we no longer conceive of the Church as a perfect society, but in such images as the body of Christ and the people of God.

Professor Olsen's Footnotes from page 7.

1. Christopher Dawson, *The Crisis of Western Education*, with Specific Programs for the Study of Christian Culture by John J. Mulloy (Garden City, New York 1965), p.9. The present essay is an abridged version of The 52nd Annual Frederick William Reynolds Lecture, delivered at the University of Utah on April 24, 1991. I thank the Frederick William Reynolds Association for permission to republish this shortened version.

2. Dawson, *Crisis*, pp. 31-37.

3. I have discussed the logic of pluralism, secularization, and civil religion in "The Catholic Movement?" *Communio* 15 (1988): 474-87, and "The Meaning of Christian Culture: A Historical View," *Catholicism and Secularization in America*, ed. David L. Schindler (Notre Dame, Indiana 1990), pp.98-130.

4. George M. Marsden, "The Soul of the American University," *First Things: A Monthly Journal of Religion and Public Life* (January, 1991): 34-47, at 39-40, citing the Harvard Report of 1945, *General Education in a Free Society*: "education in the Great Books can be looked at as a secular continuation of the spirit of Protestantism." Marsden makes telling remarks on the "Whig-Protestant ideal" of "education for democracy."

5. George Parkin Grant, *English-Speaking Justice* (Notre Dame, Indiana 1985).

6. I have explored the question of legitimate and illegitimate forms of relativism in "Transcendental Truth and Cultural Relativism: An Historian's View," in *Historicism and Faith*, ed. Paul L. Williams (Scranton 1980), pp. 49-61.

7. Jeffrey Stout, *The Flight from Authority: Religion, Morality, and the Quest for Autonomy* (Notre Dame, Indiana 1981).

8. Thomas L. Pangle, *The Spirit of Modern Republicanism: The Moral Vision of the American Founders and The Philosophy of Locke* (Chicago 1988). See also Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr., *Taming the Prince: The Ambivalence of Modern Executive Power* (New York 1989).

9. John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge, Mass. 1971), should be read in the light of such later articles as "Justice as Fairness: Political not Metaphysical," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 14 (1985): 233-51.

10. Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven and London 1972), pp. 379-80.

11. Will Herbert, *Protestant-Catholic Jew* (Chicago 1983).

12. Marsden, "Soul of the American University," has many interesting things to say about Protestantism and education in America.

13. John Searle, "The Struggle Over the University," *The New York Review of Books* 37, 19 (December 6, 1990): 34-42.

The 1992 Fellowship Convention in Pittsburgh: General Theme: "The Church and a Universal Catechism"

At the Board of Directors meeting in Denver, the decision made earlier to go to Pittsburgh in 1991 was reaffirmed. Bishop Donald Wuerl is the sponsor and Father Ronald Lawler, OFM, Cap. will be the General Chairman. Both prelate and priest (along with Tom Lawler) are the authors of the most popular catechism (in eleven languages), *The Teachings of Christ*. The convention theme was chosen to fit the expectations of Church leadership that in that year or soon thereafter the Universal Catechism will be published.

The Convention Program: In 1992 each session will be organized by a Research Director responsible for the content and presentation in his or her session, following consultation with the General Chairman.

Members of the Fellowship, competent in the fields of catechetical study listed below, are welcome to offer their services for a particular paper. They may write Msgr. Kelly at St. John's University who will refer their offer to the particular Research Director. Final decisions on the program will rest with him or her, after consultation with the General Chairman.

- Session One:** *Assesment of the Contemporary Catechetical Question*
The Vatican II Promise and the Post-Vatican II Reality: Msgr. Michael Wrenn
- Session Two:** *The Content and Commitment of Catholic Catechesis*
Doctrine, Experience, Acculturation, and the Teaching of Christ: Professor John Hass
- Session Three:** *The Importance of a Universal Catechism*
The nature, purpose, need, structure: (Research Director to be decided.)
- Session Four:** *Catechesis and Good Church Government*
Themes from *Familiaris Consortio* and the Church's plausibility structures:
Professor Robert George
- Session Five:** *Catechesis and Good Church Government*
"To Restore All Things in Christ": Responsibility of Pastors: Msgr. George A. Kelly
- Session Six:** *Catechesis and the Diocesan Bishop*
The Ideal-type Bishop: Father Ronald Lawler, OFM, Cap.
- Session Seven:** *The Transforming Power of Sacramental Catechesis*
RCIA, Pre-marital and Adult Catechesis: Msgr. George Graham
- Session Eight:** *The Worship of God and Teaching His Word*
Worship and Faith, Music, Homilies, Participation, Solemnity: Sister Joan Gormley, S.N.D.
- Keynote Address:** *Bishop George Pell of Melbourne, Australia*
Member of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

The final discussion by the Board at the Denver Convention touched upon the future of the Fellowship. Ordinary activity, the increased size of the membership to over one thousand, make it advisable that new mechanisms be developed: to handle the *Newsletter*, the National and Regional meetings, collaborative research, evaluative procedures for assisting bishops and Roman Congregations, other Fellowship publications and/or statements, day-to-day internal communications, etc. Dean Michael Healy of Steubenville, Professor Ralph McInerny of Notre Dame, and Msgr. George A. Kelly of St. John's University are a committee of three exploring new arrangements.

The Coup Against Gorbachev: John Paul II's Coup Against the Vatican Church

(Editor's Note: For several years "Time Consultants" has sponsored annual lectures. The Catholic audience to which they appeal is heavily composed of those working in the field of religious education, many of whom attend courtesy of their sponsoring parish and/or diocesan employers. Typical of the speakers is Father Richard McBrien, keynote speaker for 1991 (September 20th) at the Omni Sheraton Hotel in Washington, D.C. The following partial summary of his remarks is taken from a transcript of his address, entitled "Re-imagining the Church in the Year 2000."

One major sign of the times is the domino-style collapse of authoritarian structures all over the world – in favor of freedom of thought, expression, information, assembly, worship, freedom to choose one's own leaders and to hold them accountable. The collapse of Communism in Russia, in spite of the coup against Gorbachev by hardline bureaucrats, is a good example of the modern mood. That trend has also been noticed in the Vatican II Church with the power of the Roman Curia broken and freedom, such as the emigration of men from the priesthood under Paul VI, recognized.

But today we observe a coup against the reforms of John XXIII and the Church of Vatican II led these past thirteen years by John Paul II, abetted by Cardinal Ratzinger, Cardinal O'Connor, Opus Dei, the Knights of Columbus, Mother Angelica, and The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars – all those forces that were against the Council in the first place. The coup represents the Church of the past against the inevitable Church of the future. Its partisans favor the discipline of theologians, loyalty oaths, resistance to women, forbidding altar girls, "the imposition of a universal catechism on people who never asked for it, don't want it, and can't use it"; encroachments on religious communities, etc. The compassionate caring priests never appear on their episcopal ternas.

Those hardline Catholic right-wingers resist the loss of power and privilege in the Church (like Gorbachev's enemies), seek to reimpose a party line, and to promote hardliners. But this coup, too, will fail.

"We can't go back, we won't go back", said McBrien. "Ours is a struggle – between the future and the past." "(We have) the determination to defend our right to think, our right to speak, our right to choose, and our right to live the gospel as it was intended to be lived in freedom."

The Church body "is not a military organization; we have no chain of command." McBrien then quotes ex-priest Eugene Kennedy: "We have come to the end of that imagined hierarchically-ordered authoritarian world that has, like an ancient star, collapsed from within, not because of assault from without." Following Greeley's lead, McBrien thinks bishops have cut themselves off from any meaningful influence on the vast majority of his so-called faithful by identifying with a small ultra-conservative minority. The latter may dominate the institution, but the institution has little impact on U.S. Catholic life.

