

On the Catholic University

Ralph McInerny

ONE OF THE most surprising reactions to *Ex corde ecclesiae* on the part of university administrators has been the suggestion that the Pope has pretty well described the happy situation now obtaining in Catholic institutions of higher learning. The item most often singled out for comment was the need for there to be a greater percentage of Catholics than non-Catholics on the faculty.

Over the past year a Conversation on the Catholic Character of Notre Dame has been going on in my university, a conversation initiated, not by the administration, but by several faculty members, two of them members of the Congregation of the Holy Cross and one a Calvinist. The conversation amounts to an existential rejection of the administration view that everything is hunky-dory.

The conversation is necessary, not because there are Protestants, Jews and non-believers on the faculty, but because of the radical confusion among Catholic professors. Nowhere is the post-conciliar confusion more evident than on campuses, but of course the Catholic campus was one of the principal launching pads of defiance of and dissent from the teaching authority of the Church.

If one can go on claiming to be a Catholic after calling into question defined dogmas of the Church—not discussing them but suggesting they are products of an earlier surpassed mentality and must be replaced—Catholic identity, to say the least, is obscured. If Catholic universities have provided a home for this sort of dissident theology, their right to the adjective is called into question.

Perhaps it is not surprising that those who see everyone as anonymous Christians can give us no clear guidelines on how one can stop being a Catholic.

There are Catholic professors who resent the suggestion that anyone could tell them whether or not they are Catholics or decide whether or not an institution deserves to be called Catholic. The individual will decide what is required in the first case and the faculty in the second.

In short, there has been the widespread adoption by Catholics of the Protestant Principle.

The academic freedom which is so often invoked as an obstacle to a serious university's being Catholic is a secularized

(continued on page 2)

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

VOLUME 16, NUMBER 3

JUNE 1993

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL: The Catholic University	1
ARTICLES:	
Do We Need Catholic Universities?	2
Intellectual or Moral Failure?	6
The Core Curriculum and Free Inquiry at the University of Dallas	8
Remarks on the Christian Humanism of a Catholic University	11
AROUND THE CHURCH	
IN THE '90s	16
PRESIDENTIAL PAPERS:	
From the Heart of the Church	18
What Is Catholic About A College Degree?	20
Authority and the Academy	21
SPECIAL FEATURE:	
Catholic University Presidents and the 10 Commandments	25
OF INTEREST	36
FYI TO FCS MEMBERS	37
FCS NEWS	42
REVIEW ESSAY:	
The Truth About Women	46
BOOK REVIEWS	50
BOOKS RECEIVED	54

(continued from page 1)

version of the Protestant Principle.

In either form, it leads to incoherence.

If each individual gets to decide what it is Christ taught, and indeed who He is, Christianity becomes the sum total of contradictory claims. Catholicism is unintelligible apart from the belief that there is an authoritative adjudicator of such conflicts. We have not been left orphans.

Academic freedom, when it is invoked against any "outside interference" in the work of the university, invokes an image of the university which is not instantiated anywhere, because it could not be. Robert Sasseen, in his article, makes some obvious points about the way the university fits into the wider society such that there are inevitable and reasonable restrictions on its activity 'from outside'.

Where the faith is concerned, it is palpable nonsense to suggest that individuals, or groups of individuals, in the name of academic freedom, can play fast and loose with defined doctrine. He who says what the Church teaches can scarcely be surprised if the teaching Church has something to say about his statements. If they are taken to be doubtfully consistent with the Magisterium or if they are in outright conflict with it, it is Pickwickian to suggest that they can go on being taught as Catholic doctrine.

To do so is to fuse the Protestant Principle and its secularized version in *soi-disant* academic freedom. In this version, academic freedom becomes indistinguishable from the most libertarian notion of free speech. But there are academic analogues of shouting "Fire!" in a crowded theater. ✠

ARTICLES

Do We Need Catholic Universities?

Ernest L. Fortin

*Department of Theology
Boston College*

FOR BETTER OR FOR WORSE, the defining moment in the history of American Catholic higher education came with the publication of John Tracy Ellis's celebrated article, "American Catholics and the Intellectual Life," in the October, 1955, issue of *Thought*. I say "for better or for worse" because, in retrospect, it is not clear that the changes for which Ellis was calling are the ones we most need at the present moment.

Ellis's thesis was that Catholic universities lagged far behind their secular counterparts and had a lot of catching up to do if they were to es-

tablish themselves as major players on the intellectual scene. There were good reasons for this. None of our universities was very old, the majority of their students were of immigrant peasant stock among whom higher education was a rarity, and subtly applied quotas had long kept most Catholics out of the best non-Catholic universities. Formidable obstacles indeed, against which, despite its rapid growth, the Catholic community had yet to make much headway.

To say that Ellis's article touched a nerve would be an egregious understatement. For months, it was a prime topic of conversation at faculty gatherings on Catholic campuses everywhere. Yet there was something oddly anachronistic about it. Its statistics were gleaned from studies that often dated back a few years and reflected a situation very different from the one that began to emerge shortly after the end of World War II. By the mid-fifties the picture was still not very rosy, but neither was it as bleak as Ellis's bookish account would have us believe. Even the minuscule, all but invisible college at which I had just been hired to teach was winning its share of national fellowships and having a surprisingly large

number of its graduates admitted to the Yales and Harvards for their advanced degrees.

There was another conspicuous flaw in Ellis's article, this one having to do with the yardstick by which the author had chosen to measure the performance of Catholic universities. These were deemed inferior because they failed to live up not to their own standards but to the external standards of the modern research university, to which the Humboldt reform had given birth in Germany a century earlier and which the great American universities had been frantically striving to emulate since the beginning of this century. They were less well endowed, lacked adequate research facilities, received less support from outside sources, produced fewer Ph.D.'s, and contributed little to the advancement of science. The article said next to nothing about the kind of education that Catholic schools were attempting to provide versus that of the secular institutions to which they were being compared.

If I mention Ellis's article, it is not because it is solely responsible for the subsequent evolution of Catholic higher education but because it implicitly drew attention to a problem that had been festering beneath the surface of Catholic academic life for half a century or more, viz., the long-deferred but inevitable confrontation between Catholicism and the modern world. The irony in the story, as has often been noted, is that Ellis's stinging indictment came at a time when the secular universities that so impressed him were about to enter a period of crisis from which they have been trying to recover ever since.

In support of his general thesis, Ellis cited a remark once made to a group of Catholic educators by the legendary Robert Maynard Hutchins to the effect that Catholics had "imitated the worst fea-

The article said next to nothing about the kind of education that Catholic schools were attempting to provide versus that of the secular institutions to which they were being compared.

tures of secular education and ignored most of the good ones." Ellis's use of this statement shows only how little he had understood it. Hutchins had no intention of holding up secular education as a model to be imitated; he was merely warning his Catholic audience that they were in danger of selling their own heritage for a mess of pottage. As president of one of America's premier research universities—the home of Enrico Fermi, James Franck, and I do not know how many other Nobel laureates—he himself recognized

the importance of scientific research and supported it wholeheartedly. His own project was nonetheless quite different. It harked back to an earlier age and evinced a deep concern about the fractionalization of knowledge that the new university endorsed as the condition of scientific progress. Whatever else it might be, Hutchins thought, a university was first and foremost a place where the old Socratic question of the good life could be addressed squarely and subjected to rigorous scrutiny in the light of what the greatest minds had said about it. This explains his interest in the books that deal thematically with it and are best able to illuminate it, the Great Books, as they are now pompously called. It also explains his respect for the twin disciplines of philosophy and theology, once the centerpieces of the university curriculum and, as synoptic disciplines, the only ones capable of showing how the parts of that curriculum are related to one another and to the whole.

Hutchins's vision had a noticeable impact on a good number of Catholic colleges in this country, particularly the smaller ones. It showed them how they might be able to broaden themselves in a manner consistent with their own principles. It confirmed them in their attachment to Thomas Aquinas and his philosophic mentor, Aristotle. Above all, it helped them shake off the remnants

of an archaism that the neo-Thomistic movement had inherited from its romantic origins and of which it had never fully succeeded in divesting itself. Hutchins's subterranean influence still persists in a few of these schools. I, for one, like nothing more than to see their graduates show up in my classes once in a while. They are generally well ahead of the pack and have a lot less "un-learning" to do before they can settle into their new programs.

The same cannot be said of our larger and wealthier universities, many of which have been busy aping the features of secular education that most troubled the reform-minded Hutchins. By and large, philosophy and theology have been stripped of their status as architectonic disciplines and survive, if they survive at all, as parts of a democratic arrangement within which the quest for first principles and the unity of knowledge are dismissed not only as irrelevant but as inimical to modern egalitarian ideals. The Great Books have not fared much better. A syllabus from a well-known school that I happened to glance at recently did not list a single book that was more than three years old, even though the course was billed as a general introduction to moral theology. Needless to say, what passes for a great book today is a far cry from what Hutchins had in mind. The "canon," as it is derisively called and about which we have been hearing so much lately, has been expanded in such a way as to include a host of newcomers whose merit lies mainly in their being just that—newcomers.

Equally characteristic of the new trend is the "objective," "detached," or "scientific" spirit in which theology and philosophy are approached. The existential questions are either bypassed altogether or relegated to some undefinable realm of feeling, to be dealt with elsewhere, preferably in a nonacademic setting. Value-neutrality is the order of the day and the touchstone of one's integrity as a scholar. As often as not, students are told to "make up their own minds" about all important questions. Any attempt to teach in the old sense

of the word is branded a form of indoctrination and denounced on those grounds.

It would nevertheless be unfair to say that our new university is not governed by any overarching principle. Consciously or unconsciously, it subscribes to at least one such principle, viz., the relativity of all human horizons of meaning and value. The point was brought home to me not long ago by an administrator who proudly announced that his college's newly established "substance-free" dorm had been a total success. The fifty-odd students who opted for it had been fully "accepted" by the rest of the community. No one had tried to make fun of them. In a fit of perverse curiosity, I inquired whether anybody had expressed admiration for them. Receiving no answer, I reluctantly came to the conclusion that these broadminded students were well on their way to becoming dogmatic relativists. They "accepted" their substance-free fellows in the same way that they will soon be "accepting" the campus gay-lesbian club, if they have not done so already. The "orthodoxy" to which they are committed is that one can do whatever one chooses provided no one else is hurt by it. Have sex any way you like, but don't smoke while doing it. A strange orthodoxy, no doubt, but like all orthodoxies nowadays, it binds everyone under pain of ostracism, the harshest penalty that can be inflicted on young students.

The foregoing account may sound like a caricature of what is going on in our Catholic universities, but the frequency with which the pattern is repeated suggests otherwise. Two newer and seemingly innocuous developments are there to remind us that all is not well in the state of our educational affairs.

One is the emphasis on advisement, now a veritable campus industry requiring an enormous investment of time, energy, and money on the part of both administration and faculty. Advisement had hitherto been closely linked to what went on in the classroom, where courses dealing with questions of more than purely academic in-

terest were taught and where healthy relationships between professor and student were forged as a matter of course. Informal contacts outside the classroom were taken for granted and considered an indispensable part of student life. Much of this has gone by the board. What we have instead are formal advisement sessions in which a group of students who are total strangers to one another are assigned to individual faculty members who have never met them, know nothing about them, and spend no more than a few minutes with each of them once or twice a year at registration time. The whole system is about as effective as a bandaid on a wooden leg. Maybe we

need it, but to say that we do is to admit that real advisement is in trouble, something of an endangered species for the protection of which extraordinary means must be used.

The second development is a fixation on what is now euphemistically called "cultural diversity," along with the decision to institutionalize it by making it a "core" requirement—as if cultural diversity were a discipline on a par with other bona fide academic disciplines, as if it could be "taught," or as if a one-semester course in Mahayana Buddhism was likely to effect a significant change in anybody. What students mostly find in such courses is what they bring to them, namely, their own unconscious and typically Western prejudices. However far and wide our modern-day Columboes may travel in search of new continents, they never seem to discover anything but Genoa. I much prefer to see the few students who are capable of it immerse themselves in some great author and learn to see the world through *his* eyes for a change. This and only this will rid them of their provincialism and give them an intimation of the differences that separate hu-

Their courses correspond less to the needs of the students than to their own academic interests, and in all but the rarest of cases the subject matter is approached from a religiously and metaphysically neutral standpoint that supposedly guarantees their objectivity.

man beings. As matters stand, very few of them ever live with a good book long enough to find out what a true alternative to their own way of thinking might be and thus learn something of importance about themselves.

Why is it that the bulk of the education provided at such great cost to both graduates and undergraduates by our best schools is so often perceived by the students themselves as anemic and antiseptic to the nth degree? The reason, I suspect, is that most of faculty members are themselves products of the modern research university and imbued with its peculiar ethos. Being very bright for the most part, they realize they

will be promoted or otherwise rewarded on the basis of their scholarly achievements and are more likely to identify with their professional guild than with the school that pays their salaries. They are academic "free agents," ready to move whenever a better offer comes along. Their courses correspond less to the needs of the students than to their own academic interests, and in all but the rarest of cases the subject matter is approached from a religiously and metaphysically neutral standpoint that supposedly guarantees their objectivity. They could teach the same courses anywhere to almost anybody. Little of what they have to say touches the hearts of the students or is apt to have the slightest effect on the way they live.

Do not misunderstand me. The Catholic Church needs theological and historical research to sustain its intellectual life, and the collapse of so many of the great European institutes where this research used to be carried out is a calamity of the first magnitude, one of the tragedies of twentieth-century Catholic life. All I am saying is that this type of scholarly work is not a substitute for the

education that many dedicated Catholic students are demanding and to which they are entitled. One wonders what the Catholic individuals and foundations who have been contributing handsomely to the support of this work would think if they knew how their money is being spent.

Catholic institutions are materially better off today than they were when Ellis dropped his bomb and they have vastly superior intellectual resources at their disposal. Of even greater significance to their life and work than the spectacular advances of modern science is the fresh understanding that we now have of classical philosophy, made available to us by the most brilliant minds of our century, and therewith of the creative use to which that philosophy was put by the luminaries

of the Christian tradition. These are the issues that today's Catholic universities would do well to explore, instead of consuming themselves in endless efforts to circumvent the regulations Rome would like to impose on them or in stillborn disputes between "liberals" and "conservatives" that remind me of nothing so much as the silly quarrel between the apothecary Homais and the abbé Bournisien in Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*, the worst of the new locked in bitter combat with the worst of the old. The opportunity is there, perhaps for the first time in the modern period. It remains to be seen whether enough Catholic educators will recognize it and find within themselves the courage and the imagination needed to exploit it. ✠

Intellectual or Moral Failure?

Jude Dougherty
School of Philosophy
The Catholic University of America

MENACHEM KELLNER begins his book *Maimonides on Judaism* with this observation: "That Jews are distinct from Gentiles is an axiom of Jewish faith and a lesson of Jewish history."

Would that Catholics everywhere recognized the distinctive character of their own witness. At a time when the dominant secular philosophy has led in the practical order to cultural catastrophe the need for Catholic witness is particularly acute. Gilson once remarked, "The trouble with us Catholics is that we are not proud enough of the faith." Why should that be the case? Once in the distant past when St. John Chrysostom sought an empirical proof for the existence of God, he found it in the splendor of the Church. The evidence

which he found compelling came from the fact that the Church in its teaching appealed to noble and low, rich and poor, learned and not, and had by that teaching in a brief span succeeded in transforming the lives of individuals and nations for the better. An institution which produced such good effects, reasoned Chrysostom, could only have a divine origin. How many would be willing to embrace those same premises today?

An "ecumenical" openness to anything and everything, as if there were not truth to be defended against its denial, has led to the disintegration of a distinctive Catholic culture, and the irrelevancy of Catholic witness. Various sociological and psychological explanations are offered, the most prominent being that of the immigrant's drive for acceptance. This psychological explanation may have some merit, but the failure may be primarily intellectual, secondarily moral. To defend something even "unto death" requires first the intellectual awareness that the something is worth the ultimate sacrifice. The moral virtue of courage is necessarily grounded in a prior cognitive act. The valuable has to be recognized and sufficiently cherished before its defense follows.

It is an oft invoked principle of logic that a

thing is sometimes best defined in terms of its intelligible opposite. The worth of the Catholic outlook, call it "insight," "intuition," or "*Weltanschauung*," is easily grasped when viewed against its alternatives. Unfortunately many of the present generation, churchmen and laymen alike, remain ill informed with respect to the "intelligible opposite." Among those who cherish the faith, who has not been chagrined by the action of Catholics who should know better, ecclesiastics, theologians and journalists, fawning over persons who throughout their lives were bitter enemies of the faith. Examples could be multiplied. Personally, I have witnessed more than one reader of Dewey's *A Common Faith*, put down that brief volume without realizing that Dewey was an acknowledged atheist. In a similar vein, I once served on a doctoral dissertation committee where the dissertation in question purported to examine the theology of a thoroughgoing materialist, a prominent American scholar who did not believe in God, but nevertheless used the language of Christianity in discussing his metaphysical ultimates. Both the Ph.D. candidate and his mentors were insufficiently informed to recognize the author's duplicity. Their failure to understand was largely an intellectual failure though not exclusively. I say not exclusively, because one could detect in those academicians a common ecumenical impulse to bring everyone into the fold, unwittingly providing an example of good will driving out good sense. In this instance the damage did not stop with the theoretical, for those involved innocently embraced the practical consequences of the doctrine delineated. The purely materialistic origins of the social gospel advanced were not recognized.

I said that the primary failure is intellectual. It is perhaps a twofold intellectual failure, the failure to

"notice" and the failure to probe metaphysically. To be a player in the intellectual world one must be informed. Experience alone is not enough. One must recognize, either with the aid of historical knowledge or with the aid of imagination (one should never wait upon experience as a teacher), the practical consequences of theoretical positions. A right estimate of absent values must be mediated by appropriate signs. The necessity is distinctively Catholic, because the faith forces one to draw upon the classical sources which animated the Fathers and upon the texts which they produced and which have been commented upon in every age since. Modernity is largely a rejection both of classical learning and of the faith. To be *au courant* is in some sense to have abandoned the time-transcendent. Adherence to ancient truths may set one uncomfortably apart. By contrast, those among my peers who sought contemporary respectability usually became one of the crowd and subsequently disappeared. Similarly, departments of philosophy that abandoned the tradition by cutting themselves loose from their classical and medieval roots became second or third-rate manifestations of the secular departments they sought to emulate. An overemphasis on momentary good

relations ignored the value of the transcendent.

Gilson's question needs to be put: "Do we value the Catholic faith or do we not?" If we do, certain things are prescribed. Christopher Dawson saw this clearly. With ample evidence he maintained that the secular leviathan is vulnerable only at its brain. Fearing that the secular state school, which he regarded as the instrument of the Enlightenment, would undercut an appreciation of the Catholic tradition, he advocated an historical approach to the sources of Catholic thought. Not unlike Dawson,

**The necessity is
distinctively Catholic,
because the faith
forces one to draw
upon the classical
sources which
animated the Fathers
and upon the texts
which they produced
and which have been
commented upon in
every age since.**

Karl Löwith, in an attempt to understand the turning point of Western civilization, reminds us that the vanishing of Christianity within the European world is a direct result of the 19th century critical movement. "Philosophical criticism of the Christian religion," he writes, "began in the 19th century with Hegel and reached its climax with Nietzsche. It is a Protestant movement, and therefore specifically German; this holds true of both the criticism and the religion at which it was directed. Our critical philosophers were all theologically educated Protestants, and their criticism of Christianity presupposes its Protestant manifestation." Catholic intellectuals should take note.

Surely it is the primary purpose of Catholic colleges and universities to produce Catholic intellectuals. That aim requires a distinctive type of training. To fully appreciate Jerusalem one needs the vantage point of Athens, and Rome, and medieval

Paris. Concretely, one cannot within the academy be indifferent to the curriculum. Second-order disciplines and second-tier authors cannot be allowed to drive out the study of primary texts. Many have witnessed the erosion of the traditional Catholic curriculum as college and university administrators have stood by while the trashing occurred, or preferred arbitration rather than the defense. The vice is not peculiarly Catholic. The same weakness, intellectual and moral, is found in those secular Universities which have become politically correct and in other ways have abandoned their founding charters.

