

# The Catholic Difference

Rev. Thomas Dailey, OSFS

Recently, a good friend of mine took the opportunity to redecorate her home. She and her husband tore up the 20-year old carpeting in their dining room and refurbished the original hardwood floors. Though that was the major work, a smaller aesthetic change accompanied the project. There, in the “new” dining room, they hung a tapestry of Da Vinci’s “Last Supper.” What they received from me as a friendly memento from a trip to Italy now appears, in a beautiful frame, as the centerpiece of their redesigned space. According to these homeowners, the 1x2 foot artwork makes more of a difference in the renewal of their dwelling place than does the entire floor.

I wondered why. After all, the “art” was just a replica, a mass-produced work acquired as a souvenir. Its only real value lay in the reminder of friendship that occasioned the gift. But to them there is something more.

That something more, I think, is to be found in the subject of the art – the Last Supper – and the Catholic sensibility that accompanies our appreciation of this event. Though neither especially devout nor overtly religious, this married couple of cradle Catholics somehow knows that the wondrous celebration of the Eucharist is central to our very identity. And for that reason, its depiction serves as a reminder of what is really the centerpiece not only of our homes but also of our lives.

Each liturgical year, as the Church celebrates mysteries of the faith associated with the Pascal events – Trinity Sunday, Corpus Christi, and the Sacred Heart – we are reminded of the distinctive contribution that Catholicism makes to life in the world. Called to eternal communion with God, we know that our ultimate meaning as humans is to be found in relationship with the divine being who reveals himself to us as Father, Son and Holy Spirit. That communion we share now in this world, together with our brothers and sisters in the faith, through the celebration and reception of the real presence of God through the sacrament of Christ’s body and blood. And that sacramental gift makes forever present the abiding love that God has for each of us, the same love that poured forth from the heart of God’s only Son in and

*O Timothee, depositum custodi, devitans profanas  
vocum novitates et oppositiones, falsi nominis sci-  
entiae, quam quidam profitentes circa fidem aber-  
raverunt. Gratia vobiscum. I ad Timotheum 6*

## Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly

Volume 25, Number 2      Spring 2002

### CONTENTS

PRESIDENTS' PAGE: The Catholic Difference.....	1
ARTICLES: On the Importance of Celibacy....	3
Ongoing Reflections on Priest-Bishop Scandals.....	7
Looking Ahead at Catholic Higher Ed.....	16
MEMBERSHIP MATTERS.....	30
BOOK REVIEWS .....	32
ANNOUNCEMENT.....	42
BOARD OF DIRECTORS.....	43

(Continued on page 2)

(Continued from page 1)

through his sacrificial death upon the cross.

These fundamentals of our faith give orientation to our lives in today's world. In contrast to purely secularist approaches, that find meaning only in this world, or to avowedly postmodern approaches, that claim meaning to be entirely relative, the Catholic difference holds that there is truth to human life, a truth that transcends the vicissitudes of this world, a truth that is and is to be found in the eternal God who reveals himself in the person of his Son and remains present and active in the world through the power of the Spirit. (On this, see the excellent essay by Fr. James Schall, SJ in the May 2002 issue of *Homiletic & Pastoral Review*.)

In contrast to the divisiveness that attends international relations (terrorism/peace), political viewpoints (liberal/conservative), economic realities (rich/poor), and even individual freedoms (from/for), the Catholic difference celebrates our union with God and seeks the fuller realization of our unity with one another. The "oneness" of the Church is not centered primarily on univocal thought or uniform behavior (save, of course, the necessary correspondence with the truth of faith and morals). Rather our union is rooted in the oneness of God, who graciously shares himself with all who gather together in true worship and who live as the one Body of Christ. In a society that continues to excoriate the few in an attempt to discredit the many, the sacramental celebration of the Eucharist remains a powerful reminder that Catholicism includes saints and sinners, those rejoicing in the Church triumphant and those struggling in the Church militant.

And, in contrast to a culture that reduces intimacy to sexual gratification and exploits interpersonal relations for merely personal pleasure, the Catholic difference envisions a world reborn through true love, the ecstatic and sacrificial love of God. Our celebration of the "Sacred Heart" of Jesus gives witness to what our Holy Father said on his recent apostolic voyage to Bulgaria, namely that "*the ultimate 'why' of*

*human life and history has been given to us in the Word of God*, who took flesh in order to redeem man from the evil of sin and from the abyss of anguish" (address to representatives of the world of culture, science and art on 5/24/02). Enabled and ennobled by this love, we are capable of more than might seem possible, we are capable of changing the world.

Our world can certainly benefit from the Catholic difference that the Trinity, the Most Blessed Sacrament, and the Sacred Heart bring to human existence. Now that the U.S. bishops have begun to address the prospect of "Restoring Trust," it behooves all of us to reaffirm and stand fast in our faith – rooted in the communion of Father and Son and Holy Spirit, united as one Body of Christ, and inspired by the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

As a "Fellowship" of Catholic scholars, we profess and proclaim these truths. We are united not simply by a similarity of educational training or academic discipline or professional work, but first and foremost by our shared commitment to the Catholic faith. We rejoice in the communion with the Trinitarian God to which each of us is personally called. We welcome communion with God and one other in the celebration of Christ's Body and Blood that unites us as Church. We are moved to make that communion a lived reality through the other-centered, sacrificial love embodied for us in the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Together we embrace the Catholic difference that our faith can and does make in our world.

In this, our 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary year as a Fellowship of Catholic scholars, we seek to celebrate the Catholic difference anew. In a particular way, our annual convention will highlight the wisdom of our Catholic tradition as it gives voice to the new Springtime of the Church in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Please mark your calendars (September 27-29) to join us for this grand event. And look for more details that will be coming to you soon in the mail.

+ May God be blessed! +

## On the Importance of Celibacy

By: Doug McManaman

My wife and I, while driving home one evening in May, were listening to a rather unusual news report on the Pope's recent Apostolic Letter, Misericordia Dei, "On Certain Aspects of the Celebration of the Sacrament of Penance" (May, 2002). Never have we heard a popular and secular radio station report on the Pope's latest instruction to bishops. The report, needless to say, was dripping with sarcasm, as if to say, "Look who's telling us that we have to confess our sins to them." The very next morning, CBC news reported on the arrest of Father Paul Shanley, and this tragic story was immediately followed by another unusual news portion, a report on the wide selection of religions and spiritual movements that are now available for anyone interested in "spiritual shopping." This "commercial" was quite obviously strategically placed so as to discredit the Catholic option. Part of this report showed a brief clip of a Catholic Mass in progress, which was referred to as dull in comparison to the new and exciting options available today, which included New Age gurus and various kinds of massage therapies and healing techniques.

None of this should come as any surprise to the Catholic. This is not a new phenomenon, and it is another chapter in this glorious era, this age of Christian heroes, in which it is becoming increasingly more difficult for young people to be Catholic and remain faithful to the truths of the gospel. There is no doubt that the logical fallacy of "Part and Whole" is being implicitly committed here, not to mention the double standard. The fallacy of Part and Whole attributes to the whole what belongs only to a part. It is a fallacy that is at the root of all bigotry. Less than 1% of priests have been involved in pedophilia--no doubt too high a percentage,--and some bishops were involved in cover ups, but today we are given the impression that anyone who wears a collar is a pedophile "waiting to happen". Despite Philip Jenkins' findings that

the incidence of clergy sex abuse of children is just as high, if not higher, among married Protestant clergy, the repeated highlighting of Catholic instances and the total lack of interest in non-Catholic cases contributes to the prejudice and lends the false impression that the requirement of celibacy is the principal cause of this disorder. That is why many people today are calling for the abolishment of the requirement of celibacy, arguing that this will accomplish a great deal in terms of improving the situation in which the Church currently finds herself. The Freudianism latent in this point of view is obvious. Libido is the basic driving force in human beings, according to Freud, and he reduces all conscious inclinations to this unconscious drive. It is as if the scandals are the result of a conflict between the unconscious drive for sexual freedom and the Super Ego, which in this case would be the law of celibacy.

The media coverage may very well do a lot of good for the Church, but one cannot help but wonder about the motive behind such intense coverage. After all, John Robin Sharpe (convicted of possession of child pornography) is not going to jail, but is a free man in Canada, and in 1999, Judge Duncan Shaw declared: "There is no evidence that demonstrates a significant increase in danger to children caused by pornography." He also declared, in reference to the possession of child pornography, that "intrusion into freedom of expression and the right to privacy is so profound that it is not outweighed by the limited beneficial effects of the prohibition." And in 1987, Svend Robinson put forth a motion to remove all age restrictions for buggery introduced in Canadian Parliament, and on January 23, 2001, we read in the Toronto Star that Canada has become "a world destination for people seeking children through the sex trade." The Canadian Council on Social Development, in its document entitled "The Progress of Canada's Children into the Millennium" reveals that "the child sex trade is increasing, with an estimated 100 offences each

## ARTICLES

day in Vancouver alone." It has also been our experience as foster parents--not to mention all those we know who have done foster care in this country--that children are simply not a priority in our society. We do not live in a country that is terribly concerned for the well-being and innocence of our children. So, is this intense media coverage on Catholic sex abuse scandals motivated by an intense solicitude for the good of our children? We hope so, but personally I can't help but have my doubts. Why isn't Judge Shaw, for example, featured on the news every morning and evening?

In the context of democratic nihilism that dominates popular political reasoning, the very idea of a definite and absolute truth that makes demands on conscience is one of the very few ideas that people are encouraged not to tolerate, and is one of the few ideas that those opposed to censorship are not opposed to censoring. Genuine democracy is grounded upon the very nature of the human person and the existence of God, and so it is 'the real' that measures and determines the mind of man and makes moral demands on him. The very notion of an objective and unchanging truth strikes at the very heart of democratic nihilism, which is grounded on the principle that man is the measure of what is true and that human rights are determined not by nature, but by the Supreme Court.

The Catholic Church, Evangelical Protestants, and Muslims stand against this particular brand of nihilism and maintain that truth penetrates into every corner of our lives and makes demands on our conscience, whether it is at the work place, at the voting station, in our homes, in raising our children, in our choice of entertainment, and, much to the chagrin of someone like Pierre Eliot Trudeau, even in the bedrooms of our nation. From the perspective of nihilistic democracy, the Church can only be an enemy. But that is why celibacy is more important today than it was in any other era in the history of the 20th century.

It has been my experience that behind the popu-

lar debate on celibacy is the assumption that priests are marriage counselors. And if they are marriage counselors, wouldn't marriage only improve the quality of their work? One medical student with whom I was debating this issue argued that married people experience things that non-married people do not. "Shared experiences," she added, "helps people understand one another. By understanding marriage problems better--through first hand experience, --priests will be able to relate better to their parishioners." At this point in our debate, I decided to ask some very specific questions. First, why are people seeking the priest and sharing their marital difficulties, if they know that the priest has never been married, and if it is so obvious that the priest cannot help them as well as someone who is married and has been through it? Secondly, what are some of the things that people bring to priests about which priests have no clue? What knowledge does a priest lack (by virtue of his not having married) that is so necessary in order for him to understand the person who comes to see him? And thirdly, what have parishioners complained about in the past regarding their priests' lack of knowledge or inability to offer decent counseling, by virtue of the fact that they are not married? And what have priests complained about in the past regarding their own lack of knowledge or inability to understand their parishioners, by virtue of the fact that they are not married?

I was eager to hear her answers to these questions, because I was convinced that her responses would settle the dispute once and for all. And she did settle the dispute in my mind, for she had absolutely no answers to these questions. To each one she replied: "I don't know". "But, she continued, "I can imagine that there are many things that priests are clueless about."

The fact is we can all imagine anything we want to imagine. That is the difference between fiction and non-fiction, the difference between "man is the measure" and "man is measured". For us, it is not the case that whatever is

imagined is true. To be true, there must be a correspondence with what is real. Of course, there is a great deal that priests are clueless about, for there is a great deal that all of us are clueless about. But what specific knowledge, necessary for his priesthood, does he lack that must not be lacking? No answer was forthcoming.