Father McBrien concludes: "We have a new consciousness as men and women with the right and duty to shape our own destinies in freedom, not to live a tightly-controlled sharing in the ministry of somebody else. Shall the image of the Church for the year 2000 after all be that of Boris Yeltsin atop the tank, declaring defiance of those who would curtail or repeal that freedom? His integrity and courage fired the torch of hope and insured the victory over the coup. Our integrity and our courage can do the same."

The final paragraph of the transcript reports the reaction to the McBrien talk of Mr. Timothy Ragan, president of Time Consultants and the chairman of the Proceedings:

"Somehow, as I was sitting there, the stage seemed to turn into a tank. Did you get that feeling? Yeltsin could not have done better. It's amazing that we look to Russia for signs of how to determine the future of the Church."

At that point a reputed audience of one thousand clapped in approval.

The New Catechetical Guidelines - Promise and Reality

Msgr. George P. Graham

I. In 1987, the U.S. Catholic Conference Committee on Education was authorized to prepare *Guidelines for Doctrinally Sound Catechetical Materials*. The Guidelines were prepared primarily for publishers of catechetical materials. The Guidelines were drawn up by a task force of three bishops and fifteen other anonymous members. After consultations with some publishers of catechetical materials and with the NCCB committees on doctrine and liturgy, the work was submitted to the U.S.C.C. Committee on Education, and was then adopted by the bishops at their Fall meeting on November 14, 1990. It is noteworthy that the consultations were extremely limited, and that the preliminary drafts were not circulated widely among bishops, pastors and catechists. This failure to consult more broadly is perhaps an important reason for the failure of the guidelines to reach their promised objective.

The perspective of the task force and the Committee on Education is evident from the opening sentence of the introduction:

"Since the second Vatican Council, the Church has experienced a remarkable renewal in catechesis."

Has there in fact been "a remarkable renewal of catechesis"? Bishop Raymond Lucker asked this question in 1989 at the convention of the National Conference of Diocesan Directors of Religious Education.¹

Bishop Lucker, after stating that he believed that there is a renewal taking place in religious education in the Church in this country, said he had a heavy heart after reading the reports of the meeting of the American archbishops with the Holy Father and the officials of the Roman Congregations. He quoted Cardinal Ratzinger about a "confusion of voices, making it all the more difficult to recognize that of the Gospel". He quoted Cardinal O'Connor, who said that: "years of confusion and diversity in catechetical instructional materials. . . have left an entire generation in a state of ambiguity."

Bishop Lucker then commented:

"If what the two Cardinals say is true, then there is no catechetical renewal and - we have to go back to the 50's."

The question then is clearly: Are we in the midst of a catechetical renewal or are we in need of one? The proof is in the record.

Pastors all over the country are concerned with the growing religious illiteracy of the graduates of our Catholic colleges, high schools, and elementary schools, as well as the public school students in our religious education programs. There is a confusion of tongues, so that children and young adults are not familiar with the vocabulary of our Catholic tradition. How often have parents expressed exasperation when their children do not know the meaning of words such as sanctifying grace or mortal sin? This catechetical failure seems to be the explanation for the abandonment of the Mass by the large majority of Catholics in the United States. Years ago we used to contrast our strong attendance at Mass with that of European countries. In the last twenty years, however, our Mass attendance has dropped to twenty-five percent of our people or less. The Sacrament of Penance has also been abandoned by many people, and even by some priests. In some parishes, it is hard to know when one may get to confession. And over all this chaos of unsuccessful programs proudly reigns an establishment of dissenting theologians and catechists with a controlling interest in various diocesan offices.

It is interesting to note that the task force has supported its judgement about the "remarkable renewal in catechesis" by referring to the various documents issued by the Holy See during this period: *The General Catechetical Directory* (1971), *The 1974 and 1977 Assemblies of the Synod of Bishops*, Paul VI's "Evangelization in the Modern World" (1975), John Paul II's "Catechesis in Our Time" (1979), and the 1985 proposal of the Synod of Bishops for a catechism for the Universal Church. One need not be a specialist in catechetical documents to know that each of these documents was issued because of dissatisfaction with the catechetical enterprise. Far from supporting the concept of a renewal in catechesis, they indicate a concern for the deficiencies in what has been achieved to date. "These limitations are particularly serious when they endanger integrity of content".²

But what of the claim of Bishop Lucker that there is a catechetical renewal going on in the Church in the U.S.? He recalls the 1936 book of Jungmann, *The Good News and Our Proclamation of the Faith*, and the founding of the National Center for Religious Education in 1935, he mentions Archbishop Edwin O'Hara, Father Hofinger and Sister Rosalia Walsh. Curiously, he does not refer to Msgr. Joseph Baierl or Msgr. Rudolph Bandas.

When the catechetical renewal, if there be one, is dated from the 1930's, one can say that we are still profiting from the pioneer work of those master teachers. The fact that just about every parish has a CCD or religious education program for public school students is living proof of the continuing importance of that early work. The Summer Vacation School developed by Archbishop O'Hara still provides a vehicle for religious education. Well organized programs for First Communion and Confirmation are found in every parish in every diocese. One may legitimately speak of a catechetical renewal when one considers the large amounts of money spent by parishes and dioceses in pursuing the work. I would guess that there is no other country where such an investment is made in the religious education of children as we make in the United States.

If, then, one should wish to speak of a catechetical renewal, one would have to emphasize the human and financial resources that we have dedicated to this work. Perhaps this has allowed us to ease our consciences over the fact that we are not doing as well as we should in helping our young people to live good, Catholic lives.

If we have been unsuccessful for the past twenty-five years in preparing our children to be good Catholics, and if the failure cannot be put down to lack of effort or lack of financial support, what is the reason for our failure? The bishops have provided the answer in these guidelines. Our catechetical materials require a greater involvement on the part of the bishops "to provide direction particularly in the areas of Catholic doctrine regarding faith and morals". They have to assure that the catechetical materials be effective instruments for teaching the fullness of the Christian

message found in the Word of God and in the teachings of the Church.

Put simply like this, it would seem that this analysis of the deficiencies of our religious education programs does not take into consideration the sociological factors which stand in the way of effective catechetical programs. For example: children are exposed to television, radio and movies from an early age. In these media, religion is presented as an exclusively private relationship with God, and religious institutions are often shown as self-serving bodies which are not really necessary for a life of religious experience.

In addition, many Catholic young and old persons have been indoctrinated by the media with the belief that they have the right to reject any teachings of the Church which do not meet with their approval. We are faced with a massive rejection of Catholic doctrines, especially in the area of sexual ethics.

Another social factor which stands in the way of effective religious education is the breakdown of the family in our country. In every Catholic school and religious education classroom, we have large numbers of children whose parents have separated, divorced and, frequently, remarried. Many of these parents have become alienated from the Church, especially through remarriage outside the Church.

These and other problems cannot be overlooked in evaluating the present situation in our religious education programs. The bishops undoubtedly are aware of these problems, but they are not the subject of the document being considered. Nevertheless, the guidelines describe catechesis as a form of ministry of the Word which "suppose that the hearer has embraced the Christian message as a salvific reality". It is true that guideline Number 21 does speak of the need to nourish and teach the faith and, "because there is often a need for initial evangelization", to aim at opening the heart and arousing the beginning of faith. Nevertheless, the former statement seems to reflect the guidelines more than the latter. The need to evangelize our students and to bring them to an initial faith and a commitment to Jesus may not have been an important factor in previous decades, but any religious educator can testify to its need at the present time.