One can hope that the trend is not irreversible, that there is a generation of young Catholic scholars waiting in the wings, scholars whatever their calling who are steeped in theology, philosophy, history and literature, who are willing to accept the challenge to perpetuate a valuable inheritance. ✠

The Core Curriculum and Free Inquiry at the University of Dallas

Lance Simmons
Department of Philosophy
University of Dallas

THE STATEMENT OF PURPOSE in its current general bulletin declares that the University of Dallas is "dedicated to the renewal of the Western heritage of liberal education and to the recovery of the Christian intellectual tradition." This dedication is evident at several levels: in the undergraduate education the University provides, in its graduate programs,

and in its faculty. At the undergraduate level, students are introduced to "a substantial core curriculum and major study in the arts and sciences proper to liberal learning." At the graduate level, the Institute of Philosophic Studies "aims to recall the academic disciplines to their first principles and to maintain graduate study upon its natural foundation in the love of beauty, truth, and the good." Finally, the University seeks faculty "animated by the love of wisdom and dedicated to the quest for truth and excellence in themselves and in their students."

One consequence of this dedication to renewal and recovery is that undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty spend much of their time reading and discussing the central texts of the classical Western tradition. They read Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Anselm, Aquinas, Descartes, Kant, Hegel, Heidegger and Nietzsche. They read Homer, Virgil, Greek tragedy and comedy, Dante, Shakespeare and Samuel Beckett. They read Plutarch, Maimonides, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, the Federalist Papers,

Tocqueville and Marx. They read the Bible and the documents of Vatican II.

At first glance, this curriculum might seem inimical to academic freedom. Students and faculty are constrained in their reflections by the University's commitment to a core. This removes their freedom to follow their inquiries *wherever* they lead. After all, one might argue, free inquiry may well lead one *away* from the core texts! Establishing a substantial core thus seems to be at odds with the ideal of a University as a place where many rival viewpoints are incarnated. This tension is not lessened by the fact that students and faculty read authors such as Foucault and Derrida, who challenge the very idea of a core, for such anti-core texts are always read from within the context of a core, as external challenges to the core. How then can U.D. claim to have academic freedom?

Although there may be something to be said for this argument, it is important to make clear one sense in which it is *not* valid. It is *not* the case that at the University of Dallas core texts are subjected to monolithic, ideologically-charged readings. There is much lively dispute here concerning almost every text in the core. Some texts are studied in several different departments. For example, the Bible, Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Aquinas, Dante, Descartes, Kant, and Nietzsche are all routinely studied in more than one department. Different disciplines and individuals approach these texts in different ways, and this engenders a campus atmosphere of healthy intellectual friction between rival interpretations. Conflict of this sort shows that commitment to a core need not undermine academic freedom in the sense of imposing narrow ideological interpretations on faculty and students. Rather, the Western heritage is renewed and the Christian tradition recovered

precisely through the living dialogue which transpires as members of the University develop and defend rival interpretations of the core.

It might nonetheless be argued that a core undermines academic freedom because it suppresses minority voices that are not in the core. An institution lacks academic freedom to the extent that its students are not free to hear those minority voices and its faculty are not free to engage those voices in their research except under the guise of an encounter with the Western tradition. There are many voices to be heard, and few of them can easily be put into direct contact with the traditional curriculum and concerns of the Christian West. True academic freedom, it could be argued, requires a proliferation of different cores, many of which would speak past rather than to one another. Another name for this conception of academic freedom is multiculturalism.

I believe there is something fundamentally right about multiculturalism, but I also believe that institutions committed to substantial core curricula (whether Western or non-Western) are better situated than other institutions to recognize the truth in multiculturalism. A colleague in Politics is fond of saying that he practices *true* multiculturalism! By this he means that when he begins to

Rather, the Western heritage is renewed and the Christian tradition recovered precisely through the living dialogue which transpires as members of the University develop and defend rival interpretations of the core.

read, say, Herodotus, the first thing that strikes him is the sheer *distance* between them. So much has transpired between then and now, both historically and conceptually, that it has become a significant achievement merely to reconstitute some semblance of the original significance of the text. This goal cannot readily be achieved for several different traditions within a single institutional framework, at least not as academic institutions are currently constituted. We have difficulty enough overcoming the distance between ourselves and our own forebears. This distance is most

evident in undergraduate classes. When they read a book like the *Nicomachean Ethics*, many students are horrified by what they find. Did Aristotle *really* mean to say that most human lives are failures? Often the problem is not that students understand Aristotle and disagree with him; they simply cannot understand what he is saying or why he is saying it. For anyone who has been formed by the contemporary culture and imagination (and this includes almost everyone associated in any way with a modern college or university), to read sympathetically the central texts of the classical Western tradition is to be confronted by forms of sensibility and modes of reasoning that run counter to what one ordinarily takes for granted as a contemporary person.

As a result of such confrontations, what starts out as a mere sympathetic reading of antique texts can escalate into a full-scale war between one's habituated contemporary self and one's new-found ancient self. A student of mine recently said: "The more I confront the differences between the ancients and the moderns, the more convinced I am on the one hand that the ancients probably were right, and on the other hand that I am thoroughly modern. In light of that conviction, what should I do?" Students and faculty can only struggle together with questions such as this. Note, however, that this question could not emerge in a serious way without an institutional commitment to a substantial core curriculum, for without the core, we would no longer feel the pull of the ancients. Few reasonable people would deny that being liberally educated requires encountering voices from outside one's own tradition. Nonetheless, a deep reading of one's *own* tradition, far from being an optional extra, is a necessary first step towards the goal of truly liberating, multicultural education. Only those who have been adequately initi-

Nonetheless, a deep reading of one's own tradition, far from being an optional extra, is a necessary first step towards the goal of truly liberating, multicultural education.

ated into their own traditions can know how to treat rival traditions with the respect they deserve. Each intellectual tradition, however, is responsible for preserving itself intact institutionally. Thus, abandoning core curricula cannot advance the cause of academic freedom, for it undermines one of the central preconditions of such freedom, namely a firm grounding in and familiarity with one's *own* tradition as a requirement for encountering rival traditions in a genuine way. This point is no

longer widely understood in the West.

A few semesters ago, a freshman came to my office in a panic. Her philosophy class was slowly working through Plato's *Republic*, and she had finally reached the image of the line and the parable of the cave in Books VI-VII. She fretted: "This curriculum is indoctrinating me! I'm afraid I'll be sucked in by it and forget why I shouldn't become a Catholic!" I doubt she thought Plato was a Christian, but she clearly thought he was dangerously close to being a Catholic apologist!

It is hard to know how to interpret her reaction to Plato. On the one hand, it is flattering to discover that the mind of a freshman could identify the ideal of education as liberation—as being "led out" of one's own ignorance and prejudice—so closely with the Catholic intellectual vision. After all, the Catholic Church forever upholds the dignity of human reason against its detractors. On the other hand, it is disconcerting that there now are so few remaining advocates of the traditional Western heritage of liberal education that an intelligent freshman could see no difference between the *Republic* and the *City of God*. Catholic colleges and universities did not invent the ideal of education as liberation; we have pagans like Plato to thank for that. The day may soon arrive, however, when Catholic institutions will be the only remaining defenders of that ideal. ❖

Remarks on the Christian Humanism of a Catholic University

John F. Crosby
Department of Philosophy
University of Steubenville

I WANT TO BEGIN by saying how pleased I am at this year's theme of Christian humanism; it was an inspired choice of Fr. Michael Scanlan, coming at just the moment in the life of the university when we are ready to reflect on this and are in need of reflecting on it.

Would it surprise you if I said that the inspiration for all Christian humanism comes from the doctrine of the resurrection of the body? Why do I say this? Because this doctrine teaches us that it is not just as solitary souls that we are to be redeemed; our whole human being is to be redeemed, body and soul. But this seems to imply, as Vatican II taught more emphatically than ever before, that everything human is to be redeemed; no part of our being, no region of human life, no authentically human activity is to go unredeemed. As John Courtney Murray says, the universality of redemption does not just mean that *all human beings* are to be saved, but also that *all that is human* is to be saved. Now Christian humanism is the clear recognition of this all-encompassing scope of redemption; it is the attempt to understand how each realm of human existence is to be redeemed.

Christianity becomes un- or even anti-humanistic in very various ways. For instance, it loses its humanistic potential whenever Christians want to shut themselves up in pure interiority, limiting their life of faith to prayer and liturgical worship, and leading the rest of their lives like any

non-believer. In a different way Christians suffer this loss whenever they teach a sharp break between nature and grace. If, for example, they teach, as some have taught, that all natural human love is utterly selfish and sinful, and that Christian love is something simply opposed to natural human love, then they are not interested in redeeming human love, but rather in condemning it and replacing it with something new. Christian humanism, by contrast, will be concerned with purifying and transforming human love, so that friendship and spousal love, for example, might become for the first time what they have really always been, or what they were "from the beginning."

It has sometimes been said that one of the main concerns of the Vatican Council was to destroy in Catholics a certain dualism of faith here and life over there, and to teach them to make their faith fruitful for all the regions of their life, to teach them how to develop Christian judgment, Christian sensibilities, Christian worldview, Christian social awareness, Christian culture. This means that the promotion of Christian humanism was one of the main concerns of the Council. The important statement of the Council, "Christ reveals man to man"—He does not just reveal God to man but also and at the same time reveals man to man—is profoundly humanistic.

But our task this year is not just to reflect on Christian humanism in general, but on the Christian humanism proper to a university. This would seem to be the humanism which tries to make Christian sense of the intellectual life and to redeem intellectual culture.

Let me approach this subject by distinguishing two opposite dangers which we Christians face in leading the intellectual life. Yielding to either danger disqualifies us as Christian humanists. There is first of all the danger of failing to bring our faith and our intellectual life together; faith and intellectual work become for us incommensurable realms; we study and learn and teach just as we would if we were not believers; we worship and pray just as we would if we were not intellectuals. The per-

son living this dualism may live primarily in his intellectual work, or he may live primarily in his religious life, or he may live equally in each; but wherever the emphasis happens to fall, he is in any case living that dualism of faith and life just mentioned, and he remains innocent of the Christian humanism of the Catholic tradition.

This dualism can show itself not just in one person, but in several persons, in the sense that intellectual life and religious life fail to be united in one person but get distributed over several. This is explained in a famous sermon of Newman's in which he develops an all-important contribution to Christian humanism (and one which is not found in the *Idea of a University*). He says that as a result of the fall and of original sin the soul of man has suffered a fragmentation: "the grace is gone; the soul cannot hold together; it falls to pieces; its elements strive with each other..."¹

And among these fragmented pieces are the intellectual and the moral powers of the soul: "And it is our great misfortune here, and our trial, that where right, and goodness, and moral greatness are, there need not be talent [or intellectual excellence]. It was not so in the beginning..."²

He goes on to say bluntly: "I grant, that, from the disorder and confusion into which the human mind has fallen, too often good men are not attractive, and bad men are; too often cleverness, or wit, or taste, or richness of fancy, or keenness of intellect, or depth, or knowledge...is on the side of error and not on the side of virtue. ...and in matter of fact, in particular cases, persons may be found, correct and virtuous, who are heavy, narrow-minded, and unintellectual, and again, unprincipled men, who are brilliant and amusing."³

And here are Newman's well-known words on the task of Catholic universities to overcome this unnatural separation; they are at the same time words which convey to us the beginning of wisdom in all

**Christian humanism
begins to exist only
when "philosophy" and
"devotion" begin to
interpenetrate in an
individual, and to
perfect each other.**

that concerns Christian humanism. "Here, then, I conceive, is the object of the Holy See and the Catholic Church in setting up Universities; it is to reunite things which were in the beginning joined together by God, and have been put asunder by man. ...I wish the intellect to range with the utmost freedom, and religion to enjoy an equal freedom; but what I am stipulating for is that they should be found in

one and the same place, and exemplified in the same persons. I want to destroy that diversity of centres, which puts everything into confusion by creating a contrariety of influences. I wish the same spots and the same individuals to be at once oracles of philosophy and shrines of devotion. ...I want the intellectual layman to be religious, and the devout ecclesiastic to be intellectual."

Of course Newman will not be satisfied if "philosophy" and "devotion" exist indeed in the same individual, but merely juxtaposed; this would simply restore on the level of the individual the dualism which he deprecates. We would then have all over again this dualism in the very form in which I first presented it above. No, Christian humanism begins to exist only when "philosophy" and "devotion" begin to interpenetrate in an individual, and to perfect each other.

It is worth adding that it is not only the intellectual life which has to gain from such interpenetration. It is obvious that as believers we become capable of an entirely new kind of wisdom in all our attempts at understanding. But it should not be overlooked that our faith has something to gain, too. For the faith of an intellectual becomes in a certain way barren when it is deprived of its natural embodiment in his intellectual life. In describing this deprivation to a university audience, John Paul II once went so far as to speak of a "decapitated faith."

Thus the first danger threatening Christian humanism, the danger of a certain dualism of faith

and intelligence. But then there is also the opposite danger, which arises when these two realms of faith and intelligence, instead of remaining incommensurably outside of one another, interfere with each other. Here the two realms are indeed in contact with each other, but it is the contact of one committing aggression against the other.

This aggression can go in either of two directions. The intellectual life of the believer can interfere with and rationalistically impoverish his life of faith. Newman knew well this danger, which in the *Idea of a University* he describes with convicting precision: "Knowledge...exerts a subtle influence in throwing us back on ourselves, and making us our own centre, and our minds the measure of all things. This then is the tendency of that Liberal Education, of which a University is the school, viz., to view Revealed Religion from an aspect of its own,—to fuse and recast it,—to tune it, as it were, to a different key, and to reset its harmonies,—to circumscribe it by a circle which unwarrantably amputates here, and unduly develops there... A sense of propriety, order, consistency, and completeness gives birth to a rebellious stirring against miracle and mystery, against the severe and the terrible."

But the aggression can also go in the opposite direction, as when we assert our faith so strongly in the leading of the intellectual life that we fail to lead it in all of its integrity. If, for example, we were to conceive of the work of a university as a mere instrumental means for developing one's faith or for doing the work of evangelization or for doing pro-life work, we would deform it. We would deform it for devout religious reasons, but deform it all the same. Cardinal Newman is after all right that a liberal education is a great good in its own right, for its own sake. It is of course to be integrated into the faith of the intellectual and even subordinated to it, but to subordinate it is not to

instrumentalize it. The Christian humanist knows how to integrate it in such a way as to respect it on its own terms and to perfect it.

In my present remarks I want especially to call attention to this temptation of the believer, especially the ardent believer, to let his faith interfere with the disciplined work of the understanding. Of course I know full well that this is not the typical deficiency of most Catholic universities today; most of them need, instead, to examine their consciences with respect to the rationalism described by Newman. But it is a real danger precisely for "alternative" Catholic colleges and universities like ourselves. The likes of us may fall into an excess of our own in reacting against the "rebellious stirring against miracle and mystery, against the severe and the terrible" which we see all around us.

It is again Newman to whom we can turn in thinking about the danger of living one's faith at the expense of authentic intellectual life. He has a lot to say about this danger, just as he does about the danger of rationalism. Besides, his own life was exemplary in all that concerns Christian humanism; his faith did not interfere with the depth and originality of his own intellectual life, any more than his intellectual life rationalistically diluted his religious existence.

Newman sometimes went so far as to admit that the cultivation of the mind inevitably brings with it certain dangers to one's faith. But he thought that these dangers should not be avoided, for then one would have no real intellectual life, but that they should rather be faced and overcome. He was convinced that the leaders of the Catholic Church in England in his day did not understand this, and so when in his later years there was talk of setting up a Catholic university in England (this was some time after Newman's labors in behalf of the Catholic university in Ireland), Newman privately discouraged the idea on the grounds that "our

**Newman sometimes
went so far as to admit
that the cultivation of
the mind inevitably
brings with it certain
dangers to one's faith.**

present rulers would never give us a real one." They would exercise, Newman thought, such a tight control on the faith and morals of the students as to render impossible authentic intellectual life. Newman himself felt that he was repeatedly hampered in his own theological work by such control. He taught, in the spirit of Christian humanism, that the intellect even of believers needed a certain freedom of movement, and that faith should assert itself in the intellectual life in such a way as to respect this freedom.

You see, then, that there is a delicate balance to be achieved when Christians undertake to build a university in our humanistic tradition. The intellectual life must be redeemed, it must be illuminated with a new light, and yet at the same time it must be respected for what it is, and lived according to its own laws, or better, it must be revealed for what it really is. It is like the balance which we have to find in our relation to our body: a person should not live immersed in the body but should exercise a certain dominion over it, and yet he should never think of the body as a mere instrument. The body is not just an instrument to be used by the soul but is rather a dimension of our being, which is destined for immortality. As I indicated at the outset, the right understanding of the body is in various ways a kind of key to understanding Christian humanism.

I know that some will be troubled by my protest against instrumentalizing the intellectual life, and will think that I am calling into question the various kinds of service which the university offers to society and to the Church. But I do not call this into question at all; I am only indicating the way in which this service has to be rendered. Let us explain with an analogy. Suppose that spouses wanted to have a child and that they considered their marital intimacy to be an instrumen-

**And in a similar way,
Christian intellectuals
working in the spirit of
Christian humanism
can and must intend
that their work be
fruitful for society and
for Church, but they
must understand this
in the sense of super-
abundant finality.**

tal means for getting the child. John Paul says, on the basis of his profound and original theology of the body and of sexuality, that such spouses act immorally since they use each other instrumentally for a certain result. They have to respect the marital act for what it is, and so to live fully the unitive no less than as the procreative meaning of it. He does not mean that they should not be open for and even to strive for the fruitfulness of their marital union, but only that they must not make of their union a mere means for fruitfulness. Dietrich von Hildebrand put it like this: they

should think of offspring not in terms of *instrumental finality*, but in terms of *superabundant finality*. And in a similar way, Christian intellectuals working in the spirit of Christian humanism can and must intend that their work be fruitful for society and for Church, but they must understand this in the sense of superabundant finality.

In conclusion let me draw an important consequence for the question of evangelization and the university, a question which is often on our minds. It seems that the evangelization most proper to the university is not just that of direct proclamation; the university rather evangelizes in the first place by means of its humanism, that is, by carrying out its work of Christian imagination and Christian intelligence, and by making this fruitful for society and for the Church. The university may also evangelize in other ways, but never at the expense of the witness given by its Christian humanism. We should not lack confidence in this kind of evangelization, proper precisely to us as a university. The Christian humanism of a university is not a kind of luxury which lacks the seriousness of evangelization; it is all in its own right one main way of evangelizing.

I am saying nothing more than Pope Paul

VI said well in *Evangelii nuntiandi*. Writing about different kinds of evangelization, he says: "It is a question not only of preaching the Gospel in ever wider geographic areas or to ever greater numbers of people, but also of affecting and, as it were, upsetting, through the power of the Gospel, humanity's criteria of judgment, leading values, points of interest, lines of thought, sources of inspiration and models of life, which are in contrast with the Word of God." This means that Christians working in the university will have to develop, out of the same power of the Gospel, Christian criteria of judgment, Christian values,

Christian points of interest, Christian lines of thought, Christian sources of inspiration, and Christian models of life. The intellectual and cultural embodiment of Christian faith which then results is, I submit, the highest achievement of the Christian humanism of a university, and it is the university's way of evangelizing.

¹ "Intellect, the Instrument of Religious Training," in *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions*, 6.

² *Ibid.*, 5-6.

³ *Ibid.*, 8.

~ ~ ~ WHEN I WAS A KID ~ ~ ~

by Gilbertina N. Sullivan
for contralto or counter-tenor and chorus

When I was a kid I played guitar,
At folksy Masses I would always star.
The congregation would all sing the words,
And I'd supply accompaniment by playing chords.
Such skill I gained in playing those chords (all three)
That now I am an expert on the liturgy.
Chorus: Such skill s/he gained in playing those chords (all three)
That now s/he is an expert on the liturgy!