The truth of the matter is that a priest is not a marriage counselor. A priest is one who offers sacrifice, that is, the sacrifice of the Mass. The priest has nothing to give but Christ, and he is commissioned to proclaim nothing other than Christ, and him crucified (1 Co 2, 1-5). If married couples approach him, he can give them everything that they need for a successful married relationship, which is not clever and experienced advice, but the Person of Christ. Just as the lame man at the Beautiful Gate turned expectantly towards Peter and John, hoping for something that they didn't have, so too none of us should expect anything from our priests except what he has to give: "I have neither silver nor gold, but I will give you what I have in the name of Jesus Christ the Nazarene, walk! Peter then took him by the hand and helped him to stand up" (Acts 3, 1-7).

This reminds me of a story of a friend of mine from Brooklyn, New York. He received a call one day from a Jewish psychologist, and she wanted to know his secret to helping many of her former patients. "We deal with this person for two or three years and can't seem to do anything for him. If they're Catholic, we send them to you, and after an hour with you they're out whistling Dixie. What do you do for these people?" My friend was taken aback, and he simply told her: "All I do is hear their Confession." And she replied to him: "I've seen a lot, and you know, there's something to that Confession thing that you Catholics do."

Basically, people come to him for hope, and a good priest who knows what he has can give them hope--for his entire life is a living sign of eschatological hope, the hope for eternal life. Moreover, a person need not be married in

order to provide good counselling to married couples who are experiencing difficulties any more than a doctor needs to have experienced cancer in order to treat cancer in his patients. But my opponent in debate was not ready to give up so easily. She continued: "Simply by being married, the priest and the married parishioner stand on more common ground; they deal with the same joys, the same pains, and the same hopes and fears." She then proceeded to illustrate her point by means of a story:

When I was in high school and took Phys. Ed, the teachers ran us to the ground with exercise. They all stressed the importance of strength, endurance, and speed. They made us warm up with rigorous calisthenics; they made us jog up bleachers; they made us sprint miles around the track in 90 degree weather. They graded us based on how well we could perform chin-ups and sit-ups and push-ups. They worked us hard. Some of the teachers stood on the sidelines as we dripped with sweat. Blowing into their whistles and yelling out directions was the only work they did. Sure, they were there to watch us huffing and puffing, but they didn't get in step next to us; they didn't feel the pain of running until you couldn't breathe anymore. You could tell that they didn't practice what they preached, too, because of the amount of fat around their waists.

But some of the other teachers did more than just scream out commands; they ran up the bleachers alongside with us, they showed us how to do chin-ups correctly, and they lapped us around the track. They tasted the sweat of hard exercise, because they had sweat pouring down their faces just as it was pouring down ours. And they had the bodies to show for it, too. Abs of steel, buns of brawn. Question: Which kind of teacher was more inspirational to the students? The former or the latter?

This story is a fitting analogy, and in many ways it provided me with what I needed to conclude our debate. Celibacy is first and foremost an eschatological sign. Marriage and family are

## ARTICLES

great human goods. In fact, matrimony is a sacrament. It is holy. And sexual expression between the married couple is holy, and, according to St. Thomas Aquinas, actually merits an increase in divine grace. But there are higher goods than human goods, and these are supernatural goods. Renouncing anything that is not good is not a sign of a higher good, nor is it necessarily virtuous. Marriage is part of the natural order of basic human goods. Therefore, from a purely natural or mundane point of view, it makes no sense whatsoever to deliberately give up such a great good. What could possibly be the "reason"? The only way such a sacrifice can be at all "reasonable" is if there are greater goods for which this sacrifice is made.

In other words, the Church teaches that marriage is good and holy on the one hand, yet priests are required to give up marriage on the other.

Huh? It makes one think. In other words, the person who gives up these basic human goods is giving testimony to something greater. We've all heard the expression: "Put your money where your mouth is". Well, that's in a sense what the priest is doing. He's witnessing to the reality of these higher goods, the goods of the kingdom of God, by living entirely for them. It does not mean that he cannot do so if he's married. No, the married can do so and are required to do so. But their marriage already has a natural meaning, so in itself, marriage does not point to something eschatological.

Now, what is the priest witnessing and calling us to? To live entirely for the kingdom of God (Mt 6, 33). He's like the Gym teacher who is running up and down with us--and who has even done more running than we have. The gym teacher has the abs and the muscles to prove that he's made those sacrifices and has achieved the health that he's leading us towards, and so too the priest is living what he's exhorting us to. As a married person, I am called to love my wife "as Christ loved his Bride, the Church, who gave himself up for her" (Eph 5, 25). As such, married life is sacrificial. In the context of marriage, we are called to make all sorts of sacrifices. Each person is bound to remain faithful to his/her spouse, to give up the possibility of a relationship

with any other man or woman. Couples will have to abstain from sex during fertile periods if there is a good reason not to have a child. And when couples go through marital difficulties and those sugary feelings are just not there anymore, we know this is not the end of the world nor the end of our relationship. For we can still remain committed to one another and love one another in the highest sense of "willing the good of one another" despite our feelings; for the faithful and celibate priest witnesses to this ability all the time, because his entire life is devoted not to erotic love, or conjugal love, or love based on feelings, but agape love, which is a sacrificial love, a love that exists on the level of the will. And it is this love that marriage is ordained to achieve--a love, I might add, that couples know almost nothing about at the start of their marriage.

So the priest is very much like the Phys. Ed teacher who works out alongside his students, and the reason is that the sacrifice of celibacy is precisely a sacrifice. Because married couples that are called to live a marriage that is an image of the love that Christ has for his Bride, they will need to have someone in their lives who can witness to the life of sacrifice. The relationship that Christ has to his Bride, the Church, is a nuptial relationship, and the relationship that the priest has to the entire Church emulates this relationship of Christ to his Bride. The relationship that we have to our spouses is exemplified in these former. This could explain why so many married people consider it fitting to see a priest. And on top of everything, he has put his money where his mouth is.

Married couples are called to holiness. They need to see and know someone who is holy. It helps to have married people who are holy and living heroic lives, and we have these in our parishes. But the kind of example that a priest provides is one that can be emulated by and inspiring for both the single and the married alike. A person who is single, who has not found the right person to marry and will likely not do so, and who may find himself or herself single for the rest of his/her life, can live that life, remain faithful to the gospel, and be very happy. How do we

know? Because Father so and so is living that life, and note how happy and full of joy he is. In fact, the happiest people I have ever known were all priests or nuns, full of love, full of joy, and full of the spirit of holiness. These people live a life not devoted to temporal goods or pleasures, as most people do. Rather, they live for God, and they show us how to live for God alone.

And finally, we have permanent Deacons in the Church who are married. They can prepare couples for marriage, and they can counsel couples if couples wish to seek them out. So, if a person wants to see someone who is ordained yet married, he can see a Deacon. If a person wishes to see someone who is not married, but who has sacrificed the goods of marriage, and if he's a priest from a religious order--ownership (the vow of poverty) and self-determination (the vow of obedience), he can do so. If one is looking for people who are married and can live the teachings of the Church, and who are good wives and husbands, we have those too in our parishes. We really do have all the bases covered. In the Catholic Church, there's something for everyone.

Perhaps it is this continued witness to something eternal and unchanging, something above and beyond the fleeting nature of temporal goods and human power that irks the devotees of democratic nihilism. And yet it is the reality witnessed to by Catholic priests that is the foundation of genuine democracy. Despite the inadequacies of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, it does begin by affirming this very principle: "Whereas Canada is founded upon principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule of law." It should come as no surprise that Svend Robinson sought to have this statement removed from the Charter. He may very well succeed one day. Who, then, will be left to witness, in his body, in his manner of dress, in his lifestyle, and in the personal sacrifice of the married state, if not the Catholic priest?

## **Ongoing Reflections on Priest-Bishop Scandals**

Rev. John F. Harvey, OSFS  
Director of Courage  
De Sales University

On Monday, April 29<sup>th</sup>, I attended the assembly of priests from the Archdiocese of New York to hear Cardinal Egan's message. The Cardinal made the point that the first consideration in this kind of tragedy should be the protection of children and youth. Our support must be for the innocent young person. That having been stressed, he added that we need to explore other facets of the crisis, which has already done harm to the image of the Catholic Church in the minds of many. Both Catholics and non-Catholics believe that many dioceses have not handled the situation well.

To a large extent, bishops and their advisors have not given to the victims of priests' sexual misbehaviour the kind of spiritual support to keep them from falling away from the Faith. Settlements out of court and pledges of confidentiality were frequent. Many dioceses may have taken care of the victims with adequate counselling, while the priest involved was allowed to resume ministry after a period in a treatment center, followed by approval from the same treatment center to resume ministry away from adolescent youth.

I say adolescent youth - most often male - because over the years, very few priests have been involved in acts of pedophilia. Unfortunately, the few were involved in many acts with children from 1983 to 2000 in Louisiana (Lafayette) and in Massachusetts (Boston - Fall River). The media, however, has made the actions of a few pedophile priests the main problem. Bad as it is, the main problem of errant priestly crimes is not in the area of pedophilia, which is strictly defined as an adult having sex-

## ARTICLES

ual relations with someone below the age of puberty (12), but rather in the phenomena of priests with homosexual inclinations seeking out vulnerable youth. The secular press refuses to recognize that these priests are actively homosexual, not pedophiles. All such priests are called pedophile priests by the media who said that the Pope called the Cardinals together to solve the problem of "pedophile priests". And so on. Although one priest involved in sexual relations with teenage boys is one priest too many, still it should be stressed that the number of priests who have seduced teenage boys is a very small percentage of the 47,000 odd priests in the U.S.A. One report said that 177 priests throughout the USA have been removed from ministry. This of course is the source of serious scandal, which is made even greater by the anger of Catholic laity, who hold that our bishops have covered up these situations, and have made immense payments to settle law suits made by victims and their families. But one may ask whether our bishops *as a body* have been judged too harshly by both the media and our Catholic laity.

I believe that many of them followed the advice of psychologists and psychiatrists at various treatment centers. They were told that a priest who was now living a chaste life, and engaged in priestly ministry which did not involve children or adolescents, could do good work for the church in many forms of pastoral work and spiritual direction which did not bring him in contact with youth and children. I was asked to give spiritual direction to such priests. I saw true spiritual progress in the lives of these priests. Most of them remained faithful to their promise of celibacy.

In short, the predominant view of the bishops in the 80's and 90's was that such men should be given a second chance which included group spiritual support, individual spiritual direction, and careful supervision. From personal pastoral experience, I saw good things happening with these priests. I also was aware that some of these bishops took good care of the youth who had been victimized by priests. The bishops

acted in good faith, in accordance with the psychological advice they received from professionals in the field. But now individuals are filing law suits concerning incidents of 20, 25, and 30 years ago with accusations of cover-up appearing in the daily newspapers.

District attorneys in the metropolitan area of New York have demanded that cases reported to the archdiocese of New York should be sent directly to the appropriate district attorney. Cardinal Egan believed that before a case was turned over to the D.A.'s office, it ought to be screened by a group of Catholic laymen to make sure it was a serious charge, and not a frivolous threat. The D.A.'s, however, did not agree with the archbishop, and now he believes that he has no choice except to turn over to the D.A.'s office any complaint about a priest.

The archbishop said that the Catholic laity demand that any complaint against a priest concerning sexual abuse should be turned over to the D.A.'s office. Were he not to do so, he could be accused of covering up. This disclosure of individuals could lead to unsubstantiated charges against a priest, and, once published, this would do irreparable damage to the good reputation of the priest. He would be removed from his work, and not allowed to minister to the faithful until it is proven that the charges are false. In other words, priests are vulnerable to false accusations with no adequate defense. Recently, I was threatened by someone unemployed for psychiatric reasons, because I refused to give him time at the moment, and asked him to wait for several weeks. I do not have his phone number which would enable me to contact the local police. But if he had carried out his threat, I would not be able to do my work until my name was cleared. And how long would it take to clear one's name?