II. In order to evaluate the guidelines, it is helpful to review the progress of catechetics in this century. In the early part of the century, the persons working for renewal attempted to utilize in religious education the findings of the new sciences of psychology and educational psychology. This thrust is still important and is included in guideline Number 71, which holds that effective catechetical materials "must be based on accepted learning theory, established pedagogical principles, and practical learning strategies". During the early period, the most successful attempt at utilizing learning theory was the famous Munich Method. This method was called at first the Psychological Method. The older Analytical Method had begun with a catechism text, which was then resolved into its component parts. The parts were explained in succession, and were then recombined into a whole, that is, the catechism answer. The Munich Method, however, is synthetic. It does not take the catechism text as its starting point. On the contrary, it begins with a story containing the truth in question. From this story, the elements of the doctrine are drawn. These elements are combined in a summing-up into the catechism answer, and then are formally applied to the life of the student. The Munich Method was popularized in the United States by Monsignor Joseph Baiert of St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester. A somewhat later system was the Adaptive Way, developed by Sister Rosalia Walsh. She prepared a manual of catechetics for C.C.D. teachers and teachers manuals for the eight grades of elementary school. For each class she prepared a lesson plan with a scriptural story, or an incident from the lives of the saints. She explained the doctrine for the catechist, and then presented the catechism questions relating to the doctrine, taken from various parts of the catechism. As a young priest in the 50's, I used the Adoptive Way system in my parish C.C.D., and I found it very effective.

Another writer who influenced modern catechetics before the second Vatican Council was Josef Andreas Jungmann. In 1936, Father Jungmann published, in German, *The Good News and Our Proclamation of the Faith*. This work marked a new direction in catechetical renewal, since it focused on content rather than on the psychology of learning. The book was controversial, and was not translated into English until 1962. Jungmann's message was that the early Church was keenly aware of the Good News proclaimed by Christ,

and it was happy and confident in its living Faith in that message. The role of the teacher of religion was to present the divine plan of salvation, centered on Jesus Christ. This personal relationship with Christ gives unity and order to all of Catholic teaching. Christ is seen as the pivotal point of all God's ways. All Catholic teaching converges on Christ. His person and work form the true core of the Christian message of salvation. Catechetics then must be Christocentric. Jungmann quotes St. Clement Hofbauer's remark that we must really preach the Gospel all over again. This emphasis, which is restated forcefully by Pope John Paul II, in *Catechesis in Our Time*, is mentioned briefly in Guideline No. 10.

By the early 60's, then, the catechetical movement was committed to both the use of modern psychology of education and a focus on Christ as the center of the Good News to be proclaimed. There really was a catechetical renewal.

Then what happened? At the time of the second Vatican Council, and afterwards, it became popular to attack the use of a catechism and traditional prayer formulas. Instead, the students were helped to participate in various kinds of religious experiences, to formulate in their own words the doctrines being taught. It seems strange that this effort on the part of religious educators took place at the same time that the work of Jean Piaget became popular in American educational circles. Children whose cognitive powers had not yet matured to the point where they were capable of appreciating or constructing theory were asked to formulate the great Christian truths, despite the fact that they were innocent of the knowledge of the Church's past reflected in the traditional catechetical formulas. Instead of being challenged by the joyful proclamation of the Good News, and learning the great truths contained in the Word of God which were handed down through scripture and tradition, teachers were encouraged to help children look for "the present revelation". In many programs, religious experience was substituted for the faith of the Church, and Jesus Christ sometimes faded into the background.

If this analysis of how we got to where we are today can be accepted, it seems clear that the concern of the bishops for the content of doctrinally sound catechetical materials is well taken. We have to use all the resources of modern learning theory, and the enrichments of contemporary educational psychology. But, we have

to preach and teach the Gospel message, the Good News of Jesus Christ. We can ask, therefore, do the new guidelines help us to do that work?

III. Do the new guidelines fulfill the promise of the 1987 planning document of the United States Catholic Conference? Do they provide policy guidelines for the creation of doctrinally sound textbooks? A first answer might be yes and no. Any document produced under official auspices could be expected to use authentic materials in presenting the teaching of the Church. Nevertheless, if one looks closely at the list, one can discern a pattern of understatement and omission which reflects a theological unbalance.

First of all, some general remarks may be made about the guidelines. They are said to differ from the National Catechetical Directory and from the earlier document of the Bishop's Conference entitled "Basic Teachings for Catholic Religious Education" in two ways:

"First, they incorporate teachings and principles stated in recent papal encyclicals and in pastoral letters issued by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops; second, they single out certain doctrines that seem to need particular emphasis in the life and culture of the United States at this time".

It seems clear that, where new documents are concerned, they are strangely selective. The lessons of John Paul II's Apostolic Exhortation on Reconciliation and Penance are not taken advantage of. There is no concern for frequent devotional confession. There is no reminder of the conditions for the forgiveness of mortal sin when confession is not immediately available. Mortal sin itself is not clarified, and the teachings of *Familiaris Consortio* about Catholic sexual morality are not presented as of significant value in a doctrinally sound catechesis.

The guidelines promise to single out doctrines that need particular emphasis in the United States today. It seems, however, that an effort is made to present Catholic teaching in ways less likely to offend those who hold dissenting views.

With regard to the individual guidelines, the first nine deal with the general doctrinal content of catechetical materials. While there is nothing erroneous in the guidelines, they fail to bring out the basis for

Catholic teaching in the Word of God. No. 4 requires that one "describe the many ways that God has spoken, and continues to speak in the lives of human beings". One might wonder whether this is a covert way of bringing back the discredited concept of "present revelation" which had marred the earlier drafts of the National Catechetical Directory.

Numbers 10-17 deal with "Father, Son and Holy Spirit". Number 10 asks that catechetical materials "be Trinitarian and Christocentric." Number 13 takes up the theme of Christocentricity again when it asks that the materials "focus on the heart of the Christian message: salvation from sin and death through the person and work of Jesus, with special emphasis on the Paschal Mystery - His Passion, Death and Resurrection". This theme is continued in 14, where it says that the work and person of Jesus Christ should be the key and chief point of Christian reference in reading the Scriptures. In Number 15, Jesus is to be presented as true God and as true man. Number 16 requires that it be taught how the Holy Spirit continues Christ's work in the world, in the Church, and in the lives of believers. This is all very helpful.

Number 17 counters the feminist attacks on the Catholic doctrine about God. It asks that catechetical material maintain the traditional language, grounded in the Scriptures, that speaks of the Holy Trinity as Father, Son and Spirit. The guideline seems to be weakened, however, by adding to it an injunction to "apply, where appropriate, the principles of inclusive language approved by the N.C.C.B.". Why are these two parts of No. 17 put into the same guideline? And why does the guideline not complete the citation of the inclusive language rule Number 20, which states that the feminine pronoun is not to be used to refer to the person of the Holy Spirit.³ One has to be suspicious these days when one theologian has spoken of the Holy Spirit as the Mother of the Word of God, and another has spoken of the Spirit 'conceiving' the Word whom the Father generates as His Son. Leonardo Boff has spoken of the Holy Spirit coming down on Mary, taking human form in her, in the same manner as the Son set up his tent amongst us in the figure of Jesus of Nazareth.⁴

Guideline Number 11 states that "through grace we share in God's Divine Nature". This guideline does not, however, use the name "Sanctifying Grace", nor does it describe what is meant by Sanctifying Grace in

Catholic teaching. This is particularly damaging since the later section of guidelines beginning with No. 51 is entitled "Life of Grace and the Moral Life". That section, however, does not refer to Sanctifying Grace at all. As a result, the teaching on Original Sin in Number 51 is weak, and the treatment of personal sins in Number 55 does not refer to mortal sin or to the loss of sanctifying grace which could lead to damnation.

Guidelines Numbers 18-33 are under the title "Church". Unfortunately, this section does not mention the necessity of belonging to the Catholic Church. Consequently, Number 20, which speaks of the missionary nature of the Church, appears to be without motivation. Numbers 22 and 23 point out the special mission of teaching given to the Church by Christ. This latter guideline states clearly the special charisma of the Pope as assuring the authentic teaching of the Gospel. The concept of teaching with authority could well be added here.