I always thought Plainchant much too tough,
And I never could abide that polyphonic stuff.
Bach, Mozart, Haydn I do quite deplore,
And that awful Palestrina: what a crashing bore!
But the music of Ray Repp did so appeal to me
That now I am an expert on the liturgy.
Chorus: St. Louis Jesuits sang so appealingly
That now s/he is an expert on the liturgy!

Of Latin I could not learn a word
'Cause I think dead languages are so absurd—
Like Greek and Hebrew, what useless stuff!
I always thought plain English should be good enough.
To ancient tongues I have such deep hostility
That I work with ICEL writing English liturgy.

Chorus: To ancient tongues s/he has such deep hostility
That s/he works with ICEL writing English liturgy!

I always hated English Literature.
(But they make you take it, so you just endure.)
Through Donne I suffered; Keats just gave me fits;
And those sonnet things by Shakespeare—they were just the pits.
In fact I'm so impervious to poetry
ICEL gave the job of neutering the prayers to me.
Chorus: In fact s/he is impervious to poetry,
And s/he's making sure the Bible will be gender-free!

Progressives, all, who seek better days,
and to turn the Church aside from her Romish ways,
Since your souls aren't fettered by tradition's rule,
Try liturgy reform; it's such a useful tool!
Cultivate a tin ear, of aesthetic sense keep free,
And you all may be experts in the liturgy.
Chorus: Denude the Masses of all mystery,
And you all may be experts in the liturgy!

* Tune: "When I Was a Lad"

The Invisible Woman. Helen M. Alvare, director of planning and information for the Secretariat for Pro-Life Activities of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, wrote a letter in response to Anna Quindlen's column in the *New York Times* in which she pointed out how our message of consistent respect for life is ignored or shunned by mainstream media in search of the inflammatory 30-second news clip.

Illustrating what seems to be media bias, Miss Alvare made the following points: "The National Women's Coalition for Life, 1.8 million members strong (more than six times larger than NOW), has held a series of press conferences featuring pro-life women of every color, every age, every political persuasion and every experience. One press conference highlighted women and children (born following an abortion) who were living testimony to the non sequitur of the 'safe, legal abortion,' as well as a lawyer representing women maimed or killed by legal abortions." Not one single press report followed.

Mother Church. A group of groups put out a statement objecting to the appointment of Raymond Flynn as United States Ambassador to the Vatican. (Cheek by jowl with NOW were the following signatories: BVM Network for Women's Issues—these are the Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary; Catholics for Free Choice, Chicago Catholic Women, Friends of Vatican III, the National Coalition of American Nuns, and other 'Catholic' groups.) Patrick Riley, of the Catholic League on Religious and Civil

Rights, wrote the following letter to the editor of the *New York Times*:

The "feminists and population control advocates" who oppose the appointment of Boston's anti-abortion mayor as Ambassador to the Vatican give a lot more reasons than appear in your account ("Envoy's Vatican Post Opposed on Abortion Issue," May 14, 1993).

Beyond arguing that Mayor Raymond Flynn's appointment would offend "the sensibilities of those who do not share the religious beliefs of policy positions of the Vatican," and that a new ambassador's views on abortion "should not be in direct conflict with U.S. policy and law," the feminists and populationists indulge in criticisms of Catholic doctrine that are wholly irrelevant to the appointment of Mayor Flynn, or anyone at all.

Moreover they blame the Vatican for defending doctrine: it should not, it seems, oppose divorce, "condom education," or abortion. They dismiss Vatican City State as "a fictional construct." Finally, they level the fantastic accusation that the Vatican "requires married women employees to promise contractually that they will resign their jobs if they become pregnant."

Article 56 of the Vatican's *Regolamento Generale* provides fully-paid maternity leave of six months, which are credited toward the mother's seniority. She can prolong her leave at half pay until her child reaches the age of one. Moreover the workday of a new mother is cut by two hours so that she can nurse her child.

Where babies are concerned,

we should expect such generosity of the Vatican. How on earth did the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, NOW, ACLU, and the 27 other signatories get the notion that the Vatican could possibly oppose motherhood?

Maryknoll: The Bad News.

Father Joseph Veneroso is the editor of *Maryknoll*. In a recent editorial, he managed to put together most of the unconvincing reasons for ordaining women. Unfortunately, he put the reasons forward in order to embrace them. Why did Christ ordain men? "It was the only way he could get at least some of them into church!" Father Veneroso is happy that clerical privilege, power and prestige no longer attract men to the priesthood in great numbers. Better a shortage of priests, than becoming a priest for the wrong reasons.

It gets worse. One wants to weep. "If a woman was worthy to produce the body of Christ physically, why are women unworthy to produce the Body of Christ sacramentally?" Now why didn't Jesus think of that?

One has heard of the parlous state of theological education in the seminary. Obviously, logic too has been banished. Come *non sequitur* me?

Maryknoll: The Good News.

SJP NEWS, a Scripture Newsletter, from St. Jerome Publications, P.O. Box 305, Maryknoll, New York 10545. Members of the Fellowship will find SJP NEWS intelligent, faithful, clear. "Put simply, what I think we now need is a basic division within the field between those who want to study the Bible as one would any other piece

of literature, and those who want to study it as Sacred Scripture." But even among the latter, there is a serious division. "I think we have now arrived at the point where we no longer share a common foundation about how to interpret Scripture as the word of God. We disagree on the most fundamental principles."

The newsletter offers the following Points Towards a New Consensual Base for Biblical Interpretation:

1. Integrate more adequately faith and reason.
2. Give greater respect to the patent intentions of the sacred authors.
3. Adopt the historical as well as theological perspective of the sacred authors.
4. Treat Biblical books as literary wholes.
5. Avoid unprovable and irresponsible literary hypotheses and fanciful historical reconstructions which contradict the text.
6. Integrate theology with exegesis.
7. Produce interpretations which nourish faith.
8. Accept the inspiration of all of Scripture.
9. Interpret the final text rather than its hypothetical prehistory.
10. Put the primary emphasis in interpretation on the *theological meaning* of the text.

Monsignor Kelly Enters Seminary. New York, N.Y. — Msgr. George A. Kelly, a former John A. Flynn Professor for Contemporary Catholic Problems at St. John's University, is moving his office to St. Joseph's Seminary in Yonkers, NY 10704 as of June 30, 1993. He will assist Msgr. William Smith, the Executive Secretary of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars. Msgr. Kelly has been at St. John's University since 1970. Our Founder's telephone number is (914) 968-6200 Extension 8275.

Governor Robert P. Casey of Pennsylvania

What must the role of the pro-life public official be in 1993 in the face of the catastrophic human carnage of abortion?

Let me be specific.

First, relentless, outspoken opposition to passage of the so-called Freedom of Choice Act.

Second, continuous effort to expand and enlarge the protection of human life in state and national laws and policies.

Third, a continuous drumbeat of public expression which makes the American people confront the facts about abortion in all of its evil.

Fourth, advocacy of a New American Compact in this country which seeks to involve all public and private institutions in a fight for policies and programs to offer women meaningful alternatives to abortion and to offer children and families the help they need to live decent, healthy and happy lives.

Fifth, political action which challenges both

major parties and their candidates to protect human life and works for change in national elections.

The need for constancy, activism and relentless effort cannot be overstated. In light of recent events, there is no doubt that this country faces a crisis of awesome dimensions.

National commentators want to treat this issue as settled. We can never let them get away with that. This issue will never die. It will never be "over."

We live in a time of anarchy — when those who claim the right to choose deny pro-life advocates the right to speak. Our voices must be even more determined in response.

In summary, the role of the public official must be to lead — to stand up and say to the people of this country who believe in protecting human life: Press On!

Let this, then, be our clarion call, our call to arms, the keynote of this gathering: Press On!

From the Heart of the Church

Timothy O'Donnell
President, Christendom College

AS POPE JOHN PAUL II STATED in the "Apostolic Constitution on Catholic Universities", *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, the college or university as we know it today grew out of the Church. The Catholic college can lay claim to a most glorious tradition which reaches back to the great medieval schools at Paris, Bologna and Oxford. These universities themselves were the heirs of the great cathedral schools and monastic centers of the Benedictine and Celtic tradition. The Catholic college by its very constitution is committed not only to the search for truth but also to its acquisition as the proper end of the intellectual endeavor. All colleges and universities as living academic communities should be deeply concerned with the search for truth and its acquisition.

Sadly, this is no longer the case at most institutions of higher learning as Alan Bloom dem-

onstrated in his work, *The Closing of the American Mind*. Relativism and agnosticism are the new orthodoxy which prevail, frustrating young minds which learn not how to think critically and grow in knowledge and virtue but only how to become cynical. Bloom's work, although filled with insight as to what is wrong with modern education, is at a loss as to a genuine solution which will strike at the root of the problem. The Catholic college on the other hand is in a unique position to offer the *fullness* of truth. It alone can combine the search for truth with the certitude of already knowing the fount of all truth.

The Catholic college is open to *all* of reality, both natural and supernatural. Faith and reason met for the first time in the great sea of Christendom and their harmony is most beautifully expressed in the writings of the Common doctor, St. Thomas Aquinas. The Church has appropriately proclaimed him the patron of all Catholic schools. The Catholic college is able to offer the glory of this synthesis to her students, fully confident that there can be no real conflict between the truth proposed by faith and truth discovered by reason as both the supernatural and natural order have their source in the Triune God.

Contrary to the secularist's claim, "full-

O stands for Oxford. Hail! salubrious seat
Of learning! Academical Retreat!
Home of my Middle Age! Malarial Spot
Which People call Medeeval (though it's not).
The marshes in the neighbourhood can vie
With Cambridge, but the town itself is dry,
And serves to make a kind of Fold or Pen
Wherein to herd a lot of Learned Men.

Hilaire Belloc

Were I to write but half of what they know,
It would exhaust the space reserved for "O";
And, as my book must not be over big,
I turn at once to "P," which stands for Pig.

MORAL

Be taught by this to speak with moderation
Of places where, with decent application,
One gets a good, sound, middle-class education.

ness” means more truth not less. For the secularist, the *search* for truth is fine; but truth, especially religious truth, must always be held as purely subjective. Tragically, however, most Catholic colleges in the West have become secularized to such an extent that theology, the *regina scientiae*, is no longer taught or required. Many of our Catholic colleges, due to the demands of technical training and specialization have either abandoned completely their core curriculum or have reduced its requirements and content to such a degree that it has become meaningless. When philosophy and theology in particular are not allowed to play their proper unifying and vivifying role *within* the curriculum, the student is intellectually impoverished and is given only a truncated view of reality. There is a special sapiential role that Catholic philosophy and theology should play in a strong core curriculum.

A true education (from the Latin *educere*—to lead out [of darkness]) should help man to study *all* of reality and seek a knowledge of the causes of things. If nature abhors a vacuum, so also do all intellectual disciplines. If philosophy and theology are not allowed to play their proper roles then other disciplines such as sociology, economics or the empirical sciences move into areas that are not proper to them and become dogmatically obsessed with questions they were never meant to answer.

A proper formation in philosophy not only frees man from ignorance and error but allows man to grow in wisdom and perceive clearly the natural order of things. Despite the claims of pragmatists who dismiss philosophy as mere sophistry, this study is crucial for coming to see the natural law, the moral order, the dignity of human nature itself and is ordered to the study of divine things. This leads quite “naturally” to the study of Catholic theology which is crucial for the perfecting of man’s understanding. Revealed truth can strengthen man’s understanding and help him to more fully grasp reality since grace does not destroy but perfects nature. The great truths of theology reveal man not only as a wondrous creature

composed of matter and spirit but also as one made in the image and likeness of God who is called to a supernatural destiny. Human life itself is thereby seen as a sacred and precious gift of love from the Triune God who beckons us to know and love Him.

If a Catholic college is doing its job, fulfilling its purpose and is faithful to its great tradition, its education will be vastly superior to secularist models which rule out *a priori* vast portions of reality as unknowable. As Cardinal Newman stated in his work, *Discussions & Arguments*: “Christianity, and nothing short of it, must be made the element and principle of all education...Where revealed truth has given the aim and direction to knowledge, knowledge of all kinds will minister to revealed truth.

“But if in education we begin with nature before grace, with evidences before faith, with science before conscience, with poetry before practice, we shall be doing much the same as if we were to indulge the appetites and passions, and turn a deaf ear toward truth.”

The Catholic college has a serious obligation to bear witness to this truth in the integrity of its academic program. Sadly, in most of our Catholic colleges, theology has been replaced by “religious studies” which offers only a sociological study of what people believe and does not even concern itself, as a discipline, with the question of truth. At other times, theology faculties are filled with dissidents who distort the authentic teaching of the Church. Frequently, they proclaim their erroneous personal opinions as a substitution for the objective truths of the faith proclaimed by the Magisterium and sound theological reasoning.

Nothing short of a restoration of a traditional liberal arts core curriculum, which properly grounds students by teaching them to think critically using the essential tools of sound philosophy and theology, will enable the Catholic college to fulfill its mission to the Church and society by bearing witness to the whole truth about God, man and the created order. ✠

What Is Catholic About a College Degree

Peter V. Sampo

President, Thomas More College

LET US ASSUME the college has a Catholic liturgy, teaches orthodox Catholic theology, and is under the auspices of a religious order, a diocese, or is, at least, canonically recognized by a diocese. Further, let us assume loyalty to the Magisterium. As necessary as these qualities are, they do not suffice to make a college Catholic. A hospital is not a Catholic hospital because it has a saint's name in its title of incorporation. It is a Catholic hospital if its Catholicism is the difference that makes it a better hospital than non-Catholic hospitals can be. Likewise, a college is Catholic if its Catholicism is the difference that makes it a better college than non-Catholic colleges are able to be.

Rilke, the German lyric poet, who served as secretary to Rodin, when asked about what the sculptor's art said to him, replied, "Change your life." Unless a college seeks to change the lives of its students, that is to say to transform their lives, it is not a Catholic college.

A Catholic college must do its work of transforming the lives of its students primarily through the artifact of the curriculum. The curriculum takes its cue from Catholicism in the sense that it has time for discussing only the most significant human experiences: of pilgrimage, of suffering, of community, of death and resurrection, to list a few. Indeed, the curriculum prefigures fundamental experiences that the student will undergo throughout his life. It has no time for lesser concerns, say, of career training. Since God calls us His "image and likeness," we are icons of the divine and are therefore called to move to realize the

form that we were meant to have. The kind of education that helps free a person to answer this call has traditionally been called liberal. It embodies the type of learning started in college but meant to be completed in the world through the work of a life.

It is also the kind of education that causes joy to well up in the soul of the student because his being recognizes and approves the inner transforming growth that takes place through learning. It is also the type of education that brings about deep friendships among those sharing in this movement to fullness of form.

In the past, a liberal arts education was assumed to be only for an elite, that is to say, meant for a capable few: the others were to settle for vocational training or a mediocre education. Such a view neglected one truth revealed by Christ: that equality is part of the good. Applying this truth to learning means that regardless of race, class, I.Q., or SAT scores, a person has depth of soul sufficient to enable him to respond sympathetically to the vision presented by liberal learning. Therefore, Catholics should consider themselves responsible for providing a liberal education for everyone.

It may be helpful to point out what are not the purposes of a Catholic college. Its purpose is not to save souls since such presumption would make it a rival to the Church, a competing magisterium rather than an obedient follower of the Church's teaching. Its purpose is not to save the Church since the Church is to save us. Were its purpose to save a culture or a civilization, it would take on an impossible task. Were its purpose to preserve the work of a particular thinker, it would take on too narrow a task. Its purpose is both more modest and more ambitious: it is to help transform the heart and mind of each student who, almost miraculously, appears in the classroom. ✠

Authority and the Academy

Reflections on *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*

Robert F. Sasseen
President, University of Dallas

FOR POPE JOHN PAUL II, the modern university exists at the heart of culture and is of crucial importance in shaping the kind of world in which we live. The university educates leaders in all fields who, in turn, form public opinion and the values determining our lives. It plays a central role in the progress of science and technology, in shaping culture and in forming the character of a society. But the Pope also understands the weakness of the modern university. It is dominated by “value-free” science, and weakened by the fragmentation and compartmentalization of knowledge. The university has lost unity, coherence, and integrity in itself and its curriculum. Like the society in which it exists, the modern university is animated by a false understanding of self and an exaggerated notion of freedom. It is captive of the historicism, relativism and nihilism now dominating culture. Everything is relative, truth is a matter of opinion, “life styles” are all equal, anything goes.

This climate of opinion results in the closing of the mind of our students, extinguishing their love of truth, creating a world without meaning and souls oblivious to their longing for the divine. It undermines our conviction of “the priority of the ethical over the technical, of the primacy of the person over things, of the superiority of spirit over matter.”¹ It leads to a hedonistic culture characterized by materialism and consumerism. It leads to the corruption of politics, to the decay of cities, to the destruction of families, to abortion on demand, to euthanasia, ultimately to war and even, in some circumstances, to genocide.

Thus for John Paul II, much is at stake in the struggle to determine the character of the university and the purpose of Catholic higher education. “What is at stake,” the Pope declares, “is the very meaning of scientific and technological research, of social life and culture, but, on an even more profound level, what is at stake is the very meaning of the human person (# 7).” What is at stake is the truth about man, the order of the soul, and so the order of society. Quite simply, at stake is the future of the Church and of the world. This conviction regarding what is at stake in the character of the modern university and its central role in shaping society and culture gives a special urgency to the Pope’s call for Catholic universities to be true to their mission and vocation.

The search for truth and the education of students are, in combination and at the highest level, what defines a university and distinguishes it from all other associations. Both activities are essential parts of its mission. But for John Paul II, the quest for truth constitutes the primary and central component in the mission of a university. In *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* and in other writings, the Pope stresses the centrality in the university of the quest for truth. Even more so, he stresses the adequacy of that quest only if it is informed by faith in fidelity to the Church and its magisterium. In his view, only a Catholic university can ultimately achieve the truth which the university seeks, because only the Church possesses the full truth about God, man and the meaning of existence.

To those who maintain that a Catholic university is a contradiction in terms, the Pope implicitly replies that only by being authentically Catholic can a university be fully competent for its essential work. “By its Catholic character, a university is made more capable of conducting an impartial search for truth, a search that is neither subordinated to nor conditioned by particular interests of any kind” (# 7). By its Catholic character and Christian inspiration, a university is enabled to “search for the whole truth about nature, man and God,” to research “all aspects of truth in

their essential connection to the supreme Truth, who is God" (#4). By its Christian inspiration, a university is enabled to search for a higher synthesis of knowledge and "to determine the relative place and meaning of the various disciplines within the context of a vision of the human person enlightened by the Gospel (# 16)," enlightened by Christ who is the *Logos* of creation and of human history. It is thus enabled "to include the moral, spiritual and religious dimension in its research and to evaluate the attainments of science and technology in the perspective of the totality of the human person" (# 7).

Moreover, only by its Catholic character and Christian inspiration, is a university enabled to "proclaim the meaning of truth, that fundamental value without which freedom, justice and human dignity are extinguished" (# 4). It is thus enabled to "discern and evaluate both the aspirations and the contradictions of modern culture in order to make it more suited to the total development of individuals and peoples" (# 45). Finally, by reason of its Catholic character and Christian inspiration, a university is enabled to educate the whole person—to educate "men and women of outstanding knowledge who, having made a personal synthesis between faith and culture, will be both capable and willing to assume tasks in service of the community and of society in general, and to bear witness to their faith before the world."² In short, only an authentically Catholic university is in principle capable of achieving in practice the essential and highest purpose of a university. That purpose is truth and the education of students in truth, and for the good of human life and society.

