

# The Dreams of Youth

Ralph McInerny

**P**OPE JOHN PAUL II came to Denver to meet with the young people of the world and there was indeed a meeting — of minds and hearts. Once more one marveled at the stamina and zeal of this holy man, leading the Church at a time of great crisis, calmly, steadily, with pastoral care.

It would be silly to say that the pope was as young as anyone else at Denver. He is quite unmistakably an old man now. He has suffered much, from natural ailments, and from a would-be assassin's bullet, to say nothing of the slings and arrows of the malcontents among us. The gentle dignity with which he carries his years could give old age a good name again, even in a culture that insists on celebrating the most fatuous aspects of youth.

The Holy Father appealed to that youthful idealism all of us at least dimly remember, the desire to do a great thing well, at whatever sacrifice. And what greater thing can there be than bringing the saving message of Christ to a world drowning in its own body juices?

Those of us who have grown old if not wise in the grooves of academe, would do well to recall our youthful zeal. There is a long twilight battle to be fought on the Catholic campuses of this country. How easy it is to think, when troubles arise, that some authority, some document, some deed from on high, will set things right and we can recede into that peace teaching and writing seem to require. But, as Jeeves might have said to Psmith, it is never so.

Years ago, *Sapientia Christiana*, the work of three popes, promised a return to clarity. Instead, confusion grew deeper. Then *Ex corde ecclesiae* offered clear and inspiring direction to our personal and collective efforts. It has caused less of a ripple than Al Gore's campaign biography. Now the bishops have fashioned Ordinances or guidelines for the implementation of *Ex corde ecclesiae*. The original document, taken as descriptive of what goes on, would have been hilariously off. The Ordinances are meant to close the gap between the document and practice. We will see.

Below will be found reflections on the Ordinances from Monsignor George Kelly and a panel of distinguished Catholic scholars.

Herman Melville's literary career prospered early and then described a long, steep decline until he was living in New York in almost total obscurity. That was when he wrote *Billy Budd*. As he wrote, he had pinned before him this motto: Be true to the dreams of your youth. Not a bad motto for all of us.

# Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

VOLUME 16, NUMBER 4

SEPTEMBER 1993

## CONTENTS

EDITORIAL: The Dreams of Youth ..... 1

### ARTICLES:

Proposed Ordinances for  
Catholic Colleges and Universities  
in the United States ..... 2

Commentaries ..... 4

### SPECIAL FEATURE:

Let's Stop Kidding Ourselves About  
Catholic Higher Education ..... 15

PARENT'S GUIDE TO  
CATHOLIC COLLEGES ..... 25

FCS NEWS ..... 28

THE EUCHARIST: A RESPONSE ..... 32

A REMINISCENCE OF  
RABBI HESCHEL ..... 38

### MORALS AND MEDICINE:

Homosexualis Detestis ..... 41

Semen and Aids ..... 42

AROUND THE CHURCH  
IN THE '90s ..... 43

BOOK REVIEWS ..... 45

BOOKS RECEIVED ..... 47

# Proposed Ordinances for Catholic Colleges and Universities in the United States

## PART ONE: INTRODUCTION

**I**n the Introduction to his Apostolic Constitution *Ex corde Ecclesiae* (August 15, 1990), His Holiness Pope John Paul II says, “I desire to share with everyone my profound respect for Catholic Universities” (No. 2). He notes that the Catholic university shares with every other university that “gaudium de veritate”, so precious to Saint Augustine, which is that joy of searching for, discovering and communicating truth in every field of knowledge.” But the Catholic university, according to the Holy Father, also has the “privileged task” to unite two orders of reality that too often remain unconnected and “frequently tend to be placed in opposition as though they were antithetical,” namely, the orders of faith (“the certainty of already knowing the fount of truth”) and reason (“the search for truth”) (No. 1).

The “honor and responsibility,” as Pope John Paul II puts it, of the Catholic university is to “consecrate itself without reserve to the cause of truth” (No. 4). And in doing so, the Holy Father says, the Catholic college or university is serving both the dignity of the human person and the good of the Church.

“If it is the responsibility of every university to search... for meaning,” observes the Pope, “a Catholic university is called in a particular way to respond to this need: its Christian inspiration enables it 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” (No. 7).

*Ex corde Ecclesiae* identifies four characteristics that “necessarily” belong to research conducted by a Catholic university: “(a) the search for and integration of knowledge, (b) a dialogue between faith and reason, (c) an ethical concern, and (d) a theological perspective” (No. 15).

Of particular interest to the Catholic university, writes the Pope, “is the dialogue between Christian thought and the modern sciences. This task requires persons particularly well versed in the individual disciplines who are at the same time adequately prepared theologically, and who are capable of confronting epistemological questions at the level of the relationship between faith and reason” (No. 46). The apostolic constitution recalls for its readers the purpose of Catholic higher education as articulated in the Second Vatican Council’s declaration on Christian education: that “the Christian mind may achieve as it were, a public, persistent and universal presence in the whole enterprise of advancing higher culture...” (No. 9).

According to *Ex corde Ecclesiae*, “the objective of a Catholic university is to assure in an institutional manner a Christian presence in a university world confronting the great problems of society and culture” (No. 13). Hence, the Holy Father regards the work of Catholic colleges and universities as “irreplaceable” (No. 10) in the life of the Church. He concludes the apostolic constitution by saying to Catholic college and university educators: “The Church and the world have great need of your witness and of your capable, free, and responsible contribution.”

The purpose of the following ordinances is to provide implementation guidelines that embody both the vision and the spirit of *Ex corde Ecclesiae*. These ordinances do not apply to ecclesiastical faculties, which are governed by the Apostolic Constitution *Sapientia Christiana* (1979), but they do apply to all the rest of the remarkable set of Catholic institutions of higher learning in the United States to which Pope John Paul II looks for their “capable, free, and responsible contribution” to the future of both church and culture.

The ordinances on Catholic higher education for the dioceses of the United States are complementary to and in harmony with Canons 807-814 of the Code of Canon Law and the general norms of the Apostolic Constitution *Ex corde Ecclesiae* (part II), both of which in their entirety are part of the universal law of the Church.

1. Catholic colleges and universities are those which, through their governing boards, freely commit themselves to the Christian message as it comes to us through the Catholic character and mission.

2. Catholic colleges and universities are to identify themselves as belonging to one of the descriptive categories on the list appended to these ordinances (see Appendix) and include the appropriate identification in their governing documents (Gen. Norms, 1:3) or statements of mission (Gen. Norms, 2:3).

3. Periodically, and at least every ten years, each Catholic college or university is to undertake an internal review of the congruence of its research program (Nos. 7, 15, 18, 45), course of instruction (Nos. 16, 17, 19, 20), and service activity (Nos. 21, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38) with the ideals and principles expressed in *Ex corde Ecclesiae* (Gen. Norms 2 and 5).

4. As a manifestation of their common desire to maintain the Catholic identity of the college/university, institutional authorities and the diocesan bishop, according to their own proper roles, will seek to promote the teaching of Catholic theological disciplines in communion with the church (Gen. Norms 4:3).

5. The mandate granted to those who teach theology in Catholic colleges and universities should be understood as recognition by the competent ecclesiastical authority of a Catholic professor's suitability to teach theological disci-

---

**Catholic professors of theological disciplines are to be advised by academic officials of the Church's expectation that they request the mandate from the competent ecclesiastical authority, normally the diocesan bishop or his delegate.**

---

plines (Gen. Norms, 4:3).

6. Catholic professors of theological disciplines are to be advised by academic officials of the Church's expectation that they request the mandate from the competent ecclesiastical authority, normally the diocesan bishop or his delegate (cf. Canon 812). Accordingly, the bishop is to invite the Catholic professor to request a mandate and, after appropriate review, the bishop is to respond to the request.

7. If a dispute arises between the competent ecclesiastical authority and a Catholic college or individuals or groups within such

university, or other institutions, it is to be resolved according to procedures that respect the rights of persons in the church (for example, Canons 208-223, 224-231, and 273-289), the autonomy of the academic institution (I, n. 12; II, art. 2, par. 5, art. 5, par. 2), and the responsibility of church authorities (I nn. 28-29, II art. 4, par. 1; art. 5 par. 2) to assist in the preservation of the institution's Catholic identity. Such procedures are also to follow the principles and, to the extent applicable, the procedures of the documents of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops *On Due Process* (1972) in administrative matters and *Doctrinal Responsibilities* (1989) in matters of differences in doctrine.

8. Governing Boards, in appropriate collaboration with the administration of the college/university, should provide for an adequately staffed campus ministry program and suitable liturgical and sacramental opportunities under the moderations of the local bishop (Gen. Norms 6: 1-2).

The ordinances, as particular law for the dioceses of the United States, become effective at the beginning of the academic year following their enactment by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and communication from the Congregation for Catholic Education that they have been reviewed by the Apostolic See. (Gen. Norms, 1:2) .

---

# Commentaries on: Proposed Ordinances for Catholic Colleges and Universities in the United States

**Rev. Ronald Lawler, O.F. M. Cap**

**T**HE DOCUMENT *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* expresses beautifully the great love of the Church for Catholic Universities, and her awareness of the immense importance the authentically Catholic University has in the life of the Church. When Catholic Universities are true to their identity, unembarrassed by their Catholic faith and practice, they can accomplish great things in service both of the Catholic community and of the whole world.

Our times present special difficulties for those who wish to have universities with a truly Catholic identity, and to be faithful to everything that is expected and required of a Catholic University. Still, faithfulness to this Catholic identity is an immense blessing for a University. It helps it to obtain its full meaning, it gathers for it the support of those who love the faith, it gives meaning and hope and strength to the lives of those who work in universities.

The cultural revolutions of our time have of course created special difficulties for our Catholic universities. But they are difficulties which they can master, and in the mastery of them they can become strong and precious sources of hope for the universities. In their efforts to be open to every movement of the times, so that they can help to bring the light of the Gospel on everything in our culture, universities are understandably tempted to

lose some of the clarity of their Catholic identity. In an age of moral revolution, they are naturally inclined to seek to be at peace with the mighty forces controlling so many of the means of communication both on an academic and on a mass level in our society. These assign an absolute value to secular ideals of a certain kind of freedom or of a certain kind of autonomy than to the deeper, stronger and more realistic freedom of faith and of a life guided by an intense and intelligent Christian love.

Catholic Universities in this country have had a glorious history. Their foundation required great sacrifices and great generosity. Before some of the confusion of the last few decades struck upon us with great force, they were unashamed to pursue all the ideals stressed in *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*. Administrators were not embarrassed to tell their Catholic professors of the sorts and duties they have to be faithful to Catholic teaching, and to make clear to non-Catholics who enter our universities that they show respect for the Christian character of the university by the way they conduct themselves in their classes and everywhere.

It need hardly be said that very many of our universities have lost much of their Catholic identity, when that identity is understood in the way in which it is spelled out in *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*.

It is not for legalistic reasons that excellent ordinances are needed for Catholic Universities. Ordinances are needed to guard those magnificent and good things for the sake of which Catholic Universities first came into being, and which still provide their grounds for existing. Practical needs can make us to long to escape some of the confrontations and burdens which come from faithful adherence to Catholic teaching about the basic matters that *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* recalls to our attention. We are very likely to lean toward interpretations of "freedom," "autonomy," "Catholic faith," "Catholic doctrine," that would make it more comfortable to deal with people who have serious objections to Catholic faith and to the identity of a Catholic University in the sense in which these have constantly been upheld by the Church.

But when compromises of this kind are made to the extent that they have been made in many American Catholic universities in our time, the compromises bring with them unbearable burdens of their own. While those who administer and teach in the university doubtless indeed wish that they were carrying out their mission, that they were educating young Catholics to love the Church and to give all their faith and all their intelligent efforts to pursue those splendid objectives *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*

*Ecclesiae* speaks of, they recognize that they are far from achieving these ends. Catholic Universities become more and more like simply secular universities. Their secularization did not so much bring a magnificent increase in the virtues of a purely secular university; rather, it made them lose the special advantages and the special depths that a Catholic university as Catholic ought to have. It is a bitter thing for those who live in universities to see how frequently the faith of young people is compromised in a variety of ways by the abandonment of such objectives as are stressed in this document.

Frequently students who have attended Catholic Universities are not taught Catholic faith as the Church teaches it. They are not encouraged to accept that discipline of a Christian life which serves both intellectual effort and also that goodness of heart which is even more important. Universities have often felt they had to make compromises when really they would not have had to. True it often would have required great and sometimes heroic efforts to find right ways of fulfilling the new responsibilities that come with our time while remaining entirely faithful to the basic responsibilities that always hold for Catholic Christian intellectuals. The Second Vatican Council reminded us that: "Our era needs such wisdom more than bygone ages if the discoveries made by

---

**It is a bitter thing for those who live in universities to see how frequently the faith of young people is compromised in a variety of ways by the abandonment of such objectives as are stressed in this document.**

---

man are to be fully humanized." (GS 15)

It is embarrassing and difficult to note in the Memorandum of May 4, 1993, preceding the "proposed Ordinances..." the remark: "in some cases, bishops and presidents found themselves unanimously with opposing views on a particular proposal." Is not this, on reflection, a startling thing to say: that after considerable discussion they remained unanimous blocks in complete disagreement with each other on points that are of

such significance that they generate this astonishing confrontation. All the presidents disagreed with what all the bishops felt required to insist on!

This disagreement reveals itself also in the pain of many other Catholics. Those Catholics who agree with their bishops in matters of teaching Catholic doctrine, and teaching Catholic morals, and of guarding the Catholic ideals in the sense in which the Church herself has always proposed them, often find Catholic universities not responsive. Too often university people are captivated by ways of understanding Gospel values that the Church has never approved, though many scholars insist on their right to proclaim Gospel things in ways that confront the Church's teaching and its ordinances concerning them.

The sentence quoted above suggests doubts about how the presidents who dialogued with the bishops were selected. One knows the pressures on university officials these days, and realizes that large numbers of them have been driven to deny principles which the Holy See (and the bishops of this committee unanimously) support. But it is well known that there are some university presidents in this country who do uphold the positions that the Holy See so vigorously defends in this document, and this country, surrounded by a culture that they find it difficult to flourish in. Was there a fear that a counter-cultural president might

be offensive to the other ones invited to participate? But we are no longer living in the 1960's or 1970's. There are very many Catholic intellectuals, in both Catholic and secular universities, who would not have made a solid front with the presidents selected, who - in significant matters - unanimously disagreed with all the bishops.

Not only that, but the resource persons, and the Staff persons who took part in these meetings, do not contain any names that stand out among the great host of those who are known to support with generous and intelligent love all the ideals of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*.

What is at stake is too great to allow political correctness to harm the Catholic identity of our universities. Of course there are always dangers in doing things rightly, in full accord both with all faith teaches and with what intelligent and courageous love of human values encourages. There is always a danger that some or many of our institutions may die. They may die by unjust impositions thrust upon them from without, unfairly; they may die as martyrs to their cause—but with a confident trust that God will restore what they have faithfully waited for. They may also die out of unfaithfulness to their own principles and convictions. And this is a more dreadful death. This unfaithfulness is certainly not total, and one is not charging people with deliberate malice or simple failure to care about faith. But one must see that in this world there are immense pressures to yield to things to which we must not yield.

## QUESTIONNAIRE

**D**OUBTLESS THIS FIRST PART should be filled in with the proper numbers, but I am not sure what is best: to put in there something like a 5 in almost everything, making exceptions among the ordinances for those that are better done. For the most part, I suspect that strong disagreement will suggest disagreeing with the Catholic things that are kept, rather than with the weakness with which they are stated.

Nn. 4 & 7. Introduction. For n.4 I do not think the introduction could be graded as better than fairly well done, and for diplomatic reasons it might be better to choose that than not well done. Comments on that point could be like the following: Although we wish to be eirenic, and to persuade those who have been intimidated by the cultural forces of the secular world, we cannot leave out too much of the strong teaching of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* in its introduction. Lines 6-8, p. 1, indeed say something that is immensely important. But one notes in the document itself that the points made there are repeated constantly: points about teaching Catholic doctrine, teaching Christian faith as it is proposed by the Church, having a faculty that has possession of its Catholic faith in the sense in which the Church teaches it, and having integrated one's other knowledge with a faithful guardianship of that even more precious wisdom that faith gives... There is so much more said in n. 4 of the Pope's Introduction than is quoted in 11. 9-10 of p. 1. The abstract "cause of truth" is regularly thought by those who are deeply confused about their Catholic faith to suggest that insistent, firm, constant teaching of the Catholic Church may be doubted, questioned, assailed, and young students indoctrinated in contrary positions, as long as one can say that one is doing it in the "cause of truth." Certain things must be firmly stated and pressed for: the Catholic faith is not a vague Christian ideal, our Universities are not simply institutions in a vague "Catholic tradition" or in the tradition of some grand religious Order. They must be universities committed both to the pursuit of human wisdom and to uniting that human wisdom with that authentic Catholic faith which is the faith as it is taught by Christ in the Church which he never forsakes, in which he yet teaches.

This sort of saying, strange though it seems to many modern Catholic ears, is what runs constantly through the Pope's introduction, and is only lightly guarded here.

Lines 13-16 are too abstract and too much apart from the call to great faithfulness and love for

Catholic teaching in the way things are presented.

Lines 17-18 are particularly weak. The four points that belong to research are a theme. Much more important are the four points given in n. 13: "Every Catholic university, as Catholic, must have the following essential characteristics:

"1. A Christian inspiration not only of individuals of the university community as such.

"2. A continuing reflection in the light of the Catholic faith upon the growing treasury of human knowledge, to which it seems to contribute by its own research.

"3. Fidelity to the Christian message as it comes to us through the Church. (Obviously this defines Catholic faith in n. 2, and it helps to make clear the meaning of "Christian inspiration in n. 1)

"4. An institutional commitment to the service of the people of God and of the human family in their pilgrimage to the transcendent good which gives meaning to life."

Certainly those points ought to be mentioned in this introduction. If they are to be written here with reference to the American situation, we should not water down what the Church teaches because we have some difficulties with that, but we should—in a style which is full of hope and encouragement—hearten people not to yield to the interpretations and attitudes which contradict the spirit of all that the document says.