Guideline Number 26 is a landmine waiting to be exploded. It speaks innocuously of a "legitimate diversity in expressing its shared faith according to different ages, cultures, gifts and abilities." The statement is true enough. Nevertheless, the document earlier on has pointed out that:

"For believers to share their faith they must have common experiences and a shared language in which to express and celebrate it. Some common expression of faith is essential to the unity of the believing community. Without a shared language, the faithful cannot profess and celebrate their faith in communion with one another."

Since we do not have a catechism with an official language, more explicit guidelines should be formulated to express the principal Christian mysteries. We need a common vocabulary.

Number 27 seeks to "foster understanding and unity by accurately presenting the traditions and practices of the Catholic Churches of the East". It is not clear how feasible this goal is within the limits of catechetical textbooks. It might be said more simply that the Catholic Churches of the East are just as Catholic as those of the Roman Rite, and that they acknowledge the Pope as the visible head of the Church.

The other Christian churches and ecclesial communities are dealt with in Number 28. Despite the heritage that we hold in common with the Protestant communities, it should be made plain that Catholics may not legitimately leave the Catholic Church to join these other communities. Ecumenism (Number 29) should be presented as a movement to that unity which the Catholic Church possesses. The elements of our tradition which are held by other Christian bodies have a centripetal force which, we pray, will draw them back to the Catholic Church.

Number 30 requires that the Jews be integrated in the work of salvation. On the other hand, the Church and Judaism should not appear as parallel ways of salvation. This warning seems appropriate in view of recent statements which seem to be based on either religious indifferentism or parallel covenants.

Guidelines 34 - 37 have the title Mary and the Saints. Number 37 asks that the Church's teaching on the veneration of Saints should be explained. It is unfortunate that the guideline did not suggest that the students be made familiar with the lives of the saints. Where older religion textbooks and Church histories enabled students to become familiar with the great saints of our Christian past, the newer textbooks seems to shy away from mentioning them. The lessons in many catechetical series do not begin with concrete examples from the lives of the Saints. Instead, they often begin with fictional stories of little Chief Blue Cloud sending smoke signals across the mountain to Little Princess North Star. In the few minutes available for teaching religion, we should try to make use of every minute to enrich the minds and imaginations of our students with the attractive figures of a St. Ignatius of Antioch, a St. Ambrose standing in his cathedral with his people and defying the soldiers of the Roman Empire. Our young people need heroes and heroines, and right now they are not getting them from us.

IV. It would be tempting to reflect on each of the guidelines, but that would turn this paper into a small book. Instead, I would like to focus on one great problem of the Church in the United States. Probably our greatest single problem is the failure of our people

to participate in the Sunday Mass. With less than 25 percent of our people at Mass on any Sunday, it would seem that we have a serious failure in our catechetical work. We are not conveying to our people the wonder of the Mass and its central role in the life of the Church. The Constitution on the Liturgy of the second Vatican Council is a remarkable document, yet we have not been able to share the riches of the liturgy with most of our people.

Do the guidelines offer any help in dealing with this problem? Unfortunately, they do not. In this case, we see verified the popular remark "we have met the enemy and they are us".

It is incredible to me that one would offer a guideline on teaching about the Mass that would not say plainly that the Mass is a Sacrifice. Number 40 says instead: "Link the Eucharist to Christ's sacrifice on the Cross." Is the Mass a sacrifice, or is it not? One could remain within this guideline without ever answering the question.

It is incredible to me that one could offer a guideline on teaching about the Eucharist that would not state plainly that, in the Mass, bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, that would not state plainly that, when we receive Holy Communion, we receive the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.

This hesitancy in teaching the doctrine of the Eucharist is continued in Number 41, which speaks of the special significance of Sunday, without ever mentioning that we have an obligation to participate in the Sunday Mass. Theologians may debate about the nature of that obligation and the excusing causes. A guideline for catechists should state clearly that as Catholics we have an obligation to go to Mass on Sundays and Holy Days, and that, if we break the law without excuse, we are guilty of sin.

V. CONCLUSION

The bishops of the United States are concerned with catechesis, and the Code of Canon Law points out the responsibility of the diocesan bishop to make provision that suitable instruments for catechesis be available. (c.775.1) The issuance of these guidelines shows that the bishops want to fulfill their responsibility in this regard. The guidelines that were approved on November 14, 1990, might be considered a first step in fulfilling those obligations. Bishop Leibrecht said that the guidelines "will have to be updated periodically". I submit that the guidelines are already out of date, and they do not fulfill their promise. Perhaps what is required now would be a broad consultation of theologians and catechists to review these guidelines, to remedy their inadequacies, and thus to provide better guidance for the preparation of our catechetical materials.

1. (*Origins*, Apr. 27, 1989. The talk is also printed in *The Living Light*, Vol. 25 -No. 4 (June 1989) pp. 320-324.)
2. (N. John Paul II, *Catechesis in Our Time* (1979), No. 17).
3. See "Criteria for the Evaluation of Inclusive Language Translations of Scripture Texts Proposed for Liturgical Use" (Approved by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops on November 15, 1990.)
4. See Peter Phan, "Gender roles in the History of Salvation: Man and Woman in the Thought of Paul Evdokimov", *The Heythrop Journal*, January 1990, pp. 63,66.

Trust the Church of God implicitly, even when a different course from hers would induce you to question her prudence or her correctness. Recollect what a hard task she has, how she is sure to be criticised and spoken against whatever she does. Recollect how much she needs your loyal and tender devotion. Recollect, too, how long is the experience gained in eighteen hundred years and what a right she has to claim your assent to principles which have had so extended and so triumphant a trial. Thank her that she has kept the Faith for so many generations, and do your part in helping her to transmit it to generations after you.

Cardinal Newman in Dublin, November 14, 1859

Manual of Guidelines on Clinical-Ethical Issues

Part I: Commentary by Eugene F. Diamond, M.D.

The Catholic Health Association of the United States, of which Diana Bader, O.P., Ph.D. is the Editor, has issued a Statement of Policy regarding the Relationship between the Catholic Health Association and the Roman Catholic Church. The CHA recognizes that the Bishops have "primary authority and responsibility in decisions relating to religious and moral issues and practices". The Association, however, appealing to its own "expertise in health and social welfare" calls for a dialogue "founded upon mutual trust and respect". In recent years, some publications sponsored by the CHA, such as the disastrous *Apology for the Value of Human Life*, have indicated a tendency for CHA to go its own way on some Medical-Moral issues and to encroach on the "primary authority" of the Magisterium with some positions derived more from local competitive marketing pressures, than from authentic teaching.

The recently published *Manual of Guidelines on Clinical Ethical Issues* continues this trend. Its purpose is described in the Introduction as a response "to requests for guidance in the formation of policies and guidelines on ethical issues in the clinical setting". The Manual has three sections. Section I is devoted to Institutional Ethics Committees from an overall view and Section II presents Procedural Mechanisms for Developing Policies and Guidelines. There is much in these first two sections that would be helpful to Hospital Administrators and Ethics Committees in carrying out their functions with relationship to staff by-laws and Joint Commission requirements. It is in Section III, entitled "topics", that the usefulness of the Manual is called into question. The aforementioned Statement of Policy describes the CHA as having "a serious obligation to develop and administer policies", but to carry this out several of the topics in this Manual raise serious questions as to the CHA's commitment to authoritative teaching or, for that matter, its adherence to the NCCB's *Ethical and Religious Directives for Catholic Health Facilities*.

One issue which has been a source of continuing conflict in various dioceses is that of Surgical Sterilization in Catholic Hospitals. The threat of geographical morality on the subject of sterilization has led to a series of explicit clarifications such as "Reply of the Sacred Congregation for Doctrine of the Faith on Sterilization in Catholic Hospitals" (March 13, 1975) and the 1977 "Commentary on the Reply of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith" by the NCCB. Both of these documents painstakingly develop the application of the principles of material and formal cooperation to sterilization in Catholic hospitals. The inescapable conclusion of both statements is that *institutional* approval and consent for the performance of contraceptive sterilization in a Catholic hospital would be formal cooperation and "absolutely forbidden".