This astonishing view of higher education is ludicrous to partisans of the modern university and disturbing to Catholic educators who wish to emulate it. The modern university is a product of the Enlightenment. It is born of the desire to free

**The teaching of
Ex Corde Ecclesiae
challenges their
understanding of
academic freedom and,
more fundamentally,
their understanding
of the nature
of the university**

reason from authority and to turn it to the amelioration of the human condition through the progress of science and the conquest of nature. The dazzling success of this project has led many to view the modern university as the epitome of the idea of the University. It has led Catholic educators to reform their institutions, to move them from "the backwater to the mainstream," so they may be—and be recognized—as universities in the full American sense.

The fundamental principles of this reform movement were proclaimed in the 1967 Land O'Lakes Statement: To "be a university in the full modern sense of the word, . . . the Catholic university must have true autonomy and academic freedom in the face of authority of whatever kind, lay or clerical, external to the academic community itself."³ Since Catholic educators came to believe that this freedom and autonomy are the essential attributes of *any* university and necessary conditions of its excellence, it is no wonder that they found themselves troubled by, if not in opposition to the Pope's "Apostolic Constitution on Catholic Universities." The teaching of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* challenges their understanding of academic freedom and, more fundamentally, their understanding of the nature of the university.

There can be no doubt that a university requires autonomy and freedom to accomplish its purpose. But this does not mean that a university is not subject to lawful authority external to itself. In fact, the university is subject to law in many respects. It must be chartered or incorporated by the state in order to operate in the first place, and these charters define and restrict its activities. The university is subject to laws governing the conduct of its faculty—for example, laws regarding libel, slander pornography and fraud, or prohibiting sexual harassment and the use of controlled sub-

stances. There are laws governing intellectual property rights and research involving human subjects. There are even laws governing the curriculum, who may teach, what is to be studied and who may be admitted. This is most evident in the case of public universities, which are governed in some states by laws establishing admissions standards and requiring all students to study American government and the state constitution. Regulations governing teacher education normally apply to all universities, public and private.

The American system of voluntary accreditation masks from us the full extent to which the university is subject to lawful authority external to itself. The regional accrediting associations establish criteria and regulations governing all aspects of the university. Though chartered by the state, they are viewed as part of the academy. This is also true of the special accrediting associations. But accreditation is essentially a public responsibility, and in most countries is accomplished through state departments or ministries of education. One may argue for the superiority of the American system. But accreditation remains a public responsibility which, as the current assessment and accountability movements threaten, could legitimately be done through state agencies. The university is necessarily subject to political authority. Government has the right and duty to regulate the university in the public interest and to hold it accountable to the common good. The problem, always and everywhere, is how to prevent abuse of this authority and to ensure its wise use. Ultimately, the problem can only be resolved, not by denying the legitimacy of the authority, but by prudence and moderation on the part of both the university and the government.

Similarly, there can be no doubt that a Catholic university requires freedom and autonomy to accomplish its mission. But this does not mean that a Catholic university is not subject to lawful ecclesiastical authority external to itself. An external authority is necessary, in the first place, to determine which institutions may legiti-

mately call themselves Catholic universities. One may view it as a matter of truth in advertising and consumer protection. The common good of both the society and the Church also requires an external authority to hold the university accountable with respect to its mission and purpose. In this era of the separation of church and state, few would deny that it is the right of the Church, and not the state, to grant or deny recognition to a Catholic university and to hold it accountable with respect to the Catholic dimensions of its mission. The problem, again, is not whether the Church possesses such authority, but how to prevent its abuse and to ensure its wise use.

Pope John Paul II has exercised this authority by issuing "The Apostolic Constitution on Catholic Universities." They are to be subject to the "general norms" stated in the document and, after Papal review, as they may be "concretely applied" by episcopal conferences at the regional and local level (Article 1, Sec. 2). (The NCCB is currently in discussion with Catholic university presidents to determine how they are to be applied in the United States.) The norms affirm that "a Catholic university possesses the autonomy necessary to . . . pursue its proper mission." They also affirm that the faculty's "freedom in research and teaching" must be recognized and respected "according to the principles and methods of each individual discipline" and within "the confines of the truth and the common good" (Article 2, Sec. 5). But who is to decide when freedom has broken beyond those confines, or autonomy claims more than what is necessary and due? What is to be done after the decision has been made?

The norms place primary responsibility for its Catholic mission with the university itself, principally with the board of trustees and the president, but also and importantly with the faculty and other members of the university community. For that reason, the norms insist that "all Catholic teachers are to be faithful to, and all other teachers are to respect, Catholic doctrine and morals in their research and teaching." The education they

offer must also be a Catholic education, one that combines “academic and professional development with formation in moral and religious principles and the social teaching of the Church.” It must include “ethical formation” in professional programs, and make “courses in Catholic doctrine . . . available to all students” (Article 4). Finally, the norms give the local bishop the ultimate responsibility to hold the Catholic universities in his diocese accountable for their Catholic mission and identity. He is to authorize them, promote their welfare, watch over them to preserve and strengthen their Catholic identity, work with the board and administration to resolve problems on that score and, by implication, to declare them no longer Catholic if necessary to protect the faithful (Article 5).

These general norms constitute, as it were, the Church’s authoritative declaration of the criteria for the accreditation of a university as a Catholic university. They constitute the criteria according to which it is to be held accountable for its Catholic mission. With these norms, and in *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* as a whole, John Paul II certainly challenges any Land O’Lakes type understanding of institutional autonomy, academic freedom or the nature of the university. He affirms academic freedom, but insists that it exists in a university for the sake of its mission. Academic freedom is a professional trust granted to faculty as part of a university, not an individual right springing directly from the nature of the person. It is inherently subordinate to and limited by the nature of the university and its mission. The Pope also affirms institutional autonomy. He does not view

the Catholic university as a branch campus of the Church’s ministry of education. Nor does he teach that it is inherently subordinate to the Church with respect to its governance or its ends. But the Pope does insist that a Catholic university is accountable to the Church with respect to its catholicity. Finally, he teaches that a university is not capable of achieving its essential and highest ends unless it is “evangelized,” unless its primary activity is informed by faith in fidelity to the Church and its magisterium. In my view, it must be admitted that accreditation and holding accountable are public functions which require an authority external to the university. They are required by the common good both of society and of the Church. One cannot in principle deny to the Church the authority the Pope has exercised by issuing *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*. The problem is practical, not theoretical. The document states the criteria, but is virtually silent on the procedures for this accreditation and accountability. Much is at stake. The problem, again and finally, is how to prevent abuse of this necessary authority and to ensure its wise use. The problem can only be resolved by prudence and moderation on the part of both the Church and the Catholic university.

¹ John Paul II, “Ex Corde Ecclesiae: The Apostolic Constitution on Catholic Universities,” in *Origins* (Oct. 4, 1990) # 18. Hereafter, the citation for quotes from this document will be given in parentheses immediately after the quotation.

² John Paul II, Address to American Leaders of Catholic Higher Education at Catholic University, in *Origins*, Oct. 25, 1979.

³ In Charles E. Curran, *Catholic Higher Education, Theology, and Academic Freedom* [University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, 1990], 78-79.

Catholic University Presidents and the 10 Commandments

Msgr. George A. Kelly

THE QUESTION

Are Catholic university presidents bound by the Ten Commandments? In their personal behavior, of course, but also in their administration of an institution which draws breath, life, and support from its affiliation with the Catholic Church?

Can they be held accountable by the Church's pastors for sins of commission or omission against God's law in this institutional role-playing?

THE PROLOGUE

These questions were posed during a conversation with a forty year veteran of Catholic higher education, whose eyes sparkled at the memory of the days when our colleges turned out smart upwardly mobile graduates, who along the way simultaneously acquired a finely tuned Catholic conscience and a certain piety. He was not arguing against the pursuit of educational novelty or improved academic quality, but only about the terrible price in faith and morals that has been paid by the Church and its families, when twenty-six educators, representing a mere ten colleges, declared on July 23, 1967, their independence of Church authority in the conduct of classroom and campus activity. In due course almost every Catholic college president followed their lead. The "Land O' Lakes" charter, as it was called, went hand in hand with the rebellion of religious superiors against hierarchical dominance, those whose congregations owned most of the Catholic

colleges, and also of the theological establishment whose numbers had well-paid positions on those same campuses.

"Conservative Catholics" are not the only witnesses to what has happened to Catholic performance when Catholic institutions escape Church governance. Hans Kung, Richard McBrien, Charles Curran, Andrew Greeley, Rosemary Reuther and their friends in the media such as James Castelli, Joseph Gremillion, Margaret Steinfels, regularly report the successes of these self-styled reformers with young Catholics, even as they continue to reassert their independence of bishops. In June 1992, while the American bishops were meeting at Notre Dame, a press conference in the Hesburgh Library there announced a new Gallup survey which placed the Church's laity and their bishops increasingly at odds with each other on every Church issue from abortion to the popular election of bishops, most of which disagreements dealt with this or that aspect of the Ten Commandments. Why should anyone be surprised, therefore, that role model professors, who made a "virtue" out of autonomy from papal/episcopal governance, begot students equally intent on demonstrating their own autonomy from the requirements of Church membership laid down by ecclesiastical authority?

These "communal Catholics", as they are sometimes called, those who maintain a nostalgic relationship with the "old" Church without binding themselves to her creed, code, or cult, take evident satisfaction in having conditioned young audiences to think "American" rather than "Church." With large help or passive acquiescence from presidential chair-holders, they have made "autonomy from Church authority" a matter of ecclesial politics—of freedom, of power, of status, of economics, of democracy, matters by themselves hardly critical to Catholic faith or morals. In this view Church authority, even Christ's "sayings," may still be factors in the Catholic life style, but they no longer control the consciences of individuals or the policy of Church institutions. Living American, or modern, or educated, or free

are more relevant to the post-Vatican II spirit of Catholicity. And so, the religious framework by which all Catholic works historically have been judged, even the conduct of university presidents, viz., the Ten Commandments, have for all practical purposes become less normative for Catholic institutions.

Strangely, the “reformers” are not embarrassed in the least by the college president who leaves the priesthood after alienating his university, or the one who abandons college and religion by stealing another woman’s husband, or about the sexual aberrations going on in their Catholic community, or about homosexuality in novitiates, or about religious women on campus active in the abortion movement, and so forth. Activists occasionally rail against the high legal costs (as much as \$18,000,000 in a small diocese) paid by bishops for the public exposure of one or two priest pederasts, but they never relate the spiritual price the Church pays for the dissident teaching that they have institutionalized. Neither do they count the economic burden imposed on the Church by the low Sunday Mass attendance they helped generate. *Actio sequitur esse*, once freely translated by that doughty prelate, Patrick Cardinal O’Boyle: “If they think that way, they’re going to act that way,” also means that effects have causes. Depopulated seminaries, convents, confessional lines, cradles, even parish pews (in the absence of senior citizens), are not the handiwork of the Church’s external enemies. The damage to the Catholic faith and morals (and income) since 1965 is the direct result of bad teaching and bad example by the Church’s opinion moulders within its own academy.

“Conservative Catholics” have not been much help either. Some, like Tories of old, would conserve wrong, or unnecessary, accretions to Catholicity; others make a career out of complaining, while many accept the political rhetoric of “communal Catholics”

without realizing they will never even win a debate accepting those assumptions. Once Pro-Choice is the argument, “truth” and “right” are of no account in dialogue. The Catholic counter-revolution can only begin when primacy has been restored to “God’s Word as proclaimed by the Catholic Church,” and when Catholic action in the Church’s institutions takes place within this framework. Doctrinal dissidence, rebellion by religious, the breakdown of ecclesial discipline, and scandal on campuses are hardly mere political fallout of legitimate differences among Catholics over ethically neutral choices. They frequently involve sins against faith or morals on the part of the perpetrators. Are academics, up to and including the presidents of these universities, somehow dispensed from the Ten Commandments? A Catholic who doubts that Jesus was “born of the Virgin Mary”—or who fornicates—has reason to confess a sin. But what about the teacher who inculcates such a doubt, or who denies in the classroom the sinfulness of fornication? Is the form of behavior governed by moral norms set by the Ten Commandments, while the Catholic professor need only concern himself or herself with political categories established by an accrediting agency or by its faculty association, not with the teaching of the *magisterium*? Are Catholic academics subject to the jurisdiction and sanction of professional and political associations, but not those of Church authority? Does Church authority exercise the same vigilance over

Catholicity on campus as political groups do over professional performance?

Since Vatican II Catholic integrity in academia has not followed the patent religious framework of the ancient Church. John Paul II regularly underscores the centrality of authentic Catholic theology to the authentic Catholic university. In his 1987 visit with American bishops, for example, he reminded university

**Are Catholic
academics subject to
the jurisdiction and
sanction of professional
and political
associations, but
not those of
Church authority?**

presidents that the “wholeness” of Catholic worship and faith is seriously diluted, if not eviscerated, by the “pick and choose Catholicity” going on under Church auspices. This “wholeness” inevitably places the Church on a collision course with secular States which assert “wholeness” in their temporal governance of religion and culture. Catholics, even institutional leaders, may be encouraged by the papacy to adapt to secularity to the extent that they can—especially to civil laws, and to the sensible demands of professional academic organizations. But, as late as April 24, 1993, in an address to American bishops in Rome on an *ad limina* visit, John Paul II again warned against those “false dichotomies” which vitiate the “institutional commitment (of Catholic higher education) to the Word of God as proclaimed by the Catholic Church.” These, he outlined, are setting reason against revelation, academic freedom against the demands of Catholic identity, uprooting scholarship from its ethical and moral implications, and fudging the relationship of Church teaching to the principled campus conduct of professors. (*Origins*, May 6, 1993.)

If it is wrong, therefore, for ordinary Catholics to do certain things against God’s law, especially in the public forum, it is a greater evil for college presidents so to act, and for bishops to ignore evil, to tolerate it, to sanction it, without taking steps to quarantine offensive behavior, to delineate or offset its influence, with a view to eliminating it entirely, and to the extent that this is possible. The condition of the Church is far worse when superiors permit the impression to grow that wrongdoing by Catholic leaders, which does injury to Christ’s Mystical Body on earth, is acceptable behavior.

Let us proceed, therefore, to examine how the Catholic dimension should work out in practice, and how Catholic institutions should measure up to their alleged credal professions. In this process, the university/college president, his or her convictions and governing ability, is the responsible agent of Catholicity, because customarily the Board of Trustees, if not in the beginning of an

administration then eventually, reflects the policies and the determination of the president—for good or for ill.

1. THOU SHALT WORSHIP THE LORD THY GOD

This is the first Christian Commandment, from which no Catholic community is absolved, especially a university which claims or has been given the name Catholic.

This means, as circumstances warrant, the reverent public celebration of daily and Sunday Mass, the administration of the Sacraments, and sundry private devotions, in accordance with norms established by the Holy See and the local Bishop.

To be significantly Christian, therefore, the college or university must be a visible and proper worshipping community.

The Catholic Chapel must be as much a center of piety on campus, as the institution’s laboratories are seats of learning. Chapel bells, tolling at noon or in the evening, are only symbols, but the fact that the chapel is filled several times a day with worshippers, that priests are visible during the week in confessional centers and busy, that rooms for prayer and meditation are available and are used, defines the university as Catholic, more than any other feature. A campus, marked only by hurly burly crowds running from one class to the next, tells another story.

Sins against this Commandment include violation of the rubrics, using invalid or illicit matter in Mass or the Sacraments, scandalous liturgies, preaching inconsistent with Catholic teaching, carelessness in distributing Holy Communion during Mass when, without instruction, unworthy receptions are likely, offering general absolution in violation of diocesan regulations, marrying couples in violation of norms for validity and liceity. A sin of no small magnitude may be the indifferent relationship between the Catholic university population and its worshipping responsibility of the institution. Unbelievers and non-Catholics

can come to respect such a worshipping commitment, as they once did.

2. THOU SHALT REVERENCE THE NAME CATHOLIC IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNIVERSITY

The Catholic university, understood as a sacred trust, is an important instrument for enriching the faith of faculty and students, and for building the Catholic community. Its work—as Catholic—pertains to living Christ's life in community, as much as it does to developing the intellectual capability and the upward mobility of its enrollment.

This reverence is shown most clearly through the dominance on campus of committed and articulate communicants of the Church, not simply a *desideratum*, but as a professional qualification for effective service to the kind of community the university says it is.

The by-laws of the institution ought to state unequivocally that the university or college stands in full submission to the teaching authority of the Catholic Church, witnessing as true what the Church teaches as true, reflecting in its academic and community life the Word of God as proclaimed by the Church, eschewing whatever is considered contrary to those truths. Though freedom of inquiry and advocacy will be protected by adequate due process procedures, conduct prejudicial to the university's bond to the Church is no more acceptable, than that proscribed by secular or professional bodies.

Reverence for the name Catholic calls, therefore, for a stipulation in faculty and administration contracts acknowledging a commitment by the signer that he or she respects the Catholic nature of the institution, and that actions contrary to this accepted responsibility are subject to administrative evaluation and, where necessary, appropriate discipline.

Sins against this Commandment include taking the name Catholic lightly or in vain, in permitting others to do so, demeaning the authentic teachers of the Church, or the teachings them-

selves, using the Church's name to gain support or students under false pretenses, participating in activities or movements antithetical to the very nature of the word "Catholic," tolerating groups or instruments inimical to the Church, failing to defend the very right of the Church to own, operate, or sponsor an institution of higher education.

3. KEEP THE WEEKLY LIFE OF THE UNIVERSITY HOLY

The holiness of the university depends on the graced state of its faculty and administrators, those who determine the policies, set the example, protect the religious life of the Catholics, and witness their faith to the university's non-Catholics.

While this apostolate is normally carried on by teaching—especially reminders for Catholics of their obligation of Sunday Mass, frequent confession, and a regular prayer life—the campus gives evidence of the pervasive nature of Catholic faith in the learning community of partially formed Catholic youth, by the presidential appointments, its weekly schedule, its special religious events, its suggested interludes of time for prayer.

Sins against this Commandment include relative silence about the presence of God, tepidity in worship, unconcern about the worship or moral habits of faculty and student body, entertainment permitted which is anti-Catholic in effect, if not in intent, and exclusive preoccupation with secular opinion.

4. HONOR THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH, AND THE MOTHERS, TOO

Reverence for the Pope and the local Bishop, neither of whom are outsiders to a legitimate Catholic campus, is an essential element of truly Christian life. Reverence is more than respect. It involves awe in the presence of a sacred person entrusted by Christ to be the Father of a Christian community. The bishop is not present to manage the details of academia, any more than he operates a parish, but he is charged with responsibility to

oversee and guarantee the authentic Catholicity claimed by an institution within his jurisdiction.

Ordinary parents, religious, too, those who normally nurture the Christian development of their young by entrusting them to the Church's higher education process, deserve respect from the university simply for the confidence they manifest in the truth of what it says is its Catholic commitment. The secular academic world no longer accepts responsibility "in loco parentis," but, normally, a self-proclaimed

Catholic institution must stand morally, if not legally, "in loco ecclesiae." It must behave in a manner consistent with its Catholic claims.

Modern society, on the other hand, looks upon irreverence and disrespect as manifestations of psychological maturity and autonomy, or at worst peccadillos against old understandings of the obedience favored by authority-types. But the Old and the New Testament, (e.g. Mt. 15:3-6) and Catholic tradition, look upon such acts against proper authority to be evil, and worthy of God's wrath. Christ himself made clear that anyone not with Him was against Him (Mt. 12:30) and the Book of Revelations (3:15) enjoins Christians to be hot or cold, because the lukewarm are destined for ejection. The Church no less than Christ cannot be a body with two heads operating at cross-purposes to each other.

5. PRESERVE THE CHRISTIAN LIFE OF THOSE ENTRUSTED TO YOUR CARE

In the natural order of things, safeguarding innocent human life is a grave responsibility, imposed by God, explaining why murder and direct abortion are among mankind's gravest offenses. In the Christian disposition, God's presence in His creatures' life (grace) is the other pearl of greater price, entrusted by the Church to Catholic educators for

The secular academic world no longer accepts responsibility "in loco parentis," but, normally, a self-proclaimed Catholic institution must stand morally, if not legally, "in loco ecclesiae."

its protection and enrichment. Right teaching and authentic Catholic community are the Church's gateways for Christians to enter eternal life.