The Introduction certainly needs to expound more clearly the meaning of "Catholic identity" of a Catholic University. The Introduction of the Holy Father does this in many ways, and many important points are made there that can be drawn upon. Some of what he says is crystallized in General Norms, Article 4. The University itself has the chief responsibility for maintaining its Catholic identity. University authorities have profound personal responsibilities in this. Personnel to be recruited for the University must respect the desire to have a Catholic identity: most should be good Catholics, not only in doctrine,

but also in life. Those who are not Catholic must be such as are willing to respect the teaching and moral principles of the Church. Sub points 3 and 4 of article 3 are crucially important.

Recently a Protestant university in Quincy Massachusetts (in suburban Boston) made a stronger demand for its faculty: it said that since they are a Christian University, they would henceforth require all faculty members to be Christians. They do not insist on their being Christians of their particular denomination, but Christians, people committed at least to the general Christian vision. At first the local paper was a bit furious in its reaction. But in a short time reflection set in, and an editorial gave a more positive response: that it is part of the right of freedom of religion to be allowed to have institutions which are really and practically supportive of ideals deeply held by the people who create them; and that is sometimes right and responsible and good to make counter-cultural commitments that do displease and even seem morally repulsive to others whose moral and even religious—even if the word "religious" is not used—commitments lead them to believe other things and to expect other things at any academic community.

The Catholic Universities have generally been far broader than this, and doubtless it is good that they should be willing to have non-Catholics and non-Christians on their faculties. But we ought to insist on what this document insists, and on what experience shows necessary: that good people who have beliefs and commitments contrary to those of Catholic faith should be trusted members of a Catholic institution of higher education only if they feel that they can give that kind of respect which it is necessary for an honest person to give if he joins a community that is committed and has a mission of a definite and distinctive kind.

Ways of stating the Catholic identity of a Catholic University for our time are difficult to word in ways that are both precise, and

---

**The University itself  
has the chief  
responsibility for  
maintaining its  
Catholic identity.**

---

encouraging, and also are not subject to the easy and misleading claims that these teaching are in conflict with “American” ideals. It is far from un-American for a Catholic institution to be faithful to its own identity, and to believe and love even things that the dear secular world about us does not understand or love. Neither will we be in financial perils if we are faithful to what we are. Of course, if many institutions yield—often more for ideological than financial reasons—to requirements pressed upon them by politicians and others who wish to homogenize all the universities, they put at risk the proper liberating of every Catholic university.

#### SUGGESTED:

1a. Catholic colleges and Universities may not be given away to boards or other groups which will not respect their Catholic identity wholly. It is an illegitimate form of alienation of Church property to set up boards which are not committed to the guardianship of the institution as the Catholic institution it was created to be, and then to protest that it is not possible for the university to accept Catholic teaching and guidance, because the power in the university is in other hands. The free exercise of religion in this country allows us to have Catholic universities. When such universities exist, only legitimate ecclesiastical authority could permit giving them away to the power and control of those who are not Catholic and who are not guided by Catholic principles.

Ordinance 4. The Ordinance here is entirely inadequate as it stands. Virtually all of article 4 of the general norms ought to be incorporated into these norms. The Americanization of them should not be a watering down of precisely that which Catholic universities here most need to overcome: the sadness and malaise that has followed their secularization. Rather it should be affected

by giving encouragement, by writing in ways that show how these Catholic requirements are fully in accord with American ideals, and the like. This does not mean making a long, long article: but it does mean that in a precise and compact way the authentic teaching of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* should be presented there. A sentence should be added here expressing something like the following: “Catholic theologians, as indeed all Catholic teachers, are to be faithful to Catholic teaching as it is proposed by the Church; they are to be faithful to the teaching of the magisterium. (see General Norms, A. 4; ll. 2,3.) One would not be suitable to receive a mandate if he did not accept what the Church teaches about the duty of theologians to teach Catholic doctrine in the sense in which the Church teaches it, and to avoid indoctrinating students in the view that it is suitable for a Catholic to reject what the Church firmly teaches if this in some way seems good to them.”

Ordinance 6. It seems inappropriate to say that the bishop has to invite the professor to request the mandate: responsibilities for Catholic identity lie chiefly with the university. University officials should instruct theologians that they have the duty to seek this mandate if they are to be hired by the university. Obviously, the ordinance should spell out a bit more, in one place or another, that this mandate cannot be given if the theologian does not accept responsibilities that the Church teaches they must accept if they are to be theologians in a Catholic University.

Ordinance 7. Substantial and procedural matters should be somewhat distinguished. Thus the first two lines of Ordinance 7 should conclude with something like this: “...use to be resolved in accord with the Catholic teaching and Ordinances proposed in the Church.” then l. 8 of p. 4 should begin a new point: “Procedures that respect...”. Then l.9 should

---

**One would not be  
suitable to receive a  
mandate if he did not  
accept what the  
Church teaches about  
the duty of theologians  
to teach Catholic  
doctrine in the sense  
in which the Church  
teaches it.**

---

perhaps nuance the phrase "the autonomy of the academic institution" might better be something like "the autonomy proper to an authentically Catholic institution."

Line 10 might add a bit more: "And the rights and responsibilities of Church authorities..."

Lines 11-14 on p.4 should be more nuanced. The American documents are not entirely self-standing: They are written not to tone down but to explain to our culture the general legislation of the Church, in a faithful application to American circumstances. Hence it was better to say: "the documents of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops *On Due Process* (1972) and *Doctrinal Responsibilities* (1989) served to assist in resolving matters of differences in such questions,

both with regard to principles and with regard to procedures.

Ordinance 8. This Ordinance is far from sufficient to address many points made in *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, points which must be made to meet needs so obviously felt by universities. The mode of giving moral education, and encouraging a Catholic life style, will be different now from those of forty years ago, before the massive moral and social revolutions fostered by the media. Certainly far greater wisdom is needed now in handing on to university students not only Catholic doctrine but a Catholic form of life, an honest and realistic assistance in becoming faithful Catholics in a world in which so many forces tend to make that very trying for so many. ♣

---

**Francis Canavan, SJ**  
Fordham University

**T**HE PROBLEM of re-establishing the Catholic identity of colleges and universities (henceforth I'll call them all universities) is a difficult one, and not one that can be solved merely by the exercise of episcopal authority.

First let me point out the elements of the problem, as I see them.

Many universities, all the Jesuit ones so far as I know, and probably others as well, have legally separated the university and the religious community into two corporations. Control of the university is now vested in a board of trustees with a lay, and often partially non-Catholic, majority, though members of the religious community are also members. They are the people who have the legal power, and are the people to whom bishops will ultimately have to address themselves.

The universities are all dependent to some degree on State and/or federal money. Even if they are not under the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1988, they are bound by federal civil-rights

laws, if they receive federal funds, even indirectly through student loans. There is in addition a growing multitude of anti-discrimination laws at the State and local levels. The universities are therefore under the constant threat of lawsuits, which can be a drain on their resources even if they win. University administrations are very sensitive to this threat. They are also aware of the trade-unionism of their faculties, whether they are unionized or not, which leads faculty to resist any effort of the administration to exercise more control over the recruitment and advancement of the faculty. All of this limits the essential power of the administration of any institution, the power to hire and fire.

Without that power, however, talk about the Catholic identity of a university is mere talk. Whatever else a Catholic university may be, it has to be a school in which most of the faculty are practicing and committed Catholics who want to help in carrying out the Church's work on the intellectual plane. The problem is further compounded by the fact that there are not enough such Catholics with earned doctorates who are willing to commit themselves in this way.

The difficulty is increased by the deeply-ingrained acceptance, on the part of faculty and administration alike, of the liberal model of the university. That model cannot be reconciled with the idea of a university as having a mission to carry out the intellectual mission of the Church. The Catholic conception of a university will have its own idea of academic freedom, but it will not be the liberal one. Weaning Catholic academics away from the liberal model will require a genuine conversion, and I would not promise success in any effort to do it.

I will offer a couple of practical suggestions, again without promising any success in accomplishing them. One would be to persuade the Catholic universities that grant doctorates to hire one another's Ph.D.s. Now they are so obsessed with prestige that they hire new teachers from "good" schools, and thereby staff themselves with

non- and even anti-Catholics. Another would be to reduce the number of Catholic universities that pretend to be research universities, and to concentrate our best talent in them. The rest of the Catholic universities would be primarily or exclusively teaching colleges for undergraduates. The colleges might be forced to hire faculty with doctorates from the secular universities, because there would not be enough doctorates from the relatively few Catholic universities around. But they could aim at getting people who had attended Catholic colleges and had had solid instruction in their faith before they went to graduate schools.

None of the things I have written here are encouraging. But if there is any hope for the future of catholic higher education in this country, the first thing we have to do is to stop kidding ourselves. ♣

**Rev. Kenneth Baker, SJ**  
Editor, *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*

## PART ONE: INTRODUCTION

1) I think there should be a clear statement or definition of the Catholic university, taken from *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* (ECE).

2) ECE says in # 27: "The institutional fidelity of the University to the Christian message includes the recognition of and adherence to the teaching authority of the Church in matters of faith and morals."

3) Somewhere, either in the Introduction or the ordinances, it should be clearly stated that, to be Catholic, a university must be subject to the magisterium or teaching Authority of the Church. Without that, it is simply not Catholic, at least not in the full sense.

## PART ONE: ORDINANCES

1) "Magisterium" is not mentioned in the Ordinances nor the need for Catholics to be subject to it since it is guided by the Holy Spirit.

ORDINANCE 1: add after "Catholic Church" in line 6: "and submit themselves to the teaching authority of the Church."

ORDINANCE 3: add to line 15: "This review must be submitted to the competent church authority for approval."

ORDINANCE 6: add to line 1: "that they are required by Canon Law to request..." And strike the words after "academic officials" "of the Church's expectation that they."

Also, strike the last sentence, lines 3 to 5, and substitute:

"The bishop or his delegate will grant the request, unless there are serious reasons for not doing so. No professor of catholic theological disciplines may teach without the mandate." ♣

## Hanna Klaus, M.D., F.A.C.O.G.

**Ordinance 8** should include other areas than worship, or another ordinance should be drafted to insure that Catholic ethics are followed in Schools of Medicine, Nursing and Allied Health. Particular oversight must be exercised in teaching about, and practicing in the areas covered by *Humanae Vitae*, *Donum Vitae*, the Declarations on Sexual Ethics and Euthanasia. The Practice com-

mon in many University Hospitals which are called Catholic of transferring a patient to a non-Catholic facility for a proscribed procedure, i.e. postpartum sterilization or "genetically indicated" abortion is widespread. In addition, many full or part-time faculty make no secret that they engage in these practices off campus, and invite residents and students to come and learn the procedures. A nearby institute of bioethics is often 180 degrees from Church doctrine. ♫

---

## Monsignor George P. Graham

Dear Monsignor Kelly,

I must say at first that the draft of ordinances is an inferior product. It reminds me of a comment of my former professor, later bishop, Joe Denning: "It's vague enough to be true".

You suggested that I reflect particularly on matters of religious behavior.

### **Ordinance 1.**

Catholic colleges and universities are those which, through their governing boards, freely commit themselves to the Christian message as it comes to us through the Catholic church, and together with the bishops seek to preserve and foster their Catholic character and mission.

#### *Comment:*

One might wonder whether this ordinance would apply to any University in the United States with the possible exception of the School of Religious Studies in Catholic University.

Here one might recall canon 808 which states that no university may bear the title or name *Catholic University* without the consent of the competent ecclesiastical authority. Linking a university to the Vincentians or the Jesuits often hints at a Catholic character which in fact has been voted out by the boards of directors. Catholic parents are led through this subterfuge to send their children to schools which are in fact not really committed to Catholic teaching and the Magisterium.

### **Ordinance 3.**

Periodically, and at least every ten years, each catholic college or university it to undertake an internal review of the congruence of its research program [Nos. 7, 15, 18,45], course of instruction [Nos. 16, 17, 19, 20] and service activity [Nos. 21, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38] with the ideals and principles expressed in *Ex corde Ecclesiae*.

#### *Comment:*

Note that this is described as an "internal review". There is not even a hint that the NCCB or the diocesan bishop would be involved. This ordinance does not do justice to *Ex corde Ecclesiae*, article 5, 2 which provides that "the local bishop is to take the initiatives necessary to resolve the matter".

### **Ordinance 5.**

The mandate granted to those who teach theology in catholic colleges and universities should be understood as recognition by the competent ecclesiastical authority of a catholic professor's suitability to teach theological disciplines [Gen. Norms, 4:3].

#### *Comment:*

The mandate referred to is that required by Canon 812. The criteria for granting the mandate are spelled out in canon 810: "Teachers... who besides their scientific pedagogical suitability are also outstanding in their integrity of doctrine and probity of life; when these requisite qualities are lacking, they are to be removed from their positions in accord with the procedure set forth in the stat-

utes". Ordinance number 5 merely speaks of "suitability". The reference to general norms 4:3 should be spelled out for those who will not have access to the complete papal document.

#### **Ordinance 6.**

Catholic professors of theological disciplines are to be advised by academic officials of the Church's expectation that they request the mandate from the competent ecclesiastical authority, normally the diocesan bishop or his delegate (cf. Canon 812). Accordingly, the bishop is to invite the Catholic professor to request the mandate and, after appropriate review, the bishop is to respond to the request.

##### *Comment:*

The ordinance speaks of "The Church's *expectation* that they request the mandate". Canon 812, however, says that "It is *necessary* that those who teach theological disciplines in any institute of higher studies have a mandate." What would happen if a university hires a professor of theology and has him sign a contract? The university then informs him of this expectation. The professor respectfully declines to approach the diocesan bishop. Has the requirement of the mandate been included in his contract?

#### **Ordinance 7.**

(Settlement of discipline)

##### *Comment:*

This ordinance seems to run counter to article 5:2, which puts the responsibility on the local bishop and "if necessary the Holy See". As the ordinance stands, no bishop would ever be able to take the initiative on any question of incorrect teaching.

#### **Ordinance 8.**

Governing Boards, in appropriate collaboration with the administration of the college/university, should provide for an adequately staffed campus ministry program and suitable liturgical and sacra-

---

#### **Canon 812, however, says that "It is necessary that those who teach theological disciplines in any insti- tute of higher studies have a mandate."**

---

mental opportunities under the moderation of the local bishop [Gen. Norms 6: 1-2].

##### *Comment:*

This norm introduces an anti-intellectual element into the religious life of the university. Campus ministries have no responsibilities spelled out for the catechesis of students. Apparently, that is left to the professors of

theology, but one would be hard pressed to find any acknowledgment of the fact.

The ordinances, as particular law for the dioceses of the United States, become effective at the beginning of the academic year following their enactment by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and communication from the Congregation for Catholic Education that they have been reviewed by the Apostolic See. (Gen. Norms, 1:2).

##### *Comment:*

Line 18 of the ordinance proposes that these norms be approved as "particular law for the dioceses of the United States". This would completely tie the hands of bishops in trying to deal with problems of dissent in teaching in local colleges and universities. The designation of the ordinances as "particular law" would have no effect on the universities or colleges.

The glaring omission in the norms is the clear statement that students in Catholic colleges and universities have a strict right to receive a theological instruction in accordance with the authentic teaching of the Catholic Church. This is more significant when one realizes that the large numbers of students taking theology courses in Catholic colleges and universities have had little or no catechetical formation. Few would be able to express accurately the doctrines of the Church in such a way as to merit the appellation "well catechized". It seems foolish to speak of introducing students to writers such as Rahner, Congar, and Lonergan when they do not know anything about the Creed, the Commandments, or the Sacraments.

One approach to defusing these norms would be to have them described as "guidelines" rather than as "particular law". A second approach would be to require that the norms not be distributed without the full text of the *Ex corde Ecclesiae* and canons 807 through 814.

One final point. In the *Monitor Ecclesiasticus* for April and June 1992, there is an article by Richard J. Barrett on "The Bishop as Ordinary Teacher of the Faith". This deals with the actions of the Archbishop of Paderborn in dealing with Dr. Eugen Drewermann, a professor of dogmatic

theology at the theology faculty of Paderborn, in 1991. On October 7, 1991, the Archbishop formally withdrew the mandate from Dr. Drewermann. Much of the relevant canonical material is cited and used effectively in this article. If you do not have a copy of it, I can send you one..

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely yours,  
Rev. Msgr. George P. Graham  
Pastor



### William Bentley Ball, Esq.

An overall difficulty which I have with the Proposed Ordinances is their omission of points in the 1987 document from the Congregatio Pro Institutione Catholica which I had described in an article in *Crisis* (March, 1987) as indispensable. These points have a special value by their realistic recognition of what has gone wrong in Catholic higher education. In any event, the Proposed Ordinances seem to me to be not only wide open to very broad and differing interpretations but also to duck the serious business of correcting present widespread abuses.

**Ordinance 1** is the key ordinance since it defines Catholic colleges and universities. But surprisingly they are not defined as institutions which adhere to the teachings of the Church. Rather they are institutions (a) whose governing boards "commit themselves to the Christian message as it comes to thus through the Catholic Church" and (b) institutions which "seek to preserve their Catholic character and mission."

*Comment:* Professing commitment, however sincerely, is quite different from actually adhering. "The Christian message as it comes to us through the Catholic church" is language with which all dissenters from Catholic doctrine can easily live. Indeed, most *today* have no difficulty making similar professions in their catalogues and in their rep-

resentations to the bishops. It would appear to be a fundamental necessity that the Catholic Institution be defined as one which adheres to the teaching of the Church as given by the magisterium.

The definition would, however, give rise to the conclusion that professedly Catholic colleges and universities would then be subjected to some form of hierarchical accreditation. Such accreditation would doubtless inspire objections relating to "censorship," "Loyalty oaths," and "attacks on academic freedom." Many professedly Catholic colleges do not express objections today over forms of secular accreditation (e.g. the extreme accreditation requirements demanded by Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools relative to "cultural diversity.") Since some have enthusiastically embraced such requirements, they should have no objections to embracing a form of certification of the Church identifying them as orthodox (i.e. Catholic in adherence).

**Ordinance 3.** This provision, calling for periodic review, by the Catholic institution, of its activities is of little meaning as worded. First, should not there be a constant ongoing examination of all activity to assure its congruence with Catholic doctrine? The "at least every ten years" wording invites the holding of internal reviews not oftener than ten years. The objective of the internal review is to ascertain congruence of activities with a

very loosely stated objective, “the ideals and principles expressed in *Ex corde ecclesiae*.” Whatever is meant by that phrase, (a) no penalty is provided if the “congruence” is found to be lacking, (b) since the review is strictly internal, it need be reported to no one. This ordinance is virtually meaningless. It will be found utterly inoffensive to the most dissident of college presidents.