The Manual, nevertheless, suggests an institutional policy based on what it describes as "Material Cooperation" in which the Catholic health care facility judges tubal ligation to be permissible based on 1.) the need to provide comprehensive health care for women, 2.) avoidance of the loss of qualified medical staff, 3.) harmful competition from other providers in the community, 4.) maintaining the obstetrical-gynecological service, 5.) survival of the hospital as a "full service facility". A disclaimer is then added that "tubal ligations will be permitted only when certain indications are present. A list of twelve "indications" is then appended in which the medical-obstetrical and psychiatric justifications for sterilization read like chapter headings from a textbook, (e.g. "heart disease", "renal disease", "malignant disease", "diabetes mellitus", "genetic disease"). As has been pointed out (Linacre Quarterly 42:6, 1975), surgical sterilization is not a treatment for any disease. The indication for sterilization in all of the long list of indications in the Manual is the prevention of future pregnancy which is a directly contraceptive purpose explicitly condemned by both the Sacred Congregation and the NCCB. It is interesting to note that the old chestnut of repeat Caesarean section and so-called "uterine isolation" also makes the list of indication for tubal ligation. When the Archdiocesan Medical Ethics Commission in Chicago issued an advisory opinion condoning "uterine isolation" in local Catholic hospitals, Cardinal Bernardin was specifically advised by the Holy See that such permission should be withdrawn in the Chicago Archdiocesan hospitals forthwith.

(Part II will appear in March Newsletter)

Book Reviews

***Sex and the Marriage Covenant: A Basis for Morality* by John F. Kippley, The Couple to Couple League International, Inc., Cincinnati 1991, x+356 pp.**

In *Familiaris Consortio* (n. 31), Pope John Paul II invited theologians to illustrate "ever more clearly the biblical foundations, the ethical grounds, and the personalist reasons" behind the teaching of the Church on the intrinsic immorality of marital contraception. By doing so, they would make it possible, "in the context of an organic exposition, to render the teaching of the Church on this fundamental question truly accessible to all people of good will."

John Kippley has accepted this invitation of Pope John Paul II, and in the present volume he has admirably succeeded in providing an "organic exposition" of the truths about human persons and human sexuality that is of great help in showing persons "of good will" the liberating beauty of the Church's teaching on sexual morality, including the morality of contraception.

Kippley's major thesis, which he supports with a wealth of evidence, is that sexual intercourse is intended by God to be at least implicitly a renewal of the marriage covenant, which a man and a woman bring into being when, by their own free and irrevocable choice, they unreservedly give themselves to one another as husband and wife. The act of sexual union, in other words, in order to be "honest sex," must participate in the marriage covenant and respect the great goods of human existence that are honored and given the respect due to them in that covenant: the goods of steadfast fidelity, mutual love, and the procreation of human life.

In the light of this theology of the covenant Kippley is able to show why all forms of nonmarital genital union and of contraceptive sex within marriage are morally degrading. They are so because all these actions simply cannot be the living embodiments—"renewals"—of the spousal, procreative love to which man and woman commit themselves when they give themselves to one another in marriage. For sex to be "hon-

est," i.e., in accord with God's wise and loving plan for men and women, it must be marital; and to be marital, it must unite two irreplaceable and nonsubstitutable spouses, not join two individuals who are in principle replaceable and substitutable; and it must also be an unconditional gift of these spouses to one another, respectful and accepting of their procreative powers.

In the course of his book Kippley also takes up in detail the "arguments" set forth by the advocates of contraception (and of "premarital" sex and "committed" homosexual unions) and does a splendid job of exposing their superficiality and speciousness. He likewise provides an excellent account of the meaning of conscience and of an "informed" conscience. In addition, he discusses in depth the "infallibility" of the teaching on contraception, offers sound pastoral advice on hard cases, shows clearly how the practice of periodic continence as a way of regulating conception (NFP) differs from the choice to contracept, and sets forth briefly and accurately the history of Christian thought on the subject of contraception.

Kippley's case against contraception differs from the case that I and many others (Germain Grisez, John Finnis, Joseph Boyle, et al.) make, so there are some disagreements between us. Despite these differences, I think that Kippley's approach is sound. It fits in harmoniously with Pope John Paul II's "theology of the body," and it ought to be help a wide range of readers understand for themselves the reasons why contraception—and adultery, fornication, rape, and sodomy are immoral precisely because they are so de-meaning of human persons and human sexuality.

The present volume is a complete recasting of the argument Kippley originally developed in 1970, in one of the first full length theological studies devoted to a defense of *Humanae Vitae*—his *Covenant, Christ, and Contraception* (Alba House, 1970), reissued in 1976 by Liturgical Press under the title *Birth Control and the Marriage Covenant*. It is, in my opinion, one of the finest books on marriage and sexual morality available. A veritable mine of information, *Sex and the Marriage Covenant* is must reading for anyone concerned with marriage, sexuality, and the family.

William E. May

***Curran vs. Catholic University: A Study of Authority and Freedom in Conflict*, by Larry Witham. Edington-Rand, Inc., Riverdale, MD, 1991, 333 pages.**

The principal interest of this book, as well as over half of its actual contents, concerns the civil trial in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia which took place in December, 1988, as a result of the lawsuit filed by Father Charles E. Curran against the Catholic University of America. Father Curran sued the university because he thought it had violated its employment contract with him by dismissing him as a professor of theology following the 1986 judgment of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in Rome to the effect that Father Curran was no longer "suitable nor eligible to teach Catholic theology."

This civil trial, focused as it was on the issue of Fr. Curran's employment as a professor at the university, only got into a part of the overall "Curran case" which had continued over many years to be a periodic media sensation in the United States. It was a media sensation because, even while he continued to function over many years as a professor of theology at the American bishops' own "pontifical" university, Father Curran had made it plain that he dissented from certain Catholic moral teachings; media interest ran especially high in his case because his dissent was focused mainly on sexual morality. The American public had been well aware of who Father Curran was and what he represented from the time in 1967 when the entire faculty and student body of Catholic U went out on strike over Father Curran, thus effectively preventing Church and university authorities from carrying out the intention they had, had way back then, of not renewing his contract to teach theology; and, especially, from the time in 1968 when Father Curran helped draft and launch a public statement dissenting from Pope Paul VI's encyclical *Humanae Vitae*, initially subscribed to by 87 Catholic theologians (whose numbers ultimately swelled to over 600).

Father Curran subsequently led 20 fellow dissident Catholic U theologians and scholars in successfully facing down inept Church and university efforts to require them to fulfill what up until then everybody had understood their profession as Catholic theologians obliged them to do, namely, subscribe to and

uphold the Church's authentic teachings, including those of her ordinary magisterium. For eighteen years Father Curran was able to use the platform and prestige of his Catholic U theology appointment to make dissent from Catholic teaching appear to be legitimate in the Church in the United States. Once he and his colleagues had successfully enlisted a Catholic U academic committee on the side of the legitimacy of their dissent, the American hierarchy was apparently unable to insist any further that the theology taught at Catholic U had to be Catholic; Father Curran's position and tenure there were never seriously challenged. It was more than a decade before the CDF even informed Father Curran that his views were under investigation in Rome, although he himself has attempted to make much of the fact that the CDF had a file on him since 1966. But if the CDF had a file on him, why was it never followed up on? Nothing could have been more public than his dissenting views; he always saw to that.

The actual investigation of Father Curran's views, which were known to just about anybody who watched the evening news on TV, required yet another seven years before Rome finally acted, thus obliging the American hierarchy and Catholic U itself to act. Even then Father Curran remains the only prominent theologian out of dozens and scores and even hundreds who dissent from Church teachings yet remain in place still. So much for the myth of the relentless Roman juggernaut crushing everything in its path without either pity or remorse.