Nevertheless, many in the Church feel that these measures are necessary for the common good of the Church, that is to say, that priests who had a falling many years ago, but had been faithful over subsequent years should be banished from priestly ministry for the rest of their

lives. I have grave difficulty with this opinion. Serious as these sins committed with male youth are, does it mean that in the view of the public, they may never again act as priests? Are we giving into public opinion when it denies that God's grace can restore an errant priest to ministry in the Church? Granted, there is a possibility that he could fall again, but this is not probable in the case of most priests who have sought to remain chaste. Meanwhile, should not both clergy and laity find some gainful employment for the above priests? I think we should do so.

The irony is that some bishops worked privately for both priests and victims, hoping to avoid scandal in the Church, regarding forms of "cover-up". The manner in which the press has presented statistics leads the public to draw unwarranted conclusions concerning the current frequency of such priestly crime. The impression is that it is frequent at the present time. It is not.

But from the statistics on various dioceses - covering 30 or 40 years concerning priests' involvement with teenage boys - it is clear that the percentage of such crimes among priests is very low indeed. When recently in New York, Allentown, and Philadelphia, records of such sexual misbehaviour were submitted to District Attorney's offices, it was noted in the media that most of the cases were beyond the statute of limitations; however, throughout the country, one notes practically everyday one old case or another is brought to light. Unfortunately, this conveys the impression that such crimes are increasing, and the Church in America has been inept in taking care of victims, and in exercising necessary discipline of the accused priests.

### American Seminaries

With regard to our seminaries, I believe that Rome intends another investigation similar to that of the late Bishop John Marshall in the mid-eighties. The Marshall investigation did not succeed in rooting out dissident teaching or permissive attitudes toward questionable behav-

iour. It did not really affect dissident teachers, tighten up discipline in seminaries or promote a more vigorous spiritual program. One of the reasons the Marshall Report did not have its desired effect was that some seminaries put on their best face for the examiners - what the Italians call *bella figura* - and then reverted to their usual policies. At that time, I was teaching in a complex of three seminaries in Washington, D.C. Since then, other seminaries, known for their dissident theologians, absence of a vigorous prayer program and lack of discipline - not to mention the acceptance of homosexuality as normal - have seen a sharp decline in the number of candidates (Michael Rose, Good Bye Good Men, Regnery, Washington, D.C. 2002). In more recent years, however, some seminaries have instituted reforms in theological curriculum, more intensive prayer programs, strict discipline and screening processes. They have flourished, and will continue to attract young men who want the fullness of Catholic doctrine as preparation for ministry in the Church.

### Should a Seminarian With Homosexual Inclinations be Ordained to the Priesthood?

The issue is controversial, and I am sure that it will be discussed in Rome, and at the bishop's meeting in June. Some authors have cited the opinion of Joaquin Navarro-Valls, Vatican Spokesman, who said, "People with (homosexual) inclinations just cannot be ordained...[but he added] that does not imply a final judgement on people with homosexuality...But you cannot be in this field." (*New York Times* interview, March 8<sup>th</sup>, 2002). When questioned by Catholic News Services (CNS), Navarro-Valls declined to elaborate on his comments in the *New York Times*.

Anonymous Vatican Church officials, who asked not to be named, said the Vatican was not trying to impose an arbitrary norm against homosexuals, but was trying to make 'prudential decisions' based on individual cases at the seminary level. They added that the Vatican views the issue as mainly dealing with future

## ARTICLES

priests, and not those already ordained. As you know, some seminaries - Philadelphia, for example - screen candidates to ascertain whether they are homosexual. This includes the direct question: "Do you have homosexual inclinations?" Some individuals see this as a violation of their rights. But a vocation to the priesthood is not a right, but a special divine grace and privilege.

In an interview in 2001 with CNS, Archbishop Tarcisio Bertone, Secretary of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, said that the homosexual inclination is a potential problem in a seminarian. He went on to elaborate that the inclination leads to a "temptation that, for whatever reason, has become so predominant in a person's life as to become a force shaping the entire outlook of the person." He concludes that such persons should not be admitted to the seminary.

### My Own Opinion

In January 1971, American Ecclesiastical Review, I offered an opinion on this issue, which I reinforced in *Lay Witness* (March 2001). I hold that the homosexual inclination in itself should not be viewed as an impediment to ordination to the Catholic priesthood. I am aware of the 1961 Vatican document from the Congregation of Religious which was concerned with those entering religious orders. It stated: "those affected by the perverse inclination to homosexuality or pederasty should be excluded from religious vows and ordination." It added that community life and priestly ministry would constitute a "grave danger" or temptation for these people.

The 1961 document of the Congregation for Religious was dependent upon the state of our knowledge at that time concerning homosexuality. The document needs to be updated by the collective insights of the last forty years concerning homosexuality and nature and circumstances of contemporary forms of religious life. I hope that the Vatican will develop another document, which will be the result of consultation with scholars in the fields of psychology, sociology, and moral theology. A recent state-

ment by the Catholic Medical Association (CMA) called Homosexuality and Hope ought to be considered. It is available on the CMA's website, at Cathmed.org.

On Sunday, April 28, 2002, Cardinal George was asked on "Meet the Press" whether a person with homosexual inclinations should be ordained to the priesthood. He responded that each homosexual seminarian should be evaluated according to norms that apply also to heterosexual seminarians. He did not think we need a universal law forbidding all men with same-sex attractions from studying for the priesthood. Earlier, Cardinal Theodore McCarrick offered the same opinion.

There are other issues which remain unresolved until the bishops meet in June. One example is how shall the bishops handle cases of priests who, over twenty years ago or so, had failed in their commitment to chastity with teenage persons, but subsequently have led a good life. Another issue is whether one failure should result in dismissal from the priesthood. This needs fuller analysis beyond the phrase "zero tolerance".

What are at the roots of the problem? Some forty years ago, we witnessed Catholic theologians and ethicists who started to disagree with the authentic teaching of the Church on marriage and human sexuality, separating the procreative aspect of marriage from its love-union aspect by the justification of contraception. By the time Paul VI issued the encyclical against contraception *Humanae Vitae*, 1968, it had already been assumed by the above theologians that contraception was justified in marriage for a variety of reasons. This was the first but very significant factor in scuttling Catholic doctrine. [See also Richard Neuhaus on CNN: infidelity to magisterium.]

Next came the justification of sexual intercourse before marriage. It was said that sexual pleasure is necessary for one's fulfillment, including persons who had no opportunity to marry. Sexual pleasure became the focus of the

individual. This in turn led to describing masturbation as “self-pleasuring”. Pop psychologists recommended it for relaxation. The full meaning of human sexual intercourse had now been reduced to obsession with individual sexual “fulfillment”. Since sex was now separated from procreation and marriage, why could not two persons who had same-sex attractions find their happiness in an attempt at bodily union with each other?

This massive dissent by Catholic leaders from the magisterial teaching of the Church is the basic message of Human Sexuality by Anthony Kosnik (Paulist Press, 1977). This book and others like it reached the libraries of many Catholic seminaries and colleges and the future teachers of Catholic high schools and grade schools.

Thus the first root cause was false teaching on the meaning of marriage and sexuality. Prominent dissenting theologians were teaching at Catholic universities and no one in authority reproved them until the case of Fr. Charles Curran. The situation in some seminaries and colleges became more difficult for seminarians and students who knew that the Church’s teaching was not supported by dissident professors. For example, Catholic league president William Donohue refers to Fr. Anthony Kosnik’s view that “fornication, adultery, homosexuality, sodomy, and bestiality” were not “intrinsically evil acts”, but merely “sexual taboos”. He quotes Kosnik as saying that “priests must understand that God is surely present in homosexual relations that are marked by ‘sincere affection’.”

It is not surprising then, that dissident teaching led to deviant behaviour, the second root cause. Again, as Donohue observes, it is time we connected the dots between dissidence and deviance. While the latter is not always caused by the former, dissidence provides intellectual cover for deviance. On the specific issue of homosexual acts, the authentic teaching of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on this question as found in the *Declaration on Sexual Ethics* 1975, and later in the *Letter to the*

*Bishops of the World on the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons* 1986, was reduced to the level of a “venerable” opinion. In some seminaries and Catholic colleges, students who clung to magisterial teaching were regarded as “rigid”. Indeed, many seminarians left and the Church was deprived of priests. Many laity, likewise, latched on to dissident teaching, particularly on the issues of contraception and sex before marriage.

Besides considering the impact theological dissent had upon priests, seminarians, and the Catholic laity, we need to take a good look at the harmful effects which secular psychologists, like Karl Rogers and others had on many Catholic educators. All this is detailed in the April issue of the Culture Wars. Herein E. Michael Jones’ article, “Pedophilia and Kultukampft: The Consequences of Just Saying Yes to the Culture of Appetite” is right on target.

Jones says “the recent pedophilia case in Boston is instructive for those who want to understand how Kultukampft works in a culture where media-orchestrated opinion is the main instrument of control.” Jones views the media “commissars” as seeking to impose their views on the public. Jones notes that the secular media chose a homosexual Catholic, Andrew Sullivan, to speak as if he were a Catholic leader. Sullivan speaks as if he had the good of the Church in mind in *Time* magazine, calling celibacy “an onerous burden that can easily distort a person’s psyche.”

Such views of ‘designated Catholics’ like Sullivan are put forth as expert moral opinion. But this is only a pose, leading up to the real message “which is that the Church will have to abandon its commitment to preserving the moral order in the sexual realm.” The political purpose of the current crisis is “to break whatever hold the Catholic Church still has on morals, because morals, especially sexual morals, are the only thing which stands between the nations’ beleaguered individuals and families and the globalists control of culture through appetite...” (Jones, *Culture Wars*, April 2002).

## ARTICLES

Jones believes that Cardinal Law's 'crime' was that he listened to psychologists, and he did what the dominant culture advised him to do. He accepted the authority of psychologists, that pedophilia was curable, and so he was persuaded to reassign priests in question to other parishes, usually under certain regulations which by and large were not carefully observed.

We need, however, to go back to the late fifties and sixties. Jones says that in this period the Catholic Church became docile to the dominant culture of yielding to one's appetites. The instance he gives is that the Church began running seminars among Catholic educators and religious orders according to the principles of Karl Rogers and Sigmund Freud. The Church, he says, is at fault for listening to dominant culture, especially psychologists of this sort. Thus he views modern psychology as a major contributor to current confusion among Catholics. He holds that we need no new evidence to make his point, which is already documented in his book, John Cardinal Krol and the Cultural Revolution.

Jones also refers to the writings of Wilhelm Reich, citing The Mass Psychology of Fascism as a factor in the sexual revolution in Europe during the sixties, but he also refers to one of his American disciples, Carl Rogers with his client centered therapy. In the above book, John Cardinal Krol and the Cultural Revolution and in past issues of the *Wanderer*, Jones describes with much documentation the spiritual demise of the Immaculate Heart of Mary nuns in Los Angeles. He says that the release of moral control destroyed this order. Roger's message was to say yes to your appetites.

There is much truth in Jones' criticisms of the Rogerian approach to counselling. From my study of client centered therapy, I saw its weakness in assuming that man's desires for personal fulfillment were always in accord with the natural moral law. It was as if man did not have any unruly passions - no carnal concupiscence, no effects of original sin. One looked into his own psychic mirror and determined what was best

for him. There was no objective criteria for moral good or evil. In 1957, I wrote an article contrasting the counselling methods of St. Francis De Sales and Karl Rogers (*Techniques in Counselling: A Comparison of the Method of St. Francis De Sales With That of Karl Rogers' Client Centered Therapy*, Catholic Educator, Pt I, Feb. 1957, Pt. II, Apr. 1957.) Francis gave the counselee advice and spiritual direction; Rogers refused to give any advice, because he regarded advice an intrusion into the freedom of the person. It is easily understood, however, how persons who are given no moral criteria in discerning right from wrong may easily succumb to unruly desires or appetites. After all, the dominant culture sees repression of such desires as bad.