**Ordinance 5.** This, because it really ordains nothing, can scarcely be called an ordinance. It calls but for a “manifestation of desire.” Then it says that the object of the desire should be to “maintain the Catholic identity” of the institution. “Identity” can refer to one of the identities referred to in Ordinance 2, but it more likely is intended to mean an institution which fits the definition (or non-definition) provided in Ordinance 1. Next, the “manifestation” is to consist, not of actually promoting the teaching of Catholic Theological disciplines, but in merely seeking to. Who will do the seeking? The “institutional authorities and the diocesan bishop” — but not together, but

rather “according to their own proper roles.” Therefore (a) What is the “proper” role of the spokesman for the institution? (b) What is the “proper” role of the diocesan bishop in this matter? (c) What if the institutional authorities and the diocesan bishop have different ideas on the teaching of Catholic theological principles?

Kindly note: when we speak of “the teaching of Catholic theological principles,” we are talking about the whole ball game. The refusal of the ordinance to come to grips with this fact — flat out — is surprising. But we come then to Ordinance 5.

**Ordinance 5.** Not stated is what happens if (a) the academic officials do *not* advise the professor of the Church’s expectation, or (b) the professor fails to request the mandate, even after invitation by the bishop to do so.

*Ball, Skelly, Murren & Connell  
Harrisburg, PA*

## ~~ THE WORLD STATE ~~

*Oh how I love Humanity  
With love so pure and pringlish:  
And how I hate the horrid French  
Who never will be English.*

*The International Idea,  
The largest and the clearest,  
Draws me to all the nations now  
Except the one that's nearest.*

*This compromise has long been known,  
This scheme of partial pardons,  
In Ethical Societies  
And small suburban gardens.*

*The villas and the chapels where  
I learned with little labour  
The way to love my fellow man  
And hate my next-door neighbor.*

(From G.K.’s Weekly, 1925)

# Let's Stop Kidding Ourselves About Catholic Higher Education

Msgr. George A. Kelly

## INTRODUCTION

**O**N JUNE 23, 1967, twenty-six Catholic educators, representing ten institutions, signed what has been called since (from the Wisconsin town where it was ratified) the "Land O' Lakes Document," declaring that "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." The effect of this declaration of independence from the pastoral mission of the Church has never been autonomy and freedom within the family of faith, in the manner of St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure. The Catholic cannot use the terms in an unbelieving or secular sense, which necessarily denies the validity of any institutional commitment to truths of faith or any intellectual assent to the Church's magisterium. The Holy See has tried to maintain the phrase "Catholic University" as conjunctive, rather than disjunctive, in 1968, 1969, 1972, 1973, and 1983, without much success. In 1990 John Paul II issued the Apostolic Constitution on Catholic Universities (*Ex corde Ecclesiae*), intending it to have the force of law for such institutions around the world. On May 4, 1993, a Committee of Seven Bishops, acting for their National Conference, issued a draft of Ordinances, proposed as instruments for implementing the Pope's legislation in the United States.

What follows surely is not the last word on this subject but represents a point of view widely

held by Catholic parents, by academics dissatisfied with the present state of Catholic higher education, and by many bishops.

"Let's stop kidding ourselves" about Catholic higher education was an offhand remark by a Jesuit educator after he read the newly proposed episcopal "Ordinances" for our colleges and universities. But the jibe raises a dark question: Does Catholic higher education, as presently constituted, really serve the Church and the religious well-being of the Catholic faithful?

The eight "Ordinances", drafted to implement John Paul II's Apostolic Constitution on Catholic Universities (*Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, August 15, 1990), are hardly laws, orders, or commands to anyone, especially for Catholic college presidents. At best, they are mere invitations to educators to identify their institutions as Catholic, to commit themselves to the Catholic message (the word *magisterium* is never used), to reevaluate themselves internally every ten years, to have Catholic theological/canonical professors request a mandate from bishops (Cn. 812) to teach the sacred sciences (presumptively in the Catholic mode), to settle disputes with bishops according to newly created procedures which protect academics more than prelates, and to provide suitable worship opportunities through on-site campus ministry. Nothing is really demanded by bishops of academics, certainly not that the campus be suffused with the Catholic way of life ordained by the Church's creed, code, and cult. And, no mechanism is established for dealing with institutions which *de facto* or *de iure* fail to accept the invitations, or who do so without the intent of fashioning fully believing practicing Catholics.

Another Jesuit, reading the same Ordinances, considered that further dialogue on this subject is a waste of time. College presidents, and their sub-alterns, he avers, have long since abandoned subordination to Church authority, except when they use alleged Catholicity as a shield against some unsavory government intrusion, or when the religious cover serves their own political

purpose. As presently constituted, rare is the president who can claim, institutionally at least, that he exercises a pastoral mission on behalf of the Church, if that means full blown Catholic teaching and practice, as this is defined and decreed by magisterium. Indeed, a third Jesuit, this time a former president, is shocked that the word "magisterium" never appears in a document that allegedly proposes "Ordinances."

These dour views of the subject assume that the secularization of Catholic higher education is all but complete. The die was cast in 1967 when a handful of college presidents demanded "autonomy" from pope, bishops, and religious superiors, got it, and in the process achieved "autonomy" down the line for faculty and students, from learning and teaching in accord with the creed, code, and cult of the Catholic Church.

The Catholic campuses we are talking about were conceived as successors to those which flourished in the shadows of medieval cathedrals. They were founded to be a little bit of land reserved by the Church for thinkers to contemplate, worship and live by the message of Christ proclaimed by the Church *ubique, semper, ab omnibus*. No Church developed Catholic higher education better, or more fully, than the late starter in Christianity, the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. Almost 250 institutions of Catholic higher learning represented the Church's hopes for the children of indigent immigrants, many of whom were hardly Catholic-wise when they landed in a nation hostile to papists. Nineteenth century bishops, abetted by religious congregations, demonstrated remarkable genius and faith by setting up a separate school system, from kindergarten to graduate school.

Bringing knowledge, civility, and a little culture to their newcomers, in the American mode, was part of their motive, but turning them into the best practicing Catholics any democratic state ever saw became the obvious result.

Then, what began as a

land where Christ and His Church prevailed became, in our time, a Land O' Lakes. Even though the Sign of the Cross or the Statue of Our Lady still stood high on campus grounds, the secular culture's definition of higher education, not the Church's, became the rule of campus life. A college president ceased acknowledging a pastoral mission for his school, began instead to render to Caesar what Caesar demanded in the name of "modernity," cut juridical ties with Church authorities who spoke authoritatively for Christ, defended the freedom of faculty and students to doubt, deny or reject the Church's creed, code, and cult. This mood of Land O' Lakes was hardly what one expected in a Land O' Christ.

Whenever good Catholic teaching norms are redefined to make skeptics comfortable with them, trouble awaits the faithful. Take words like "catechesis" or "indoctrination." Strictly speaking, these simply mean authentic instruction in the faith of Christ and the building up of His Church. For secular ideologies, however, they suggest brainwashing, and oppressive brainwashing at that. (As if thoughtful witnesses, like Allan Bloom in *The Closing of the American Mind* and E.D. Hirsch in *Cultural Literacy* had not already begun to expose the myths about objectivity in the modern secular university.) Still Catholic university presidents now allege detached objectivity about whether or not the truths of the Catholic faith are authentically presented on their campuses. One Jesuit president from Seattle, for example, indiscriminately denied in 1985 that the Catholic university had indoctrination as its mission. A few years later, the president of Notre Dame, without appropriate distinctions, rejected the notion that his university was a catechetical center of the Church.

Obviously the Catholic university is not a parish, any more than a hospital is. Nonetheless, it is a place where Catholics think more deeply, an institution which hopes to teach its young Catholics how to relate the an-

---

**Then, what began as a  
land where Christ and  
His Church prevailed  
became, in our time,  
a Land O' Lakes.**

---

cient faith to their time and place, and to the new knowledge of modernity. In selected research centers, its best minds also search for new methodologies, even new formulas, by which the message of Christ comes across with a modern ring. But whatever the novelties, or the level of learning, it is still a place with a pastoral mission. Like the hospital, it may serve intellectual or humanitarian purposes. But its reason for existence qua Catholic is evangelical. It may have on hand the best secular wisdom available, but is also a place where the ancient faith is to be re-presented, not to be contradicted or doubted. The end result of this Catholic process is catechetical; that is, putting on the mind of Christ (Phil. 2,5), as this is understood by the magisterium, is as valid objective for the Catholic university as it is for any of the Church's other efforts.

## LET'S STOP KIDDING OURSELVES

LAND O' LAKES, in its conception and in its results, has been disastrous for the Church. These days we do public penance, and pay a high price, for the scandalous conduct of priests and religious, yet we examine our consciences not at all about the relation of bad acting to bad teaching on college and university campuses. Catholic leaders today psychoanalyze those who cause scandal, but hardly ever acknowledge the cause as a breakdown of Catholic discipline as a direct result of "the autonomy" granted to Catholic higher education to stand apart from the magisterium. The sad tale of the vanishing Catholic moment has often been told in recent years, but God forbid that a prominent pastor point a finger of fault at our Land O' Lakes campuses. Yet, it is precisely these centers where the Church's three most anti-establishment forces have been meeting for a quarter of a century, as if in concert — dying religious order leadership, anti-Roman college bureaucracies, and an entrenched dissenting theological community — all living together in a privileged sanctuary created

and maintained by the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities.

Not long ago Catholic researchers discovered what bishops knew, viz. that the solidarity of Catholic secular achievements, and not least the piety of the American faithful, was due largely to the Catholic school system, up to and including its universities. Indeed, the best practicing Catholics were the college educated. The Greeley-Rossi book, *The Education of Catholic Americans* (1968), was only one of a dozen books of its kind which substantiated the obvious. Strange, indeed, is the reluctance of contemporary opinion-molders to acknowledge the correlation between what Greeley later called a "declining Church" (1976), and the dissent that has been going on in Catholic schools, especially in the Church's colleges and universities. From Louis Bouyer's *Decomposition of Catholicism* (1969) to William Kilpatrick's *Why Johnny Can't Tell Right From Wrong*, the story has been often told. It needs only facing, not retelling.

By 1973, studies indicated that doctrinal dissent within the Church had become widespread, open defiance of Catholic norms within Catholic institutions no less. Mass on Sunday, marriage by a priest, chastity in and out of the single state, lost their force as serious demands on the consciences of educated Catholic elites. By the 1980's important dioceses were reporting Sunday Mass attendance down to 25 percent. Call to Action meetings, Vatican III and Times' Consultants Conferences, Canonical and Theological Conventions, etc., staffed mostly by Catholic professors who, concentrating on the Church's social message, also fed doubt, distrust, disaffection, and denial among clergy and laity alike, about its credal and moral propositions. Those with direct access to the rank and file were the more serious offenders. Books like *The American Catholic People* (Gallup-Castelli, 1987) and *The Emerging Parish* (Gremillion-Castelli, 1987), developed for or with elite Catholic groups (e.g. Notre Dame University), suggested that "*sentire cum ecclesia*" was unfashionable in post-Vatican II circles, while picking and choosing among doctrines and morals was

a new privilege. Among educated Catholics, it was implied, to proclaim oneself as "orthodox" was to associate with fundamentalism or narrow-mindedness. Criticizing John Paul II (with or without Cardinal Ratzinger) became commonplace on college grounds, while speaking unfavorably, for example, of feminism or liberation theology was looked upon as less than Vatican II correctness. Whatever indoctrination or catechizing did go on in Catholic institutions of higher learning, reinforcement of the Catholic creed, code, and cult, as those are understood by the magisterium, was not in many places a high priority. Every Catholic college had its "pious remnant," of course, those who stand with Paul VI and John Paul II, that is, but this community operated mainly on the fringes of many institutions. The "mainstream", *de facto* and *de iure*, had become autonomous of magisterium's control, and thereby was free to think and act according to its own lights.

**L**E<sup>T</sup> US STOP KIDDING OURSELVES, therefore. This very autonomy is harmful because our vast system of allegedly Catholic higher education deals mostly with youngsters.

Back in 1967 the rationalization for "autonomy," *à la Harvard*, was in order that our colleges might become great research centers. Instead, we received free thinkers among the young rather than creative teachers and faithful researchers who prided themselves on their Catholic commitment to magisterium. A generation later, the largest Catholic universities still deal mostly with youngsters. About 10 out of 238 average a total enrollment of around 10-20,000, making them "big league," but even here three quarters of their students are undergraduates. The other 200 plus institutions deal almost exclusively with 18-22 year olds, young adults

not exactly well-trained Catholics. Modern Catholic campus youngsters are more likely nowadays to face a pedagogy which features all the questions raised by Rahner, Schillebeeckx, and Curran, and less the answers supplied authoritatively by the Church's Creeds or the Documents of Vatican II. If the young attend Catholic graduate schools they may receive terminal degrees, but only rarely will they come across a Hans Urs Von Balthasar, a Henri De Lubac, or a Germain Grisez, those unusual intellectuals and defenders in the Catholic faith in these times.

**L**ET US STOP KIDDING OURSELVES, too, about the meaning of the phrase "free thought." Our best Catholic teachers have always been freewheelers in the use of their minds, many being outstanding debaters, too. The seeming disarray in their old-style lecture halls generally ended in respect for the Church and for Catholic convictions. Their open dialogue normally closed on faith propositions, and taken as given was the Catholic way of life. Freedom — and there was plenty for those who exercised it responsibly — was played out within the environment of the Church, in which hierarchy was acknowledged as the proper guardian of ecclesial discipline. (Academics today loudly complain about abuses of pastoral authority, and at times inhibit its use. Yet century after century the more common defect in Church administration is the failure to correct obvious evils in Church institutions at the appropriate time. This has been especially true since 1965, the Curran case being a glaring example.)

Whose free thought, therefore, are we talking about today? The free thought of those who, under the Sign of the Cross, foster less than devout thinking Catholics? What about the right of students to obtain what the college advertises as its given heri-

---

**Criticizing John Paul II  
(with or without  
Cardinal Ratzinger)  
became commonplace  
on college grounds,  
while speaking unfavor-  
ably, for example, of  
feminism or liberation  
theology was looked  
upon as less than  
Vatican II correctness.**

---

tage? What about the right of Church authorities to see that the Church reaps the blessing of any education called Catholic? Secular culture cannot be held responsible for the anti-Church postures of our young when, like it or not, what the young experience "out there" is reinforced in Catholic classrooms. Does anyone seriously think that the anti-magisterial views of many priests and nuns were learned purely in classes at Harvard or Yale? Is there any doubt, too, that in universities and colleges conducted under Land O' Lakes auspices, freedom is somewhat restricted for outspoken defenders of magisterium? The very best one can say is that presently at least two Churches co-exist within Christ's body, highly undesirable as that may be.

**L**E<sup>T</sup> US STOP KIDDING OURSELVES: the views expressed in The Catechism of the Catholic Church are never going to be considered on the same level with the negative thinking of any college teacher standing before the young. In a truly Catholic institution, legitimate authority should not allow these young people to be misinformed about what the universal catechism teaches.

**L**E<sup>T</sup> US STOP KIDDING OURSELVES: Catholic higher education may well be the greatest impediment to the healthy future of the Catholic mission in the United States. Autonomy, symbolized by "Land O' Lakes," has now been institutionalized down the line of the Church, even to pewholders who never went to college, but who hear what their better educated offspring are saying. And, the worshipping faithful are becoming increasingly disillusioned with divisions among pastors. To continue nitpicking with educators, many think, is a waste of time, i.e. to dialogue further with those who define Catholicity on their own terms and who look on pastors as "outsiders"

---

**Is there any doubt,  
too, that in universities  
and colleges conducted  
under Land O' Lakes  
auspices, freedom  
is somewhat  
restricted for  
outspoken defenders  
of magisterium?**

---

to their private project. Further, since the bones of contention no longer are Church laws and practices, but the very worship of the Church itself, the continuance of this status quo has become intolerable.

When, in the face of the violent 19th century Protestant Crusade to keep America Protestant, our bishops pondered how to deal effectively with the hordes of undeveloped Catholics arriving on our shores, they made a hard choice: to reinforce Catholic

faith and discipline through a separate school system. They did this over the opposition of Americanists, like Fr. Edward McGlynn, who thought priests and nuns were better used on streets providing services to the poor, rather than slowing down the Americanist amalgamation in a separatist classroom setting. Today, episcopal choices are no less difficult, because this time the virulent crusade is aimed at marginalizing all revealed religionists, not just believing Catholics. And the present crusade, more dangerous to the Church, is going on at the very time its once vaunted defense mechanisms of learning no longer wish to be Catholic in any sense the Church's magisterium can accept, except perhaps hypocritically. Friends of magisterium can debate interminably the dangers created for the Church by Land O' Lakes, but only bishops can do anything about a proper counter effort. Of course, they can also dissipate whatever ecclesial strength the Church has left by keeping Land O' Lakes in force.

**I**t is the contention of this paper, however, that for a while at least, bishops should put bombing and Bosnia aside in favor of ecclesial priorities more fully in line with those of John Paul II and his Good News of Salvation. In essence, a Church which would give moral counsel to Heads of State on complex political matters about which good men often disagree legitimately, must first be in

order itself about its opt proclaimed moral absolutes. If heads of the Church at important levels are permitted to function, while disbelief, doubt, and disobedience regularly go on under Catholic auspices, it is not likely that Statesmen will look upon Catholic moral guidance as worthy of respect, or even creditable.

## THE TIME FOR A NEW DEAL

**T**HOSE WHO OBSERVE Catholic higher education up close realize our system is not working for the Church. Important segments are still unabashedly Catholic (e.g. the Franciscan University in Steubenville), but these remnants, given the present will of most college administrators, may wither away in time. (Diseases spread with contamination, health only through care and vigorous exercise.) Thus far, Church authorities have failed to persuade the officers of Catholic higher education to abandon or modify Land O' Lakes to the Church's advantage. It seems propitious, therefore, to suggest that bishops try something else, at least to do whatever might salvage that segment of our college system which is still willing to serve the Church's mission. Fine tuning a failed policy no longer will do; a radically new policy is required, viz. calling religious orders, faculty associations, theologians, and campus pastors back to the roots of their personal faith commitment, and from there go forward to its institutionalization.