Christ urged His followers to resist three special temptations (Mt. 4) to any self-fulfillment, autonomy, or power which is irreconcilable with the faith commitment He personalized. Succumbing to these temptations, laid before the unwary by Satan himself, invert Christian priorities. For a college president, therefore, to speak volumes about

lifting his nation's poor out of poverty, but little about raising them from their sinful ways; to be concerned about the racial, ethnic or sex mix of classrooms, but manifest small worry about the low rates of Sunday Mass attendance among students or faculty; to make headlines for their political clubs on behalf of secular causes, yet remain aloof from ministries favoring family life and the Right to Life; to be known for his labors on behalf of "the secular city" but not for courageous efforts to Christianize it, hardly represents what Christ had in mind when He said: "Seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness." (Mt. 6:33).

In the 1987 Los Angeles meeting with the American hierarchy, one Archbishop challenged John Paul II to recognize one special difficulty for pastors in the United States, viz. the superior educational attainments of this country's Catholics. The pontiff responded that if this was the patrimony of our Church, where was the Catholic influence on American culture? Obviously, the Pope did not think that, as touted educated Catholics, we had a great influence on American culture at all.

Few offenses may be graver than a major Church institution inculcating diminished faith, doubt, impiety, misbehavior, anger against the Church, estrangement. The "woes" that Christ reserved for scandal mongers are readily transfer-

rable to a university administration which maintains on campus those habits which strangle God's life among His people. (Mt. 11:21; Lk. 10:13; Mt. 18:7; Mt. 23:16, etc.)

6. THOU SHALT NOT ADULTERATE THE CATHOLIC MESSAGE

When biblical authors speak of truth they mean fidelity to God's Word in speech and behavior. Living the Catholic faith, therefore, witnesses Christ's truth more than merely pronouncing His propositions correctly. But, in a teaching situation, passing on those propositions in their Catholic sense is what cements membership in the Church, and thereby a bonded relationship with Christ. Fidelity is its essential characteristic.

Christians often sin against God, sometimes through weakness and temptation. Or by deliberately acting against established norms, they pick and choose what they believe or do, still calling themselves Catholic. Far more wicked, however, are educators and college administrators who legitimize what John Paul II condemns as "pick and choose Catholicity." Such adulteration of the Church's message is in many cases a grave offense. Pretense by some educators that they are defining a "core Catholicity" that is (according to them) the Church's bottom line, but permitting students to believe that they have the option to ignore or reject what they do not like about most of the rest, is itself sinful. Some of this teaching (e.g. on adultery or lust) has been condemned seriously by Christ Himself. Its adulteration represents infidelity of a high order. Furthermore, the newly promulgated *Catechism of the Catholic Church* gives lie to anyone's claim of a right to pick and choose what the core of Christ's message is, and a right to ignore or deny the rest.

7. THOU SHALT NOT STEAL FROM YOUR FAITHFUL SONS AND DAUGHTERS

When families pay for their children's higher

education, they have a right to obtain that for which they sacrifice so much of their income. Material possessions are not the issue, truth in advertising is. Those who teach under professedly Catholic auspices, but do not practice what the Church preaches, are engaged in thievery. St. Paul once taught: "You who teach another, are you failing to teach yourself? You who preach against stealing, do you steal?" (Rom. 2:21). The Apostle was clear on this point: "Neither thieves ... nor robbers will inherit the Kingdom of God." (1Cor. 6:10). Years ago, a Jesuit named George Bull gave credit to college presidents for placing their young on the country's upward mobility track as full believing and practicing Catholics. Today, Catholic college administrators, not uncommonly, look upon a hierarchy that insists on firm authentic teaching of the Catholic faith as a threat to their secular enterprise. However, Catholic parents do not pay for a formation of their young according to the thinking represented by Richard McBrien, Charles Curran, or Richard McCormick.

Another aspect of honesty is the acknowledgment of the truth about what goes on Catholic-wise in an institution under the Church's care. One president, upon his accession, found himself faced with an exegete who relativized biblical truth, a personnel director who rejected moral absolutes, a social scientist promoting atheistic Marxism, a dean who wanted to abandon Sunday liturgies because they were so lightly used, and sexual immorality plus drug abuse in the college dorms. This particular president had choices to make, but the real question is: How did these aberrations take root in an ostensibly Catholic set-up? And who takes the responsibility before God?

8. THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS TO AN IMPORTANT CHURCH WORK

The Eighth Commandment of the Decalogue is about truth-telling. St. Paul said it well: "Living the truth in love, we should grow in every way

unto Him Who is the head, Christ.” (Eph. 4:15). St. James (3:2) claimed that a person is perfect if he makes no mistakes in what he says, because sins of speech are ones human beings commit most often. In our time, however, it is “the big lie” and “the cover-up” which have become profitable institutions, expressions of humanity, they sometimes say—even if they lead to economic losses and wars.

But what about advertising a Catholic university education when the product is imperfectly Catholic, or badly Catholic, or hardly Catholic at all? Is not false advertising an evil? Are not people harmed by it? And the Church, even more so?

Any college president, whose actions belie the Church’s convictions, indulges in the kind of hypocrisy which Christ leveled against the Pharisees, when he advised his disciples not to follow their false leads. Priests and religious, particularly, give false witness, when their department gives the lie to the testimony the Church says they are to project. False witness is especially offensive when given by those whose Church roles are authoritative. Claims that the Church once approved slavery, or that Pius XI favored Fascists, and Pius XII Nazis, or John XXIII favored dissent are typical examples of such false witness.

An especial kind of false witness occurs when university presidents lie to their superiors, including bishops, about their intentions or the conditions of Catholic life upon their campuses, and when those superiors lie to the faithful about what can be expected Catholic-wise when they enroll their children there.

9. and 10. THOU SHALT NOT COVET WORLDLY RENOWN AT THE EXPENSE OF THE CHURCH

Lust for worldly glory is a greater temptation

**Any college president,
whose actions belie the
Church’s convictions,
indulges in the kind of
hypocrisy which Christ
leveled against the
Pharisees, when he
advised his disciples
not to follow
their false leads.**

than lust for sex. Born of pride and vanity, this desire devours its victim more completely, because its driving force is self-pleasure for a dead object. Every university is nothing more or less than an educational institution at the highest level of someone’s system—the State’s, owned by a private corporation, by a faculty or affiliated with the Church, each sponsor defining its specific reasons for establishing a university, and how its special reason for existence is to be realized. Motives of scholarship and good teaching, of

glory, or recognition, or monetary gain, or status, or any other earthly reward, may impel a Catholic university to accept modes of operation determined by groups or individuals who neither believe in, nor have kindly regard for the Catholic faith or for any university that plays by more than their rules. In such cases, administrators of the religious school betray the patrimony of those faithful, religious and lay, who gave the Catholic institution its being, brought it to life, and developed its powers as an instrument of the Church’s evangelization mission, as well as classical education. The secularized Catholic university is a contradiction in terms. The trade-off of its religious nature for secular gain must contend with Christ: “What profit is there for one to gain the whole world and forfeit his life? What could one give in exchange for his life?” (Mark 8:36)

EPILOGUE

Following the Second Vatican Council many Catholic controversies assumed a political, rather than a moral coloration. “Truth” and “right” gave way to phrases like “politically correct” and “socially irrelevant.” The demand for “consensus judgments” about the meaning public law led special interest groups in academia and media to demand, and eventually, obtain concessions which

placed them above or outside the public law of the Church.

Catholics, even pastors, gave up talking about sin or punishment for wrong-doing, to concentrate on promoting psychological or social well-being for the Church's membership. During that period when decisions were made by undergroups within the Church against the Catholic faith, its worship and moral code, or against its public law, pastors began to shy away from finding the perpetrators guilty of fault, persuaded that the disorders would correct themselves in time, probably through additional discussion. (Not surprisingly, even the Sacrament of Penance fell into desuetude.)

Yet the judgments of anti-establishment activists, purported to be examples of new political freedom within the Church, were moral in nature, involved good or evil conduct depending on whether they conformed to or violated any one of God's ten essential laws for proper human behavior. Poorly conceived political action in the secular order sometimes begets unexpected political fallout, but it can also involve sin. Evil thinking and vicious conduct offend God. The violations will be venial or mortal depending on the quality of the offense. Tampering with Catholic worship, heresy, quasi-heresy, doubts of faith entertained or inculcated, bad example and scandalous behavior leading the young into sin, failure to do one's religious duty, violations of state of life or vows—these have gone on in various degrees at many, if not most, Catholic institutions of higher learning. Sometimes the Church's officials took notice of the misbehavior belatedly, usually when there was the likelihood of an unfavorable headline. But, in the normal course of events, very little corrective action occurred at the bishop' level. Indeed academics who played fast and easy with Roman definitions and norms, took control of most departments of religious study and campus ministry, or pursued courses inimical to Church interests

The record shows that ecclesial authorities sometimes participated in the breakdown of Catholic discipline.

without interference either by religious superiors or bishops. The record shows that ecclesial authorities sometimes participated in the breakdown of Catholic discipline.

Once Catholic higher education alienated itself from Church supervision, its Catholic faith, as much as its discipline, suffered, not only among student bodies, but in diocesan structures where university personnel commanded a formative role. Thirty years after the fact is an appropriate time to demand that Catholic university/college presidents be called upon by higher authority to give an account of their stewardship. If higher authority is finally prepared to face the real Catholic world, it must decide who and who ought not be steward any longer of a Catholic trust. And convey its judgment to relevant university presidents, or to the Catholic public, as necessary.

The integrity of the Church calls for no further delay in making such judgments, if only by reason of higher authority's responsibility for the "cura animarum", which presently is in jeopardy. If there is ever to be a "Catholic Moment" in this post-Christian world of ours, it will come when there is something in the Catholic world worth imitating—good morals and deep faith being the two essentials, witnessed especially in the Church's teaching world.

THE TEN "WHY CAN'T YOU" QUESTIONS

When Catholics, trained to be the best Catholics they ought to be, seek to become what the Church expects them to be, they acquire a fairly clear idea of what Christ expected of His disciples. They realize their importance to Christ's mission and their role in the Church. Acknowledging their human shortcomings, practicing Catholics learn that living a pious life this side of eternity becomes easier when the Church itself is faithful

to Christ, and when the Sacraments, especially of Penance and the Eucharist, are worthily received. Confessors, also properly trained, come to understand those factors in human life which diminish culpability, but they always keep Christ's norms (i.e., the Commandments) before the eyes of the penitents. Every penitent does penance, however light. From time to time, the priests come upon recidivists—those seemingly mired in repeated acts and habits of sin—who excuse themselves of fault with the alibi "I can't!" "I can't give up the other woman," "I can't throw away the contraceptive," "I can't pay back what I stole," "I can't stop drinking," "I can't leave the gang." And so forth.

From New Testament times, "I can't" was often a euphemism for "I won't." Yet the confessor, like his Master, usually gave absolution anyway on a penitent's promise to try harder to eliminate grievous sin from his or her life. Some penitents, after a while—the real "I wonters"—walked no more with the Church, at least for a little while, but they knew what it meant to be a disciple and they realized what was necessary to remain in God's grace. Most Catholics kept trying to deserve their graced relationship with God, because they needed a clear conscience, as much as they wanted absolution.

In our day of few and short confessional lines, the traditional violations of God's Commandments are the sins rarely mentioned any more. Spoken less out loud are the sins committed by the teachers of the Church, especially priests, religious, and their superiors, who instruct the would-be faithful that they, not the Christ or His hierarchy, decide what sin is and when it occurs. Sins against faith, morals, and Church discipline have always been sins, but what is new in our time is the ingrained sense that teachers who teach against faith, morals, and Church discipline are not themselves sinners, excusing themselves with the time-worn apologies for weakness or malice, "The Faculty made me do it," "What else can I do," "I'm a victim of circumstance."

So, the moment of truth is at hand for an old-fashioned Catholic examination of conscience.

And, since many new sins are committed on Catholic college/university campuses, this examination might be directed at those responsible for the conduct of those institutions.

1. Why Can't those entrusted with God's authority use their sacred office to see that His mind and will set the tone in communities over which they have been placed in sacred trust?

2. Why Can't they enter their campuses in such a way that all clearly understand what the president of a Catholic university means, what his or her new leadership expects of members who accept the university's nature as a given, and how their community will be called upon to realize better God's purposes in this noble work of Catholic higher education?

3. Why Can't new leaders begin by inspiring their subjects to measure whatever they are and do first by their obligations to God, and then by how effectively the faith and a good moral life of their company are intensified? No believing Catholic, doing the Father's work, may claim rightful authority against God—against Christ for that matter, or against the Pope and the bishops in union with him doing Christ's work.

4. Why Can't a committed Catholic university president, once he assesses the de facto conditions of his university, and, with the appearance of a man serious about the Church's business, openly declare his specific religious goals from the start of his administration, just as he readily announces what he expects to accomplish academically or socially?

5. Why Can't he or she do this first with his trustees, then with the faculty association, then before the student body, and in due course, to the Catholics of his diocese?

6. Why Can't a university president tell an errant theologian that his doctrinal propositions, or his

behavior, is unacceptable on this campus?

7. Why Can't a faculty union, properly informed, also take a dim view of conduct unbecoming a Catholic priest/theologian/professor?

8. If the issue is serious enough for Catholicity **Why** on occasion **Can't** a university underwrite legal action against an obstreperous offender against the university's commitment or moral code?

9. Why Can't a religious superior, whose forbears bequeathed him a valuable patrimony, take whatever action wisdom and good governance demands of him against an errant president?

10. Why Can't a bishop make clear to all and sundry, in a civil and Christian way, but unashamedly, what he expects of a Catholic university Board of Trustees and their President? And do what he must do, privately or publicly, to safeguard the holiness of his people?

One wonders why, in view of the supposed institutional commitment of the university/college to the Catholic Church, it is so difficult for members of the administration and faculty who sincerely share that commitment, to make the Profession of Faith and take the Oath of Fidelity which the Holy See has since 1989 demanded of a large class of Catholics assuming certain specified offices in the Church. Newcomers accepting new contracts should be so induced, and large numbers of academics, though not legally bound, would want to do so because they love the Church, and are its obedient professionals. Wanton disregard of this "Oath of Office" is seen by many to be *prima facie* evidence of a lack of that institutional commitment to the Church, which gave birth to the institution and still maintains whatever religious life it has. **Why cannot** officers of *magisterium* move in orderly fashion to see that the basic elements of Catholic identity be observed? Surely this responsibility is not only canonical, but moral.

Of course, authority figures have easy roles to play when they deal with law-abiding citizens in the City of God. But respecters of public order, in or out of the Church, were not born obedient; most of them became accustomed from an early age to restrain their worst impulses within a family, where destructive activity by incorrigibles was held bound to the "underworld," or to the closet. By inculcating virtuous behavior, and privatizing anything that might lead to vice, authority figures solidified their family around God's law and ensured the well-being of all who wanted to stay well. The Godless society makes God's ten fundamental demands irrelevant in a culture where self-interest alone counts. In a secularized situation it is the State which determines faith and morals, even if it legitimizes lust, violence, or vulgarity.

Every institution, calling itself Catholic, normally lives within a hostile outer world. Yet if its native land is a free country, *why can't* Church authorities in the twentieth century protect their own institutions with the same effectiveness their predecessors demonstrated in the nineteenth? The Catholic house cannot long remain divided, macro-managed by a pope and bishops in union with him going one way, micro-managed by Catholic higher education going another; such a house is hardly what Christ had in mind.

The publication of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* is evidence that "the Battle for Rome" has been won. The Church still teaches what it has always taught, about the Fall and the Redemption, about the priesthood of Christ and the Church, of Mary and the Ten Commandments, and of the Four Last Things. Ever since the end of Vatican II certain dissident intellectuals, aided by some bishops in various parts of the world, have conducted vigorous sorties against the *magisterium* of the Church, expecting Rome eventually to fall before the weight of their arguments, or the public opinion they manufactured or the media pressure they generated. Clearly, Rome has survived. And never have so many in the Church owed so much to the comparatively few Catholic apologists who

gathered around John Paul II in defense of the faith.

Like the Battle of Britain, the war against the Catholic faith continues, but on a larger scale, directed by academics on a Catholic campus somewhere, larger because the fight is no longer over this or that doctrine, but over the very truth about Christ Himself. The stakes are higher, too, because those who believed in the Church, but thought they could find peace in their time through negotiation with organized dissenters, finally must throw their weight on the *magisterium's* side of the right and the true. The Church's self-declared reformers have over recent years lived in a privileged sanctuary safe from attack, because they claimed that their rebellion was only over power, to be seized by "the have-nots" (the people) from the "haves" (the *magisterium*). In reality the territory in contest from the beginning of the Post-Vatican II era was Christ's Revelation and who, after Christ, was entitled to say what the deposit of faith continued to mean in the twentieth century. Even the popular causes of this period—"preferential option for the poor," shared responsibility of all Catholics for the Church enterprise, and ecumenical outreach—cannot a quarter century later be defined by "might" taken or given, but by Catholic doctrine and ecclesial policy based on that doctrine. As for freedom for people in and out of the pews, the issue no longer is political liberty of individual Catholics to organize against the *magisterium*—and against any revelation handed down by the Apostles and their successors of which they disapprove—but of the freedom of the Sons of God, true believers and their Good Shepherds, to do what Christ called upon them to do, to protect their institutions from the hirelings who would use civil power and naked might to crucify that

Christ in our time represented by John Paul II. (Interestingly, talk has already been heard of manipulating the next Conclave to elect a hireling as the present Pope's successor.)

Since the center of opposition everywhere, to what is faithfully contained in the new *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, is the Catholic university campus somewhere, and, since the major leadership of the Church's rebellious forces are now to be found in the United States, not Europe (although significant ones still function in Rome itself), it behooves the Good Shepherds of the Church to direct their attention to how well or poorly the traditional system of Catholic higher education serves the Church today. Once (shortly after 1967) the Catholic university president looked upon himself or herself as "the pastor" of a Catholic community, responsible to the Church for the souls of his constituency, he became simply a civil functionary only, preoccupied with the secular well-being of his institution. Catholic interests became his only if they did not threaten his institutions political viability. But, Catholics trained under such auspices went forth into convents, seminaries, diocesan agencies, houses of

bishops, and parishes representing an ideology that serves Mammon and its lusts, more than God and His Ten Commandments.

The Church's self-declared reformers have over recent years lived in a privileged sanctuary safe from attack, because they claimed that their rebellion was only over power, to be seized by "the have-nots" (the people) from the "haves" (the *magisterium*).

The Battle for Rome is over; the Great War for Christianity outside the pale of the Catholic Church may also be over. But the one within the Church it is still underway. A solid body of veterans of Catholic University life think that "the idea of a Catholic university," so eloquently expostulated by more than John Henry Newman, is irretrievable, and gone too the rich patrimony of the Jesuits beginning in 1789, of the sisters of Charity from 1843 onward, and

of Catholic laymen as late as 1977. The cause is lost, they say, not only because university presidents are addicted to government money and secularism, but because the major organs of Catholic opinion-molding will not allow the Church question to be reopened in any serious way, leaving the saved talking increasingly in smaller circles to the no-longer powerful saved. Yet, if this be the continuing Catholic reality, the Church of the United States, and by inference, the Universal Church, is an endangered species. Catholic higher education is the only segment of Catholic schooling still growing (now over 600,000 enrollment). If these 238 colleges and universities continue to speak for secularity, more than Catholicity, and if the Catholicity tendered there is not dissimilar from bankrupt mainline Protestantism, the very warp and woof of the Church of the 21st Century will be eroded.

Nonetheless, just as optimism grew in Britain once the superpowers joined forces against the common enemy, and now that the die already cast for allied Church shepherds, the Barque of Peter must launch out into its own deep sea once more. Christ's vicars must draft a charter of Four Freedoms of the Church—to worship, to teach, rule, sanctify according to its own constitution, to reclaim their institutions on behalf of that same charter, and to root out of the system those concrete

bastions of watered-down doctrine which dilute Catholic vigor and harm those “little ones” for whom Christ gave up His life. The days of pointless or anti-Roman dialogue are over. The time for the Good Shepherds of the Church to exercise their freedom in Christ's name and do their duty is at hand.