### What Can We Do?

I think the first thing we can do is not panic. The Church has been in crises worse than this before. The point was made by a priest in Fall River, Fr. Roger Landry, who then referenced Saint Frances De Sales: At the beginning of the seventeenth century, Francis De Sales, the exiled bishop of Geneva, was asked to publicly address a scandalous clerical situation in what is now southern France - then Savoy. He said that the sins of clerics were a source of scandal and could lead to the murder of souls; but he added that the greater evil was that of those who allowed the scandalous acts of clerics to turn them away from the Faith of the Church, to give up the Mass and the reception of Holy Communion. This he called spiritual suicide. Do not allow the scandalous conduct of a relatively few priests to shake your Faith in the Church and in Christ.

A second example, also cited by Fr. Roger Landry, is that of Saint Francis of Assisi. Like Saint Francis De Sales, he lived in a time of great immorality in the clergy. He was asked by one of his confreres, another Franciscan brother, "Suppose you knew that the priest celebrating the Mass has three concubines. Would you receive Holy Communion from him?" Francis answered that he would receive Holy

Communion from him because, however sinful the priest may be, he has changed bread into the Body of Christ and wine into His Blood. This is so important: The efficacy of the Sacraments, including the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and sacramental absolution, does not depend upon the holiness of the priest.

What can we do? I submit that we can continue to practice chastity of the heart, for which we daily pray. Allow me to distinguish chastity of the heart from its imperfect form which I term “white-knuckled chastity”. This occurs when the individual is constantly in contact with impure fantasies and desires. Past sexual experiences continue to fill his imagination, particularly if he had formed bad habits. His affections are not yet purified from these impulses. He finds himself in constant fear that he will yield to mortal sin. He is practicing imperfect chastity or continence - it is a virtue. He needs to intensify his prayer life, which will cleanse his heart of lustful desires. He needs to cultivate chaste friendships. With God's grace, he will find chastity of the heart. Such chastity is a form of divine love, because it is rooted in the strongest motive for practicing chastity (virginal or marital), and that is love for Jesus Christ crucified.

### **The American Bishops' Meeting in June 2002**

As I continue this commentary, I note that the American Cardinals in their communique to the American bishops hope that the June meeting will develop three goals: (1) to send the congregations of the Vatican a set of national standards which the Holy See will review. These standards will include essential elements for policies dealing with the sexual abuse of minors in dioceses and religious institutes in the United States. (2) To recommend a special process for dismissal from the clerical state of a priest who has become notorious because of serial and predatory abuse of minors; and (3) To propose a special process for the dismissal of priests who are not notorious but who are regarded by the diocesan bishops as a threat to the protection of

children and young people. Such a dismissal is meant to avoid grave scandal in the future and to safeguard the common good of the Church. Other proposals were added to achieve these three goals.

In the opinion of Dr. Germain Grisez, the bishops will not be able to achieve these goals in four days; he suggests that they issue an interim report to the Catholic public, indicating that they will continue to work on these goals and purposes until they are completed. This, however, will not satisfy many Catholic laity and clergy, who demand that the bishops come up with universal statements as soon as possible. Personally, I find this demand by some members of the faithful and by some clerics unreasonable. If it is enacted in hysteria, it will probably be rescinded some years from now, when the American Church regains its spiritual equilibrium. Meanwhile, many priests who have demonstrated great virtue over many years, after original lapses will remain without any kind of ministry in the Church. Are we as Church ignoring the reality of God's grace that has worked in their lives? John Paul II referred to the divine graces that bring about conversion in sinners. But are these priests to be cast out because their serious sins of years ago are unforgivable?

### **Germain Grisez's Commentary to the U.C.C.B.**

Grisez submitted a series of recommendations to the Bishops' Ad Hoc Committee. I want to comment on a few of his recommendations in the space of this article.

From the many recommendations that Grisez submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee, I shall comment on a few in this article. He takes issue with Stephen Rossetti's A Tragic Grace: The Catholic Church and Child Sexual Abuse and also with an article “Priest-Pedophile” in *America* magazine (25 April, 2002) by Melvin C. Blancette, S.S.S. and Gerald Coleman, S.S.S.. Rossetti, for example, says that acts with post-pubescent children by the “majority of perpetra-

## ARTICLES

tors" are "more amenable to treatment". One of the treatment goals "is to develop satisfying relationships with age-appropriate peers." But what does Rossetti mean? According to Grisez, Rossetti holds that no change in sexual orientation is necessary for the "perpetrators" - actively homosexual men; consequently, "with treatment, they can stop committing crimes with underage men and enjoy 'satisfying relationships with age-appropriate peers' [Rossetti's expression]...."

"Priests should and usually do enjoy satisfying non-sexual relationships with many of their spiritual children from the cradle to the grave. Only unchaste relationships must be limited to age-appropriate peers - to consenting adults. Rossetti apparently considers that limitation a successful treatment outcome." Here Grisez regards Rossetti as justifying such adult homosexual relationships by priests who formerly were involved with teenagers. Rossetti needs to clarify his position. One wonders why he uses the word "perpetrators" when he is referring to homosexual priests.

Grisez's criticisms of Blancette and Coleman in that article in America "Priests Pedophiles" is well articulated. The above authors claim that "ephebophilia" is a "basic sexual orientation". But Grisez doubts that an adult sexual interest in adolescent men or young women is a distinct form of homosexual behaviour. The term "ephebophilia" is not found in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American Psychiatric Association. I believe the term ephebophilia is useless in the analysis of adult homosexual men seeking adolescent males.

The media's use of the term "predatory priests" is not really in accord with the typical pattern of adolescent seduction. The media constantly refers to predatory priests when, in most cases, "physical or assaultive kinds of behaviour" are rare. The most common pattern among such priests is "that they enjoy the company of youngsters, like the companionship, want to do good for them, and then, unfortunately, as a bond develops emotionally, they begin to feel

sexually tempted and persuade the youngster to go along with sexual activity." (Frederick S. Berlin, M.D., Ph.D., Director of the National Institute for the Study, Prevention, and Treatment of Sexual Trauma - interview, USCCB website).

Grisez believes that the American bishops ought to publicly condemn criminal homosexual seduction of adolescents and young men by clerics. This would be "an appropriate first step for dealing with the homosexual subculture in the Catholic Church in the United States." Grisez believes that the bad example of the priest scandals may lead other Catholics, including priests, to commit and "rationalize" lesser sexual sins.

Grisez is on target in holding that a bishop's first concern in dealing with an offending cleric must be "the good of the cleric's soul". This is in line with the Holy Father's address on April 23, 2002: "We can not forget the power of Christian conversion, that radical decision to turn away from sin and back to God..." The bishop should treat the offending cleric with pastoral mercy and help him to change his way of living.

Grisez, however, holds - like some bishops - that a cleric who has committed even one sexual offense should never again be permitted to engage in ministry, except to administer the sacraments to the dying. I find this position difficult to accept, but I leave it to the judgement of the Holy See. Grisez refers to the fact that there are many clerics who are openly sexually active, "though only with consenting and age-appropriate peers". Seemingly, their sexual activity is tolerated by their bishops. In my judgement, the number of such priests may not be known by the Ordinary, because they keep their way of life underground. I know this from a priest who left the underground but did not reveal the matter to the Ordinary for fear of punishment. This happened twenty years ago when even the admission of homosexual orientation would be avoided by clerics and religious. In the current situation of the Church in

the United States, however, there may be no tolerance of homosexual acts by clergy or religious.

Grisez quotes the Pope on Catholic moral teaching and dissent: "They (the Catholic faithful) must know that bishops and priests are totally committed to the fullness of Catholic truth on matters of sexual morality, a truth as essential to the renewal of the priesthood and the episcopate as it is to the renewal of marriage and family life" (John Paul II, 23 April 2002).

The Final Communiqué of the United States participants in the Vatican meeting on April 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> stressed the need to promote the correct moral teaching of the Church and "to publicly reprimand individuals who spread dissent and groups which advance ambiguous approaches to pastoral care."

Grisez recognizes that "dissent has become institutionalized and significantly divides the collegium itself." The present division in the Catholic Church is not only over sexual morality, but over other issues which some bishops consider "uncompromisable"; it will be overcome only by a collegial effort of the Pope and the other bishops. Grisez hopes that our Holy Father will initiate a collegium of the bishops which will be truly representative of all the bishops. Hopefully, some bishops will urge the Pope to do so. At the end of his discussion on spiritual formation in a seminary, Grisez holds to the traditional principle that candidates for ordination need to be perfectly "continent" for at least a full year before they promise celibacy, and also during that year they should "make progress towards peaceful chastity, so that they could be morally certain before they promise celibacy that they will not be aflame with passion." In my opinion, those persons who have struggled with chastity need to have been continent for more than a year before the promise of celibacy. Such a judgement should be made by the spiritual director. Again, chastity of the heart describes more accurately the kind of interior chastity which the candidate should have.

Grisez sees the need to overcome the distrust which some members of the laity have towards their bishop. In his view, "the crises that began in the United States in January 2002 is not about sexual abuse. It is about some bishops' behaviour over many years; they tolerated clerical sexual offenses and even seemed to facilitate them..." This lead to the crises of January 2002. Bishops, says Grisez, need to be true Fathers of their flock. All clerics, moreover, need to support each other in serving the spiritual needs of the laity. We need to be concerned for the common good of the members of the Church and for the preaching of the Gospel. We need to break away from the kind of cooperation among clerics which is blinded by preoccupation with status and self-interest

## Conclusion

In an op-ed column in the *Morning Call* (April 1, 2002), Larry Chapp, Chairman of the Theology Department at De Sales University, seeks the roots of the sexual abuse crises in our society: "The problem with the Church isn't that bishops were guilty of an abuse of power. The problem is that the bishops did not exercise their power at all. What was needed was more assertion of genuine Gospel-based authority, not less." Chapp hopes that the American bishops will turn to the leadership and example of John Paul II. They will find in his writings on the nature and meaning of human sexuality, a truly modern perspective of God's design for marriage and family. In summarizing the Pope's writings, Chapp speaks in such a positive way on the Christian understanding of celibacy, viewing celibacy as "a form of sexual expression, not its lack, a fulfillment of the commandment to 'love thy neighbour' rather than the absence of love - in deed that the genital expression of our sexuality is but one way that love expresses itself rather than the only way."

It is to be hoped that the teaching of our Holy Father on marriage and the family will receive far more attention from the American hierarchy when matters begin to settle down in our Church.

## LOOKING AHEAD AT CATHOLIC HIGHER ED

Gerard V. Bradley

The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars was founded twenty-five years ago by academics who wished to "redirect the Catholic scholarly community towards a more friendly approach to the teaching authority of the Church". Our first President, Father Ronald Lawler, OFM, Cap., described the founders as "isolated and frustrated" at their home institutions. They came together, he said, "for a discussion of the Catholic academic situation". Comprised mostly of priests, the founders included several sisters and a few laymen, one of them particularly mysterious: according to Father Lawler, the "name was suggested by an Australian layman who happened on the scene by chance".

Monsignor George Kelly, ever the guiding force behind the Fellowship, traces the founding impetus to Gabriel Cardinal Garrone, Vatican Prefect of Education. Garrone asked, "Is there anyone who will speak for the Catholic colleges in America, besides Father Hesburgh and the Jesuits?" His Eminence was exasperated by a decade of campus dissent launched by "Land O' Lakes", the 1967 declaration by Fr. Hesburgh and the Jesuits of their schools' independence from "all external authority, of whatever kind, lay or clerical. [Emphasis much deserved but nevertheless mine.] The FCS aimed to be that missing voice.

The Fellowship was thus born from the heart of the academy, back when congestive heart failure was the diagnosis. It has since aimed to make this patient -- the Catholic colleges and universities -- well, where "well" means restoring a genuinely Catholic *education* to institutions calling themselves Catholic. FCS members have done yeoman's work at their home bases; the group was especially active (though modestly successful) during the decade-long struggle to implement *Ex corde ecclesiae*. Even ex-Presidents still warm to the challenge.