If Catholic colleges today need a charter from the State, there is also reason for them to have a charter from the Church to call themselves Catholic. The Catholic system was never better than when it was small, poor, and depended largely on its fervent faith and on the contributed lives of those who held that faith dearly. A new charter should spell out in contractual terms what once was taken for granted, and heretofore accepted even by non-Catholics who wished to learn and teach in a Catholic world. Those terms

should contain all the demands made in recent years by the Holy See, but which have been generally ignored in their major details. Institutions should be given a reasonable time to accept the terms—a year at most—and a reasonable time to establish the appropriate machinery to make a Catholic master plan work—no more than three years. Some institutions will no longer choose to walk in the Land of the Church. LET THEM GO.

**F**rom the moment the Holy See, through Gabriel Cardinal Garrone, accepted the world's Catholic Universities' own definition of their role within the Church (1973), Rome began to define certain elements as constitutive of an authentic Catholic university or college, whether or not it is juridically/canonically established:

1. An institutional commitment in study and teaching to the Faith of the Catholic Church, as that comes through the magisterium.
2. This commitment extends to the worship, doctrine, and the moral code, as these are also defined or regulated by the magisterium.
3. Pope and bishops are not external to such institutions, but internal to their Catholic life in its entirety.
4. Institutions, which claim the name Catholic, are to write this commitment into the statutes of the college or university specifying how Catholic identity is to be promoted and protected.
5. The autonomy of these learning centers is understood to mean internal freedom effectively to pursue by proper means their particular educational and religious objectives; but autonomy from external supervision or judgment by magisterium, pertaining to the fidelity of the academic community to authentic Catholic life, is excluded.
6. Autonomy, under the other rubric, "academic freedom," posits Catholic assumptions, not excluding the freedom of Church authority to protect the faith of faculty or students, or to limit public scandal of the faithful.
7. When the truth of the Christian message is at stake, the bishop has the right and duty to

intervene in the affairs of the Catholic university by advising the person or persons involved, by advising the administration and, in an extreme case, by a public declaration. The bishop's voice may be heard not only concerning theological positions, but whenever the pastoral work of the Church is adversely affected by what goes on in a university, professedly committed in supposed fidelity to the Christian message.

In the face of widespread abuses in Catholic academia – not only in false teaching, scandalous behavior, but in false worship – the Holy See more recently has insisted on additional requirements:

1. A profession of faith and an oath of fidelity for a wide variety of Church officials, even at the university level.

(*Rescript from Cardinal Ratzinger, September 1, 1989; Cf. Code of Canon Law, Cn. 833, No. 7.*)

2. A mandate from competent ecclesiastical authority for Catholic professors in various theological disciplines. (*Canon 812*).

Other requirements have also been indicated by Church authority, e.g. that a majority of the faculty be composed of believing and committed Catholics. (*Ex corde Ecclesiae*).

**L**E'T'S STOP KIDDING OURSELVES: Practical judgments must be made that most Catholic institutions are teaching institutions; their charter must specify them as such. Such teaching bodies must conform faithfully to the magisterium in matters of faith, worship, and way of life. The handful of Research Institutes must also be identified for what they are. And the freedom of their academics to explore the outer regions of faith propositions, to test new formulae, to propose ecumenical accommodations, etc., while granted, must be carried on under guidelines not dissimilar to those for universities who research for the federal government. On matters where the security of the nation, or the well-being of its citizenry is at stake, there is no secular quarter. Neither is there sound reason to think that Catholic academics are a law unto themselves. Freedom, after all, is a

power used for good or evil. What is lacking in the Land O' Lakes declaration is the recognition by its supporting academics that they are not final judges of Catholic good or evil.

Finally, it is incumbent on bishops, representing Christ and on behalf of the whole Church, to lead the Catholic community in a public confrontation with those forces of secularity, including government, which unreasonably interfere with the Church's freedom to conduct such institutions by its own norms, or which deny its members whatever blessing are due them as citizens of the United States.

**O**nce upon a time there was a body of recognized Catholic opinion, regularly noticed, respected even when resented. Today, public bodies and elected officials with their bureaucracies, ignore much of what is labeled Catholic opinion, asserting that pope and bishops do not represent the views of their constituents. Accrediting agencies are reluctant to justify religious controls of academic performance, not because they deny that right, but because Catholic college presidents have long since abandoned their conviction about the religious freedom acknowledged in 1940 by the American Association of University Professors. If Land O' Lakes was justified in 1967, as a doorway to public influence by educated Catholics, it has failed; as a Catholic principle it was wrong conceptually, and counterproductive for the Church, even in secular matters. Furthermore, government, through its laws, judiciary, bureaucratic administration, using tax money as a battering ram, has inhibited most major religious leaders wishing to adhere to divine revelation and/or laws, from exercising comfortably their constitutional freedom to manage Church institutions in the best interests of religion. The battle over freedom of religion still has to be fought, and the Catholic Church, one might expect, should be a major combatant.

In any event, "Land O' Lakes," for the Church's own good, must be replaced by the "Land O' Christ." Only the bishops are guarantors that this latter community truly exists, and no

separatist force of Catholics should be permitted to rule otherwise. Better for Catholic education to be smaller and poorer, but more faithful to the Successors of the Apostles in union with the pope than to the masters of the secular academic world or Catholic dissenters in their midst.

Perhaps the significance of these issues for the Church can be capsulated in three recent meetings:

**C**HURCH ONE was evident in The Future Of The American Church Conference, held in Washington, D.C., September 7-19, 1993, featuring the Washington Theological Union, a major seminary for religious priests and quondam office of The Catholic Theological Society of America. Six major Catholic universities, Fordham, Georgetown and Santa Clara (Jesuit), Villanova (Augustinian), Niagara (Vincentian) and Notre Dame (Holy Cross Fathers) co-sponsored the event. Intended to fashion the Church's future pastoral leadership, and subtitled "From Impasse to Opportunity: Listening to the Voice of the Whole Church," the models of this budding ecclesial leadership were to be, among others, Anthony Padovano, Charles Curran, Francis Buckley, S.J., Rosemary Reuther, two Catholic bishops and a woman bishop of the Episcopal Church. Obviously, the organizers are dissatisfied with the teachings of the Church on marriage, sex, holy orders, especially on its hierarchical constitution and, implicitly, are displeased with the pontificate of John Paul II. The fact that such a conference owes its major support to institutions nurtured by the Church itself, including hierarchy, defeats whatever authentic pastoral mission the Church has from Christ.

**C**HURCH TWO is an offshoot of CHURCH ONE. Collegium, it is called, a network of 44 Catholic colleges and universities has been orga-

---

**The recommended exponents of the new recovery include, among others, Monika Hellwig, Michael Himes, David J. O'Brien, William Shea, Andrew Greeley, Michael Buckley, S.J.**

---

nized to recapture what its founders sense has been lost - a truly Catholic intellectual life. Still, its recent meeting at the Jesuit managed Fairfield University (June 4-12, 1993) demonstrates that its membership is interested in the Catholic tradition, not the Church per se, in the experience of being Catholic, not so much in the Church's truth and norms, in networking with contemporary intellectuals about the Catholic tradition, not in the faith commitment and religious

practice of students, in proclaiming Catholicity and worshipping Catholic, but not if bishops interfere to tell them what that means. The word magisterium never appears in its literature. The recommended exponents of the new recovery include, among others, Monika Hellwig, Michael Himes, David J. O'Brien, William Shea, Andrew Greeley, Michael Buckley, S.J.

Neither of these "Churches" manifests any sense of obedience to the authority of the Church, nor expresses assent to its teaching, nor does either mention any obligation to pass on to the next generation that tradition of which magisterium speaks so eloquently.

**C**HURCH THREE appears in the 1993 story of the maximum accreditation given to Thomas Aquinas College of California by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). Aquinas, a young college founded by laymen, with an enrollment running into the hundreds not thousands, was given high marks (1) for the way it pursues truth dialectically in the light of the Catholic faith, (2) for the freedom that pervades the institution within the framework of its Catholic mission, (3) for the absence of racism or sexism, even as it argues against the secular conception of diversity, including its refusal to use gender inclusive language. Although the college takes no affirmative action as prescribed by government, the

women and non-Catholics on campus spoke appreciatively of the environment; the students in general characterized the college as character building. ("It not only teaches you, it changes you.") The WASC team "found the Thomas Aquinas students enormously engaging, remarkably focused, evidently pious, and uncommonly serious about their studies," complimenting the "extremely dedicated staff who are most enthusiastic about the college and its mission." The only critic of Thomas Aquinas was a onetime official of a major Jesuit university.

The strength of Thomas Aquinas vis-a-vis the secular establishment, including government agencies, especially under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, is that this college states its Catholic convictions up front, indicates before public bodies its clear determination to adhere to the teachings of the Church, and to organize its faculty and student procedures accordingly. Accrediting agencies and government bureaus may wish Thomas Aquinas to do otherwise, but they also recognize the school's right to make its own educational choices as long as the college Board and faculty proceed professionally in pursuit of their particular excellence.

Putative Catholic institutions, on the other hand, often appear before public bodies muting their commitment to the Church and its doctrines, confess their comparability with other American colleges, that they have no religious tests in hiring or firing, that their worship is voluntaristic, that the same pluralism exists in religious, as in political, matters. Such schools have already abandoned any hope of maintaining Catholicity. Government bureaus, especially those connected with funding and employment, and faculty associations, will enforce the secular conditions of hiring, firing, and professionalism (secularly defined) that they have come to expect of all institutions which seek their favor.

**L**EAT'S STOP KIDDING OURSELVES:  
Hardly anyone is happy these days with the  
Catholic Church, except futuristic Americans, and

even they complain that Rome has not approved their notions of what it means to be Catholic. Secularists resent any intrusion by authentic Catholic voices into the world they dominate, and they no longer worry about hierarchy's power over the baptized voters. On the other hand, the Church cannot be an effective voice for Christ without its Catholic moment in the public arena, nor with a half believing constituency within its own ranks. Among its own, today, the Church often appears as a Tower of Babel in the very institutions upon which it relies for making disciples. Long ago in Europe, the Church fell to a low estate because of a long standing habit of prelates to temporize with arrogant princes of the realm. There is little reason to think that dissenting American academic princes can do less harm to the Church's pastoral mission in our time, especially when college professors foreswear institutional responsibility for students being in the state of grace. If the princes of academe want freedom, then give them freedom. Give them the choice now to go their way without Church blessing. This may be the only possible way open to pastors of the Church in the 21st century. Let the officers of the magisterium write real ordinances, and let the institutions choose.

Consider Article 5 from *Ex corde ecclesiae*. "Every bishop has a responsibility to promote the welfare of the Catholic universities of his diocese and has the right and duty to watch over the preservation and strengthening of their Catholic character. If problems should arise concerning this Catholic character, the local bishop is to take initiatives necessary to resolve the matter, working with the competent university authorities in accordance with established procedures, and, if necessary, with the help of the Holy See." Laissez-faire for Catholic higher education must give way to the primacy of Church welfare on Catholic college campuses, under the authority of those alone who are entrusted to guarantee Catholicity. *The responsibility is episcopal; the choice for bishops is no longer academic.*

## POSTSCRIPT

**E**very orderly society, including the Church at its best, subjects its citizenry to public law, wherever it applies, even to rugged individualists and venturesome enterprisers. Within the scope of such law, and under its demands, most citizens, and in the Church's case believers, exercise their rights and talents always under the law. In principle at least, every member of a responsible community is bound by law. In special cases, even under canon law, there are dispensations and commutations of general obligations. But, at all times, the common good of State and Church prevails over private and personal actions, especially if these threaten the peace and security of society itself. In a particular way, the Church was founded to form the baptized into a truly believing and generally holy people. To carry out its message

effectively, it often establishes schools, sometimes up to the university level.

Not all Catholics end up fully believing or law abiding, retaining their freedom to think and act against the Church, or their own spiritual well-being. Still, the pastors of the Church are not freed, thereby, of responsibility to safeguard the Church's mission, certainly within its own institutions.

Down the ages, and with some exceptions, this has been a normal Catholic source.

Recently, Methodist theologian Stanley Hauerwas restated the objective (*First Things*, February 1991, 2627):

"Moral life is about the formation of virtuous people by tradition-bound communities. Perhaps this is what a Christian university is or could be about."

The Church should demand no less ever in any education that bears the name CATHOLIC. ♦

~~ ON PROFESSOR FREUD ~~

*The ignorant pronounce it Frood,  
To Cavil or applaud.*

*The well-informed pronounce it Froyd  
But I pronounce it Fraud*

(From G.K.'s Weekly, 1925)

# Parent's Guide to Catholic Colleges

Reverend C. John McCloskey III

**N**OW THAT WE FINALLY have a product of a Catholic institution of higher learning in the White House, the question of what makes for a good Catholic education is more pressing than ever. Through the years many parents have asked my advice regarding the choice of a Catholic college for their child. Their concern is hardly surprising given what is at stake, particularly given the dramatic changes that have taken place in these institutions in the last thirty years. It is recounted that the late Herman Kahn, the well-known futurist, said there are only two times in life when one's ideas, attitudes, and convictions are radically altered: before you are six and when you go to college.

I have found that to be true in my own pastoral work with college students, and particularly true in that which pertains to religious belief and behavior. The choice of a college for one's child should be an overriding concern of any Catholic parent, given the important transition between the teen years and young adulthood, from dependence to responsible independence. In addition to the fact that college is probably the last chance of forming the character which will determine the question of happiness or unhappiness both in this life and the next, there is also the financial question.

During the four years of undergraduate education, parents will be shelling out up to \$100,000 on college tuition, fees, room and board, books, clothing, etc. This large sum of money could easily be invested, spent, or for that matter given away in a manner of real benefit to the Church, society or one's own family. Prudence would dictate that such an important decision be

preceded by a serious period of what is called on Wall Street "due diligence."

I think it important to point out from the start what I do not consider the principal criteria in choosing a Catholic college, to wit: a pretty campus, good food, athletics (participation in the NCAA "March Madness" or New Year's Bowl games), famous alumni, social life, success in sending graduates off into the professions, the understandably biased opinion that alumni, faculty and administration members have about their own institution, and so on. These may or may not be useful in selecting a university to attend but they are not related to what makes a college Catholic. I have found through the years a surprising amount of hopeful self-deception about the Catholicity of colleges. This is true for any number of reasons, most of which are related to a "The Way We Were" nostalgia concerning pre-Vatican II Catholicism. On the other hand, there is also a general sense of despair about sending the kids *anywhere* for four years of college without losing their faith or their moral compass.

I also want to point out, lest I be judged as unduly critical, that the United States has had the largest network of fine Catholic universities and colleges in the history of the Church world-wide. These institutions had an admirable record — in some cases for close to a century — of providing coherent, faithful education and formation to millions of Catholic men and women preparing them for their all important roles as fathers, mothers and citizens. They were staffed by tens of thousands of dedicated men and women, clerical, religious and lay, to whom great glory and credit is due.

The following are only some of the criteria to apply and questions to be asked when searching for an appropriate school. I will not be recommending particular schools; only parents together with their children can measure their satisfaction with the answers and make the responsible choice. It does trouble me, though, that parents will trundle their children off to institutions guilty of false advertising, and after four years are surprised to find themselves a hundred-grand poorer, and

their child a non-practicing Catholic.

Perhaps the first place to look for basic criteria is, surprisingly enough, the Church herself. In a recent decree from the Congregation of Catholic Education entitled *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, Pope John Paul II, a noted university man himself, laid out what the Church expects of institutions that label themselves Catholic. Pick it up and read it thoroughly; then apply it to the colleges in which you are interested. In the document the Church applies its perennial wisdom to the contemporary scene and provides a sure guide for distinguishing private whimsy from authentic teaching regarding the university. After, all, who could know better than the Church which gave birth to the university? Indeed, it is safe to say that those institutions that ignore this authoritative teaching will eventually lose their Catholic status both *de facto* and *de jure*, a process that will resemble the secularization of so many formerly Protestant universities in the U.S.

At the heart of a truly Catholic university will be a sound Theology Department which, as befits the “Queen of the Sciences,” should be considered the central department of the university. Apart from the competence and academic qualifications of its members, there is the all important question of whether it is, in fact loyal to the teaching authority of the Church. The majority of Catholic colleges have a two or three course requirement in theology for its undergraduates, who presumably will consider the teaching of their professors as authoritative. A college that habitually tolerates teaching that is at odds with the Church’s teaching forfeits the name Catholic in any real sense. It is sometimes difficult to ascertain what type of theology is taught at any given school. Ask the authorities if the criteria of the “Instruction on the Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian” of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith have

been applied to its theology faculty and if they have taken the recently reformulated oath required of them. Another good indicator is to simply probe the knowledge of any recent graduate. A few pointed questions will quickly reveal what he knows and where he stands with regard to the Church and her teaching. Finally, if the university harbors any well-known “dissenters,” the case is closed.

A Catholic university should have a philosophy of education that places emphasis on a well-rounded liberal arts education centered around a core-curriculum, i.e. it must believe that there are areas of knowledge which should be common to all students in the areas of literature, philosophy, music, and art. If the university merely views itself as a place that prepares students for a career rather than a place that prepares them for life and gives them a deep appreciation of knowledge as an end in itself in the natural sphere, then it disqualifies itself as anything other than an academic super-market.

A good place to search might be the *National Review College Guide* (written by two Catholic gentlemen) which spotlights several Catholic colleges whose educational philosophy reflects Dawson and Newman rather than John Dewey or Richard Rorty. After coming up with your “short-list” of universities, spend some serious time with their current catalog in order to examine not only their philosophy but their curriculum and requirements.

Be sure to read the college’s mission statement (if they have one). If you encounter words like standard, belief, maturity, conviction, commitment, marriage, family, evangelization, culture, character, truth, and knowledge, take a closer look. On the other hand, if you encounter words and phrases like values, openness, just society, search, diversity, and professional preparation and so on, move on.

---

**At the heart of a truly  
Catholic university will  
be a sound Theology  
Department which,  
as befits the “Queen of  
the Sciences,” should  
be considered the  
central department of  
the university.**

---

A close look at the emphasis on religious practice and formation in the campus life of the student will help determine the Catholicity of the environment. I am not referring here simply to religious statuary and saint's names on buildings, which may be simply relics of a bygone age. The state of the college chaplaincy can often be a strong indicator. What percentage of the student body and faculty is Catholic? What percentage "practice" their faith in the traditional sense of weekly mass and (at least) yearly confession? Does anyone on campus know or care? Is the emphasis placed on catechesis, formation, practice, and evangelization rather than on "social justice" and "community building" exclusively? Are there students increasingly responding to the call of the priesthood, religious life, or other forms of total dedication in the middle of the world?