Is not *The Catechism of the Church* the *summum* of what the young of our time are to be taught with conviction by those who call themselves Catholic educators? And should they not be held so to account, by Church Fathers, certainly as firmly as they are liable before magistrates of the secular agenda?

Can you imagine Christ undertaking His public mission with excuses for not doing what he was sent to do because of pain He would suffer, or rewards He would forgo, at the hands of Scribes or Pharisees or Sadducees, or even of the mob, or from a Herod or a Pilate, or even from an in-house traitor, like Judas? Outside of the Crucifixion itself, there is no more poignant and distressful moment in Christ's life than the agony in Gethsemane, Christ in anguish and the Apostles sleeping, and the Lord's plaintive reproach: “Could you not watch one hour with me?” (Mt. 26:40). Eventually, they awoke, all to die a martyr's death for Him. ✠

OF INTEREST

Notre Dame Institute, Arlington, VA and Franciscan University of Steubenville are co-sponsoring a major conference on the new “Catechism”, July 9, 10, 11, in Crystal City (Arlington, VA). Anyone registering before June 15 gets a free copy of the “Catechism”. Contact Mr. Rook, at Steubenville University (614) 283-6318, FAX (614) 283-6442.

Christendom College, 1993 Summer Institute, June 13-20, 1993, Apologetics of the 90s—A House Divided: Evangelization Within the Church. Contact John Ciskanik (800) 877-5456.

Liturgical Music and the Restoration of the Sacred, a colloquium sponsored by Christendom College in collaboration with the Church Music Association of America, June 25-28, 1993, Christendom College, Front Royal, VA. Call (800) 877-5456.

Safeguarding the Faith

A Project for Maintaining Purity of Doctrine among Catechists

Fr. Basil Mary Arthadeva

IN THE *FELLOWSHIP* of *Catholic Scholars Newsletter* of March 1992 a report was published that "in some places dissent among catechetical leaders from authoritative teaching has been commonplace." The article adds that "such dissent, which often is thinly based, has been turned into orthodox conviction whenever pastoral care of catechesis follows Catholic norms in a determined way." The present article aims to provide such a decisive remedy insofar as possible.

Father Basil and others—including three Philippine priests—concerned with the extent to which the problem has affected the areas in which they work, consulted Cardinal Sanchez to seek support for what is set forth below.

Curial Support for Our "Contract"

His Eminence, José T. Cardinal Sanchez, President of the International Council for Catechesis (and Prefect of the Congregation for the Clergy), has written the following supportive letter, on behalf of a project devised by some of us to protect the faith—in danger due to the fact quoted in the above introductory note. Together with His Eminence's letter (dated at Rome, 28, November 1992, Congregatio

Pro Clericis, file Prot. 2252) we present copies of the documents sent to him to which his letter refers, that is, the "Contract, Declaration of Position and Purpose" with the accompanying footnotes and appendices. The Cardinal's letter is addressed to myself:

"Reading with great interest the 'Contract and Declaration of Position' which you suggested should be signed, after their period of formation, by men and women to be recruited for catechetical work, we recommend your very laudable effort to ensure fidelity to the Papal Magisterium and the Tradition of the Church.

"Catechists are in the front line of our evangelizing efforts and it is of particular importance that they be sincerely convinced of the Church's teaching.

"For the one engaged by the Church as a catechist, to evangelize is always an act profoundly related to the Church and never individual, or private. He acts not merely in virtue of a personal inspiration or initiative, but as one called and commissioned by the Church, whose faithful fond servant he is considered to be. Hence he does not catechize according to individualistic viewpoints and criteria, but in profound communion with the Church and her pastors (cf. EN 60).

"Moreover, one who becomes a disciple to learn of Christ has a right to receive the content of the faith as preserved by the Church, not something mutilated or falsified or diminished, but complete and integral in all its effectiveness and vigor.

"It is Christ Himself who commands the catechist to pass on the message in its fullness: *Teach ye all*

nations...teaching them to observe all things...(Mt. 28:19-20).

"Consequently no authentic catechist can lawfully make from the deposit of faith entrusted to the Church, a selection according to his liking, of what one is to consider important and what one will consider unimportant, so as to teach the former and lay aside the latter (cf. CT 30).

"In conclusion, when he transmits the faith of the Church in its integrity, the catechist fosters an appreciation of belonging to the Church among those catechized, he introduces them to the liturgical life and to the duty of charity in the community, and he educates them in a solid Church-related spirituality, so that they learn to think with the Church and in the Church.

"I bless your venture and wish it all success."

José T. Card. Sanchez + C. Sepe
Prefect Secretary

Contract and Declaration of Position

Contract

I, the undersigned, certify that I make my own the following fundamental position quoted from the "Declaration of Principles" of 1969 of an international sacerdotal movement centered in Madrid, this movement, with its "Declaration," having been praised in an official letter of May 6, 1971, from the Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation for Clergy:

"The Sacerdotal Brotherhood of St. Anthony Claret and St. John of Avila...cannot remain silent in

this critical hour in the history of the Church, when "plots threaten her" (Paul VI, Dec. 7, 1968)...Before the whole world...we make a Declaration of our doctrinal principles, **FOR WHICH WE ARE READY TO GIVE UP OUR LIVES** (3a): We declare our firm adherence to the See of St. Peter, living rock upon which the holy Church was founded and the doctrine that comes from that See. With thankful hearts we accept the doctrine and decisions of Vatican II, Vatican I, Trent, and all the Councils of the Church, of the Magisterium and the Tradition of two thousand years."

Hence I gladly and fully subscribe to all teachings in the "Profession of Faith to be made by Converts" (published 1964 by NCWC, USA, and approved by the Holy Office) and I subscribe to the *Professio fidei* published by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in AAS 1989, pp. 104-105 (having familiarized myself with the contents of these two documents).

Enlightened by divine grace and having received instruction on the divine credentials and claims of the Roman Catholic Church, I am convinced that the Roman Pontiffs, Christ's Vicars, possess a charism and authority received from God which I am bound to acknowledge in order to be saved.

I hereby profess that I have received that grace whereby I can and do *think with and within the Church*, in the sense that I accept as God's will and message sufficiently promulgated to me to bind me to believe firmly all the teachings of the ordinary and extraordinary

Papal Magisterium as they harmonize into a unity according to their respective rank of authority (Canons 749-754), and my conscience obliges me to follow Pius XII's teaching in *Humani generis* (CS-3885):

"Nor must it be thought that what is contained in Encyclical letters does not in itself require assent, on the pretext that in them the Popes are not using the supreme power of their teaching authority. Rather, these teachings pertain to the ordinary teaching authority, about which it is also true to say: *He who hears you, hears Me...* If Popes in their official acts deliberately pass judgment on a matter that has been debated up to then, it is clear to all that the matter...cannot be considered any longer a question open for discussion among theologians."

Hence I stand by the Holy See against dissenters to *Spiritus Paraclitus* of Benedict XV (AAS 12:384 ff), *Casti Connibii* of Pius XI (AAS 22:560 ff), *Humanae Vitae* of Paul VI (AAS 60:481 ff), and the Instruction of the Holy See *Persona Humana* (AAS 68:77-98), especially certain important parts of these documents which have been distributed to us for study and discussion. I attach no value to contrary teachings, nor to any theories in faith and morals being revived today which were condemned by the Church in the past by her Ordinary or Solemn Magisterium such as by Pius II in *Cum sicut accepimus* (DS 1361-1369) and by the Council of Trent concerning the Holy Eucharist (DS 1651-1652)

Purpose

I am pleased if the superior who engage us as catechists require a renewal of this Contract and Statement from any or all of us annually and whenever they see the need. I believe that this should make it more effective (even if not 100%) in keeping out the kind of men who have undermined the Faith, and I sincerely desire them kept out of a teaching commitment. In fact, if superiors think it would help toward this end for this document to be executed by us under oath, I would not object. I beg Jesus and Mary to always keep me of the mind expressed in it.

Signed

Date, Place

Witness

Abbreviations

- AAS = *Acta Apostolicae Sedes*, an official Vatican Bulletin.
- ASS = *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, an earlier official Vatican documentary (Rome, 1865-1908).
- DS = Denzinger-Schonmetzer, *Enchiridion Symbolorum...*, 1976 edition, an unofficial documentary of Church documents of greater consequence issued throughout history.
- CT = Apostolic exhortation *Catechesi tradendi* of Pope John Paul II.
- EN = Apostolic exhortation *Evangelii nuntiandi* of Pope Paul VI.

Quade on Multi-Culturalism

Quentin Quade, director of the Virgil Blum S.J. Center for Parental Freedom in Education at Marquette University, draws some lessons from the erstwhile Soviet Union:

THE STRIKING difference between the results of ethnic differentiation in a voluntary circumstance and the results in a forced circumstance such as the Soviet case, could have pertinence to the current debate on cultural diversity in the United States. For example, reflection on this might indicate the limits of racial and ethnic independence. Our democracy is a voluntary union. With two gaping exceptions to be noted below, it was always a voluntary union. But it is a *union*, and it cannot be stretched too far without either breaking or beginning to repress in order to avoid break-up. The fracturing of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia can show us something about the limits that must be placed on cultural diversity if surrounding unity is to be maintained. One should note that, whereas the most powerful centrifugal forces in the Soviet Unions have a geographic base, and thus a natural repository for their dynamism — a place to embody their nationalist desires — the basic centrifugal forces in the U.S. have no geographic identity and no geographic 'solution.' The discontented must find peace within.

The two exceptions to the American ideal of voluntary union, of course, are Native Americans and the blacks. The first became

part of the America polity by military conquest, and the second by enslavement. No doubt those facts play a substantial part in the exceptional difficulty the U.S. has had in fully integrating these peoples. Contrasting the American and Soviet experiences as outlined above may provide some clues for intelligent policy for both the majority-reflecting government and those portions of the black and Native American communities that exhibit greater-than-normal alienation.

Government, and the fully assimilated majorities it is supposed to reflect, may want to soft-pedal the refrain of "The Poles did it, the Italians did it, the Japanese did it — why don't *you* people do it, too." "It" meaning to secure their place in society and in the economy. That refrain rests on an analogy and, as we have seen, the analogy suffers badly in one crucial respect: how they became part of the polity in the first place.

There is more natural distrust, frustration and resentment flowing from black and Indian history; perhaps more majority stereotyping; and, in that hot volatile mixture, more continuous chafing than we find in other communities within the greater community. Thus, while it is surely true that the best the U.S. can offer blacks or Native Americans or anyone else is color-blindness and barrier-free equality of opportunity, a wise policy will recognize that the extraordinary history may well justify temporary extraordinary helping hands, especially to remedy disproportionate economic disadvantage, extraordinary efforts to encourage the citizens of black and Indian

heritage to 'buy in'. Perhaps this may lend some perspective on current discussion of affirmative action. The key is to test any temporary device to ensure that it does not have unintended consequences worse than its causes.

And for those blacks and Native Americans who experience alienation and reject color-blindness and integration as the best social objective, a reflection on the Soviet X could also be enlightening. For it reminds us that a nation-state has a limited number of ways to respond to social centrifugality. It can invite the alienated to join in. It can repress any destructive expressions of such alienation. Or it can accept the flight of such peoples to a more natural and inviting locale. But in the United States the third option does not exist, for there is no other locale more fitting for today's troubled people. Repression is possible, but hardly desirable. Thus, among responses to current major social discontents the only suitable one is to buy in, to reconcile, and to focus on becoming a functioning part of the larger community. Racial or ethnic separateness is not an acceptable goal in the U.S. ✠

Catholics and Politics In Post-World War II America: Some Key Questions

Joseph A. Varacalli, Ph.D.

Introduction

The first major national writing project of the Society of Catholic Social Scientists is a proposed monograph entitled *Catholic Political Activity in the United States*. Under the general direction of Dr. Stephen M. Krason of the Franciscan University of Steubenville, the project consists of three sections, each led by a co-director or co-directors.

The first "normative," section, led by Father Brian Mullady and Mark Recznik, will present the teachings of the Catholic Church both on the question of the obligation of Catholics to participate in political and public affairs and on the basic principles which should structure political and social life. The second, "empirical," section under the guidance of Joseph Varacalli, is intended to analyze just *how* Catholics — whether as individual citizens, members of Church or other voluntary organizations, government officials, or Church leaders — have *actually* participated in American political life in terms of both *quality*, i.e., how their political behavior formally compares with the official pronouncements of the Church, and *degree*, i.e., the extent and seriousness of their political activity on behalf of the Faith. The final, 'policy' part, led

by Dominic Aquila, will propose ways by which the gap between the *ideal* and the *real* can be closed, i.e., will offer practical suggestions by which Catholics can more faithfully present their religious worldview in the public square.

The following questions constitute an interim report or initial step in the eventual completion of the empirical portion of the overall analysis. They are divided into the following categories: Society, Political Parties, Religion, Bishops, Church Professionals, Organizations, Politicians, and Laity. The publication and dispersion of this interim report is intended to solicit useful scholarly feedback.

Society

1. How do such basic sociological background variables as race, ethnicity, gender, age cohort, life-cycle stage, education, socio-economic class, residence, and geographic region today affect one's appropriation of the Catholic faith and, derivatively, political behavior?
2. What has been the impact of a Protestant and, later, a secular cultural hegemony in the American public sphere on Catholic political behavior?
3. What has been the legacy of the "immigrant Church" on Catholic political behavior? Conversely, what has been the impact of the relatively recent *embourgeoisement* of American Catholics?
4. What have been the consequences of historically differing interpretations of the 'separation of Church and State' that have been institutionalized in the United States for Catholic political behavior?
5. Is the moral issue of abortion in

contemporary American society the single greatest catalyst for united political activity on the part of both the Church hierarchy and orthodox grass-root Catholics? If so, why, if not, why?

Political Parties

1. Was the historic and taken-for-granted association of Catholics with the Democratic Party up until the McGovern candidacy in 1972 primarily a result of the perception that the "old liberalism" (Stephen Krason's term) was at least tolerable from a Catholic point of view? Or was the association more a function of the perception that the Democratic Party was better suited to meet the basic material needs of an immigrant and working class group as much essentially pagan as Christian?
2. Is the slight de-alignment of Catholics away from the Democratic Party since 1972 in the form of embracing either Republican or Independent candidates primarily a result of the rejection of the overtly anti-religious and anti-Catholic policies and programs of what Krason calls the "new liberalism"? Or is it more a function of the perception that the Democratic Party, at least from 1972 to 1991, was not the best organization to promote economic prosperity? Why did so many Catholics vote for either Bill Clinton or Ross Perot?
3. Why haven't Catholics, in any significant way, been part of an attempt to create a third Christian political party?
4. What is the nature of the political alliance, if any, between Catholics and conservative Protestants since the election of Ronald Reagan in 1980?

Religion

1. How does the fact that the Catholic religion is internally variegated, i.e. contains many sub-traditions, affect Catholic political activity?
2. What are the differences in both political thought and behavior between 'nominal' Catholics and those 'active' Catholics who participate in the sacramental and organizations life of the Church?
 - a. What is the difference in political behavior between those 'active' Catholics who affirm Magisterial teaching and those 'active' Catholics who do not?
 - b. Was this distinction between types of 'active' Catholics as analytically useful in the immediate aftermath of World War II as it is in the post-Conciliar Church?
3. How different was the stance of the Catholic Church in the United States toward the political order prior to the Council?
4. What role did Vatican II (or its selective misrepresentation) play in spurring on the 'new activism' in the Church over the past three decades?
5. Has the post-conciliar Church in the United States gained or lost political influence?

Bishops

1. Do most American Catholic Bishops today speak *in like mind* about crucial political issues of moral import? If not, why not?
2. Do most American Catholic Bishops today speak out *clearly and loudly* on political issues of moral import? If not, why not?
3. Has the nature of the American Bishops' posture toward the political order changed in the post-Vatican II era vis-à-vis the 1940's and 1950's? Why?

4. What roles have the National Catholic Welfare Conference and, since 1966, the NCCB/USCC bureaucracies played in American Catholic political activity?
5. What has been the impact on the Catholic vote of Cardinal Joseph Bernadin's 'seamless garment' argument and the 1979 statement of the Administrative Board of the USCC, "Political Responsibility: Choices for the 1980's"?
6. What has been the impact of the post-Vatican II acceptance on the part of the American Bishops of a 'consultative' decision-making process?
7. Will the combination of [a] the increased secularism institutionalized in the American public square, [b] the election of Bill Clinton to the American presidency, and [c] the continued inability of those Bishops loyal to the Pope to take control of the NCCB/USCC force His Holiness John Paul II to take a more active role in American political life?

Church Professionals

1. How much influence does a new Catholic 'knowledge class' composed of Catholic bureaucrats, intellectuals and social activists have in the post-conciliar Church in America?
2. Is there a 'gap' or 'gathering storm' between the religio-political worldview of Church professionals and orthodox Catholics?
3. Is there a 'gap' or 'gathering storm' between the religio-political worldview of Church professionals and working class and lower middle class Catholics?

Organizations

1. What are the major Catholic organizations (theoretically, actu-

- ally, potentially) under ecclesiastical oversight that are capable today of influencing Catholics in crucial political elections on issues of moral import?
2. Do Bishops influence their own organizations on political matters affecting the Faith?
3. What are the major Catholic lay-based voluntary organizations that are today capable of influencing Catholics in crucial political elections and on issues of moral import?
4. Do lay-based Catholic organizations expel, with or without explicit ecclesiastical support, members who support or actively engage in political activities that violate the basic tenets of the Faith?
5. How does a Catholic education (from grammar on up) affect political thought and behavior?

Politicians

1. Have Bishops excommunicated or admonished Catholic politicians who, while claiming to be 'personally opposed', support *qua state official*, government-sponsored programs that violate key tenets of the Faith?
2. Do any 'personally opposed' Catholic politicians who execute state activities contrary to the Faith as public officials simultaneously work to change those policies *qua private citizen*?
3. Do most American Catholic politicians today agree with the broad thrust of John F. Kennedy's address to the Houston Ministerial Alliance during the 1960 presidential election?
4. Has Catholic representation in Congress and among presidential candidates increased in the post World War II era concomitant with the *embourgeoisement* of the

Catholic population?

5. In post World War II America, have Catholic Congressmen, i.e. elected members of the House and Senate, voted as a religious and cultural bloc? If not, why not?

Laity

1. How orthodox are the religious views held by American Catholics?
2. How do the religious views held by Catholics translate into political behavior?
3. Does the Catholic laity support the idea that Church leaders should preach and teach the Catholic social doctrine of the Church?
4. Does the Catholic laity support the idea that Church leaders should

pronounce on *specific* social and political issues?

5. Does a vital acceptance and participation in a 'devotional' Catholicism inhibit concern and activity for the institutionalization of justice?
6. On what kinds of political issues of moral import are American Catholics most likely to respect Church teaching?
7. What types of Catholic accept what types of Catholic teachings on political issues of moral import?
8. What impact has the recent surge in exogamous marriage by young Catholics had on their political values and activity?

Are the above questions pertinent? What important questions have been ignored? What are the reasoned responses to the list? What empirically-based studies and analyses should be undertaken to answer these questions?

Suggestions and reflections on this interim report, as well as the names and addresses of scholars interested in assisting in the completion of this section of *Catholic Political Activity in the United States*, should write the author, Dr. Joseph A. Varacalli, Department of Sociology, Nassau Community College -SUNY, Garden City, NY 11530.

FCS NEWS

Report of Nominations Committee, Fellowship of Catholic Scholars:

The Nominations Committee was composed of the three first presidents of the Fellowship: Ronald Lawler, O.F.M., Cap., Msgr. William Smith, and Professor James Hitchcock.

It has been the practice of the Fellowship to keep former presidents on the Board. This seemed especially useful in the early years of the Fellowship, as a means of maintaining a certain continuity in setting the directions of the group. However as time passes there is a growing number of former presidents; and their presence on the Board as voting members could become less desirable.