I think that the patient is now dead.

It is thirty-five years since Land O' Lakes, and twenty-five since the Fellowship's birth. The Code of Canon Law, with its muscular provisions governing Catholic colleges, was promulgated in 1983. The run-up to *Ex corde ecclesiae* started soon afterwards; it appeared on the Feast of the Assumption, 1990. In ECE the Holy Father called upon bishops' conferences to adopt implementing norms. Ten years of debate and agitation and dialogue and drafting and listening followed. Everything that could be said was said. The words have all been spoken.

Rome took the matter as far as it could against a wealthy, united (at least on this issue) bishops' conference. The bishops finally enacted guidelines in 2000. The deadline for theologians to secure the dread *mandatum* passed on June 1, 2002. Almost no one noticed. The Church has other troubles.

Let us take inventory, and not worry about appearances: the hierarchy's norms are weak. The bishops have declined to judge frankly the colleges' Catholicity by standards in the Church's universal law. No bishop seems prepared to say publicly that a college calling itself Catholic, isn't. None has. There will be no change of heart: whatever capital the bishops were willing to spend on collegiate reform is spent. Or they are saving it for other crises.

The interventions of authority are done. Nothing on the horizon suggests that the colleges left to themselves will get religion. The Catholicity quotient of our institutions is set for the next generation. What you see is what you are going to get. The future is now.

Here is what we got. The people in charge -- faculty, college administrators, trustees, other intellectual elites, and (judging by what they do) the bishops -- do not believe what they need to believe to restore Catholic *education* to the colleges: that a Catholic education is better because the faith is true. This I call the Indispensable Conviction. It is the pearl of great price. Our

leaders no longer possess it. And, without a Catholic *education*, our magnificent campuses are like whitened sepulchers.

Is the status quo really so dire? What does the next generation portend? Can demand for Catholic education be stimulated? If so, what delivery systems are best suited to meet it? Is the hugely capitalized, stand-alone Catholic campus fading away? What might take its place? What can the Fellowship do?

To these questions I turn.

## I The Indispensable Conviction

In *Ex corde ecclesiae* the Holy Father described the university as “dedicated to research, to teaching, and to the education of students who freely associate with their teachers in a common love of knowledge”. Thus far the Pope is speaking of any university -- Princeton, NYU, Notre Dame, Cal-Berkeley. The distinguishing task of the *Catholic* university is “to unite existentially by intellectual effort two orders of reality that too frequently tend to be placed in opposition as though they were antithetical: the search for truth, and the certainty of already knowing the fount of truth”. From this fount flows the truths of the faith, valid propositions which, along with their implications and entailments, run like capillaries through the intellectual life of the Catholic university. According to Francis Cardinal George, “faith in higher education means that... the truths of the faith take on an intelligibility that can influence an entire university's vision of reality.”

The faith's traction naturally varies across the disciplines, exercising a gentle restraint upon exploration of some subject matters, suffusing the whole of others. The humanities and social sciences are more illumined by the faith than are the natural sciences. Since the subject matter of theology *is* the faith, it is essential that only Catholics who hold the faith teach the theological disciplines. Canon Law requires it.

This much is obvious enough. I should like to articulate some less obvious matters, in the form

of responses to objections.

Someone might object that the Indispensable Conviction implies that *any* Catholic college is better than, say, Princeton, because any Catholic college possesses the truth and Princeton does not. But this, the objection concludes, is patently false.

My response: the Indispensable Conviction does not imply that any specific institution is, all things considered, better than any other. My own judgement is that Princeton is much better than, say, a local Catholic college. The relevant question is whether Princeton is better *because* it is not Catholic, or (the same question) whether the local college is worse *because* it is Catholic – as opposed to financially starved, bereft of quality students because it is in a miserable neighborhood, has a small library, is run by remnants of a dying order of sisters. And so on.

The pertinent comparison is not that between Princeton and an undistinguished Catholic college. Fordham in 1955 was no Princeton. But neither was any place else. The useful comparison is that between two schools with similar facilities, equally distinguished faculty, comparable endowments and reputations and all, save that one of them is Catholic and the other is not. The former *is* better because it is Catholic.

For what it is worth: nothing in the Indispensable Conviction implies that Catholic colleges in the halcyon days of the fifties (assuming that the Indispensable Conviction was widely held back then) were just swell. They were not just swell. I grant that much indoctrination masqueraded as education in Catholic colleges back in the fifties. I am not willing to grant that less indoctrination – of a different sort – happens now, all across American higher education.

The objection is likely to attribute the indoctrination I have granted (but not conceded) to the colleges' Catholic character. This is the standing objection to ECE, the canonical *mandatum*, and the whole idea of re-Catholicizing our colleges: academic freedom, critical thought, and genuine education are not compatible with conceits about “possessing” the “truth”.

## ARTICLES

The objection so restated is itself facially implausible, an insidious conceit in its own right. How so? We can thank post-modern thinkers for unmasking *some* such talk of “openness”, “freedom”, and “liberalism” as disingenuous ideology, even dogma, itself contemptuous of such matters as metaphysics, natural law, and revealed religion. It is also paradoxical to posit that academic freedom, which is justified as instrumental to the search for truth, is ruined by the attainment of its object.

Indoctrination is not a deformation of education, but its opposite. Education seeks to guide students along the search for truth, and to help them freely to embrace that which is true. Indoctrination is the manipulation of students into adhering to a set of favored positions. Critics of Catholic education glibly allege that “truth” is the engine of indoctrination. But is it not intuitively more likely, and does not experience confirm, that where there is no truth there is more likely to be manipulation? Where there is no truth, there can be no genuine common good. There can only be shifting consensus about this or that, implying that “right” and “wrong” manifest not things as they are, but interpersonal power relations. This field is ripe for indoctrination.

Finally, the commonly cited opposition between freedom and truth confirms the thesis of this essay: that our academics have lost the Indispensable Conviction. The objection squarely rejects ECE’s defining passage: the Catholic intellectual existentially unites the search for truth with the fount of truth. According to the objection, people who think they have the truth stop searching, and stop thinking.

The objection is falsified every day by believing Catholics, functioning freely and critically, at the highest levels of academic life, in their teaching and in their scholarship. The objectors evidently cannot see them. Nor, apparently, do they see in themselves the harmony between truth and freedom characteristic of the Catholic mind, a harmony beautifully described by the Holy Father in *Veritatis splendor*.

A similar existential blindness keeps alive a com-

mon criticism of celibacy. This stereotype holds that celibates cannot be happy or normal, because regular sexual satisfaction is, allegedly, essential to happiness and normalcy. To this the entirely adequate response is to show them the happy celibate, preferably a high-functioning academic scholar!

Someone might now object: Catholic education cannot be better because it a phantom. Cardinal George and the Pope are simply mistaken in holding, as they do, that the truths of the faith make *that* kind of difference. Catholic education is pretty much the same as other kinds, save that those involved might understand it to be their personal vocation, a special call from God to help build the Kingdom by doing their essentially secular work, well. Show me, this objector exclaims, “Catholic” physics or geometry or computer science!

The response: it is true that Catholics in educational apostolates may understand their work as vocation. They should. But the objection otherwise fails.

The faith possesses a small mortgage on the study of the natural sciences. Scientists investigate matters not constituted by human thought; the discipline proceeds by replicating observable regularities in the external world. But a modest mortgage is not no mortgage at all.

It is true that I -- me, Bradley, the ex-President writing this article -- cannot show anyone a Catholic physics. That is because I know nothing about physics (or geometry or computers for that matter.) I can, on the other hand, give an account of the difference which the truth makes to areas within my ken, such as law, legal philosophy, history. Nothing in my inability to give a demonstration about physics, however, suggests that none is possible. That I, being ignorant, cannot describe a Catholic physics is a fact about me, not about physics.

No one can know what the introduction of the Catholic faith to any subject matter will do unless someone performs the necessary acts of integration. Until someone possessed of a profound un-

derstanding of the faith achieves thorough mastery of a subject matter, we can only know as through a glass, darkly, what the work of integration may yield.

The integration of which I speak may be compared to inculcation of the faith. Imagine a literate and accomplished society, innocent of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The question might be mooted among the missionaries, who have already carefully studied the culture: what would a Catholic Pretorian (a member of our fictional people) look like? No firm response is possible, *ex ante*. The answer necessarily lies at the far end of the work of integration, work commenced by evangelizing the people. No one knew what a Catholic Nigerian would look like until a relatively short time ago, when there first came to be Nigerian Catholics. Now we can all see them, straight on, as they really are.

The Catholic university offering a Catholic education is not a generic product in different wrapping, like laundry detergent or vodka (which, as I understand it, are chemically and in every other substantive way, indistinguishable.) Many Catholic schools today are like vodka: same education you can buy elsewhere, wrapped distinctively and marketed with a lot of hype about the kind of person you must be because you buy Catholic: concerned, caring, different, spiritual.

The Catholic university is not generic. It is not a compound, either. Even though a genuine Catholic university is a university like any other, “Catholic” is not a separate element added to a “university.” “Catholic university” is not an aggregate of two things, it is not a term comprised of adjective and noun.

A Catholic university is an undivided but complex whole. It is simultaneously and always a faith-filled, real university. The faith suffuses the entire institution, and transforms it, and causes it to transcend non-Catholic counterparts.

I can think of two illustrations of this type of complex unity. One is sublime, the other is not. The sublime: marital acts. The sexual act of a married couple is a also single, undivided whole.

The act is nevertheless intelligible according to its twin ends or properties, the unitive and the procreative. The marital act is still not a compound or aggregate of two separable (though distinguishable) characteristics. Subtract either, and there is no marital act at all. None. So, too, a Catholic university: unified whole, recognizably a university, irrevocably Catholic, one and indivisible.

The illustration which is not sublime: the Catholic university is to a university as a contemporary word processor is to the dusty old Royal in your attic. Your Macintosh types better than your old Royal, but you would not say, simply, that the Mac is a better typewriter. The Mac is not a typewriter at all. It surpasses the Royal by incorporating its function – typing – within a qualitatively different, higher functioning system. This prosaic example captures, I think, something important about real Catholic colleges. They carry on teaching and learning like other schools, yet do it better, and different.

## II The Formula

Someone might still object: today’s Catholic institutions may not be not all that they should be. But they are surely not secular. There are undeniable differences, the objector says, between Georgetown or Boston College, on the one hand, and George Washington University or Boston University on the other. If so, how are those differences to be described, save as the difference between Catholic universities and secular universities?

I do not deny that there are differences between, say, BC and BU. I do not deny that these differences may be attributed to the “Catholic” (or “Jesuit) character of the former. I do say that there are very limited differences *intellectually* between them, and that neither logic nor experiences requires us to say that *either* offers a Catholic education. It could be the case that one is more traditional, in an entirely secular sense of the word, than the other, in the way one could rightly say that St. John’s College in Annapolis is different, because it is very traditional, than either

## ARTICLES

Georgetown or George Washington.

Let me explain, starting with what I call, The Formula. The nearly ubiquitous recipe for a Catholic college today is to surround an education indistinguishable from that at other schools with a Catholic collegiate atmosphere. This is “The Formula”. It may distinguish Catholic institutions from secular counterparts in a way that could be called “Catholic”. But it does not mean anyone is getting a Catholic *education*. If The Formula is working, students at most Catholic colleges are getting an off-the-rack education, in an environment conducive to wholesome moral development, to personal piety, and to awakening social consciousness. These latter things constitute the “Catholic collegiate atmosphere.” Considered by themselves, they are very good things. Often enough, things do not go “well”. More important, piety and clean living salted with activism – even if all are present in abundance – do not make a college Catholic.

Some Notre Dame graduates spend two years with Holy Cross Associates. (It is similar to the better known JVC – Jesuit Volunteer Corps.) They live in dorms, share an intense community spiritual life, and they perform corporal works of mercy. Is HCA a university? I think not. Many excellent secular universities, like the University of Illinois where I used to teach, have superb Newman centers, including a dormitory with wholesome rules for single-sex, communal living, opportunities for corporal works of mercy around town, and regular chapel. Does that make the University of Illinois a Catholic university? I don’t think so, even though at Illinois there are more Catholic students – eleven thousand – than at Notre Dame.