Naturally a college will be as Catholic as the people who direct it, whether it is run by the diocese, a religious congregation, or dedicated lay people. If it is directed at least nominally by a religious congregation, what is its condition? Are there vocations? What percentage of the faculty is made up of members of the institute? Are they noted for their loyalty to the Church, not just historically, but actually? Do they wear their religious garb on campus (and not just on parent's and alumni weekends!)? Is there an openness to the variety of spirituality in the present-day Church, particularly to the lay movements and institutions that are providing so much life in this historical moment? Or does there exist a "turf" mentality or downright hostility to other spiritualities and institutions approved by the Church?

Be sure to talk to a cross-section of recent graduates. Are they well-educated by your standards with an appreciation for the finer things of mind or spirit? Are they the type of young adults (and not arrested adolescents) that you would like your children to be in a few years? Is the practice of the faith what gives central meaning to their life or is it simply accidental to be sloughed off when convenient? In short, are they Catholic first and American second or vice-versa?

For those students who are not commuters, living arrangements are of the highest importance. Do the college dormitories at the school that you are examining have basically the same rules and regulations, moral tone, and adult supervision that you would wish for your college age child if he were living at home? Are the dormitories places where character can be built and where virtue can grow, be practiced and if need be, protected? This is not a question of turning a college residence into a cloister but rather of assuring an environment where young men and women can live as Christians without being subject to unnecessary temptations and provocations. Are the dormitories single-sex? Or is that at least an option? Throwing hundreds of young men and women together in close quarters produces inevitable and natural results, most of which do not prepare them for Christian marriage in the best case scenario and which cause irreparable damage in the worst case. If you dare, spend the night or even a day or two living in a dormitory. In my experience most parents do not want to believe the atmosphere of hedonistic immaturity and boorishness that reign in these places. High spirits are one thing; animal behavior raised to an art is another. Remember it is your child you may be placing at moral and physical risk and paying for the privilege of doing so. Are there abortion referrals and contraceptives dispensed on campus? Is the college unequivocally pro-life or is there waffling and double-talk on the most important question of our time, the sanctity of life from conception through natural death?

Are there authentic Catholic universities and colleges in the U.S.? Yes, but they are far fewer than might appear at first glance. Some of the above should be a help in identifying them — along with your own additional criteria which I may not have even touched upon. But do not be fooled by those who purport to be Catholic and whose livelihood and retirement depend on protecting this fiction. Nor should you fool yourselves into thinking that you are sending a son or daughter to a Catholic institution if it does not live up to the Church's standards.

I write this from the perspective of a priest who revels in the work of catechesis and evangelization in exotic pagan and secular mission territories such as the Ivy League. Secular universities have many problems, but claiming to be Catholic is certainly not one of them. If you can't find the right Catholic college, send them to the best possible secular university — taking into account cost and their academic ability — and encourage them to bring their belief and practice as Catholics to

bear on their studies and friendships. Who knows, with the passage of time — perhaps decades or less — we may Catholicize the secular universities. The Pontifical Princeton University has a nice ring to it, don't you think? ♣

*The Reverend C. John McCloskey III is the chaplain of Mercer House, a center of Opus Dei, near Princeton University. He is also the U.S. Representative of the Roman Atheneum of the Holy Cross.*

## FCS NEWS

### Welcome to New Members

#### In Canada:

Richard Jacques Bernier,  
*Pierrefonds, Quebec*  
Marilyn Mangan, *Toronto, Ontario*  
Sean Murphy, *Prince Rupert, B.C.*

#### In Dublin, Ireland:

Katherine Buggle, *Newtown Farms*  
David Doyle, *University College*  
Brian Gogan, CSSP,  
*Blackrock College*  
Elizabeth Holmes, *St. John's*  
Michael O. Searcoid,  
*University College*

William O'Connor,  
*University College*

#### In the United States:

Richard G. Cummings,  
*Benedictine College, Kansas*  
Richard J. Dougherty,  
*University of Dallas, Texas*  
Scott FitzGibbon,  
*Belmont, Massachusetts*  
Carmine Gorga,  
*Gloucester, Massachusetts*  
Mark S. Latkovic,  
*Sacred Heart Major Seminary, Michigan*  
William Riordan, S.T.D.,  
*Sacred Heart Major Seminary, Michigan*

Thomas W. Smith,  
*Villanova University, Pennsylvania*  
Benedetto P. Vaghetto,  
*J.C.L., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*

Happy as we all must be at the wide and representative membership in the Fellowship, it seems clear that we are far from achieving our full potential. Members are asked to acquaint colleagues with the purposes of the Fellowship and urge those who share our loyalty to the Magisterium to apply for membership.

Ralph McInerny

### Friends of the Fellowship

We are grateful for the spiritual and material help of:

*Most Rev. John F. Donoghue,*  
Bishop of Charlotte, NC  
*Most Rev. John L. Paschang,* Retired  
Bishop of Grand Island, NE  
*Most Rev. Francis R. Shea,*  
Bishop of Evansville, IL  
*Archbishop Daniel Sheehan,*  
Archdiocese of Omaha, NE  
*Most Rev. James C. Timlin,*  
Bishop of Scranton, PA  
*Most Rev. Fremiot Torres Oliver,*  
Bishop of Ponce, PR

*Most Rev. Thomas J. Welsh,*  
Bishop of Allentown, PA

*James Cardinal Hickey,*  
Archbishop of Washington  
*Bernard Cardinal Law,*  
Archbishop of Boston, MA  
*Pio Cardinal Laghi,* Congregatio de  
Institutione Catholica, Rome,  
*Most Rev. Rene H. Gracida,*  
Bishop of Corpus Christi, TX  
*William Cardinal Baum,*  
Rome, Italy  
*Most Rev. Harry J. Flynn,*  
Bishop of Lafayette, LA  
*Most Rev. John H. Ricard, S.S.J.,*

Auxiliary Bishop of Baltimore

*Most Rev. John J. Myers,*  
Bishop of Peoria

*Most Rev. William H. Keeler,*  
Archbishop of Baltimore

*Most Rev. William B. Friend,*  
Bishop of Shreveport

*Most Rev. Howard J. Hubbard,*  
Bishop of Albany

*Most Rev. S. S. Schladweil,* Retired  
Bishop of New Ulm, MN

*Most Rev. Robert W. Donnelly,*  
Auxiliary Bishop of Toledo

*Most Rev. Francis E. George, O.M.I.,*  
Bishop of Yakima

## Board of Directors of the fellowship of Catho- lic Scholars 1993-1995

PRESIDENT AND EDITOR OF FCS  
NEWSLETTER

**Prof. Ralph McInerny,**  
Jacques Maritain Center  
714 Hesburgh Library  
Notre Dame, IN 46556  
(O) (219) 631-5825  
(H) (219) 232-2960

PRESIDENT EMERITUS

**Rev. Msgr. George A. Kelly**  
St. Joseph's Seminary  
Catechetical Institute  
Yonkers, NY 10704  
(O) (914) 968-6200 ext 8275

1ST VICE PRESIDENT

**Prof. Gerard V. Bradley**  
219 Law School, Notre Dame, IN  
46556  
(O) (219) 631-8385

TREASURER

**Dr. Joseph P. Scottino**  
Gannon University, Erie, PA  
16541  
(O) (814) 871-7272  
(H) (814) 459-6258

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

**Msgr. William B. Smith,**  
St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie  
Yonkers, NY 10704  
(O) (914) 968-6200  
(H) (214) 963-7487

### DIRECTORS

**Dr. Carl Anderson**  
John Paul II Institute  
2900 N. Dinwiddie St.  
Arlington, VA 22207  
(O) (202) 526-3799  
(H) (703) 534-9144

**Rev. Kenneth Baker, S.J.**  
Homiletic and Pastoral Review  
86 Riverside Dr.  
New York, NY 10024  
(O) (212) 799-2600

**Rev. Cornelius Buckley, S.J.**  
University of San Francisco  
San Francisco, CA 94117  
(O) (415) 666-0123

**Dr. Jude Dougherty**  
Catholic University of America  
Washington, DC 20064  
(O) (202) 635-5259  
(H) (301) 299-7886

**Sister Timothea Elliot, RSM**  
St. Joseph's Seminary  
Dunwoodie  
Yonkers, NY 10704  
(O) (914) 968-6200

**Sister Joan Gormley**  
Sisters of St. Mary of Washington  
4909 Baltic Ave.  
Rockville, MD 20853  
(O) (301) 933-1279

**Dr. Michael J. Healy**  
Franciscan University of  
Steubenville  
Steubenville, OH 43952  
(O) (614) 283-6228  
(H) (614) 282-2146.

**Dr. James Hitchcock**  
St. Louis University  
St. Louis, MO 63103  
(O) (314) 658-2910  
(H) (314) 863-1654

### Rev. Ronald Lawler, OFM.

**CAP.**  
St. Paul's Seminary  
2900 Noblestown Rd.  
Pittsburgh, PA 15205  
(O) (412) 921-5800

**Dr. Joyce Little**  
St. Thomas University  
Houston, TX 77006  
(O) (713) 522-7911  
(H) (713) 956-1936

**Dr. William May**  
John Paul II Institute  
487 Michigan Ave.NE  
Washington, DC 20017  
(O) (202) 526-3799  
(H) (301) 946-1037

**Dr. Janet E. Smith**  
University of Dallas  
1845 Northgate Dr.  
Irving, TX 75062  
(O) (214) 721-5258  
(H) (314) 650-0785.

**Dr. Joseph Varacalli**  
Nassau Community College  
Garden City, NY 11530  
(O) (516) 222-7454  
(H) (516) 334-3103

**Rev. Earl A. Weis, S.J.**  
Loyola University  
Chicago, IL 60626  
(O) (312) 274-3000

**Dr. Kenneth Whitehead**  
809 Ridge Place  
Falls Church, VA 22046  
(H) (703) 538-5085

## Problems and Solutions

Gavin Boyd

**T**WO FUNDAMENTAL problems which have to be considered in the work of the Fellowship relate to the dispersal of many of its members across relatively long distances, and to the effects of the sadness that they can experience because of the trials of the Church.

These problems, in conjunction with the consequences of social disorders, tend to limit the scope for and the utility of interactions within and across disciplines. They have to be considered with reference to what we learn from the history of the Church and from manifestations of the contemporary designs of Providence.

The problem of relative isolation, resulting from confinement in a small college, or to an unfriendly environment in a large institution, demands attention because it affects potentials for innovative application to the tasks of general and authentic knowledge. Synergistic interactions which ought to be possible do not occur. When this problem is experienced one has to reflect on the difficulties seen by Cardinal Newman, before his conversion, when he was expelled from Oxford, and had to cope with the deprivation of opportunities for fruitful exchanges with his colleagues.

The experience of isolation tends to be made worse by anguish over the trials of the Church. This anguish is spiritually purifying, but it is not meant to prevent intrusions of the joy promised by Christ. For each member of the Fellowship the intellectual apostolate has to be served through phases of the spiri-

tual life, through the nights and dawns of faith. The dawns are meant to prevent the harm that sadness can do to the mind. There is, accordingly, a profound relationship between contemplative prayer and the application of energies to the development of knowledge. In this context we can stress the great importance of liturgical functions, especially solemn high Masses and Holy Hours with Benediction, that make us joyful in the house of prayer, and that renew our youth.

The problem of relative isolation has to be considered with reference to the spiritual life. The analytical, theoretical, and designing insights needed in the generation of knowledge have to be sought prayerfully, as they were by St Thomas Aquinas, without neglect of study and opportunities for interaction. Certain practical measures, however, can be considered. Consultative networks can be set up through initiatives by individuals and by the Fellowship as a whole. Instead of an annual meeting lasting only a few days moreover a week long annual conference could be held at a college campus offering modest accommodation.

Such a conference could have a major liturgical dimension. This would help to revive traditional devotions which have been downgraded since Vatican II by irresponsible clerics. Here we must identify a profound need which is not commonly understood, but which is closely associated with the concept of true humanism. Through the traditional devotions Divinely chosen symbols become sources of inspiration for us, enabling us to *live in spirit among*

*Heavenly things*, but also to make innovative contributions to the building of a Christian civilization, through the consecration of intellectual endeavors.

Among the traditional devotions is one which has special significance in the larger contemporary context of cultural atrophy, alienation, and pessimism—a context similar to the one of university life in Paris which made the young Maritains think of suicide. This especially significant devotion is an ancient French one to Notre Dame de Liesse, in which there is a focus on the Mother of Christ as the Cause of Our Joy and as a source of vitality: Liesse conveys a sense of joyful vitality. As the Mother of Divine Grace, *gifted beyond all the Saints with Heavenly light*, as St Thomas Aquinas explains, She is the source of all the inspirations which give us insights into issues of philosophy, theology, the social science disciplines, and the humanities. All authentic poetic inspirations can be seen to come to us through Her.

While contributing to a devotional revival, the Fellowship can bring its members closer to the Cause of Our Joy and thus enable them to radiate the triumph of the life of *the spirit*, in continuity with all the consecrations of genius in the history of Christian civilization. There is an orchestral wisdom in Divine Providence, and our multi-functional involvement in this is intended to derive great inspiration from the Mother of Christ, as is well illustrated in the life of Pope John Paul II.

While we are conscious of the intimate connections between the life of prayer and the work of the mind we have to appreciate that

what we can do in all areas of what is to be a Christian culture will afterwards be immortalized in the new Paradise standing forever with perfections endowed by Divine grace. This we know from many of the things confided by Our Lord and His Mother to the Saints. Our perspective on this matter can help us in many ways, for example by assisting us to understand the significance of Edith Stein's life and work: all did not end when these German thugs murdered her. The brutality of the concentration camps should not prevent us from understanding that all Edith's accomplishments will be visible, in great splendor, when we share her beatitude.

The contemporary designs of Providence, we may say, are above our thoughts. Those designs are merciful, however, seeking to *give us life to the full*, and from what we know of them we are aware of the human emotions of the Great Heart of Christ, expressed with requests for acceptance of the life which He offers. Prayerful union with the Divine Heart is our primary objective, and we have to understand that this is meant to be an intimate friendship, in which we can receive inspirations for all our activities, as none of them are meant to be divorced from the life of prayer. We can readily understand St Thomas Aquinas seeking theological insights in prayer, but we do have to become aware that problems in *all* areas of learning are intended to be illuminated in prayerful reflections, through the diffuse influence of grace on our analytical capabilities. This does not mean that we can dispense with intellectual effort, or that the necessity for intense and prolonged

intellectual effort can indicate a lack of progress in the life of prayer. The effort derives its spiritual value from our dedication, although it may seem unsuccessful for a long time and may have to be undertaken during some spiritual trial.

One of the major contemporary designs of Providence is to inspire greater devotion to the Sacred Heart of Christ. Whatever may be done for that, for example through the liturgical dimension of the annual meeting, may indeed be followed by unexpected advances in the cultural endeavors of numerous members, through collegial exchanges but also through work in relative solitude. The tasks that await our engagement concern the building of a higher civilization based on renewal in the Church. All activities for this purpose will have to be undertaken with a deep sense of the obligations of interdependence, within and between societies: as industrialized societies become more advanced, innumerable specializations multiply the interdependencies linking individuals, groups, industrial sectors, and countries. The moral requirements to manage these interdependencies become more demanding, and there are increasingly important obligations to contribute what may be lacking in the common good. This is more than a matter of providing what market forces are not producing, and it involves transcendental accountability.

Renewal in the Church, to which the Fellowship contributes, requires intense prayer in union with the Holy Father, and vigorous opposition to the jackals who attack him. Their endeavors to give masks of virtue to their betrayals do

not amount to advances in Christian culture, and should not reduce our confidence. We can anticipate some surprises: there are many indications that the contemporary designs of Providence are far reaching. Some of these relate to the deepening significance of Our Lady's role in the life of the Church. We may indeed be close to the swift and total conversion of Russia that was predicted by Padre Pio. There an authentic theology of liberation could well generate a new culture for our admiration. Meanwhile Edith Stein's prayer for Christ's acceptance by His own people may come closer to fulfillment. This indeed may begin in a way that will dramatize Our Lady's significance as *Notre Dame de Liesse*.

The difficulties confronted by the Fellowship, especially in North America make its long term efforts all the more significant. The spiritual and cultural formation of future leaders is beginning. This necessitates building with ruins, among ruins, often in relative isolation. We have to remember the resolution with which Newman applied his talents, prayerfully, after being obliged to leave Oxford. He is a model, and we can seek his intercession. We may remember the beginning of His hymn, "Lead, kindly light... ♣"

*Gavin Boyd is an Honorary Professor in the Political Science Department, Rutgers University, Newark, and a Research Associate at the Centre for International Business Studies, University of Montreal.*

# The Eucharist: A Response

Bishop John M. D'Arcy

*"I am the living bread which has come down from heaven. Anyone who eats this bread will live forever;..." John 6:51*

## INTRODUCTION

RECENTLY THE NEWLY renovated Church of Loretto on the campus of Saint Mary's College was re-dedicated and re-opened. At the dedication liturgy, a small pamphlet was given to those in attendance and also made available to those who might visit the church later. The pamphlet attempts to explain briefly the purpose behind the new interior structure of this church. However, it presents an understanding of the Holy Eucharist that is flawed and does not do justice to the teachings of the Church.

Central to the office of the diocesan bishop is the task of teaching within his diocese. In fact, teaching is called "one of the principal duties of bishops" (*Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishop in the Church: Christus Dominus*, no. 12). Indeed, for a bishop, there is no task more central than preserving and explaining the deposit of faith so its richness is available to all and so it is kept intact for generations to come. To teach the faith accurately requires, at times, and certainly requires in this case, the obligation of correcting teachings which are erroneous. For me to allow this presentation to go unchallenged would be a dereliction

in the responsibility given to me by Christ through the Church. As a pastor, I must correct and also present, in place of these distortions, the true and correct teaching on the Holy Eucharist.

This responsibility is especially serious because of the matter before us, the Holy Eucharist, which is at the very center of our faith and of Catholic life here in our diocese and throughout the Church. At the outset, I want to thank Sister Catherine O'Brien, CSC, for the spirit of gracious collaboration which she has shown in giving assurance that copies of this response will be placed in Our Lady of Loretto Chapel and also helping to see that it is made available to all those who may have read the previous text.

## A GENERAL CONSIDERATION

*What is obviously missing?* There is no mention in this presentation of those words which are at the center of our teaching on the Holy Eucharist. God is never mentioned, nor is there any mention of sacrifice, redemption, sin, mystery, salvation, Paschal Mystery, death and resurrection. The words memorial, Body and Blood of Christ, grace and sin, Holy Spirit, are never used. The word Jesus Christ is used once, but in an incorrect manner.