In spite of having been judged and found wanting by the highest doctrinal office of his Church, Father Curran in no way felt obliged to accept the official Roman judgment about his lack of suitability and eligibility to teach Catholic theology, any more than he had ever felt obliged to accept papal encyclicals--or, indeed, dogmatic canons from the Council of Trent such as the one affirming the indissolubility of a valid sacramental marriage. His logical course of action, therefore, was to sue the university when he was finally dismissed after considerable "due process."

Father Curran's position was based upon the claim that the Catholic University, as an American university with institutional autonomy and academic freedom, had wrongly allowed itself to be coerced by an entity external to itself, namely, the CDF and the archbishop of Washington, acting as university chancellor, in deciding to dismiss him in spite of his contract

and tenure at the university. Even the very perceptive Judge Frederick H. Weisberg, who tried the case, was able to see that Father Curran's position really entailed nothing else but a demand that Catholic U as an institution should join with him in defying Church authority.

That was never a likelihood. As the brilliant defense lawyer engaged by the university, Kevin Baine, pointed out in his summation, in engaging Father Curran, "the Catholic University of America had never contracted away its religious freedom, and there was nothing to show that the university had promised to protect Curran from a Vatican declaration of his ineligibility." In the end, said Attorney Baine, the plaintiff's civil case was not based on any contract at all but on, "on the plaintiff's idea of a university." And this particular plaintiff's idea of a university, as it happened, took into account neither the First Amendment nor the fact that religiously affiliated colleges and universities have been a legitimate part of the American academic scene for as long as there have been any colleges and universities in this country.

Once Church and university officials had actually been taken into court by Father Curran, they closed ranks and quite creditably defended the university's Catholic character. It remains dismaying, however, how many present and former Catholic U officials and other prominent Catholics were found to testify in favor of Father Curran's view of a university, which is neither Catholic nor American (all American universities are ultimately "controlled" by their "sponsors"; this is especially true if they are state universities; one of the witnesses at the trial, former Catholic U President Edmund Pellegrino testified that he was accustomed to much more "outside" interference when he was president of the University of Kentucky and of the State University of New York at Stony Brook than he was while president of Catholic U).

In retrospect, it was inevitable that the court would have had to find for the university. Father Curran really did not have any case; only a simplistic notion of academic freedom could ever make it appear that he had a case. In the end, owing to the very narrowness of the contract issue on which he had taken the whole thing into court, he was reduced during his cross-examination to denying while under oath his own previous public and in some cases published statements recognizing Catholic U's special "pontifical"

character. But his civil case could only be based on the assumption that Catholic U was, and could only be, obliged to put "academic freedom" ahead of its Catholic character if it was to be considered an American university in the full sense of the word; but, in the event, it was an American court of law which declined to endorse such an ideological view of what an university is supposed to be.

This book is mainly a very readable and absorbing account of all the hue and cry and back and forth involved in the trial itself. Once I really got into the book, I found it to be a real page-turner, in the course of which a fair number of the many issues involved in the Curran affair were brought out to one degree or another. The author, a reporter for *The Washington Times*, covered the trial and no doubt there saw its dramatic possibilities for book-length treatment. He has done an excellent job of bringing it alive for the reader. His sketches of the chief actors in the drama are similarly lively and informative.

Since in his preface the author thanked a collaborator for having assisted him with "Catholic terms, usages, and citations," I was, on the whole, quite impressed with his chapters treating the background "issues" in the Curran case, namely, "Magisterium and Dissent," "Moral Theology," "Catholic Higher Education," and the history of the Catholic University of America. In these chapters the author covered a good deal of very treacherous territory in quite a creditable fashion, making a real and, on the whole, successful, effort to be fair and objective to all sides.

Ultimately, though, the discussion of these issues in this book will be found somewhat inadequate by those members of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars with specialized knowledge of some of the same issues. How, for example, can a reporter, no matter how competent, discern that a Father Richard P. McBrien is not really a reliable authority on Catholicism in spite of his authorship of a huge tome entitled *Catholicism*? How can such a reporter know that a Father Francis A. Sullivan, author of a book entitled *Magisterium*, similarly does not get the Church's magisterium right either? Or that a Sister Alice Gallin does not have the last word on the nature of Catholic higher education in spite of being in charge of an organization called the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities? Or that the view of Fr. Avery Dulles that Vatican II "accepted dissent implicitly" is unfortunately not cor-

rect?

With the best will in the world, how can a researcher and writer, no matter how conscientious, get such things exactly right, if these are the accepted authorities out there he has to rely on? Under the circumstances, Mr. Witham does pretty well. He truly does not appear to have any *parti pris* with respect to the current conflicts within the Catholic Church; and, unlike most revisionist modern Catholic writers on these subjects, he appears to be just as happy citing a Professor William E. May or a Monsignor George A. Kelly as any of the above, if the latter happen to be at hand for his purposes.

More commendably, he takes very seriously and actually cites frequently official Church documents as his sources. He concludes the book with a balanced discussion of the 1990 CDF documents on the vocation of the theologian and on Catholic higher education. Apparently he sees no reason why the Church herself, in fairness, should not be allowed to state in her own voice what she is and where she stands. In a book on the Curran case, this kind of respectful attention to what the Church herself has been trying to say is very welcome.

Since the author consciously chose to consider the whole Curran case as what he calls a conflict between "authority" and "freedom," the book also falls short in the end of doing complete justice to what the conflict illustrated by the Curran case really is: it is not so much a conflict between freedom and authority – at no time in the history of the Church have Catholic theologians enjoyed as much "freedom" without correction or interference from Church authority as they do today – as it is a conflict between one authority, the true authority of the Church's magisterium, and another claimed or asserted authority of modern academic theology to be able to decide theological and doctrinal questions in the end – in other words, to displace the official magisterium with a pretended theological "magisterium" of their own.

This book chronicles the failure of a Fr. Curran to achieve that goal in his own career. As everyone knows, however, there remain many other claimants at work out there with whom the Church will have to go on contending.

K.D. Whitehead
Falls Church, Virginia

***Liberalism, Conservatism, and Catholicism: An Evaluation of Contemporary American Political Ideologies in Light of Catholic Social Teaching*, by Stephen M. Krason. Forward by James Likoudis. New Hope, Kentucky: St. Martin de Porres Lay Dominican Community, 1991, pp. xi +340.**

Perhaps James Likoudis best summarizes the vital importance of this volume authored by Stephen Krason of the Franciscan University of Steubenville when the former states that:

The political philosophy of too many American Catholics ignores the truth that God and politics are connected with each other. Thus do they appear to be "liberals" and "conservatives" first, and Catholics second. To the contrary, every serious and informed Catholic knows that "all things must be reestablished in Christ" (Eph. 1:10) – and that includes the political order. He realizes that political life, like all human activities, has a role in helping man move toward his rightful end, namely, **Salvation** (p. ix).

In a short review it is simply impossible, however, to sufficiently convey to the reader either the many nuanced arguments and prudential judgements that Krason makes or the incredible breadth of knowledge – both secular and Catholic – that his research project required him to master. His analysis, for one thing, puts to rest the claim that a specifically "Catholic political science," based in part on a judicious incorporation of secular methods, is a contradiction in terms.

Krason's volume is logically ordered. After summarizing the most important Church teachings, derived mainly from Papal documents, on social, economic, and political matters, he compares them to both American liberalism and conservatism. He divides American liberalism into two periods, the "old liberalism," marked by the beginning of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal in 1933 and lasting until 1960, and the "new liberalism," starting from 1960 and running through to the present, with the watershed figure and year being George McGovern and the 1972 Presidential election. In the process of defining the core of American conservatism, the author analyzes its

various branches: "cultural conservatism," "fusionism," "economic libertarianism," "neo-conservatism," "new right," and "active conservatism in national politics."