Father Peter Ryan of Mount Saint Mary’s writes: “activism on behalf of social justice and a robust ministry program ... important as they are .... are extrinsic to the essential activities of a university: teaching and learning.” Once you set up a university, it is important to have them. But you do not set up a university in order to soup kitchens. You do not keep a university going so that young people go on retreats. Even if every student and staff member works Easter vacation for Habitat

for Humanity, that does not make a college Catholic. You need a Catholic *education* for that.

Teaching and learning and research are the university. Not the collegiate atmosphere. Education is the bellwether of any university, Catholic universities included. We often forget it because today’s controversies have little to do with intellectual things. We treat classroom crucifixes, recognition of pro-choice or gay student groups, and graduation speakers as defining moments. Debate over these matters elbows out the main question: whether the intellectual content of the faith has been evacuated from the classroom.

I do not say these other things have no significance. They matter. They *can* be telltale signs of a college’s apostasy. A Catholic college which takes down crucifixes for fear of offending faculty suffers from terminal mission fatigue. A college which gives an honorary degree to a notoriously pro-abortion politician surely bears false witness.

But these symbols fly true only in the negative direction. They are ratchets, unreliable as indicators of good health. Sometimes a college which has lost its faith in the Redemption does not wish to highlight it by taking down once hallowed, now hollow, signs of lost faith. Pressure from alumni groups may keep the graduation festivities in line, even where the faculty delights in undermining students’ faith. Apostates recognize that appearances matter, especially to parents and donors.

Colleges ought to deny recognition to student gay alliances, save for the rare case where the group accepts the Church’s teaching about chastity for all unmarried persons. But how far does a college’s faith extend? Does it run to where it really matters, the classroom? Is a university Catholic if it denies recognition to the gay student group, but says nothing about the openly gay lifestyle of faculty? Is it a Catholic college if not a single faculty member will publicly defend the Church’s teaching on chastity, even where honorary doctorates are awarded regularly to famous Cardinals? What if no one on the faculty thinks the teaching is *true*?

Some people argue that Catholic colleges are indeed distinguishable -- and superior -- in *intellectual* terms. Alan Wolfe's engaging recent essay in the Chronicle of Higher Education makes this argument. Wolfe, who describes himself as a non-believing Jew, recently moved from Boston University to Boston College at least partly because he wanted a Catholic intellectual environment.

Wolfe recommends that environment on three bases. He welcomes the "natural-law tradition", a phenomenon he scarcely comprehends but which he nevertheless (correctly) perceives "inoculates" adherents against the post-modernism rampant at other schools. Wolfe says that "at its best, respect for natural law gives one the self-confidence that makes possible the passion and curiosity that fuel intellectual inquiry." At its worst, it can lead to "ideological rigidity and inflexible inhumanity". Wolfe here reveals his confusion. He thinks less of natural law if it is of the immutable variety. But natural law is by definition the same, everywhere and all the time.

Wolfe prefers the social justice attachments of Catholic schools to the apathy elsewhere. But he describes nothing more than simple-minded enthusiasm for yesterday's liberal causes, even a knee-jerk anti-Republicanism. He laments that at Catholic colleges they "don't always recognize that there has sometimes been a conflict between the urge to do the right thing and an understanding of the complexities of what the right thing is." He registers surprise at the "liberal intellectual smugness" on Catholic campuses.

Finally, Wolfe welcomes BC's commitment to the intangible. He cites the "correspondence" between writers who take Catholicism seriously, and those take seriously an appreciation of the symbolic, interpretive, and meaning-creating aspects of the human species". He sees in them a welcome relief from the reductionism -- materialism, determinism, evolutionary biology -- found elsewhere.

Wolfe's BC is a pretty decent place, one evidently possessed of more intellectual sanity than most colleges. But he identifies nothing pecu-

liarly *Catholic* about Boston College. Nothing at all. Wolfe describes what every university should be, what almost all American universities were until a generation ago, and what many - though a decided minority -- still are. One could easily name a dozen schools just like Wolfe's BC, except that they are better for being less naively Democratic in their politics. None of the dozen is, or professes to be, Catholic.

Wolfe likens BC's liberal smugness to that of 1950's Ivy League schools. He says that BC's intellectual self-confidence was abundant in American higher education thirty years ago. In all, he provides powerful confirmation that the intellectual life at Catholic schools is not identifiably Catholic, just a bit of throwback to yesterday's *secular* universities.

Alan Wolfe came not to bury Catholic colleges but to praise them. He says little good about them though, save that they are places where people still believe that knowledge is possible. This belief is not a Catholic birthright; it is, or should be, the conviction underlying *any* college. Wolfe succeeds in establishing that BC is indeed a *college*. And in making one wonder what manner of institution is such a place as BU.

### III The Faculty

Some time ago I came across a New York Times story about the abrupt resignation of Brown University president E. Gordon Gee. Brown is a very good, very secular university. Its spokeswoman said that Gee's departure would prove to be a blip in Brown's history. Why? Because, she said, "the soul of a university is its faculty". Just so.

The faculty is the principle of any university. The Catholicity of the faculty is the principle of a Catholic university. No college can be much more, or will be much less, Catholic than its faculty. Without a solidly Catholic faculty there is nothing a college can do to be Catholic; with a solidly Catholic faculty, there is little more that needs to be done. Anyone looking for a bellwether of Catholicity can stop looking, once the faculty is up on the radar screen.

## ARTICLES

“Catholicity” here has a quantitative and a qualitative component. The quantitative term most commonly heard from the academic establishment is “critical mass”, as in: “There must be a critical mass of Catholic faculty so as to make the tradition a real presence on campus”. It may be conceded that, if “real presence” is all that is desired, “critical mass” might do the job. But “real presence” is not nearly enough.

Why? There is no reason to suppose that a college’s faculty need possess or include one “critical mass.” That there be more than one seems to be the end desired end by today’s establishment: they want a “diversity” of voices. Or, say that they do. But why should one of several “critical masses” – the Catholic one – be the earmark of the whole college’s identity? *A fortiori* “real presence”: a great number of them could inhabit the one campus.

The notion of “critical mass” is also misguided. It treats a college as one big faculty seminar, and wonders how many different voices are at the table. Catholicity in colleges is foremost a matter of the classroom, and the transmission of knowledge to students, not to faculty colleagues.

“Critical mass” is also at odds with Church law. The Holy Father says in ECE that a majority of the faculty should be Catholic. Canon Law requires a whole faculty outstanding for “integrity of doctrine” and “probity of life”. *Everyone* who teaches disciplines involving faith and morals is canonically required to make a Profession of Faith.

Quality is as important as quantity. At all but the few orthodox colleges, critical discussion of “quality” is strictly taboo; self-identification as “Catholic” on personnel forms is the conversation stopper. But every sentient being knows that it is willful blindness to treat that “check mark” as a profession of faith.

I submit the following checklist for separating the faculty pretenders from the real thing: what does the institution require of faculty applicants as a demonstration of Catholicity (or, as the case may be of, “integrity of doctrine” and “probity of

life”)? What happens at the candidate’s interview? Is he given to believe that talk of Catholic character is for bingo-playing and rosary-praying donors and parents, and not for faculty? What happens to faculty who give scandal by public dissent or by immoral conduct? Are they dismissed without delay? Does the institution adhere to Canon Law, especially to Canon 812 (the *mandatum*) and Canon 810 (the aforementioned “probity of life” and “integrity of doctrine” requirements)? This list of inquiries is not exhaustive.

One cannot get this information from college videos, view books, occasional football weekends, and the like. But, then, from where? Colleges keep this data, if they compile it, under lock and key. The Formula has a PR addendum: outsiders must not gain access to facts which contradict the college’s assertions of fidelity to the faith. But insiders know better.

Note well: the propositions here advanced about institutional Catholicity and faculty faith are not falsified because solid Catholic teachers are found on most Catholic campuses. Most readers can identify a few, even at their *alma mater*, their kid’s college, or the Catholic university in town, all of which the reader knows to be dubiously Catholic. The real question is, how many? Is orthodoxy the norm, rather than the exception?

There are solid Catholic teachers on almost *every* campus – Catholic, public, private. Ralph McInerny teaches at Notre Dame. But Robert George is at Princeton. Mary Ann Glendon used to be at Boston College. Now she is at Harvard. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese is at Emory, Jim Gordley is at Berkeley, John Finnis is at Oxford (and Notre Dame). Gerry Bradley, for that matter, is at Notre Dame. But he used to be at The University of Illinois.

None of this should not cause surprise. Catholics make up a quarter of the American population. We are as educated as any other religious group. We should therefore expect that Catholics be well-represented, on all campuses. The number of Catholic faculty might be lower in areas (the mountain states and parts of the South) where

Catholics are few, higher at city universities in Chicago, Boston, New York, Philadelphia. For this reason, beware of Catholic institution at which new hires are, say, almost thirty percent Catholic. The college may advertise it as evidence of mission hyper-drive. All it may reliably show is that the institution is not actively discriminating against Catholics.

The most striking fact here may be the scarcity of Catholics at putatively Catholic schools. The number of “check-the-box” Catholics on most Catholic law school faculties (Ave Maria and Notre Dame excepted) is less than twenty-five percent. The number of solid Catholics is scandalously low. By contrast, the percentage of Catholics on the faculty of Illinois law school, when I taught there a decade ago, was higher than that of many Catholic law schools then, and now.

What about “Catholic Studies” programs at Catholic colleges and universities? These are very positive forces on campus, and we should be pleased to have them. But the cautionary tale is this: they are often faithful colonies in an intellectual wasteland. One should bear in mind, too, that Catholic Studies need not be limited to Catholic institutions. There is no legal impediment to establishing such programs even at state-supported institutions. Prospective donors would be wise, too, to fund Catholic studies at prestigious public universities. Among other reasons, the public schools may be less ideologically opposed to appointing “conservative” Catholics to the faculty than Catholic colleges.

#### **IV** **The Future**

Looking around we see a discouraging picture. Catholic colleges and universities, save for a few faithful institutions, are gone. The bishops are indifferent, or otherwise occupied. Rome has had it. Popular demand for genuine Catholic education is modest. What then is to be done?

The (obvious) first question: can we reclaim lost colleges for genuine Catholic education? I think not. They are beyond recall.

Changing Presidents is just a start; without the trustees and money people behind him, he can do almost nothing. Even if united at the top, the faculty has to be remade. It is the principle of any university. Its apostasy is what raises the question of reclamation in the first place. But tenure, the laws against forced retirement, and increased longevity make faculty turnarounds very time-consuming. Often, retiring professors are not replaced. Their line is left vacant. Their courses are taught by instructors or adjuncts, if they are taught at all. Classroom teaching might be improved, if the temps are sound. But part-timers do not participate in academic governance, new hiring, and institutional maintenance. Lasting faculty change is almost impossible during institutional downsizing.

If all goes right, and every opportunity to Catholicize a small faculty is maximized, faculty re-do is a decade-long proposition. Longer at larger schools. Already it is time to select *another* President. And things never go that well. We also have enough recent experience – not a lot, but enough – to see what comes of promising Presidential appointments: very little. The force of inertia is very powerful; the impetus to reform, weak. A pop quiz: other than Steubenville, name a Catholic college or university which has been truly turned around in the last twenty years. Is there another?

More than one President has said to me: if only we could evangelize the faculty, and get students who wanted a Catholic education, then we would be fine. Well, yes. Of course. And if Harvard had a Catholic faculty offering Catholic education to interested students, it, too, would be Catholic. Or as good as.

One of my informant Presidents surely accepts the criteria of Catholicity found in ECE and Canon Law. He holds the Indispensable Conviction. Wishful thinking and hope do not, however, change facts. Objectively, he presides

## ARTICLES

over an institution which is not now Catholic. It is Unitarian or, at most, nearly Episcopalian. And he overlooks a crucial question: how is the ailing school to be regarded during the long haul to restoration?