## BASIS FOR ERRONEOUS EMPHASIS

The following statements are found in the pamphlet in question and are used to give a basis for an understanding of the Eucharist and also for explaining the new struc-

ture of the church: "The most powerful experience of the sacred is found in the celebration and the persons celebrating, and in the action of the assembly. The assembly is the primary sign of the priesthood of Jesus Christ; the assembly is the primary minister; the assembly is the Church."

These words present an understanding of the Eucharist which does not tally with the Church's own catechesis on this most central area of our faith. The text in question links these statements to "contemporary Church teaching". In fact, such a presentation can only be described, with all due respect, as a misrepresentation of authentic Church teaching, both contemporary (Vatican II and post-conciliar documents) and ancient.

Catholics who attend Mass each Sunday and listen to the Eucharistic prayer will note that these prayers are God-centered. Those in attendance at Mass are not "celebrating themselves" (as the text we are examining claims), but are giving praise and thanks to God. At Mass, we remember the sacrifice of Christ through which we are redeemed. Indeed, there is more. At Mass, the Sacrifice of Christ and the Person of Christ are remembered and also made present. The pamphlet says that the most powerful experience of the sacred is found "in the celebration and in the persons celebrating and in the action of the assembly" (emphasis added). Let us see where the Church places "the most profound experience of the sacred" when we are at Mass.

"To accomplish so great a work Christ is always present in His Church, especially in her liturgical celebrations. He is present in

the Sacrifice of the Mass not only in the person of His minister, the same now offering, through the ministry of priests, who formerly offered Himself on the cross', *but especially* in the Eucharistic species.

By His power, He is present in the sacraments so that when anybody baptizes, it is really Christ Himself who baptizes. He is present in His Word since it is He Himself who speaks when the holy scriptures are read in the Church. Lastly, He is present when the Church prays and sings, for He has promised 'where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them'." (Mt. 18:20) (Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy: *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 7) (emphasis added)

The shift in this pamphlet away from the liturgy as centered in God to the liturgy as centered in ourselves is a misrepresentation which, if accepted, would bring about spiritual harm. In the Eucharist, we are celebrating the love of Christ poured out for us on the cross. We are not celebrating ourselves. Surely our active response at Mass is important, even central. But it is a response of faith in what is made present, the redemptive act of Christ, our Savior. It is also a response of praise, thanks and love through which we offer ourselves to God in union with Christ. When we are present at Mass, we cannot participate properly, even worthily, unless we begin to understand in faith the sacred action which is taking place. Here again we must look to the Church to understand the nature of the Eucharistic action.

### ***The different Modes of Christ's Presence***

"In order that they should achieve a deeper understanding of the mystery of the Eucharist, the faithful should be instructed in the principal ways in which the Lord is present to His Church in liturgical celebrations.

"He is always present in a body of the faithful gathered in His Name (cf. Mt. 18:20). He is present, too, in His Word, for it is He who speaks when the Scriptures are read in the Church.

"In the sacrifice of the Eucharist, He is present both in the person of the minister, 'the same now offering through the ministry of the priest who formerly offered Himself on the cross,' and above all under the species of the Eucharist. For in this sacrament Christ is present in a unique way, whole and entire, God and man, substantially and permanently. This presence of Christ under the species 'is called *real* not in an exclusive sense, as if the other kinds of presence were not real, but *par excellence*'". (*Instruction on the Worship of the Eucharistic Mystery: Eucharisticum Mysterium*, no. 8)

### **CONSEQUENT ERROR**

**T**here is no mention of the role of Christ the Priest, and this is accompanied by a similar disregard for the role of the ordained priest at the Eucharistic sacrifice. We read in this text that liturgy is "the action of the Christian assembly". This statement is theologically misleading and pastorally harmful. The liturgy is, first of all, the action of Christ, the Savior, the Head and Bridegroom of the Church. The Eucharistic liturgy is Christ's very

action. Church teaching is very clear on this. "The liturgy is rightly seen as an exercise of the priestly office of Jesus Christ". (Decree on the Liturgy no. 7); and, in the same paragraph of this pivotal document of the Second Vatican Council, we read that "every liturgical celebration is an action of Christ, the Priest, and of His Body, which is the Church, and is a sacred action surpassing all others." Clearly then the liturgy is sacred because it is the action of Christ.

The text in question also states: "The assembly is the primary sign of the priesthood of Jesus Christ; the assembly is the primary minister; the assembly is the Church". This presentation eliminates the role of the ordained priest in the Eucharistic sacrifice and replaces it with the assembly. One of the most beautiful aspects of our Eucharistic liturgy is that there is a diversity of roles. We do not all do the same task. This is not a question of one person being better than another. Rather it is each one carrying out his or her God-given task so that, as in nature, a beautiful diversity is present which, if properly understood and carried out, shows the action of Christ, creates a unity of love and gives us a glimpse, however imperfect, of the infinite beauty of God.

The text in question declares that "the assembly is the primary sign of the priesthood of Jesus Christ; the assembly is the primary minister." The text in question does not support, does not even mention, and even seems to replace the role of the ordained priest. So we must turn again to Church teaching so we can have, in its full and clear beauty, the role of the ordained priest at Mass:

"However, it is in the Eucharistic cult or in the Eucharistic assembly of the faithful (synaxis) that they (the priests) exercise in a supreme degree their sacred functions; there, acting in the Person of Christ and proclaiming His mystery, they unite the votive offerings of the faithful to the sacrifice of Christ their Head, and in the sacrifice of the Mass they make present again and apply, until the coming of the Lord (cf. 1 Cor. 11:26), the unique sacrifice of the New Testament, that namely of Christ offering Himself once for all a spotless victim to the Father (cf. Heb. 9:28). (*Dogmatic Constitution on the Church: Lumen Gentium*, no. 28)

### CONSEQUENCES OF THIS ELIMINATION

This elimination of the role of the ordained priest, along with the failure to mention the action of Christ and the consequential shift to the assembly as the primary minister, renders asunder that close unity, that deep communion of faith and love which should always exist and must always be fostered between the ordained priest and the faithful, who also share in the priesthood of Christ. When this unity is opposed, directly or indirectly, harm is done to the Body of Christ. The theological foundation of the unity is clearly shown in a second most highly instructive and doctrinal text from the Second Vatican Council which has now become classic and which, if properly understood, heals and overcomes any false division between priest and laity.

Though they differ essentially and not only in degree, the com-

mon priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial or hierarchical priesthood are none the less ordered one to another; each in its own proper way shares in the one priesthood of Christ. The ministerial priest, by the sacred power that he has, forms and rules the priestly people; in the person of Christ, he effects the Eucharistic sacrifice and offers it to God in the name of all the people. The faithful indeed, by virtue of their royal priesthood, participate in the offering of the Eucharist. They exercise that priesthood, too, by the reception of the sacraments, prayer and thanksgiving, and witness of a holy life, abnegation and active charity.

(*Dogmatic Constitution on the Church: Lumen Gentium*, no. 10 )

The text in question also removes the priest as a sign of Christ, the Good Shepherd.

### A MISUNDERSTANDING OF THE CHURCH

In the same sentence, we also read that "the assembly is the Church." What does this mean? It is hard to know. If it means that this particular assembly is the whole Church, that is theologically incorrect and obviously untrue. If it means that the assembly, those gathered in church in a way that is undifferentiated, is, in fact, the Church, then we have what appears to be a kind of congregationalism indicating that there are no diverse roles and gifts in the Church. That is certainly not the Catholic Church as revealed by Christ as handed down even to our own day and as explained in full clarity in the Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*, of the Second Vatican Council.

If, on the other hand, it means that this particular assembly gathered at Mass, priest and people, shepherd and flock, all exercising their roles of offering worship to God the Father, in and through Christ, is a sign of the Universal Church, that is correct.

However, to put it in the way it is placed here is, at the very least, misleading. Sound teaching as well as sound theology always clarifies, instructs and teaches. This text, on the other hand, obscures and misleads rather than clarifies.

### THE TEXT HAS A NUMBER OF OTHER SERIOUS PROBLEMS FROM BOTH A THEOLOGICAL, LITURGICAL AND PASTORAL POINT OF VIEW

I mention these problems here briefly. The text declares that what the assembly needs from architecture is "optimum conditions for realizing itself and expressing itself as a true community". It also calls for: "optimum conditions for maximizing the collective sense of the gathering, for contemplating each other, as well as the principle focal points of the action". At Mass, we are not "contemplating each other". That is not our purpose. Rather we participate in and join ourselves to the action of Jesus Christ. We contemplate what He has done. We contemplate the redemption and the Redeemer. Our attention on one another is derivative. We are aware of what we have become, not by our own action, but by the action of Christ our Savior.

The text also refers to the worshiping community of Christians as "a baptizing, reconciling

community". Before we baptize and reconcile, we are baptized and reconciled by Christ. It is essential to say this; otherwise our attention remains fixed on the community and not on the One who has made us a community by His death and resurrection. Once again, the activity of our Savior is neither mentioned nor honored. But it should be the focal point of any church, true church architecture should give space so the action so Christ can be more easily grasped. It should help us to contemplate His action. True contemplation of Christ's action brings about deeper respect for what Christ has accomplished in each one. This is the only true basis for nourishing a communal spirit at Mass.

We are also told that our common prayer involves "sharing of our story through the public reading of the bible". Once again, we find, at the very least, a significant incompleteness. Our attention to the Word of God read at Mass involves sharing the story of Christ and applying it to our daily lives.

#### APPROPRIATE USE OF CHURCH DOCUMENTS

**W**hat must be noted here is that those who write texts like this, as well as those who design a new church or renovate an old one, have a serious obligation to follow the proper and official Church documents. Where should one look for such guidance?

Ours is a Universal Church and we find clear guidance in appropriate universal documents concerning the Sacred Liturgy, documents which also give guidance for the construction of

churches and related matters. Many of these norms are in what is called the General Instruction, which forms an introduction to the Sacramentary. The Sacramentary is that book which the priest uses for the various prayers when he celebrates Mass. There we read: "Further, the places and requisites for worship should be truly worthy and beautiful, signs and symbols of heavenly realities." (*General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, no. 253) Here, in this most official document concerning the construction or reconstruction of churches, we also read: "The people of God assembled at Mass possess an organic and hierarchical structure, expressed by the various ministries and actions for each part of the celebration. The general plan of the sacred edifice should be such that, in some way, it conveys the image of the gathered assembly. It should also allow the participants to take the place most appropriate to them and assist all to carry out their individual functions properly." (*General Instruction*, no. 257)

This General Instruction, which is the authoritative document on how churches should be arranged, indicates clearly that the arrangement of the spaces must be such that the diversity of offices and ministries are clearly shown, even though these elements, at the very same time, "form a complete and organic unity, clearly expressive of the unity of the entire holy people". (*General Instruction*, no.

257) Unity and diversity mark nature; unity and diversity mark the Church; and unity and diversity should mark the action of the liturgical assembly which, if properly understood, is a sign of the Church. This is the holy reality,

the reality of Christ and His people. It is both Head and body, Shepherd and flock, at prayer, and this is the reality which should be made more easily discernible by the arrangement of the place of worship.

Here again, in this document which teaches us how we should construct a new church, we read: "At this table, the priest, representing Christ the Lord, accomplishes what the Lord Himself did and what He handed on to His disciples to do in His memory".

I have not yet seen the new Church of Our Lady of Loretto. In light of the document in question which explains its structure, it is appropriate to ask whether the General Instruction, which protects the unity and diversity which has always marked our beloved Church, was consulted and followed as part of this renovation. This is an important question since the unity and diversity of our Church is of divine origin. For example, in the text in question, we read "The whole space has become the sanctuary". However, in the General Instruction, we read the following directives:

"The sanctuary should be clearly marked off from the body of the church, either by being somewhat elevated or by its distinctive design and appointments. It should be large enough to accommodate all of the rites." (*General Instruction*, no. 258)

"The priest and his ministers have their place in the sanctuary, that is, in the part of the church that brings out their distinctive role, namely to preside over the prayers, to proclaim the Word of God, or to minister at the altar. Even though these

elements must express a hierarchical arrangement and the diversity of offices, they should at the same time form a complete and organic unity clearly expressive of the unity of the entire holy people. The character and beauty of the place and all its appointments should foster devotion and show the holiness of the mysteries celebrated there." (*General Instruction*, no. 257)

**A**nother text which should guide our construction or reconstruction of churches, as well as the explanation of such works, is the ceremony itself through which a new church is consecrated. This ceremony shows clearly the priesthood of Jesus Christ as shared in by all the faithful through Baptism and in a distinct but intimately connected way by the ordained priest. Thus the Rite of the Dedication of a Church speaks very clearly about the role of Christ, the centrality of the altar, the role of the ordained priest, the gifts of the assembly, the splendor of diversity, and the unity of all.

Above all, however, it is the General Instruction which should guide those who design or renovate churches and also those who prepare explanations of those new structures.

### CONCLUSION

**I**t is not easy for me, as a pastor, to write these words. My admiration and respect for the Sisters of the Holy Cross, who have been instruments of uncounted blessings in this diocese and throughout the world for over one hundred fifty years, is very strong. They are an outstanding congregation with a remarkable history marked by holiness and unselfish dedication.

The center of their worldwide missionary activities is located here and this is an honor for our diocese. In fact, my admiration and respect for these sisters is one of the reasons I have prepared this statement. Their kindness to me on many occasions is deeply appreciated, as is the collaboration of Sister Catherine and her Council on a number of other matters. I surely look forward to cooperating with them in the years ahead in the work of Christ. However, my first purpose in writing this response is to uphold the teaching of the Church and to protect the life of faith. This I pledged to do most solemnly when I became a bishop. I would like to conclude with a few pastoral reflections.

Jesus Christ is at the center of our worship. In the Holy Eucharist, His redemptive act of love is remembered and made present. It is through the words of the ordained priest that His sacrifice, His death and resurrection, and thus His love are made sacramentally but truly present to us. We do not foster and nourish the vocation of the lay person or religious by the elimination or diminution of the role of the ordained priest or bishop. The priest, if he lives up to his vocation, is a person who submits himself to the call of Christ, the action of Christ, and the work of Christ. He gives up his life so Christ can be more accessible to all, not less accessible. We are a Church of Word and Sacrament. The Sacrament of Holy Orders is received by a man so he can give his life in service to the priesthood of the faithful. Elimination of his role in documents like this only tends to divide the Church and

move the people further away from Christ. The collective unity of the entire people at Mass is lessened when the diversity of offices and gifts are eliminated. This unity is strengthened when the diversity of gifts is clearly shown. Unity cannot come when all are seen as doing the same thing, for this tends to diminish the recognition of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. ("Since we have gifts that differ according to the grace given to us, let us exercise them." -Romans 12,6)

The result of sincere worship at the Holy Eucharist and the reception of Holy Communion brings about a special grace, a unique result, for all who are assembled - those who share in the priesthood of Christ through Baptism, which is all of us, the priest included; and those of us who share in the priesthood of Christ through Holy Orders. We ourselves become offered. All of us should leave the Eucharist confirmed in our self-giving to God and to our brothers and sisters. How can we assemble at the Eucharist where we are drawn deeply into His self-giving without giving ourselves to others. This is the purpose of the Holy Eucharist. It is not to "tell our story". It is not to "contemplate one another". It is not to "enter into the choreography". It is not to divide us or eliminate an essential role. It is so that we all may be offered to God, to carrying out His will, to His service, and to be reminded of our final goal. When we all understand this, our unity will be strengthened.

For our further growth in understanding these beautiful truths, I have included as an appendix the presentation on the Holy Eucharist in the soon-to-be published Cat-

echism of the Catholic Church. It shows clearly the full faith of the Church in the Eucharistic mystery.

I regret that it has become necessary to write this pastoral response, but I would fail in my responsibility before Christ and His people, and before the Sisters of the Congregation of Holy Cross, if I did not do so. For there are consequences to the pamphlet in question. A bishop, called at his ordination to "protect the Church", must see these consequences and try to prevent them. Such a work is a work of true pastoral love. Also, I believe good can come from all this. It remains my hope that reflection on this document, which I have prepared over many hours, will help us all to grow in the understanding of and love for this great gift of Christ, the Holy Eucharist. ☩

Sincerely yours in our Lord,  
Most Reverend John M. D'Arcy  
June 13, 1993  
Feast of Corpus Christi  
Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend

## Appendix

### THE EUCHARIST

**T**he Eucharist is the source and summit of the whole Christian life. The Eucharist contains the Church's entire spiritual treasury, that is, Christ Himself. He is our Passover and Living Bread.

Through the grace of the Eucharist, we share in divine life and the unity of people by which the Church exists. It is the culmination both of God's action sanctifying the world in Christ and of

the worship we offer to Christ and through Him to the Father in the Holy Spirit. By the Eucharistic celebration, we are already united to the heavenly liturgy and anticipate eternal life when God will be all in all.

The Eucharist has different names. Each name evokes certain particular aspects.

The Eucharist is an action of "thanksgiving" to God. The Greek words from which eucharist is derived means "to give thanks" and "to bless". In the Jewish tradition, blessings, especially during meals, proclaimed God's works: creation, redemption and sanctification.

It is called "The Lord's Supper" because it reenacts the Last Supper the Lord ate with His disciples on the eve of His passion and anticipates our being with Christ in heaven for all eternity.

The Eucharist is called a "memorial" of the Lord's passion and resurrection.

It is called the "holy sacrifice" because it makes present the one sacrifice of Christ the Savior and includes the Church's own offering.

It is called "communion" because by this sacrament we are united to Christ who enables us to share in His holy Body and Blood to form a single body.

In the Latin Church, it is called "Holy Mass" because the liturgy in which the mystery of salvation is fulfilled concludes with the sending forth (mission) of the faithful, so that they may fulfill God's will in their daily lives.

In the Eucharistic celebration, the signs of bread and wine are used. By the use of the words of Christ and the invocation of the Holy Spirit, they become Christ's

Body and Blood. Faithful to the Lord's command until His glorious return, the Church continues to do in His memory what He did on the eve of His passion. He took bread and wine and they became His Body and Blood in a way that surpasses understanding.

By celebrating the Last Supper with His apostles in the course of the Passover meal, Jesus gave the Jewish Pasch its ultimate meaning. Indeed, Jesus' passing over to His Father by His death and resurrection is the new Passover, anticipated in the Last Supper and celebrated in the Eucharist, which fulfills the Pasch and anticipates the final paschal feast in the glorious kingdom.