Krason compares Catholicism with American liberalism and conservatism in their *general philosophy of politics and government* (defined in terms of the following five areas: "the general purposes of government," "God, religion, and the natural law as the basis of the political order," "thinking about freedom," "thinking about equality," and "view of communism") and *specific public policy proposals* (defined in terms of the following six sets of issue areas: "economic and social welfare policy," "agriculture and environment," "civil rights and civil liberties," "education," "foreign policy," and "defense and disarmament"). Representative writers were used to determine the philosophical underpinnings of the "old liberalism," the "new liberalism" and of conservatism. Representative presidential platforms of the Democratic and Republican parties were used to exemplify the policy formations of the "old liberalism" the "new liberalism" and of conservatism with the policy positions of two national organizations, the liberal-oriented Americans for Democratic Action and the conservative-oriented American Conservative Union, being used to "check" the authenticity of the liberalness and conservativeness of, respectively, the Democratic and Republican party platforms.

Regarding the analysis of which of the three *philosophies* is closest overall to the Church's teaching, Krason concludes that:

When we bring these five areas together, it is clear that neither conservatism nor liberalism in either of its post-World War II periods conforms fully to Church teaching. It is apparent...that conservatism comes closest, the old liberalism is next (though not far behind), and the new liberalism is least in accord with her teaching (p. 243).

Regarding the analysis of which of the three groups of *policy proposals* is closest to the Church, Krason concludes that:

Taken together...the old liberalism...must be judged to be most in conformity with the

Church. Conservatism...is next closest to the Church (not too far behind the old liberalism). The new liberalism is third, fairly far back. Again, it must be pointed out that none...conforms fully to the Church; each is wanting in some key areas (pp. 247-248).

In his *overall* general conclusion, Krason states that: When we put the two categories of our analysis together—1) the general philosophy of politics and government and 2) the issue areas—we find conservatism to be first, barely ahead of the old liberalism. The new liberalism is a distant third, by far the farthest from the Church (p. 248).

Given that neither the conservatism embodied in today's Republican Party or the new liberalism that holds a monopoly in the contemporary Democratic Party fully corresponds to the teaching of the Church, the question arises as to the proper nature of Catholic participation in the American political system. Krason explores both the merits and limitations of forming a third, i.e., Christian Democratic, political party as well as continuing to work within the major parties, especially the Republican. But the author stressed that "we...should not be sanguine about the possibility of a Catholic bloc in the American electorate asserting its influence to get public policy on social questions to conform more closely with Catholic teaching...(given that)...so many dissent in belief and practice" (p. 258). For Krason, "this analysis suggests that to promote a social order based on the teaching of the Church and on natural law, Catholics will have to re-evangelize their own people as well as reach out to other Christians" (p. 258). By implication at least, Krason is informing us that talk of a "Catholic moment" in contemporary American religious, cultural, and political life is premature; American Catholics must roll up their sleeves and start the painful process of putting the pieces of their religion back together again given the post-Vatican II debacle.

This volume would make an excellent textbook for a course on the American political system or on Catholic social thought in the American context. All Catholic scholars and libraries should purchase it.

Joseph A. Varacalli, Ph.D.

***Lay Ministry: A Theological, Spiritual and Pastoral Handbook*, by William J. Rademacher, Crossroads, New York, 1991, 274 pp., \$14.95.**

Within the larger context of enabling and encouraging lay ministers in the Church today, William J. Rademacher identifies some of the advantages and problems associated with a collaborative model of ministry.

When he expresses his vision for the future of ministry in the Church, however, he bogs down in error and confusion, especially with regard to the ordained priesthood.

Collaborative ministry "is not a solution to the clergy shortage," writes Rademacher, an associate professor of theology and director of the pastoral ministry program at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh.

But the concern over vocations might be a "blessed occasion for rediscovering the collaborative principle that is part of the very nature of the church," he adds.

Rademacher names eight "biblical/theological foundations" for shared ministry. Among them: the Christian community of essentially a sharing community, which naturally fosters shared ministry; the Pauline image of the body of Christ; the empowerment of the sacraments of initiation to "co-discipleship" and a sharing in the priesthood of Christ.

He also sees hopeful signs in the modern church of a gradual development of "pastoral collegiality" – his term for an extension to all believers of the collegiality that the Second Vatican Council applied to bishops, a model for which he infers support from scripture.

Current sociological and historical conditions also point to a need for greater collaboration in ministry as well as in consultation, he claims.

"Sociologists today compile impressive data showing that Catholics conditioned by democracy and modern management systems expect to have a significant voice in the decisions that directly affect them," says Rademacher. "Paternalistic and authoritarian models, therefore, are ineffective in today's Catholic culture."

But while a "team ministry" approach has some advantages – above all, a more efficient use of the various ministries involved – there is also a downside

to such a collaborative model, he says. Lack of an ultimate authority can lead to confusion; seemingly endless consultative processes may convey indecisiveness or ineffectiveness; team members might not challenge or criticize one another or hold themselves accountable to the people they serve.

Citing another author, Rademacher refers to "confusion in contemporary theology" – a phrase that is often redundant – as a particularly acute obstacle to shared ministry:

"With the emergence of different models of church and parish, it is not easy for the team to reach a consensus on a specific model that translates smoothly into pastoral practice. As a result, pastoral planning can be filled with conflict. The team's energy, instead of becoming focused on common goals, gets diffused by unnecessary infighting."

Charging some priests with an enduring clericalism that resents lay invasion of their ministerial turf, the author endorses the notion that eucharistic "presiders" and other parish leaders should be chosen by the community from among its own ranks and "ordained" for service in that community – a proposal that springs from a "new theology of orders" he advances elsewhere in the text.

This new theology, which he asserts was the norm in the church prior to the Council of Trent, defines ordination more broadly to encompass "a variety of nonclerical ordinations" that "confirm and celebrate that a Christian has been prepared and approved for public ministry in the church."

These ordinations, he continues, would "have a sacramental character" but would not be equated with the sacrament of Holy Orders.

Rademacher does an adequate job defining some of the positive and negative elements of the collaborative model of ministry. His treatment of the empowerment to ministry through the sacraments of initiation and the universal call to holiness likewise merit mention. And his early chapters on the history of ministry in the church are interesting, although there are many convenient interpretations and his slanted view is very much in evidence.

But some of his proposed solutions to contemporary ministerial questions would create far more problems than they can solve – which means they are not solutions at all.

Particularly problematic are his attempts to make an end-run around the Church's teachings on Holy Orders. His brisk jog alongside the theologian Edward Schillebeeckx in suggesting that individual communities could legitimately call forth persons of either gender to celebrate the Eucharist is followed by the whimsy that the Church would eventually ratify such a practice. His proposed redefinition of ordination, too, is a transparent attempt to dilute the unique ministerial role of the priest and blur the distinct functions of clerical and lay leaders. In short, in some instances he confuses collaboration with ecclesiastical coup d'etat.

Conspicuously absent from his 274-page text is any suggestion that the laity are responsible for encouraging qualified men to consider a vocation to the priesthood.

*Gerald Korson
Editor, The Montana Catholic
Helena, Montana*

Mind Your Metaphors, by Maureen Aggeler, RSCJ, Paulist, Mahwah, NJ, 1991, 149 pp.

If the title of this book evokes a vaguely comic image of a schoolmarm's finger-shaking warning ("mind your manners," "mind your p's and q's," "mind you, wear your rubbers"), the subtitle, "A Critique of Language in the Bishops' Pastoral Letters on the Role of Women" dashes any hope that this book will be any more intentionally humorous than others among the dense forest of feminist tracts.

Sister Maureen aims to show that the language used by several American bishops in their pastoral letters on "women's issues" in recent years demonstrates the beginnings of a "paradigm shift" in attitudes which, she hopes, will lead to a "breakthrough in perceptions," a "transformation of consciousness" and a new "non-hierarchical model of church," etc., etc. She selects examples from the pastoral letters of a dozen bishops: Archbishops Weakland (1982), Borders (1977), Hunthausen (1980), Gerety (1981) and Mahoney (1987); Bishops Matthew Clark (1982), Charles Buswell (1975), Victor Balke and Raymond Lucker (1981), Leo Maher (1974), John Cummins (1981) and Carroll Dozier (1975).