Honesty requires that prospective students, donors, and faculty be told the truth. But the truth -- that what was once Catholic is no more -- may be a death sentence. The shallow pool of talent and resources available for renewal will run elsewhere, where there is more cause for optimism. No one with talent and faith, and other options, will board a sinking ship.

To the few universities of this description – a President accepting of Church law, determined to turn things around – I offer the following recovery program. It is honest, but no death sentence. The program amounts to provisional Catholic status, a stint in intensive care, a term in limbo.

Here it is, in outline form.

After a frank assessment of the *status quo*, the diocesan bishop and the President jointly and publicly declare that the school is not now satisfactorily Catholic. The leading deficiencies are frankly noted. The bishop then states that the President and he have agreed upon a ten-year plan for Catholic restoration. The bishop declares his confidence that the college will eventually make it. He recommends it as safe for Catholic patronage. That is mainly because, he says, the college is today making the following two changes, effective immediately. First, the President (if he has not already done so) is now taking the Oath of Fidelity and making his Profession of Faith. Second, the college is henceforth following Canon 812. His Excellency explains that only theologians holding the *mandatum*, which the bishop grants upon sufficient showing of fidelity, will teach courses in the theological disciplines. That done, patrons can be sure that where the faith is taught, it really is the faith being taught. The bishop, ultimately responsible for campus ministry anyway, then vouches (if he can) for *its* soundness.

Central to the Plan is the college's commitment to henceforth make faculty appointments, without exception, in line with all relevant Church norms. It is agreed and publicly stated that annual progress reports be compiled and published. The college undertakes to formally announce its secularization at the end of ten years, unless by agreement with the bishop, the Plan is extended for a period of no more than five years.

How does this proposal benefit the college? It survives as a Catholic institution, albeit one on probation. The bishop's blessing and the Plan should fortify Catholic students, donors, potential faculty. And scare off those inimical to Catholic character. The Plan's publicness should also fortify the parties. Along the way they may wish to temporize, backslide, even to deceive. Published standards and regular reports lead them not into temptation. The Plan, or something like it, is the college's last, best hope.

A welcome by-product of introducing the Plan: colleges whose Catholicity is *in extremis* will have to fish or cut bait. Wherever a bishop publishes his willingness to enter into such arrangements, local colleges will sort themselves into two camps, even if the bishop does nothing else, even if the colleges do nothing at all: those whose Catholicity is *obviously* fine, and those which have no announced plan – at least none in collaboration with a willing Ordinary – to restore Catholicity. Of the former there are few; their RSVP will occasion no scandal. Of the latter, potential patrons will have learned something telling.

Very few colleges are candidates for the Plan. Not because they do not need it. They need it, but do not want it. What does the future hold for them? Let me thus put aside the faithful places, the orthodox few most recently joined by Ave Maria University. We should nurture them as prize orchids, and prudently direct additional resources to them. Replications of them ought to be undertaken with great care, and only where adequate money, and out-

standing leadership, are in hand.

I leave aside, but just for now, the prosperous, high-end institutions -- Georgetown, Boston College, Notre Dame. Their success transcends The Formula. Their alumni base, their strong brand identification, and their educational quality judged by secular standards assure their continued flourishing. These schools compete with each other, and with non-Catholic schools a cut below the Ivies, for faculty. Because they are large research universities, the elite Catholics lose no faculty to the smaller, orthodox teaching colleges. Rarely do the elites lose students to them. Later we shall consider possible new Catholic competitors to the elites, for both students and faculty.

Having put aside the elites, the faithful, and the recovering, let us look down market, where the rest of the 235 dwell. What do we see?

A deathwatch. Many small Catholic colleges are already in hospice; others are sure to follow. Over the next generation, dozens of schools will disappear altogether. Dozens more will stop calling themselves Catholic. Given that these places have all abandoned Catholic education, we need only say: *requiescat in pacem*.

The causes of death go beyond the Indispensable Conviction. Demographics matter. Some of these schools are located in city neighborhoods which once teemed with large Catholic families, families squeezed into flats or row houses, families in which blue collar parents propelled their kids beyond the parents' own horizons, to the professions and into the white collar world of commerce. They put their kids aloft by enrolling them at Fordham, the University of Detroit, Loyola, Marquette, or at fictional St. Leo's, from a neglected classic movie starring John Wayne and Donna Reed, *Trouble Along the Way*.

Those inner cities still have kids from blue-collar families, headed by parents with the same aspirations mine and yours had. But they are not Catholic. They place no demands upon in-

ner city schools for genuine Catholic education. They receive none.

Where genuine Catholic education no longer occurs, the honorable choices for a college are three: go on the Plan; accept institutional martyrdom and sell the property to developers; or publicly declare the end of a venerable Catholic apostolate and hang out a secular shingle. This last option eliminates scandal, and gives some students what they want.

Why do "Catholic" schools resist martyrdom? They may be the last institutional apostolates of once populous, vibrant orders of priests, nuns, brothers. Few religious of working age remain to support the retired stalwarts. The order's income is now a fraction of what it once was, and what is today required. Without the college, it might be financial lights out for the community. Make no mistake about it: these schools were founded by heroes, if not by saints. Their past efforts deserve our greatest respect. But the founders would not endorse their successors' deceptions, or their unwillingness to see that God may be calling the place home.

Why do these ghosts linger, without hanging out the new shingle? Some surely believe that serving the inner city just *is* Catholic. Maybe, but that swings entirely free of Catholic *education*, of which they offer none. The students have no interest in the Catholic worldview. They want courses in nursing, business, computer tech, physical therapy, education. Often, even The Formula is watered down: dorms (if any) are occasions of sin. Campus ministry is more new age than Catholic. The students hold jobs to pay tuition. They may eat at the soup kitchen. Volunteer work there is out of the question.

Why, then, keep up the Catholic facade? Well, would anyone pay ten thousand to attend St. Leo's if it sported no halo at all? Not if the same programs were available at City College across the street. St. Leo's faces potentially ruinous competition as a *purely* secular school.

## ARTICLES

Yet it cannot afford to be very Catholic. Or wants to be. It is a precarious existence indeed.

St. Leo's case exposes the Achilles Heel of The Formula. Catholic colleges up and down the food chain are hemorrhaging students to public competitors. The average family income of public school families is now higher than that of Catholic college families. The middle-class is going to State, not to Saint Leo's. The problem is sure to worsen. Capital expenditures and operating costs at private, stand alone campuses drive tuition up and up. Taxpayer pressure keeps it low at State.

Will Catholic colleges bleed to death? Some will. What if a Catholic collegiate atmosphere were available at *public schools*? What if The Formula were available at State, at a third the cost of Saint Somebody's? This could be a doomsday scenario for schools without the Indispensable Conviction.

What if The Formula *plus* some real Catholic education were available at State? Here is a great opportunity to deliver Catholic education to the next generation of college students. Modify supply systems, discount the price, meet the demand curve by colonizing public universities. Starting at the better institutions, establish small Catholic residential colleges on their perimeter. The intention is not to starve St. Leo's but to feed the sheep, wherever they are to be found, with sound teaching and wholesome living. And to do these things at no additional cost. Students have to pay room and board somewhere.

The new Catholic colleges would at first have an informal relation with host institutions. Over time more formal cooperation could be explored, with a view to replicating the Newman Center at the University of Illinois. So far as I know, the University of Illinois is the last state school in which Catholic courses are offered, by the Newman Center, for university credit. Contrary to popular belief, this arrangement runs afoul of no constitutional limitations. Getting credits accepted will be, admittedly, a

difficult but tractable political problem.

Donors could establish Catholic Chairs, even Catholic Studies Programs, at public institutions. Low-overhead delivery systems could also parachute drop Catholic education to secular campuses. Distance learning is suited for this role. Ralph McInerny's video International Catholic University is the prototype. Perhaps, too, an adult-oriented Catholic Educational Television (CET) would work, too. Each could approach adult education more systematically than can, say, Mother Angelica. Each could offer a coherent curriculum, and some measure of certified completion. The Internet could either supplement, or substitute for, these relatively primitive technologies.

For those who prefer live education, Catholic scholars in the area could band together, and offer full day conferences and occasional workshops to all interested parties, students included. Local chapters of the Fellowship, and of kindred groups such as the Society of Catholic Social Scientists, fit this profile. So, too, does the *Lumen Christi* Institute of Chicago. Groups such as the Cardinal Newman Foundation could keep Catholic students in Catholic institutions informed, as could COMPASS for students at secular schools. In all these examples, the center of gravity would be among, but not within, any specific institution -- Catholic or public.

The Catholic Colonization Project outlined above takes demand as is. Is present demand really so modest? Can it be stimulated? If so, how?

I think that demand is now *deceptively* low, and could realistically be stimulated to higher levels.

First, today's demand curve. *Conscious* demand for genuine Catholic education is probably what it seems. And it seems low. Yes, the handful of recent foundations inspire hope. But the total number of students attending Magdalen, St. Thomas More, Ave Maria and the other new schools is less than a large lecture class at Catholic universities. Even if added to

the enrollments at established places, such as Steubenville, Thomas Aquinas and Christendom, the total is still less than enrollment at Georgetown.

Why do I refer to “*conscious*” demand? And say it is “deceptively” low? Because demand for The Formula is *artificially* high; *knowing* choices *against* Catholic education have become almost impossible for ordinary Catholics to make. This is the effect of elite indoctrination, over the course of a generation.

Recall that my point about the Indispensable Conviction was that *elites* either do not hold the truths of the faith, *or* do not think that the truths of the faith make a difference to higher education, *or* both. Because it has long been so, ordinary people cannot help but think the same way. They can scarcely comprehend what a genuine Catholic *education* is, cannot intelligently want it, and certainly are not going to pay much for it. They have come to believe that anyplace with a Grotto is as Catholic as it needs to be. Or, as it can be. They think The Formula *is* Catholic education.

Elites tell them that the only alternatives are a few “conservative” cocoons, populated by children of right-wing parents, afraid to expose their kids to “the real world”.

Elites have been saying: we are Catholic, and those who say we are not, are Catholic fundamentalists. Elites have put the truth under near total eclipse. They substitute their ersatz education for the real thing, which they proceed to caricature beyond almost anyone’s conscious choosing

I do not say that, if only the truth about education were known, Catholics would stampede to the orthodox bastions. But there would be an exodus. Some substantial number of Catholics would, if the truth were made known to them, make different choices.

That ordinary Catholics have been manipulated implies no insult or condescension to them. The fact is, demand for Catholic education is

driven from the top-down, just as demand for liberal education more generally is. And that is because Catholic education, like liberal education, has to be experienced to be known, and being known, to be valued. Sages have long said that it is impossible to convince an innocent that he would be better off liberally educated, should want to be liberally educated, and should be willing to pay for it. One might as well try to explain what red is to a blind person.

Demand for something so sublime as liberal education -- and, by extension, Catholic education -- is generally sustained by authority. This type of “authority” is not a matter of obligation, of formal subordination of one’s will to that of another. (Although any account of the explosion of Catholic institutions after the War has to include, prominently, that some bishops practically interdicted non-Catholic schools.)

“Authority” here is cultural authority, broadly construed. It includes attractive exemplars, family tradition, norms about what the better sort do, and the like. Sometimes a few well-placed individuals possess cultural authority. Think of Michael Jordan. Advertisers have long trafficked in culture authority: “Be Like Mike” is worth millions.

It is not a question of creating this sort of cultural authority, and using it. This authority is always present, working for ill or good. Catholics who have abandoned the Indispensable Conviction exercise precisely this type of authority. So doing, they have marginalized real Catholic education. The challenge now is to take the authority back.

One way is for courageous bishops to speak up. Another is for groups such as the Fellowship to rededicate themselves to *public* – and not strictly academic – discussion of the problem. By now to no one’s surprise, I recommend extreme, if not brutal candor, in such discussions. Perhaps it suffices to say that only the New Evangelization can really do the job.