This sacramental sacrifice of the Eucharist is:

\* thanksgiving and praise to God the Father

\*the sacrifice memorial of Christ and His Body

\*the presence of Christ by the power of His Word and of His Spirit.

### PRAISE AND THANKSGIVING TO THE FATHER

**I**n the Eucharistic sacrifice, the whole creation which God loves is presented to the Father through the death and the resurrection of Christ. Through Christ, the Church can offer the sacrifice of praise in thanksgiving for all that God has made good, beautiful and just in creation and in humanity.

### THE SACRIFICIAL MEMORIAL OF CHRIST AND HIS BODY, THE CHURCH

**I**n sacred scripture, a memorial is

both the recollection of past events and a proclamation in the present of the marvels God has done for His people.

The Eucharist is a sacrifice because it makes present the sacrifice of the cross. Christ's sacrifice and the Eucharist are one sacrifice. The same Christ who offered Himself once in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross is contained and is offered in an unbloody manner.

The Eucharist is equally the Church's sacrifice. The Church, which is Christ's Body, participates in the offering of its Head. With Him, it offers itself completely and unites itself to His intercession with the Father for all people. In the Eucharist, the sacrifice of Christ becomes also the sacrifice of the members of His Body. The lives of the faithful, their praise, sufferings, prayers and works, are united with those of Christ and with His total offering, and so acquire a new

worth.

To Christ's *offering* are united not only His members still here on earth, but also those already in heavenly glory. In communion with and commemorating the Blessed Virgin Mary and all the saints, the Church offers the Eucharistic sacrifice. Also, the faithful departed who have died in Christ and are therefore assured of their eternal salvation but not yet wholly purified are part of the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice.

#### CHRIST'S PRESENCE IN WORK AND IN THE HOLY SPIRIT

**C**hrist's presence in the Eucharist is what we call real presence. This makes the Eucharist a totally profound reality. The ordained priest, in the role of Christ, pronounces the words of Christ. Through Christ's activity, He be-

comes wholly present in each of the elements of bread and wine in such a way that the breaking of the bread does not divide Christ.

In the greatness of His love, Christ wanted to remain present to His Church in this unique way. His visible presence while on earth is exchanged for His sacramental presence in the Eucharist. In His Eucharistic presence, He remains mysteriously in our midst as the One who loves us and gave Himself up for us, and He remains under signs that express and communicate His love.

The Church knows that the Lord now comes to us in His Eucharist and is present in our midst, though His presence is veiled. Therefore, we celebrate the Eucharist as we wait in joyful hope for the coming of our Savior, Jesus Christ.

Adapted from the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1993 (Unofficial Translation)

#### MEMORIES

### A Reminiscence of Rabbi Heschel

Brian Van Hove, SJ

In June, 1971, I was visiting Father Walter Ciszek, SJ, at the old Russian Center at Fordham University in the Bronx. He had written *With God in Russia* (1964) and was engaged in writing *He Leadeth Me* (1973) when I saw him. His work had moved me immensely. I was twenty-two then, and a naive midwesterner who had never been in New York before.

Around that time the books of Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel had also become a notable influence on me. He was deeply spiritual when that was out of fashion. He used the language of piety and of the soul when all around me a secularized lexicon seemed to predominate. I had read everything of his I could locate after hearing him speak in Milwaukee in August, 1969, at the Liturgical Conference convention. As he later would tell me, "I think I was the only one who spoke on prayer."<sup>1</sup> The gathering was activist. That convention had included an odd assortment of things such as a lecture by some Black Panther Party representatives, an exhortation to social

action by Robert McAfee Brown, and (I can't think of any other description) a "snake-dance" Mass which was bizarre even by the standards of the anarchical 1960s.

Let me repeat that I was a completely naive midwesterner. I was studying philosophy at St. Louis University, but it seemed perfectly natural to me to look in the telephone book under "H" and see if Heschel was listed. Since his spiritual doctrine was so attractive, I thought I would take my chances and visit his apartment to see if he was home. Perhaps we could meet.

I located the apartment building on Riverside Drive and quickly went up the stairs and knocked on

the door. He opened the door a few tiny inches, and I timidly explained the purpose of my visit. he said he generally didn't grant interviews of this kind, but that he would make an exception. It was a Friday afternoon, and he was cooking something on the stove. Then I remembered that one of his books was *The Sabbath*.

We sat down in a smallish sunlit parlor. He had serene blue eyes and a snow-white Moses beard. He explained that his wife was away, but would be returning fairly soon. Nearly as we began the conversation he said, "Well. So you're a Jesuit, eh? So many of you write just like the atheists!"<sup>2</sup> I must admit I was shocked. It was intimidating enough being in the presence of someone whose thought was familiar to me, but whose acquaintance I had just made personally, and under the circumstances just described. The only thing I could think to say was, "Well, I guess these days you have to go by the individual, not the label." Rabbi Heschel had read of a discontented confrebre who had confronted Cardinal Cooke during an ordination ceremony in St. Patrick's Cathedral; it was in all the papers.<sup>3</sup> Again, rather weakly, the only thing I could think of saying was, "Well, I guess there is now pluralism." He scoffed, a bit, and said, "That is old-hat with us." He just couldn't seem to understand what the problem was, and my answer didn't satisfy him.

Some years later, in the early fall of 1974, Daniel Berrigan, SJ, would tell me during a car trip between Omaha and Lincoln that Heschel had approached him, very grieved, over the book by ex-Jesuit Garry Wills, *Bare Ruined Choirs*.

Heschel had wanted a collaborative effort to publish a refutation to which he would write the introduction himself. He confided this to Berrigan on the grounds of St. John the Divine Cathedral after the installation of Paul Moore as Episcopal Bishop of New York. alas, he died in the late fall of 1972 and before the project could be realized.

Our conversation continued. He asked me which of his books I had read, and I said nearly all of them. This seemed to please him. He stressed that he was a Jew, and did not accept Christ. His favorite interrogatory then followed, "Do you follow me?"

Now that I think of it, I went on the offensive. I asked why there were so many atheists in Israel. I was thinking of the sabras. He explained that in Eastern Europe they had to pray eight hours a day, and that it was unreasonable.<sup>4</sup> A kind of reaction had set in among the younger people. He assured me that he reproached the Israeli atheists and their materialism by saying, "Is it any better to make money eight hours a day?"

Readers who may have seen the recent biography of Gustave Weigel, SJ, by Patrick Collins<sup>5</sup> are aware of Heschel's ecumenical side. (Cynical Hasids are sometimes tempted to say "He thought he was himself the messiah to the world".) The reason for this came up as he spoke. He said that in Poland we, meaning "we Jews", didn't get along with the Catholics because they were so anti-Semitic. But in America he was forced to change his mind. He profoundly admired the Catholic Church for the great people it had produced. He used that expression — "so many great

people" — at a later point as well during our talk. Surely he was thinking of Weigel.

The most intimate moment came when he spoke of Pope Paul VI. "Well, this was supposed to be ultra-confidential, but I guess the time has passed." He spoke of being summoned to Rome by the Pope in order to proofread and give his final verdict on the Second Vatican Council's document on ecumenism, "*Nostra Aetate*." The document dealt with relations between the Catholic Church and the Jews. He said he went to the papal bedroom, not the library. He sat down at a desk to read, and did the corrections. The Pope personally marked the places so the text would be changed. Then the Pope took him to the door and embraced him. He said, "Imagine me! Invited by the Pope!"

Other topics we touched on included the philosopher at St. Louis University, James D. Collins. Heschel had once spoken at St. Louis University. He thought Collins' writing style too dry. Collins told me later the following autumn that it was deliberate — to obtain a kind of precision in philosophical discourse, and to avoid ambiguity. By contrast, certainly anyone reading Heschel today will recognize the emotional, even passionate way in which he tries to press religious realities. He was professor of ethics and mysticism, and the mystical always came out when he spoke or wrote. The concern for ethics may be seen in his first work which was actually is dissertation, *The Prophets*. He was active in the anti-war movement at the time I met him, though he did not refer to it.

After perhaps forty-five min-

utes to an hour, Mrs. Heschel returned. We greeted her in the kitchen, then he reminded her of a large number of books that had to get back to the library in time. I offered to help, and so she and I went by bus to JTS with all the works he had been using.<sup>6</sup> The last thing he told me was to read Charles Moller. I regret to say I never go around to that, but I have continued to read anything I can find that has been written of Abraham Joshua Heschel since his death. Had I not been such a brash midwesterner I would never had that privileged visit.

*Rev Brian Van Hove, SJ, is engaged in doctoral work in the department of church history, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.*

### End Notes.

<sup>1</sup> I heard him speak on one other occasion. That was in the spring of 1971 at Washington University's Hillel Center in St. Louis. The questions from the audience were aimed at discussing the Holocaust and Hasidism. I was not sure whether the questioners were 'planted' or spontaneous.

<sup>2</sup> Last year one of my confreres admonished me in the *National Jesuit News* for referring to this, but I have to say it was just an accurate recollection. Heschel did not refer to anyone in particular, nor did he dwell on the point. See *NJN*, vol. 21, n. 7 (April 1992), 4.

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion of this event and the career of O'Rourke, see Joseph M. Becker, SJ, *The Re-Formed Jesuits*, Vol. I, Appendix 4, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992, 380-385.

<sup>4</sup> Heschel was of Hasidic background from Poland, but had abandoned the movement for a more 'mainstream' practice of Judaism. Hasids today regard him as somewhat of a traitor since he had been destined to be an important Rebbe. His ancestor was Rabbi Avraham Yehoshua Heschel of Apt. Details of Rabbi Heschel's ancestry can be in *No Religion is an Island: Abraham Joshua Heschel and Interreligious Dialogue*, edited by Harold Kasimow and Byron L. Sherwin, Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1991, 23-41.

<sup>5</sup> See *Gustave Weigel: A Pioneer of Reform*, Collegeville: Michael Glazer/The Liturgical Press, 1992, p. 279.

<sup>6</sup> Mrs. Heschel brought out an English translation of his first work (1935) posthumously, in 1981, entitled *Maimonides: The Life and Times of the Great Medieval Jewish Thinker*. Reprinted by Image/Doubleday, 1991.

### ~~ IN LAUDIBUS ~~

Verbum supernum prodiens,  
Nec Patris linquens dexteram.  
Ad opus suum exiens,  
Venis ad vitae vesperam.

In mortem a discipulo  
Suis tradendus aemulis  
Prius in vitae ferculo  
Se tradidit discipulis.

Quibus sub bina specie  
Carnem dedit et Sanguinem:  
Ut duplicitis substantiae  
Totum cibaret hominem.

Se nascens dedit socium,  
Convescens in edulium,  
Se moriens in pretium,  
Se regnans dat in praemium.

O salutaris hostia,  
Quae coelis pandis ostium!  
Bella premunt hostilia,  
Da robur, fer auxilium.

Uni, trinoque Domino  
Sit sempiterna gloria,  
Qui vitam sine termino  
Nobis donet in patria. Amen.

St. Thomas Aquinas

## Homosexualis Detestis

**I**t has become increasingly obvious that there exists a serious need for Catholics to respond to the now common charge of ‘homophobia’ when explaining the teachings and position of the Church on homosexuality. More and more the usual accusation leveled against those who give witness against homosexual acts is that we are homophobic. We are by implication, therefore, at least beneath credibility and probably outright bigots unworthy of respectful attention.

It is worthwhile to remind ourselves that the accusation arises from a confusion in definition, and therefore in thought. It is necessary always to distinguish between three separate phenomena: the person, the proclivity, and the act *qua* act.

First and foremost Catholics are commanded by their Savior and His Church to love all persons. For the believing Catholic no phobia<sup>1</sup> is permissible toward any person or group of persons. We are called upon to love, never to hate. We are called to compassion, never to a morbid fear or dread, and certainly never against a whole category of persons.

Secondly, we are called to express that compassion toward the person by doing our very best to be understanding of and charitable concerning human proclivities — in this case the proclivity to homosexuality. If persons with this pro-

clivity were to bear this cross and remain chaste in their own lives we would be witness to a moral and perhaps heroic lifestyle. The alcoholic who remains sober, the person with a proclivity to anger who struggles to keep self-control: these are among the many burdened persons we are commanded to love. They are part of the suffering of humanity, those who have proclivities we must have compassion for and genuinely try to understand. To those with a proclivity to homosexuality we must offer our Christian love and our sustained support. At no time and in no way may a Catholic nor any believing Christian condemn such a person as a person, nor such a proclivity simply as a proclivity.

The third and still separate phenomenon is the act as act. By analogy, while we must love dear aunt Maud as a person, and strive to understand her pronounced proclivity to light matches near flammable materials now and then, we must as well witness against her *per se* as setting a fire. If Aunt Maud continues in the act we must speak out against it, probably to the proper authorities, in defense of life and property and dear old aunt Maud herself. But our witness is not against Maud as a fellow human being, nor is it any simple-minded condemnation of her mental processes and proclivities.

In like manner, the Christian, the believing Catholic, must give witness against — must speak out against — the homosexual act *qua* act. There is no choice in the mat-

ter. The homosexual act is a perversion<sup>2</sup> of the natural generative process of creation and the God of Creation. It is an error and is in error<sup>3</sup>. Such error must be testified against, must be *detested*. Catholic theology, and Christian morality in general, attest to this necessary moral and theological position — a position which mandates teaching in opposition to this act.

The position and teaching of the Catholic Church then is clearly *homodetestic*<sup>4</sup>, but just as clearly is not *homophobic*. The accusation of homophobia must be rejected with clarity of explanation. The position of *homosexualis detestis* must be maintained with vigor.

Gerard F. Rutan  
*Western Washington University*

<sup>1</sup> From the Greek *phobus*: “a morbid fear or dread”. In contemporary usage the term has come as well to imply a malevolent aversion or unreasoning hatred.

<sup>2</sup> From the Latin *perversus*, “turned the wrong way”, “awry”.

<sup>3</sup> The latest official statement on the homosexual act was issued by the Church in 1981. The homosexual act in any and all manifestations was declared to be “an intrinsic moral evil”.

<sup>4</sup> From the Latin *detestari*, “To give witness against”. The verb *testificari*, “to bear witness” is preceded by the pejorative *de* making the verb. In origin the verb meant to “speak out against” [the derogatory] while witnessing to a deity. *Homosexualis detestis* is the necessary witness to God and to fellow humans against the homosexual act.

## Semen and AIDS

Herbert Ratner, M.D.

(An Editorial from *Child and Family*, 21:170-172, 1993)

**A**CQUIRED IMMUNE deficiency syndrome (AIDS) includes one or more of a variety of opportunistic diseases consequent to an immune deficiency state. It is most often preceded or associated with a human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection. The time it takes for HIV to progress to a case of AIDS varies. It may extend to 10 or more years. Presumably there are many factors which determine the progress, some known, others unknown. AIDS is usually lethal except when opportunistic infections are controllable by drugs and host factors of defense are strengthened. Infected semen is the primary and the foremost means of genital transmission of HIV. Females who acquire HIV may also transmit it genetically especially if other sexually transmitted purulent infections are present.

Among genital sexual practices, the receptive partner in anal intercourse is by far at the greatest risk of acquiring an HIV infection. This is true whether the receptive partner is male or female. It accounts for most HIV infections in the United States. Other genital sex practices which transfer HIV infected semen into another's body also contribute to the number of cases. The secondary spread of HIV through blood contact, e.g., through shared infected needles among drug users or vertically from mothers to unborn children, does not lessen the fundamental role of

genital sex, particularly anal intercourse, in the genesis and maintenance of the AIDS epidemic.

The unique danger of receptive anal intercourse involving HIV infected semen is fourfold: the trauma associated with the act whereby HIV directly gets into the blood stream; the special affinity HIV has for colorectal cells; the colorectal cell's rapid absorption of components of seminal plasma compared to the slow and modulated absorption of the vaginal wall; and the seminal plasma's enhancement of viral activity. The constituents of seminal plasma and some of their physiological functions when introduced into and absorbed by the vagina are discussed in "Semen and AIDS" Parts I & II (cf. 20:275282, 21 :90-96). The danger of semen introduced into the rectum, even in tiny amounts, is its powerful pathological ability to produce, maintain, and increase an immunodeficiency state in the recipient. In an HIV infected person this immunodeficiency state becomes a co-factor which has hardly been delineated in discussions on the development of AIDS. Seminal plasma causes immune dysfunction independent of the presence of HIV. This may explain the newly discovered, puzzling cases of AIDS in the absence of HIV.

The danger of anal intercourse is so great that the United States Public Health Services (USPHS) on February 16, 1989, based on the conclusions of its Advisory Board of Obstetrics and Gynecology, released to Associated Press, United Press International and Reuters a statement from which the following is quoted.

"Because of the association

between anal intercourse and transmission of the AIDS virus, this sexual practice must be considered extremely risky with or without a condom for either heterosexual or homosexual partners where one person may already be infected. . . . the most effective way to reduce risk is to avoid this practice altogether."

Unfortunately, those promoting condoms as a protection against HIV infections and AIDS seem to be ignorant of or indifferent to the USPHS's firm warning to avoid anal intercourse altogether. They also seem to be ignorant of the prevalence of heterosexual anal intercourse and the role of the bisexual and the unisexual male in spreading AIDS to the heterosexual world. Epidemiologists and others studying HIV transmission in heterosexuals lack scientific clarity when they fail to distinguish between the different types of heterosexual genital sex.

The medical case against anal intercourse was actually much stronger than the experts of the USPHS realized. They showed no awareness that seminal plasma acts as a powerful immune suppressant, that seminal plasma facilitates HIV infections, or that this enhanced immune suppressant activity in anal intercourse may have relevancy to the study of the progress of an HIV infection into AIDS.

The admission of the USPHS that condoms are untrustworthy as a defence against lethal HIV during anal intercourse highlights the general problem of leaning on the condom as a solution to the AIDS epidemic. First of all, it is irresponsible of sex educator enthusiasts to employ false slogans which identify condom usage with "safe" or "re-

sponsible" sex. It's doubly irresponsible to stir up and preoccupy the minds of sexually uninitiated pubescents and adolescents in school programs by concentrating on sex and condoms. In effect it puts the seal of approval on genital sex as long as it is "safe" and "responsible" as defined by condom usage. No one, however, has confronted the California high school study which concluded:

Sexually active adolescents report placing high value and importance on using a contraceptive that protects against STDs and know that condoms prevent STDs, yet the females continued not to

intend to have their partners use condoms and the males' intentions to use condoms decreased . . . although the study was conducted in a city with a high prevalence of AIDS, and where media and school coverage of the epidemic was increasing over the time studied.