Hence, the Nominations Committee suggests that we reconsider this policy of maintaining presidents regularly as voting members on the Board. We, the first three presidents, wish to submit our own resignations from the Board. We would be grateful if the presidents of the future would consider allowing us to attend Board Meetings, at least in part. The Board might wish to consider, in the presence of the former presidents, what would be a good general policy in this matter. Perhaps it might be good to urge that for the first term after one's presidency, one might serve on the Board as a voting member.

This committee submits the following names for officers for the Fellowship 1993-1995:

President:

- Professor Ralph McInerny
- President Emeritus:*
- Reverend Msgr. George Kelly
- First Vice President:*
- Professor Gerald Bradley
- Second Vice President:*
- Dr. Janet E. Smith
- Treasurer:*
- Dr. Joseph P. Scottino
- Executive Secretary:*
- Msgr. William B. Smith

Nominations for the Board:

Preliminary Note: We would envisage the following as leaving the Board, after many years of good service, at the time: Reverend Thomas Weinandy, O.F.M., Cap. (who had been First Vice President); Msgr. Michael Wrenn (who had been Second Vice President); Dr. James Hitchcock; Reverend Ronald Lawler; Dr. Mary Mumbach.

In view of the fact that these, and perhaps other former presidents of the Fellowship, may be leaving the Board, we make 6 nominations for the Board at this time (we list these simply alphabetically):

Sister Timothea Elliott, R.S.M.
(Saint Joseph Seminary,
Dunwoodie)

Reverend Joseph Fessio, S.J.
(San Francisco)

John Guegen
(Illinois State University)

Dean Jude Dougherty
(Catholic University of
America)

Professor Joyce Little
(University of Saint Thomas)

Reverend Stuart Swetland
(Diocese of Peoria).

Additional Notes:

At our meetings to prepare these nominations we did not have on hand a current copy of the bylaws of the Fellowship. It seemed to us that some of our customs modified the original bylaws, and it might be wise for the president to appoint a small committee to survey our bylaws and practices in matters affecting officers and their selection, to make a report to the Board on whatever modifications or clarifications would be useful in this matter.

The committee might also provide a service in helping to clarify all relevant provisions in determining the way the Board has

certain new members added at each election, while continuity is maintained on the Board. It might be wise to have some official place where there is clearly recorded in a rather permanent way when each member of the Board became a member, and for how long a period of time.

From Monsignor Kelly's Secretary

I want to thank so many of you wonderful Fellowship members for your past considerations and kindnesses to me. I shall dearly miss your friendships.

It has, for me, been a true privilege working with and for so many of you.

Be assured of my continued prayers for all of you. May God grant you continued strength in your selfless efforts.

Respectfully yours,
Terry Archer

Janet E. Smith to Receive Cardinal Wright Award

Professor Janet E. Smith, of the University of Dallas, has been designated as the sixteenth recipient of the Cardinal Wright Award for "an outstanding contribution to the Church", and the first woman to

be so honored. Her new book *Humanae Vitae: A Generation Later* (Catholic University of America Press) has been hailed as a first-rate piece of historical and philosophical scholarship on behalf of magisterium, published in timely fashion and in advance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of Paul VI's most famous encyclical.

The award itself was the creative idea of Chicago's John and Eileen Farrell in 1979 to mark the passing that year of the Boston Prelate who served as the first post-Vatican II Prefect of the Holy See's Congregation of the Clergy, and one of the early promoters of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars.

Dr. Smith, born in Warren, Pennsylvania, was educated at Grinnell College in Iowa and the University of Toronto, majoring in classics, and teaches philosophy. She was Phi Beta Kappa at Grinnell. She taught at the University of Notre Dame from 1980-1989, and has taught at the University of Dallas since. In 1992-1993, she taught in the overseas program for Dallas in Rome. She has been active in the Right-To-Life Movement and has written extensively on abortion. She was a featured speaker on life issues at the 1991 Fellowship Convention in Denver.

The Fellowship Board is proud to confer the Wright Award on a creative thinker, an outstanding scholar, and a devoted Catholic.

THE CHURCH AT THE SERVICE OF THE FAMILY

1993 Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Convention
September 24-26, 1993
Orange, California

Program Director: Carl A. Anderson (202) 628-2355	Convention Manager: Jack Rook (614) 283-6318
--	---

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 24

9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

Registration for Hotel and Convention

12:00 p.m. - 1:00 p.m.

Lunch at will

1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

Welcome:

Ralph McInerny, University of Notre Dame,
Notre Dame, Indiana

Session 1

Man and Woman, the Image of the God Who Is Love: Toward an Adequate Anthropology for a Theology of the Family

Research Director:

Ronda Chervin, St. John's Seminary,
Camarillo, California

Principal Speaker:

Alice Ramos, St. John's University,
Jamaica, New York

Respondent:

Margaret Harper, John Paul II Institute,
Washington, D.C.

3:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Continued Registration for Hotel and
Convention

4:00 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.

Session 2

Forming a Community of Persons: The Rights, Dignity and Role of Men and Women

Research Directors:

Helen and James Hitchcock,
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri

Principal Speaker:

Patrick Lee, Franciscan University
of Steubenville, Steubenville, Ohio

Respondent:

Mary Shivanandan, John Paul II Institute,
Washington, D.C.

5:30 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

Supper at will

8:00 p.m. - 9:30 p.m.

Keynote Address

The Family at the Center of the New Evangelization

His Eminence Alfonso Cardinal Lopez Trujillo
Pontifical Council for the Family
Vatican City State

Introduction:

Ralph McInerny, University of Notre Dame,
Notre Dame, Indiana

9:30 p.m.

Social Hour

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 25

9:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.

Session 3

***Cooperators in the Love of God the Creator:
The Family in the Transmission and Service
of Life***

Research Director:

Hanna Klaus, Natural Family Planning Center,
Washington, D.C.

Principal Speaker:

Paul M. Quay, S.J., Loyola University of
Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

Respondent:

David and Kay Ek, Natural Family Planning,
St. Cloud, Minnesota

11:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

Session 4

Society at the Service of the Family

Research Director:

Henry V. Sattler, C.Ss.R., University of
Scranton, Scranton, Pennsylvania

Principal Speaker:

Raymond Dennehy, University of San Francisco,
San Francisco, California

Respondent:

Thomas E. Dillon, Thomas Aquinas College,
Santa Paula, California

1:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.

Lunch at will

2:00 p.m. - 3:45 p.m.

Session 5

***The Family as a Saved and Saving Community:
A Specific and Original Ecclesial Role***

Research Director:

Joseph Fessio, S.J., Ignatius Press, San Francisco,
California

Principal Speakers:

William and Patricia May, John Paul II Institute,
Washington, D.C.

Respondent:

Timothy and Catherine O'Donnell,
Christendom College, Front Royal, Virginia

4:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

Session 6

***The Family as a Believing Community:
Pastoral Care of the Family***

Research Director:

Msgr. George A. Kelly, St. John's University,
Jamaica, New York

Principal Speaker:

Reverend Timothy MacCarthy,
Pastor, St. Cecilia's Church, Tustin, California

Respondent:

Dr. Richard Geraghty, St. John's Seminary
College, Camarillo, California

6:00 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.

Reception

6:30 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.

Banquet

Presentation of Cardinal Wright Award

9:00 p.m.

Social Hour

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 26

8:30 a.m.

Business Meeting for Fellowship Members

The Truth About Women

Suzie Andres, O.C.D.S.

"Let all who thirst come; let all who desire it drink from the life-giving water." Rev. 22:17.

FATHER BOUYER and Rhonda Chervin have written books which together, in their profound complementarity, offer an antidote to the ravaging poison of feminism.* The great error of our time regarding women, men, and 'equal rights' seems to be a denial of complementarity as a possible solution to the problem of inequality. The equal dignity of man and woman in the orders of nature and grace is generally accepted. Unfortunately, the complementary vocations God has bestowed upon man: male and female, this is not so well appreciated; even when it is accepted, it is frequently misunderstood.

Thanks be to God, for even in our own dark age of ignorance, confusion, and rebellion, the beacons of knowledge, clarity, and submission continue to shine and can illuminate the darkness, if only one knows where to look. Ignatius Press is always a good place to start. Thanks to the continued efforts of Fellowship member Fr. Joseph Fessio, their latest catalogue (Spring/Summer, 1993) boasts at least five books on woman's Christian vocation and seventeen books on heroic Christian women (not to mention the twenty books on that most heroic woman, Our Blessed Mother, nor the ten books on current 'women's issues').

Women Mystics, by Louis Bouyer, is featured prominently on page five of Ignatius' cata-

*Louis Bouyer, C.O., *Women Mystics*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993. 197 pp. \$13.95; Rhonda De Sola Chervin, *Prayers of the Women Mystics*. Ann Arbor: Servant Publications, 1992. 252 pp. + bibliography. \$7.99.

logue, and touted as 'An ideal book for those whose intellectual acumen might wrongly keep them from the wonderful fountain of wisdom of the women mystics. Bouyer's own scholarly mastery of the field of spirituality can provide an entrée to a world as enriching to Catholic men as to women. Fascinating and rewarding.' This quotation is attributed to "Rhonda Chervin, Author, *Woman to Woman*." Well, Rhonda Chervin ought to know! Another Fellowship member, Chervin is also the author of several books on the saint, the latest of which is *Prayers of the women Mystics*, a perfect companion volume to *Women Mystics*. (although Ignatius Press currently offers two books by Chervin, one must turn to another source, Servant Publications, for her *Prayers of the Women Mystics*.)

Bouyer begins his book by noting, "Our age seems characterized by...an almost sudden awareness of the importance of the role of women in all civilization and [by] a singular deficiency shown...in this regard." He had already written in 1976 a book on *Woman in the Church*, a profound meditation on the mystery of woman, her complementarity with man, and the mystery of woman, her complementarity with man, and her specifically feminine role in the Church. That book was dedicated to Catholic novelist Elizabeth Goudge, and included an epilogue by Hans Urs von Balthasar and an appended essay by C. S. Lewis, all for only \$7.95 (from Ignatius Press, of course!)

Bouyer concluded *Woman in the Church* by emphasizing that "above all...we must begin with a better understanding of what women accomplished in the Church in the past and of what this implies with respect to possibilities offered to or by women in the Church today." Thus *Women Mystics* is something akin to a sequel, following the purely speculative reflections of *Woman in the Church* with a historical/theological consideration of five women universally acknowledged for their contributions to the Church. In this new book Bouyer argues that their contributions were, in fact, uniquely feminine as well as indispensable to

the development of Christian spirituality. In his words, "It is particularly their tradition that has led modern Christians...from idle speculations or sentimental devotions to the reality of the Christian experience in its purity, which is inseparable from its fecundity."

Bouyer hopes to show "through deeds and texts" that in the history of the Church women have had a role "quite different, to be sure, from that entrusted to men, but one without which the men's role could not have been carried out" he especially intends to show that this is true "for the Church of modern times". He hopes and intends and, one should add, he succeeds! The women he has chosen whose "deeds and texts" he catalogues, span the centuries from the high middle ages (Hadewijch of Antwerp) through the spiritual revival of the sixteenth century (St. Teresa of Avila) to our own times (St. Thérèse of Lisieux, d. 1897, Bl. Elizabeth of the Trinity, d. 1906, and Bl. Edith Stein, d. 1942).

One thing that impresses Bouyer about these women is their interconnection; he sees their individual achievements in the light of their influence on each other; that is the influence each earlier figure had on her successors. The connection between Teresa of Avila, mother of Carmel, and her three Carmelite daughters is obvious, by why does Bouyer include Hadewijch, a non-Carmelite from a previous era? One of the great insights Bouyer provides in this book is precisely the intimate, if not immediate, relationship between Hadewijch and all the others. He traces this first mystic's influence through Master Eckhart and Ruusbroec (the "Rhenio-Flemish" mystics) down to Teresa of Avila and John of the Cross. Centuries later Elizabeth of the Trinity would read and frequently quote Ruusbroec himself, but aside from this direct influence, the three modern Carmelites would absorb the benefits of the early Flemish mystics via Teresa and John. All discolored Carmelites refer to Teresa and John as "our holy mother" an "our holy father", seeing in them the founders of their order whose charism they thus

inherit. Hence Thérèse, Elizabeth and Edith were formed spiritually and intellectually by Teresa and John. The inter-connection between the three modern mystics is also fairly easy to track, because both Elizabeth and Edith have written about the effect Thérèse's *Story of a Soul* had on them.

Bouyer does a marvelous job presenting these five women, both in their continuity and in their distinctive individual roles. His treatment of the important male mystics who served to develop, authenticate, and pass on their experiences is in itself a treat for the reader, because too often books about women and their feminine gifts exclude all mention of male counterparts. Bouyer's treatment of the complementarity of Teresa and John is especially fascinating.

After his last chapter, which is on the last of these women mystics, Edith Stein, Bouyer asks, "How and why it fell to women to create this inner renaissance of which the Church as well as the world has the greatest need..." Fittingly, he looks to Edith Stein's writings on woman's nature and vocation, for the answer, and he presents a short summary of her paper "The Ethos of Women's Vocation". This is an excellent and helpful way to conclude a book on the specifically feminine contributions of women to the Church; unfortunately Bouyer refers the reader to another secondary source on Edith Stein, instead of supplying a reference to the original wealth of her own writings. This omission is one of the few weak points of the book, and can be easily rectified now: the intrigued reader should procure a copy of *Woman*, a collection of Edith Stein's lectures and essays, originally written for a German Catholic audience in the 1930's. The translator is Freda Oben, and the book is available from the Washington D.C. based Institute of Carmelite Studies for \$8.95.

For those who would like to supplement Bouyer's book with more on the theme of women mystics, Rhonda Chervin's book *Prayers of the Women Mystics* will prove helpful. While Bouyer offers much insightful historical background,

Chervin (with what Bouyer would identify as a characteristically feminine ability) goes straight to the heart of the matter. Her concern is women *mystics*; mystics are named for their mystical experience of God through prayer; therefore, where else would one look to know a mystic if not to her prayer? Chervin begins with a down-to-earth investigation of the meaning of 'mysticism'. By relating her own experience in discovering the mystics, she is able to reassure the reader that by mysticism she means not just any bizarre experience purporting to be from God, but rather a special grace of union through prayer which results in virtue and love of neighbor. Her reflections here slowly ease the reader into a healthy desire to pray with the mystics. She then gives her criterion for the nineteen women mystics whose prayers she includes, and also suggestions on how to use the book in prayer.

Chervin's book complements Bouyer's for several reasons. First, whereas his task obliges him to surround the "deeds and texts" of his heroines with much theological commentary, Chervin is able to say little and let the women mystics really speak for themselves. 'their experience of God is immediately accessible to the reader, at least insofar as this experience is at all relatable. Their prayers, poetry and descriptions are introduced by only brief biographies, and the commentary which accompanies the mystics' words is also succinct. Thus while Bouyer's book fills out the whole tradition, puts the women within their historical milieu, and shows the movement from one to the other, Chervin's book sets forth the finest fruit of the mystics' union with God in a pure and simple manner.

Her book is also a fine companion to his because she includes three of the same figures: Hadewijch, Teresa of Avila and Elizabeth of the Trinity. Surprisingly, Chervin even points out in her introduction why she excluded Thérèse and Edith in particular. She explains, "I have chosen those whose spirituality is most formed by the mystical graces they received...someone like St. Thérèse of Lisieux is more extraordinary in her

surrender to a life of pure faith than in her response to specific mystical graces. Others, such as Blessed Edith Stein, are more of interest for the way God's providence mingled their particular gifts with dramatic circumstances."

Lastly, the books are complementary in their beautiful illustration of Bouyer's thesis. Chervin performs the "specifically feminine and absolutely fundamental" task of leading "modern Christians from idle speculations or sentimental devotions to the reality of the Christian experience in its purity." Bouyer, on the other hand, in his masculine role repeats the work he has attributed to Ruusbroec and John of the Cross: to bring out, finally, all of that which the women had expressed in a general intuition, that is, "to bring out everything but also to preserve everything from threatening confusions in the heritage." Perhaps it is too much to say that Bouyer has brought out *everything*, but certainly he has brought out many wonderful things. Furthermore, it is an often-forgotten truth that philosophy and theology are necessary to the life of the Church to stave off the insidious "threatening confusions." Thus while Rhonda Chervin's book lovingly sets forth the heart of the matter, the actual prayer of the mystics, Louis Bouyer's book fills out the original intuition with the equally important theological implications. Together these two volumes offer the best of man and woman, and together they will shed much light on the shadows feminism has cast.

There are three other books each of which is easily worth its weight in gold.** Ignatius Press manages to publish simply the best books on any given subject and these provide no exception.

Fr. Dubay's book is a phenomenal achievement. In the space of 312 pages he manages to

***Fire Within: St. Teresa of Avila, St. John of the Cross and the Gospel—On Prayer*, by Thomas Dubay, S.M. (\$17.95); *Two Sisters in the Spirit: Thérèse of Lisieux and Elizabeth of the Trinity*, by Hans Urs von Balthasar. (\$19.95); *Edith Stein: A Biography*, by Walter Hebrith. (\$11.95).

convince the reader that every Christian is called to the heights of mystical union with God in this life (he proves this from Scripture, and two Doctors of the Church: Teresa of Avila and John of the Cross), and he takes the reader step by step through this prospective spiritual journey (again using Scripture, Teresa, and John), and finally he answers every potential difficulty the reader might raise along the way. This is a gentle but powerful book by another Fellowship member; it is both readable and effective.

Von Balthasar's book is actually two books in one volume: his work on Thérèse of Lisieux was originally published in 1950, his work on Elizabeth in 1953, then they appeared as one in 1970. (Ignatius has republished the 1970 volume.) This book is worth owning just so one can read and re-read von Balthasar's masterful introduction on the mission of the saints. His reflections on the meaning of sanctity and the purpose of canonized saints in the Church provide an eloquent opening for his further thoughts on the missions of Thérèse and Elizabeth, but perhaps more importantly they provide a foundation for better understanding any and every saint the Church proclaims.

Herbstrith's book on Edith Stein is the finest now available in English. Edith Stein's own

sister wrote of this book in 1978: "I still consider this to be one of the finest biographies there is of my sister...Despite the fact that she [Herbstrith] never knew Edith personally, she has managed in my opinion to produce a very true-to-life portrait of her."

For the reader who is thirsting for the pure source, the Institute of Carmelite Studies is in the process of publishing the complete works of Teresa of Avila, Thérèse of Lisieux, Elizabeth of the Trinity, and Edith Stein, as well as John of the Cross. Published thus far and currently available are: three volumes of St. Teresa's writings (everything except her letters); three volumes of Thérèse: *Story of a Soul*, and all her correspondence; one volume of Elizabeth: her four short spiritual treatises; and four volumes of Edith Stein: her unfinished autobiography (*Life in a Jewish Family*), *Woman*, her doctoral dissertation under Husserl *On Empathy*, and a selection of her spiritual writings. The Institute plans to have Edith Stein's complete correspondence available for the first time in English sometime within the next year. (For further information call 1-800-832-8489) Incidentally, the former editor and chairman of ICS is yet another Fellowship member, Fr. John Sullivan, O.C.D. ☩

Of course religion is not just something for a quiet corner and a few hours of leisure; it must be the root and ground of all life, and this not only for a few chosen ones, but for every true Christian (of whom, indeed, there is always only a small number). It was through St. Thomas that I first came to realize that it is possible to regard scholarly work as a service of God. Immediately before, and a long time after my conversion, I thought living a religious life meant to abandon earthly things and to live only in the thought of the heavenly realities. Gradually I have learned to understand that in this world something else is demanded of us, and that even in the contemplative life the connexion with this world must not be cut off. Only then did I make up my mind to take up scholarly work again. I even think that the more deeply a soul is drawn into God, the more it must also go out of itself in this sense, that is to say into the world, in order to carry the Divine life into it.

Edith Stein

letter, February 12, 1928

How to Keep Your University Catholic.