(Bishop Dozier, Sister solemnly proclaims, is "the prime metaphorist among the bishops who wrote pastorals on women in the church." [p. 50]).

For the most part Sister Maureen's opus reads like the self-consciously pedantic efforts of a candidate for a Master's Degree in "women's studies". Here is one example, gleaned at random from the text:

"Dozier's effort to describe women's new consciousness results in three metaphors... He says that women are 'a live issue today in the international consciousness' and 'women's awakening is indeed as global as inflation.' He writes that 'for the woman, the narrow institutions of the past seem more dispensable than ever, because woman has discovered her sister. Their mutual embrace reaches around the world: it is feminist, reverential, even ecclesial.' This trio of metaphorical expressions seeks to disrupt the readers' epistemic world so that previous understandings have to be revised. By drawing the reader into paradox, the bishop invites a new perception of a complex world where rigid categories no longer hold. The metaphors indicate that Dozier was extraordinarily conscious of the impact of the women's movement on society as well as the Church and desirous of communicating his insight. However he did not connect the impact with the need for social reconstruction.

"Other metaphors show a concern for problem-solving. The statement 'Equality needs to be nourished by new models of participation' [Minnesota bishops] suggests that the principle of equality needs to be strengthened. It further implies that 'new models' can be accommodated within the present structure of Church. No hint of changing it occurs. Similarly, the assertion that 'in our time the Church clearly desires that women should become aware of the greatness of their mission and take their equal, if sometimes different place alongside their brothers in Christ' [Gerety] reflects a grasp of women's desire for equality, but it seems to arise from the hope of accommodating women in the existing system...Mahony's phrase, 'we need to recover a greater sense of men and women working collaboratively, side by side', offers a variation on this theme. His

metaphor suggests there was a previous relationship of collaboration and offers a similar 'side by side' image of the sexes working together in the future" [pp. 112, 113].

But does Sister Maureen accomplish her objective in showing a sea change in the bishops' views? Well, yes and no. First off, she acknowledges that most of the pastoral letters were actually written by women (hence, of course, the language used was not directly that of the bishops); however, she points out that the bishops, after all, issued them, so they presumably approved the way they were written. Granted. But are these letters representative of the views of the American bishops collectively, or only of the twelve who issued them? Sister's optimism on this score would seem less well founded. If it appears evident from the quotations she includes that most of the bishops who issued these pastoral letters (she seems to regard Bishop Maher as an exception) have been heavily influenced by the standard feminist analysis, or are, in fact, (as Bishop Clark has said of himself) 'converts' to feminism, it is surely statistically significant that in seventeen years such a few out of more than two hundred bishop-ordinaries who might have done so have felt compelled to issue such statements. (Apparently the 'pastoral statement' of Bishop Howard Hubbard of Albany, dated October 4, 1990, was issued too late for inclusion in the book.)

That is not, however, to say that the effect of feminists (including feminist bishops) is insignificant. Their influence within the Church far outstrips their number, pervading parishes, classrooms, chancery offices, Catholic publishing – even the Bishops' Conference itself. Furthermore, Sister Maureen correctly understands the principle of *lex orandi, lex credendi*; that is, the way we speak about something deeply affects what we believe about it. The promoters of feminist language, for example, encountered no effective impediment to the accomplishment of most of their goals at the NCCB meeting last November. Feminism and its grim consequences remain, arguably, the most serious threat authentic Catholicism has encountered in our time. The damage has been profound. And the ordeal is far from over.

Helen Hull Hitchcock

***Medicine and Christian Morality*, by Thomas J. O'Donnell, S.J. Revised Edition, Alba House, 329 pp., \$16.95.**

How good it is to read a book outlining the principles of medical ethics which adhere to solid Catholic teaching. *Medicine and Christian Morality* is such a book. Those who are involved in the health care field be he/she physician, nurse, administrator, pastoral care worker, interested layman, theologian or philosopher will find this volume written by Fr. Thomas J. O'Donnell a veritable treasure. This volume is an updated version of his original *Medicine and Christian Morality* published in 1976. This effort by this distinguished moral theologian is completely new and up-to-date. The vast progress made in medical fields in the last thirty years has created new medico-moral questions and they are discussed at length in this book. This unprecedented explosion in medicine has been accompanied by a burgeoning literature in bioethics. We have witnessed the proliferation of hospital ethics committees, the creation of bioethical centers, the sponsorship of many seminars and symposia on medical ethics and the intense interest of professional medical bodies in this once dormant field. Medical personnel, governmental bodies, legislatures and congress itself have an insatiable appetite for answers to medico-moral dilemmas. This deep interest for answers has not been satisfied, in my opinion, because there is no unanimity on underlying principles guiding human conduct. From the Catholic point of view, these principles are clearly outlined and applied in concrete fashion in this volume. This volume is a reliable guide for all people of good will who wish to adhere to the rule of human conduct which upholds the dignity and sacredness of human life. While this present generation has been subjected to the confusing cacophony of dissident moral theologians for the past twenty-five years, the reader will see none of this in O'Donnell's *Medicine and Christian Morality*. It comes as a relief to see erroneous and dissident opinions given short shrift in these pages. It is with enthusiasm that we recommend this book to the public who are looking for answers in these confusing times in medicine.

*John P. Mullooly, M.D.
Editor
Linacre Quarterly*

Books in Brief

Ignatius Press

Adrienne Von Speyr, *John: Birth of the Church*, (443 pp., \$24.95).

Reflections on the Fourth Gospel and the roles of Peter and John in the early Church – as office and love.

Joseph Pieper, *Guide to St. Thomas*, (182 pp., \$11.95).

An introduction to the thought of the Angelic Doctor.

Alba House

Jan G. Bovenmars, M.S.C., *A Biblical Spirituality of the Heart*, (205 pp., \$12.95).

A biblical basis for Devotion to the Sacred Heart by a Dutch missionary theologian.

Michele T. Gallagher, *Honey From the Rock: Reflections on the Eucharist and the Liturgical Year*, (96 pp., \$4.95).

Colman E. O'Neill, O.P. and Ramanus Cessario, O.P., *Meeting Christ in the Sacraments*, (320 pp., \$16.95).

Classical Sacramental Theology updated in Vatican II terms.

Brendan Byrne, S.J., *Inheriting the Earth: The Pauline Basis of a Spirituality in Our Time*, (100 pp., \$5.95).

Patrick J. Hammell, *Handbook on Patrology*, (170 pp., \$6.95).

A concise guide to Church Fathers.

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

Edmund C. Lane, S.S.P., *Do Not Be Afraid, I Am With You*, (52 pp., \$2.50).

Helpful meditations and prayers for those confined in any way.

Lucy Fuchs, *Gifts and Giving*, (116 pp., \$6.95).

Do's and Don'ts about giving.

Charles J. Healy, S.J., *A New Song to the Lord*, (82 pp., \$5.95).

A book on conversion of soul.

Catherine M. Meade, C.S.J., *My Nature is Fire: Catherine of Siena*, (192 pp., \$12.50).

The world of a saint and her story.

Fr. Anthony Zimmerman, *Original Sin: Where Doctrine Meets Science*, (Vantage Press, New York, \$16.95).

This book combines loyalty to the Magisterium with bold and innovating theories. A moderate evolutionist, the author sets the outside date for the appearance of humanlike creatures at some 2 million years ago and the time of Adam's creation at about 200,000 B.C. Some of the book's most fascinating pages speculate on the lessons the Creator taught the first human beings at the beginning of mankind. They are vaguely reminiscent of the anthropomorphic acts of God in Genesis 2 and 3.