Furthermore, everyone agrees that the greatest threat to the transmission of HIV are multiple sex partners and must surely know that premature and precocious genital sex are the inevitable road to promiscuity and multiple sex partners.

This is undoubtedly why the Deputy Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

and a pioneer in tracking down the early origin of the AIDS epidemic in the United States, Mary Guinan, M.D., Ph.D. raised the following question:

Adolescent girls are especially unlikely to have good negotiating skills in sexual matters, and—in light of their greater risk for heterosexually transmitted HIV infection compared with adolescent boys—we should encourage all adolescents to delay the onset of sexual activity. Is it too radical a concept to strive to keep teens sex-free, at least through high school, to avoid a fatal infection? (JAMA, 268:520, 1992)

## AROUND THE CHURCH IN THE '90s

**Father Steven Scherrer, M.M.** entered the Carthusians in May but not before his *Commentary on the Book of Isaiah* (St. Jerome's Publications, Maryknoll 10545) became available. By pursuing what he calls a "narrative and canonical approach," Father Scherrer plumbs the depths of its historical, as well as its theological perspective for people of our time. He considers Isaiah one book.

**John F. Kippley** has recently published a new 71 page booklet called *The Seven Day Bible Rosary*. It is a creative effort by a founding member of the Fellowship to provide a suitable biblical text for meditation at each *Ave* and, following the 1973 suggestion of U.S. bishops, to propose new mysteries for meditation based on Christ's public life. (E.g. "Jesus teaches us about marriage.") Available from K Publishers, 2911 Werk Road, Cincinnati, OH 45211.

## Freedom of Choice

(from *Religion and Science*)

**I**t is interesting how Congress has taken to giving Utopian, messianic, millennialistic-sounding titles to its bills: the Religious Freedom Restoration Act and the failed ABC (Act for Better Child Care) are cases in point. If the Social Security act of 1933 were being passed today, it would probably be called the Wealth and Happiness Act, or the Happy Golden Years Act. One is inclined to be distrustful when a piece of legislation bears a Utopian-sounding title and seems to promise the people the world and the moon in addition.

The "Freedom of Choice Act," nicknamed FOCA, has passed through the House Judiciary Committee in mid-May but was not voted on before Congress adjourned July 4. Of course in this context "choice" means abortion, but current language rules prohibit

saying what it really is. Congressman Don Edwards (D., Cal.), a fervent supporter of abortion under any and all circumstances, succeeded in getting the House Judiciary Committee to reject any and all limitations on this wonderful freedom: the Act, if passed, will prevent states from doing any of the following: (1) prohibiting abortion after fetal viability when the life of the mother is not endangered (this is permissible, at least in theory, under *Roe v. Wade*); (2) require a waiting period of any kind before an abortion may be performed; (3) prohibit non-physicians from performing abortions; (4) exempt private and public institutions as well as individuals from performing abortions when abortions offend their moral or religious beliefs (thus roman Catholic and other Christian hospitals as well as individual health care personnel would apparently be obliged to perform abortions whether they wish to do so or not); (5) require

that information on fetal development and on alternatives to abortion be given to women prior to an abortion; (6) continue to enforce constitutionally valid state laws that require parental notification.

### THE PRO-LIFE RACKETEERS

The Supreme Court, on June 14, agreed to hear a case brought against the Pro-Life Action League and Operation Rescue by the National Organization of Women, an attempt to enforce the provisions of RICO, the Racketeering-Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, against organizations which supposedly "conspire" against women to prevent them from exercising their constitutional rights to an abortion. The RICO Act permits successful litigants to claim triple damages from the defendants—or, one might more correctly say, the victims. Of course applying such an act to voluntary organizations supported by donations is the fiscal equivalent of a lethal injection. To be willing to apply RICO is to say that we must be rid of the irritating presence of pro-lifers no matter what the cost to traditional standards of freedom, decency, and even honest.

The Supreme Court, in its present conformation, has followed the urging of the Clinton administration in agreeing to hear the Chicago case, after the Seventh U.S. Court of Appeals in Chicago ruled last year that RICO does not apply to abortion protesters, inasmuch as they are not motivated by financial gain. (Of course, it is conceivable that the Court has taken on the case with the intention of lending greater authority and broader applicability to the decision of the Chicago jurists.)

N.O.W. contends that the defendant, Joseph M. Scheidler of the Pro-Life Action League, Randall Terry of Operation Rescue, et al., have formed a "nationwide criminal conspiracy of extremists" who employ "unlawful and violent methods" to try to drive abortion clinics out of business. There is financial gain involved, clearly, but it is the financial gain that the "abortion providers" lose every time a woman is persuaded, intimidated, shamed, or otherwise influenced to bear the child she is carrying rather than to have it "terminated."

Clinton administration contended that the federal court in Chicago wrongly concluded that a financial interest must underlie the supposedly unlawful methods in order for them to be subject to the Racketeering-Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act. Additional, N.O.W.'s attorney, Fay Clayton, argued that the "economic motive" behind the so-called "campaign of terrorism" is "to destroy the clinics' business and force them to close." That that is the motive of Scheidler, Terry, and others can hardly be disputed. But what makes it wrong for protesters to desire the cessation of business operations that they consider involve murder or manslaughter? One could have argued with equal plausibility that the protests against the Vietnam War, in which the then Oxford student Bill Clinton took an active part, had an economic motive in that they intended to force the military out of the business of fighting in Vietnam, and thus deprive officers and professional soldiers, armaments manufacturers and suppliers, of the income on which they rely. By the N.O.W. definition, Mr. Clinton himself was a racketeer in his stu-

dent days. If RICO had been in force then, by this logic it could have been used against the future President and other of like sentiment.

As far as "terrorism," "unlawful and violent methods" are concerned, Mr. Scheidler has experience with them, but as a victim, not as a perpetrator. He was blinded in one eye when a security guard at a Michigan Avenue abortion facility smashed the camera he was using to take pictures of the clinic into Mr. Scheidler's face. Any even remotely fair discussion of abortion protests will reveal that the anti-abortionists have suffered far more violence, frequently at the hands of the police, than anything they have caused.

Mr. Clinton's Justice Department argued that the activities of the anti-abortionists "may have some incidental economic benefits for the organization, such as increasing contributions from members and supporters." In other words, people who contribute to a cause may be stimulated to contribute more when they observe those to whom they have contributed performing the tasks that the contributions were intended to promote. How diabolically clever! Surely when such conditions exist, the Justice Department must step in — although perhaps it need not immediately bring in the tanks.

It is hard to believe that the attitude of N.O.W. and its attorney, of President Clinton and his Justice Department, is anything but cynical deception. One can only hope that they themselves are deceived, for if they are not self-deceived, then they are consciously resorting to language rules, in other words engaging in what Hannah Arendt says "in ordinary language is a lie."

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

Rita Marker

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

Reviewed by George A. Kelly

**R**EMEMBER 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 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 Fellow-

ship 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.

**What Is God Like?**

James V. Schall, SJ, The Liturgical Press, 1993. 250 pp. \$14.95

Reviewed by Michael J. Nader  
*Fair Oaks, California*

**I**n 1950, Reinhold Niebuhr published a chapter on "The Perennial Crisis," in which he asserted that "Men do not, whether by evolutionary or revolutionary means, exchange their position of creatures of historical process to that of history's masters." (*Reinhold Niebuhr on Politics*, p. 38) God is the master of history, as we are limited by, among other things, our disordered passions and aspirations. In 1960, John Hallowell published a chapter on "The Crisis of Our Times," (*Main Currents in Modern Political Thought*). Today, the crisis remains: having outlived the Cold War, it has taken on a new intensity and popularity as the Culture War. Father Schall leads us out of the crisis, along "The Sundry Paths of Orthodoxy."

Addressed to those who have lost faith in the ideologies and "seek to know about God, not politics." Schall's book teaches "that the ultimate struggles are not over the kingdoms of this world, or even over philosophical truths, but over ourselves and how we ultimately orient ourselves." (226) This is a most serious book, inquiring as it does about the "mother of joy." Unlike Marx, who believed that "the more man puts into God,

the less he retains in himself," Schall thinks that God truly is other and "worth the dedication and passion of our lives." (18)

The author's passionate striving for "the highest things" is a way of life, inspiring his friends, students, and readers to contemplative activity rooted in Christian realism. He insists that "no place" can prevent us from knowing what God is like, not the worst regime, not even the Gulags. (10) Never at a loss for sources, Schall marshals several profound letters from unnamed friends, the wisdom of Plato and Aristotle, the insights of Augustine and of Raissa Maritain, the reflections of Samuel Johnson, the thoughts of Camus and Nietzsche, the wit of Chesterton and Flannery O'Connor, and numerous others, even Charlie Brown, to elucidate the divine.

Schall does not begin, or end, this quest with a dull abstract catalogue of such divine attributes as infinity, immutability, eternity, omniscience, immateriality and pure actuality. Nor does he use such theological concepts as the "Supernatural Existential" to expound the essence of the deity. His method is as follows:

We will always come to the higher things by the lower ones. We come to anything gradually as befits the finiteness that is the condition of our being. God is not vague. Everything about God is as particular as we can possibly imagine, including the divine relationship to us. (11)

Following Chesterton, Schall begins with "gravel and grass, pigs and pelicans, chalk and cheese," to stir the primal sense of wonder that leads to the mystery of the Divine Essence." (138) If we embark with the knowledge of these simple things, not caused by us, existing

outside our minds, changing and not self-explanatory, they denote a purpose and a Creator.

Raissa Maritain's reflections affirm that women posses the "realism" and "keenness of intellectual vision" that "delights in the knowledge of ultimate realities." (53) Her diaries encourage young women interested in metaphysics to "frequent the truths of the faith" and "cultivate their intellect humbly and fearlessly." (54) In contrast, Hegel insisted that women "are not made for higher forms of science, such as philosophy," because they lack a "universal ingredient" and "a talent for the ideal." Raissa's realist epistemology begins with things, and is anchored in the Incarnation, a doctrine she believed and contemplated. Hegel's ideology endeavors to begin at the summit of pure thought. This book makes clear how knowledge of God as the Word made flesh is an insight into ourselves and our real abilities.

Schall brings to our attention our finite, frail and contingent existence. Empires rise and fall, buildings crumble, books are lost, public order fails, and the body is in constant danger of illness and death. Truly, it is hard to imagine anything more dangerous than being alive. And yet, revelation teaches that our existence is ultimately important, with eternal consequences. In the light of the Gospel, our weakness reveals our dependence on God who has conquered our brokenness through the resurrection of Christ.

We pray at Mass for God to "protect us from all anxiety," yet tension is a common experience as our frail bodies and finite minds are pulled by the soul towards all that is. This theme pervades the book. We must be humble to apprehend the "grandeur" of revelation. We

"feel present in our very being a contrasting sense of limitlessness and limitedness." (145) "A tension exists between a creature's capacity to know and God's inner knowability." (194) Individuals agonize over investing their lives in ideology or faith. Christians must resign from the urge to try and establish absolutely perfect justice within the horizon of history and be thankful for the divine grace and mercy that make a measure of justice possible here and now. We are thrown onto the trajectory of history, pushed by physical desires, pulled by an inkling of what God is like. Schall tells us that we must reflect deeply on what we are like. Our being is a question grasping for an answer, and we need to allow God to grasp us.

Scripture says that Christ revealed "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven" that can only take root "in rich soil." (Mt 13, 23) Augustine believed that everyone chooses to be unteachable at some point in their lives. Schall summarizes the disposition necessary to behold the truth: But Augustine forces us to realize that we not only must understand the truth but also choose it. We must allow ourselves to be attracted by it, and we must finally transcend any fault that prevents us from following it. Augustine, perhaps more than any other single person in the history of philosophy, stands for this fact: We must also choose the truth. (219)

We must cultivate the virtue and pray for the grace to develop an alert and attentive soul that wills the truth. The magnificent Christian drama of life is our freedom; "choose our ultimate status." (202)

Schall presents a forceful explanation of how each and every man and woman is free to risk it all, for

eternity! We work out our salvation amidst the particular and mundane actions of our ordinary lives. Fulton Sheen said that nothing is as fatiguing as boredom. Our response to this truth should be a renewed commitment to diligence in daily work and enthusiasm for prayer and service.

Schall often speaks of creation as the free gift of God's superabundance, providing "what we want in the depths of our being." (7) Life conquers death, peace overcomes anxiety, friendship with God unites "loneliness and joyfulnes." (72) Our will is united with God's will, and no conflict exists between reason and faith, holiness and intelligence.

Schall discusses Aristotle's struggle to understand God as First Mover, alone without friendship, while human beings need friends "for the exchange of truth and wisdom." (141) Pagan philosophy's search for the divine is completed by revelation as Christ teaches his friends, the Apostles, always to pray to Our Father. Schall's chapter on the Trinity describes the inner life of God and all of creation in harmony, resembling, according to the Church Fathers, "music and dance and play." (185) He agrees with Chesterton that to doubt the relevance of knowing the inner life of God "amounts to saying that a man's head is a useless appendage to his automatically cheerful body." (177)

God's superabundance and friendship seem "too good to be true." (190) To understand is to laugh with joy. Schall questions, again with Chesterton, why God did not reveal His mirth. (65) Biblical laughter often "expresses one's gladness at the downfall of an enemy or indeed of anyone who is cast down from eminence or suc-

cess. (66) During a long Dodger losing streak, Tommy Lasorda remarked, "When things are not going well for you, 80 percent of the people are glad, the other 20 percent just don't care." I must confess that, as a Giants fan, I delight in each and every Dodger loss. Apart from a sport fan's indulgence, however, laughter at another's misfortune is a depraved sentiment and a distortion of wit.

Schall knows that God is "a be-

ing standing in delight and deep happiness," but I think he overlooks an important Biblical theme that illustrates his thesis. When Abraham's wife Sarah, then aged a Biblical fourscore and ten, gave birth to Isaac, she said, "God has given me cause to laugh; all those who hear of it will laugh with me." (Genesis 21, 6) The Gospel tells us that the Word has become a silent baby, born of a virgin, asleep in straw. Certainly, God revealed His

mirth by choosing to work through the poor, weak and humble to present His eternal glory. This is the most powerful barrier to ideology.

This book inspires the reader to seek the living God of the Trinity, not the gods of ideology, the future, the collective, or the state. Choose to be among Schall's recruits and pursue the highest things. Walk with him along the "sundry paths of Orthodoxy" toward the mother of joy.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

### New from Alba House, Staten Island, NY:

*Annulment: Do You Have a Case?*  
Terence E. Tierney, Revised and Updated by Joseph J. Campo, J.C.L., x + 142 pp., \$9.95.

*An Undivided Heart: Making Sense of Celibate Chastity*, Sean Sammon, FMS, xii + 160 pp., \$9.95.

*The Virgin Mary and the Priesthood*, Cardinal Pierre Paul Philippe, O.P., Foreword by Cardinal Mario Luigi Ciappi, O.P., xxii + 136 pp., \$9.95.

*Crossing Home: The Spiritual Lessons of Baseball*, James Penrice, x + 108 pp., \$5.95.

*Evangelical Kernels: A Theological Spirituality of the Religious Life*, Dennis J. Billy, C.S.S.R., xxxviii + 274 pp., \$15.95.

*Teresa of Calcutta: A Pencil in God's Hand*, Franca Zambonini, trans by Jordan Aumann, OP, xx + 191 pp., \$9.95.

*The Ministry of Consolation: A Parish Guide for Comforting the Bereaved*, Terence P. Curley, D.Min., xii + 70 pps., \$3.95.

*Elizabeth Ann Seton, A Woman of Prayer: Meditations, Reflections, Prayers and Poems Taken From Her Writings*, Sister Marie Celeste, SC, ed., xxvi + 134 pp., \$7.95.

*Educating Street Kids: Non-Formal Education in the Charism of Edmund Rice*, Paul Wilson, CFC, xii + 100 pp., \$5.95.

### New from Continuum:

*Pedagogy of the City*, Paulo Freire, Translated by Donaldo Macedo, pp. 168, \$17.95.

### New from St. Jerome Publications:

*Reading Jeremiah as Sacred Scripture Today*, Steven Scherrer, M.M., pp. 167.

**New from K Publications**, 2911 Werk Rd., Cincinnati, OH 45211, (513) 661-7396.

*The Seven Day Bible Rosary*, John F. Kippley, pp. 71, \$4.95.

**New from Ignatius Press**: San Francisco, CA 94118 (415) 387-2324

*A Shorter Summa: The Essential Philosophical Passages*, ed. Peter Kreeft, pp. 162, \$9.95.

*Why Humanae Vitae Was Right: A Reader*, ed. Janet E. Smith, pp. 591, \$24.95.

*A Still, Small Voice: A Practical Guide on Reported Revelations*, Fr. Benedict J. Groeschel, C.F.R., pp. 175,

*New from Temple University Press*, Philadelphia, PA (215) 204-8787.

*Religion and Cultural Freedom*, E.M. Adams, pp. 193, \$39.95.

### New from Irish Academic Press:

(available from International Specialized Book Service, 5804 NE Hassalo St., Portland, OR 97213.)

*At the Heart of the Real: Philosophical Essays in Honor of Archbishop Desmond Connell*, ed. Fran O'Rourke, pp. 427, \$45 (hardcover).

**New from Multnomah Books**, Sisters, Oregon (503) 549-1144

*No Night Too Dark: How God Turns Defeat Into Glorious Triumph*, Steve Halliday, pp. 252.

*Tender Warrior: God's Intention for a Man*, Stu Weber, pp. 224.

*Fillin' Up: Daily Fuel for High Performance Living, A Teen Devotional*, Mark Littleton, pp. 180.

*The Me God Sees: Celebrating Your True Identity*, Roberta Kuhne, pp. 202.

*A Promise Unbroken*, Al Lacy, pp. 307.

**New from Gold'n'Honey Books**, Sisters, Oregon 97759

*Loving One Another: Beginner's Stories on Being a Good Friend*, Neta Jackson, illustrated by Anne Gavitt (hardcover)

*A Tale of Two Princes*, Eckart Zur Nieden and Gisela Scheer, English text adapted by Mack Thomas (hardcover)

**New from Poseidon Press**, Simon and Schuster Building, New York, NY (212) 698-7541

*Battleground*, Stephen Bates, pp. 365. (hardcover)

---

**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