Leonard A. Kennedy, C.S.B., Ph.D. Life Ethics Centre, 53 Dundas Street, Suite 308, Toronto, Ontario M5B 1C6, Canada. Distributed by Veritas Bookstore, 5354 Westheimer West, Houston, TX 77056, Tel.: (713) 963-8431. \$5.00; postage \$1.00 (for any number of copies).

Reviewed by K.D. Whitehead

THE CRISIS OF FAITH of approximately the past quarter of a century has hardly left many Catholic colleges and universities unaffected; indeed, most of them have exhibited the advanced symptoms of passing through this contemporary crisis of faith in perhaps much more acute form than some other Catholic institutions. Too many such institutions of higher education have not only substantially divested themselves of almost everything properly describable as authentically Catholic; more than that, too often their officers, trustees, faculties, benefactors, students (and parents of students) rarely exhibit either any sign of awareness of what has been lost or evince the slightest regret about it. Considering what a Catholic university ought to be according to both the tradition and the current official guidelines of the Church, and what most higher education institutions continuing to call themselves Catholic really are today, a contemporary prophet Amos might well understandably cry out about this state of affairs: "Woe to those who are at ease in Zion" (6:1).

Nevertheless, more than

twenty-five years into the massively failed experiment of the secularization of the formerly Catholic colleges and universities of North America, there have appeared some highly tentative though still rather definite signs on a few campuses—besides those of the new, orthodox institutions which have been founded since the onset of the crisis of faith—that some kind of a restoration might not only be desirable; it might even be possible. There have been few, if any, outright admissions on the part of the university administrations or faculties that, well, they were just wrong to have rushed like so many Gadarene swine into the dubious waters of secularization in order to conform so depressingly to the spirit of the age; nevertheless, a few of them do appear to be quietly back-tracking. Here and there, academic departments are affirming the desirability of maintaining or restoring a more recognizable Catholic character; open dissent is less taken for granted and is even becoming a bit muted if it is not actually beginning to be frowned upon in some quarters; and—gratifyingly—on some campuses there are student voices being raised calling for a return to a more open and affirmed Catholicity.

If even the possibility of such a Catholic restoration exists in the case of at least some of today's currently nominal Catholic colleges and universities—and I believe it does—Father Leonard Kennedy's new book *How to Keep Your University Catholic* could not have appeared at a better time; and, indeed, its appearance may be itself hopefully symptomatic of what could be a modest new trend back towards orthodoxy on the part of

some Catholic institutions.

This book is a short, concise, yet lucid and thorough study which knowledgeably and ably does exactly what its title says it aims to do, namely, it sets forth the how, what, and why of insuring that an institution which calls itself Catholic may in fact be maintained as Catholic, even in the present confused era. Father Kennedy addresses himself primarily to the leaders of would-be Catholic higher education—bishops, trustees, regents, academic officers, and so on. These are the people who have to be won over with a practical, workable approach if any Catholic colleges and universities are actually to be taken back for the Church. This book prepared for the attention of such leaders is both readable and unforbidding enough so that it stands a chance of actually being read and assimilated by many of them, if only it could be gotten into their hands. To the extent that it does end up in the hands of any such higher education leaders, it could just help motivate them to take stronger practical positions in favor of insisting that Catholic institutions which go on calling themselves Catholic for historical, money-raising, or whatever other reasons really in all honesty ought to be trying harder to be Catholic. And Father Kennedy describes exactly what that means.

Father Kennedy has laid it all out very carefully, in fact: why a Catholic university needs to affirm the organic link it must necessarily have with the Church if it is to be truly Catholic, what canon law in fact requires in this regard, what Pope John Paul II has clearly said on the same subject, and why arguments such as those about plural-

ism, ecumenism, academic freedom, or government funding, and the like are simply inapplicable and irrelevant to the case of an authentic Catholic university. Father Kennedy has been both a dean and a college president (he is currently a professor of philosophy), and hence he knows whereof he speaks. He has published much of the material in the present book in periodical form over the past decade, and thus it is evident that he has been thinking about his subject long and responsibly before finally bringing it all together between two covers in more systematic and usable form.

If I were a college president or senior officer (or a trustee or even a bishop) setting out to try to insure or restore the authentic Catholic character of an institution of higher education for which I had some responsibility today, I would keep this little book handy as a guidebook or check-list of exactly what path needs to be followed.

K.D. Whitehead, a former U.S. assistant secretary of education, is the author of Catholic Colleges and Federal Funding (1988).

In Search Of A National Morality

William Bentley Ball, Ed.
Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 298 pages

Reviewed by
Eugene F. Diamond, M.D.

WHAT IS BEING attempted by certain elements in the American society is the privatization of religion

whereby individuals are entitled to hold personal religious viewpoints but may not gather into coalitions to attempt to convert these moral beliefs into public policy. The motive for the attempted implementation of this restrictive standard (by groups such as the ACLU, the National Organization of Women and People for the American Way) is obvious. There is emerging in the United States, at least potentially, an unprecedented coalition between 60 million Evangelical Protestants and 50 million Roman Catholics. The undoing of such a coalition would necessitate the depoliticization of important moral beliefs held in common. The deemphasis or trivialization of abortion as a political issue, for example, is crucial to the privatization agenda.

In Search of a National Morality is subtitled A Manifesto for Evangelicals and Catholics. It consists in a collection of eighteen brilliant essays on nine vital issues: secularization, morality, witness-bearing, human life, family, education, higher education, government and rights. Each issue is discussed by an author writing from the Evangelical perspective and another from the Catholic viewpoint. The writing is consistently cogent and insightful and the extent of common ground which is explored is both surprising and reassuring.

Secularization in light of the current reductionist theories of reality is profoundly described by Carl F.H. Henry and by the highly perceptive James Hitchcock who notes that the liberal churches themselves have become a major secularizing force through their ill-advised process of "demythologizing". Harold O.J. Brown cata-

logues the current state of morality in terms both pessimistic and realistic. Henry Hyde expounds on the view that democracy is not merely a matter of procedure but that the republic requires a virtuous citizenry and there are moral norms which transcend the American public experiment. With highly documented references from historical sources, Richard Land portrays the preeminent role played by religion in the development of the American revolution and the writing of the Constitution. The founders and framers of the American dream were indeed religious men.

Much shared belief and mutual concern is covered in the sections on human life and education.

The quality of the scholarship has attained a remarkable level of consistency and there is not one dissertation in the collection which is less than impressive.

It has been said that one of John Paul II's deepest concerns is the declining influence of religion on public affairs. The unwillingness of the churches to proclaim their spiritual authority out of a false notion of pluralism has inevitably led to a decline in their political influence in an increasingly secularized society.

This remarkable book will, hopefully, signal the beginning of a cooperative effort by people of prayer and people of belief to reclaim the sacred in the midst of social disintegration. The Christian assault to reclaim the high ground will require many alliances.

Eugene F. Diamond is the Contributing Editor of Linacre Quarterly.

*A Flock Of Shepherds:
The National Conference Of
Catholic Bishops,*

Thomas J. Reese, S.J.
(Sheed and Ward, 406pp., \$19.95
paperback)

Reviewed by George Kelly

HERE IS A twofold fascination to this book—one, that a Jesuit of his persuasion would be so fixated by what bishops are, and what they do, and two, that, in view of his less than warm appreciation for Rome, so many bishops would give him so much time, even leaking to him documents he confesses he “could not get from the NCCB/NSCC staff”! In his earlier 1989 book (Archbishop: Inside the Power Structure of the American Catholic Church) Reese opined that John Paul II’s authority over Raymond Hunthausen was simple moral, not jurisdictional, preventing the Pope from removing the Seattle Ordinary, in spite of what Vatican I and II said doctrinally about the Pope’s universal jurisdiction over the entire Church, including bishops; his 1990 book *The Universal Catechism Reader*, the result of a well-publicized symposium at Georgetown, featuring Reese, has been correctly identified as a “pre-emptive strike” against the Catechism of the Catholic Church, then its final stages of preparation for publication in Rome after eight years of writing, consultation, and final editing.

Yet, Father Reese’s free access to official documents and NCCB’s personnel, plus his social science reporting style, makes this a book worth having for the record it portrays. he may not be a friend of

magisterium, but his nine chapters, plus appendices, make it a valuable source book for those who have followed Church developments in the United States closely since 1965. His accounts make worthwhile reading—of the bishop selection process, of the history of the National Conference itself (seen largely through the eyes of Bishops McManus, Malone, John Quinn), of the nine NCCB presidents and their United States Catholic Conference and Episcopal Committees, of their internal divisions over secular and/or religious matters, of the legislative procedures they use at home and in relationship with Rome and, finally, of problems of the present-day ecclesial economy.

In his conclusion, Father Reese judges that the NCCB/USCC organization has been successful in its management of Church reform, has adapted well to the American political context, is an important media presence for the Church, especially as representatives of American Catholics on most political and social issues, and in support of local dioceses. As he sees it, the NCCB’s structural weaknesses include its clericalism, lack of follow-through, lack of widespread episcopal involvement in its operation, it overextended agendas and lack of ecclesial power. He would like to see the NCCB have a greater say in the nomination of bishops.

In a limited review, even a worthwhile book rarely receives full justice, and this volume is a veritable social science report of modern Catholic affairs by a sympathetic commentator. Although sociology by self-definition is a science of “suspicion”, and an exposé if “institutional hypocrisy”, A

Flock Of Shepherds is not at all anti-institutional nor debunking of NCCB. The book’s index fully lists the appropriate witnesses consulted by the author; the non-consultees are noticeably by their absence. George Weigel reviewed it early for *First Things* (February 1993) with an essay entitled “When the Shepherds are Sheep”, a reference to the way in which bishops-in-the-field have been turned into followers of leaders (NCCB’S) rather than leaders themselves. he analyzed how the peace and economic pastorals came into being, hardly touching the more substantive issues of doctrines taught by the Ordinary as well as the Extraordinary Magisterium.

The massive detail in Reese’s book, about how the post-Vatican II Church functions at the episcopal level, fails to provide information as to whether the Church is better than it was during NCWC days—in its worship, in its sacramental life, in its priesthood and religious states, in its teaching effectiveness, in its holiness. *A Flock Of Shepherds* effectively describes the contemporary ecclesial game, inning by inning, but without and overall scorecard, without totaling the results at the parish level, largely because the umpires are taken from the Washington League. Consensus between leadership and bishops-in-the-field gets A+, although other scorers might take credit away for a number of bobbly performances, not the least being serious modification of earlier (and wrong) positions in first drafts of major pastorals, the result as much from outside pressure as from internal arguments or discussion (which Weigel calls “thin”). Much is also made in the book about subservi-

ence of staff to bishops, which may be true of its relationship to leadership, but not to those bishops-in-the-field who have been stonewalled by staff, or by leaders using staff as an excuse for stonewalling disagreeing fellow bishops.

A few anecdotes from the other League to ponder: One bishop reported that he was outvoted in committee by his peers four to one, but nine to one, when staff members were in the room. It's an old Beltway story. Reese tells a cute story (page 25) about the old NCWC, citing Bishop William McManus as follows: "Mooney, Stritch, and McNicholas were the braintrust. They wrote the statements — (the other faction consisted of) Spellman and his cohorts with money." Anchorage's Archbishop Frank Hurley, a one-time NCWC staffer from 157-70 rounds out the story:

"The Detroit-Chicago Axis kept Spelly at bay." The only trouble with this analysis is that the episcopal likes of Spelly were not coerced in Washington meetings by "Axis" decisions made in Detroit. Their successors, however, are forced to play a game organized by a new Axis which controls the forging of consensus, and which few contemporary bishops care to criticize publicly.

Other judgments about institutional misadventures of the last quarter century are not thoroughly evaluated, e.g., the insistence by leadership that all was right with Catholic religious communities, seminaries, colleges, and the theological establishment, when most Catholics in the pews knew it was not. One would have to search elsewhere for the effects on the Church of imbedded dissent in

high Catholic places, of the first confession controversy, of easy annulments, of the break-up of the Catholic school system, of clerical misbehavior and rabid feminism, of the "seamless garment" policy and of lowered Mass attendance, etc. As far as the claim that NCCB represented Catholic opinion on social issues (a fair enough statement), one would still start an argument among the laity about the Church's political role as the savior of this world, or as a competent authority on the technical aspects of general economic prosperity, or its lack. Father Reese, also, does not capture some of the drama that occasionally goes on in national meetings: the drama, for example, of Bishop McDowell rising to tell the national assembly they can get another committee chairman if bishops attempt to sidetrack *To Teach as Jesus Did*; or of Bishop William McManus challenging his peers with the news that Cardinal Cooke's amendments to the National Catholic Directory were unacceptable to the USCC staff. There are other dramas lightly explored, not the least of which, in 1986, was the hiring in Washington of an executive director for The Doctrinal Committee, his firing at the subsequent National Meeting in Collegeville when bishops-in-the-field protested the choice, and his re-hiring later when leadership got back to the Nation's Capitol, after bishops-in-the-field returned to their scattered home. The allegation by Reese that the opposition to Jesuit Michael Buckley was simply "conservative", that his doctrinal ambiguities were not substantial, that Cardinals Mahony and Law suffered politically within the Na-

tional Conference because they opposed Buckley's appointment, may not really say what his words mean, but something more ominous.

Sheed and Ward, described as a service agency of the National Catholic Reporter Company, has a helpful book on its hands, but it does not tell the whole story, maybe not the important one.

Deadly Compassion: The Death of Ann Humphry and the Truth about Euthanasia,

Rita Marker

(William Morrow, Inc., 310 pp., \$18.00)

Reviewed by George Kelly

REMEMBER THOSE "hardship cases," the reasons Catholic moralists in the 1960's found reasons to make exceptions to moral absolutes like "thou shall not kill an innocent human being," "shall not commit adultery," "thou shall not blaspheme," etc. Well, Rita Marker beautifully describes how it has come to justify a doctor's right to kill not just those who suffer terrible terminal illnesses, but those who are considered mentally incompetent, physically disabled, or just too expensive to nurse.

This is the story of Rita Marker's friend, Ann Humphry, who committed suicide by overdose, asserting that her husband, Derek, drove her to it, abandoning his wife once he found she had breast cancer. Derek Humphry is the founder of the Hemlock Society, and leader of

BOOKS RECEIVED

the right-to-die crusade. Marker calls it a "Right-to-Kill:"

In the current economic climate, in which any guarantee of even medical attention is unavailable to so many, legalization could make it an option for the rich and the only medical 'treatment' the poor can afford.

Seventeen beautifully-crafted chapters, well documented with two-hundred-forty-nine references by a woman who knows her subject and a member of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars. Attorneys used to say "hardship cases" make bad law, but consequentialist moralists, who made faultless contraception, divorce, and abortion on demand a right for everyone, are now looking at euthanasia by prescription. A fascinating book.

New from Alba House, Staten Island, NY:

Sound the Trumpet: Reflections on the Paschal Mystery, Michele T. Gallaher, x + 134 pp., \$6.95.

The Spirit Broods Over the World, George A. Maloney, S.J., xx + 172 pp., \$9.95.

Gift of Laughter: A Cartoon Collection from 'Beyond the Stained Glass', Ed Sullivan, pp. 96, \$3.95.

Mary's House: Mary Pyle—Under the Spiritual Guidance of Padre Pio, Dorothy M. Gaudiose, pp. 190, \$9.95.

My Way of the Cross Journal: A Lenten Journey with Jesus, William F. Maestri, 87 pp., \$5.95.

Saints of the Roman Calendar, Enzo Lodi, trans. Jordan Aumann, O.P., pp. 419, \$9.95.

Who Do You Say That I Am?: An Adult Inquiry into the First Three Gospels, 192 pp., \$9.95.

No Less Zeal: A Spiritual Guide for Lay People, Douglas J. Morin, xiv + 142 pp., \$7.95.

Music & Morals: A Theological Appraisal of the Moral and Psychological Effects of Music, Basil Cole, O.P., xiv + 159 pp., \$8.95.

The Real Presence Through the Ages, compiled and edited by Michael L. Gaudoin-Parker, L + 222 pp., \$14.95.

New from Crossroad, New York:

Content of Faith: The Best of Karl Rahner's Theological Writings, ed. Karl Lehmann & Adalbert Raffelt, pp. 668, \$42.50.

New from Ecco Press, New York:

Still Life with a Bridle: Essays and Apocryphas, Zbigniew Herbert, trans. by John and Bogdana Carpenter, pp. 162, \$27.99.

New from Ignatius Press, San Francisco:

St. Philip: Of the Joyous Heart, Francis X. Connolly, pp. 168, \$9.95.

A Still, Small, Voice: A Practical Guide On Reported Revelations, Fr. Benedict J. Groeschel, C.F.R., pp. 165, \$9.95.

The Seven Wonders of the World: Meditations on the Last Words of Christ, George William Rutler, \$9.95.

A Memory For Wonders: A True Story, Mother Veronica Namoyo Le Goulard, P.C.C., pp. 189, \$9.95.

From Cottage to Work Station: The Family's Search for Social Harmony in the Industrial Age, Allan C. Carlson, pp. 171, \$12.95.

Two Sisters in the Spirit: Therese of Lisieux and Elizabeth of the Trinity, Hans Urs von Balthasar, pp. 499, \$19.95.

The Meaning of Christian Brotherhood, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, xvi + 93 pp., \$9.95.

The Snakebite Letters, Peter Kreeft, pp. 123, \$7.95.

Degenerate Moderns: Modernity as Rationalized Sexual Misbehavior, E. Michael Jones, pp. 259, \$16.95.

New from Harcourt Brace Jovanich, New York

Barbarian in the Garden, Zbigniew Herbert, trans. by Michael March & Jaroslaw Anders, pp. 180, \$7.95.

New from NavPress Publishing Group, Colorado Springs
Great Divides: Understanding the Controversies That Come Between Christians, Ronald H. Nash, pp. 222.

New from The Sophia Institute, Manchester, NH

Liturgy and Personality: The Healing Power of Formal Prayer, Dietrich von Hildebrand, pp. 165, \$14.95.

Light of Faith: The Compendium of Theology of Saint Thomas Aquinas, tr. Cyril Vollert, S.J., 411 pp. \$19.95.

New from St. Jerome Publications, Maryknoll, NY

A Commentary on the Book of Isaiah: Isaiah as Sacred Scripture, Steven Scherrer, M.M., pp. 153.

Spring 1993

Open Letter to President Clinton on Abortion and Taxation.

President Clinton, you and I differ on promoting the abortion of human life and on taxing to pay for abortions.

While you say that you are personally opposed to abortion, you support the arguments of the abortionists, a woman's "right to control her own body," her "right to privacy," and her "pro-choice" option, all attempting to justify a non-existent "right" of a woman to disrupt the human process of reproduction and to abort a new human life developing in her womb. Also you are using your presidency to tax citizens to pay for such termination of human life.

Abortionists contend that the life in the womb has no rights against the so-called "rights" of a woman and that some justices have sanctioned the view that a mother may destroy her unborn baby. But abortionists—and justices as well—know that the prime reason for getting rid of an unborn child is that she or he is a human being steadily outgrowing the womb.

To tax me to pay for abortions is offensive to me as a member of the human race. While your team members are trying to pawn off tax support of abortion as a health measure, they ignore the reality that abortion is the ultimate health disaster for its helpless human victims.

Earlier American culture honored reasonable control of sexual conduct and respected woman with child. But now abortion is a social plague together with out-of-control sex, breakdown of the family, shocking number of single-parent arrangements, the feminization of poverty, deterioration of human capital, mounting euthanasia and other factors that are shaping a frightful new American culture.

Mr. President, step back from this cultural anarchy and from the dreadful Freedom of Choice Act (FOCA), which you sponsor. Protect the unborn. Do not tax me to be an accomplice in abortion.

Professor Frank Brown,
DePaul University,
Chicago, IL 60604-2287

**Fellowship of
Catholic Scholars
Newsletter**

Box 495

Notre Dame, IN 46556

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Notre Dame, Indiana
Permit No. 10

**Fellowship
of Catholic
Scholars
Newsletter**