Perhaps. I add this concrete suggestion: a special new foundation. This one promises to at-

## ARTICLES

tract the top students – and faculty – from the best Catholic institutions. This foundation would nicely supplement the existing heroic witnesses. It would be distinguished in some way from each one of them: larger than most; less insular than some; more intellectually ambitious than others; more engaged with secular intellectuals than perhaps all the others.

I call this foundation “Catholic Swarthmore”. It is to be a medium-sized brilliant liberal arts college. It should be ecumenically Catholic. “Ecumenical” means here avoiding the intellectual stamp of particular schools of Catholic thought, and perhaps even the spiritual direction of a particular order. Everyone united in the faith; where the faith is not definitive, all points of view are welcome.

“Catholic Swarthmore” students, educated by some of the best Catholic faculty in the country, would often aspire to secular graduate and professional schools. If the job is done right, these young Catholic intellectuals could position themselves to enter the academy, and the professions, as agents of conversion. And, by instantiating a true Catholic education, they would stimulate further demand. Their example would be fertile.

The academic scope of “Catholic Swarthmore” should be large enough to sustain a variety of majors, including those necessary for the students to gain admission to medical school. The size should be sufficient to sustain a vibrant and varied (within limits) collegiate atmosphere: intercollegiate athletes, student clubs of diverse sorts, drama, journalism. A student body of between twelve hundred and two thousand would do.

Faculty resources should be sufficient to attract and keep those who are primarily teachers, but who are also active scholars engaged with the best in their fields – within and without the Catholic intellectual world. If so, “Catholic Swarthmore” could attract the best and brightest Catholics not only from the elite Catholic schools, but also from the top public and private

universities in the country.

### Conclusion

The FCS is at a turning point. From the start we have dedicated ourselves to putting our intellectual gifts at the service of Jesus and His Church. That mission is still good; in season and out there will always be good work to do. But the focal points of our efforts must change. Until now they have been two: reforming the colleges, and serving as the hierarchy’s scholarly arm. The colleges are done, and the hierarchy is nearly in meltdown. The bishops have not sought our scholarly assistance very much, anyway.

I leave to others what to do about the bishops’ wariness of the FCS, save to observe that no one should presume it reflects poorly upon the Fellowship.

From Father Lawler’s recollections of the event, we see that the FCS was founded principally as a response to campus apostasy. Our fortunes have been intertwined with that of the colleges and universities ever since. *Intertwined*, but fortunately not *identical with*. We are a fellowship of individual Catholic scholars, not an association of institutions. Our statement of purposes contains not a word about colleges or universities. Many of our members toil in secular schools, or outside the academy altogether. As the membership files of our foreign affiliates suggest, the FCS could flourish even where -- as in Australia and England and someday in America -- there is scarcely a Catholic college to be found. FCS efforts in favor of Catholic education will now be less *institutionally* focused. I hope this paper stimulates productive discussion of where the new focal points lie.

The work promises to be different, but no less worthwhile. Our children face a world our parents could not have imagined. Our children must claim a living from an economy in which a strong back, and discipline enough to get up on time each morning, secures no family wage. It did for our parents, and even for some of our

generation. Our affluence permits us to purchase a Catholic education for the new millennium. An education both contemporary, and timeless. Composed of novel solutions to undreamed of problems, and of perennial truths.

The Pope says in ECE that "the future of the Church and of the world is being played out as we conclude the twentieth century. There is only one culture: that of man, by man. And thanks to her universities, the Church explores the mysteries of humanity and of the world, clarifying them in light of revelation."

The mysteries of cyberspace are new. The truths entrusted to the care of the Church are not new. But those truths will light up the challenges of cyberspace -- and globalization and asexual reproduction of human beings -- just as they did the challenges of centuries gone by: the invention of the printing press, of steam power; of gunpowder, of money; the discovery of the ovum, and of the atom; the rise of the nation state, of the United Nations, of space travel. A true Catholic education will give our children what they need, in order to be leaven in the societies they will have to build, and which they will inhabit.

### **AQUINAS COLLEGE PHILOSOPHY and THEOLOGY POSITIONS**

The current full-time positions for theology and philosophy will primarily concern the adult accelerated, evening programs, with less teaching responsibility in the traditional setting. Candidates with a terminal degree are preferred, though Masters' level will be considered. Teaching experience is also preferred.

Those who may wish to inquire further about these opportunities may contact Sister Mary Justin, Academic Dean, at 615-297-7545 ext 425 or by e-mail: [haltom@aquinas-tn.edu](mailto:haltom@aquinas-tn.edu).

#### **Nursing Faculty Position**

Aquinas College, a Catholic institution under the Direction of the Dominican Sisters in Nashville, Tennessee has a full-time faculty position vacancy in its RN to BSN Program beginning in August 2002. An MSN in adult health or med-surg is required, doctorate in nursing, preferred. Current clinical experience required. Job requirements include classroom teaching, student advisement, clinical site arrangement, and committee responsibilities. Please fax vitae with copies of transcripts and 4 references to Dr. Linda Watlington, Director, (615) 222-4008. Aquinas College, 4210 Harding Road, Nashville, Tn. 37205.

## **Membership Matters**

By Christopher M. Janosik

Thanks to all who have nominated colleagues for membership to the Fellowship. Each receives a letter of invitation, our statement of purpose, an application, and preliminary information concerning our upcoming 25<sup>th</sup> annual convention.

At April's meeting of the **Board of Directors**, the directors approved a motion to fill vacancies created upon the election of Dean Bernard Dobranski to the office of vice president, and the appointment of Dr. Chris Janosik to Executive Secretary. Dr. Steve Miletic (Franciscan University) will complete Dean Dobranski's term through 2004. Dr. Patrick Metress (Catholic Research Center) will complete Dr. Janosik's term through 2003.

The Board accepted with appreciation, Fr. Matthew Gamber's proposal to assemble an "**Experts Guide**" for the Fellowship, to be circulated to various media outlets for the purpose of acquainting television, radio, and print media with our membership and its expertise.

The **nomination and election** of new board members to replace outgoing directors Dr. J. Brian Benestad (University of Scranton), Dr. Stephen Krason (Franciscan University), Rev. Msgr. James Schall, SJ (Georgetown University), and Rev. John Rock, SJ (Gonzaga University) is underway. Only regular members who have paid dues for the current year are eligible to vote. Please return your ballot promptly.

Long time Fellowship board member, former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Education, and vocal advocate of Catholic higher education, KENNETH WHITEHEAD has received the Distinguished Service Award from the Brent Society of the Diocese of Arlington.

Congratulations to DR. PAUL VOSS, formerly of Georgia State University, who has become vice president for academics at Georgia's first Catholic institution of higher education, Southern Catholic University.

Members of the Fellowship continue a distinguished contribution to Catholic scholarship. Among these are:

MSGR. GEORGE A. KELLY, whose article, "The 2<sup>nd</sup> Catholic Scandal: Downsizing the Legitimate Rights and Pastoral Concerns of Orthodox Catholic Believers" appeared in the *Catholic World Report* (March, 2002).

JAMES HITCHCOCK, who contributed to both the *Catholic Dossier*, "From Survivalism to Recusancy" (March/April, 2002) and the *Catholic World Report*, "Subversion Through the Good Old Boys Network" (June 2002).

ELIZABETH FOX-GENOVESE, who contributed "The Way of Conversion" to *Crisis Magazine* (June, 2002).

REV. JAMES SCHALL, whose "Catholicism and the Truth of Things" appeared in *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, (May, 2002).

REV. DONALD HAGGERTY, who recently published "Letter to a Newly Ordained Priest" in *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* (April, 2002).

REV. JOHN F. KOBLER, whose reviews of two books, *Between Two Ages: The 21<sup>st</sup> Century and the Crisis of Meaning* by William Van Dusen Wishard and *The Death of the West: How Dying Populations and Immigrant Invasions Imperil Our Country and Civilization* by Patrick J. Buchanan appeared in *Social Justice Review* (May/June, 2002).

REV. MICHAEL ORSI, who recently published "Bishops Forget Souls" in *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, (May, 2002).

PHILIP BLOSSER, who recently published "The Kasper-Ratzinger Debate & the State of the Church" in *New Oxford Review*, (April, 2002).

RAYMOND DENNEHY, who recently completed his 30<sup>th</sup> semester debating proponents of abortion, has published *Anti-Abortionist at Large: How to Debate Abortion Intelligently and Live to Talk About It* (Trafford Publishing).

ANNE BARBEAU GARDNER, whose "Elizabeth Cellier, the Popish Midwife - A Woman for All Seasons" appeared in *Catholic Dossier*, (March/April, 2002).

THOMAS MORROW, who has published "Evangelium Vitae: A Cultural Time Bomb" in *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, (May, 2002).

RICHARD ROLWING, who recently published second volumes of his *Israel's Original Sin: A Catholic Confession*, and *My Daily Constitution: A Natural Law Perspective*. Both are available from Xlibris Press.

RONALD RYCHLAK, who contributed "Goldhagen v. Pius XII" to *First Things*, (June, 2002).

THOMAS SCHECK, who has translated *Origin: Commentary on the Epistle to the Roman* from Rufinus' Latin translation from the original Greek. The two volume work has been published by the Catholic University Press as volumes 103 and 104 of the *Fathers of the Church* series.

RUSSEL SHAW, who has recently written "The Very Model of A Modern Bishop" for *Crisis Magazine*, (May, 2002).

WILLAIM TIGHE, whose review of *The Voices of Moreath: Reformation and Rebellion in an English Village* by Eamon Duffy appeared in *New Oxford Review*, (May 2002).

KENNETH WHITEHEAD, who recently published "The Latest Anti-life Thrust: Emergency Contraception" in *New Oxford Review*, (March, 2002).

RICHARD YOUNG, whose "John Donne, Richard Crashaw, and the Mystery of God's Grace" appeared in *Catholic Dossier*, (March/April, 2002).

MICHAEL BEHE, who has rewritten his chapter from the FCS's *Science and Faith* (2001) for the Catholic Educator's Resource Center.

The Catholic Educator's Resource Center provides an Internet library of journal articles, essays, book excerpts, and other texts chosen for their objective, concise, and clear presentation of Catholic teachings, history, and culture, particularly in areas in which the Church's role is unknown or misunderstood.

See: [www.catholiceducation.org](http://www.catholiceducation.org)

---

All members of the Fellowship are encouraged to submit news of appointments, awards, and publications directly to the Executive Secretary for this column.

If you know of contributions, or if you would like to help "scan" Catholic periodicals to help ensure timely recognition for our members, please contact christopher.janosik@villanova.edu

Preference will be given to events that have already taken place, and publications that are available in print, subject to limitations of space in each issue of the *Quarterly*.

## BOOK REVIEWS

Schall, James V., S.J. *On the Unseriousness of Human Affairs.* (ISI Books, Wilmington, DE. 001), 250pp

Among the things I cherish are a darkly cold rob roy with two cherries, a skillfully turned third base to second to first double play, the dance music of Eddie Duchin, and a slow burning cigar.

Also on that list is anything written by James V. Schall, S.J. whose theme in *Unseriousness* is joy, whose existence, he says, is harder to explain "than death, sadness, evil or finitude."

There they sit on my shelf, Father Schall's thousands of pages, a procession of wit, cunning, irony, intensity and humility-inducing reflection. He is a keeper, since all of us need and many of us want keystones.

My father's father had a heart-beat of 14, so he slept just three hours a night. By his 40's (he died at 91 in 1933) he had read everything important in English or translated to English.

Probably no one can any longer do that---not to mention what's important in writings not yet rendered to English. So one has to be careful whom he selects for his teachers.

For as Father Schall says, taking from Plato, "We cannot afford to make a mistake

about the highest things because we have only one lifetime in which to get it right."

In trying to get things right, no one can err in using Father Schall's books. For folks like me, his works are reminders that we've missed our opportunities. I read a great deal and I know many things. But I am not educated, I am not learned and I am not wise. He is wise. For those of us on that raft, Father Schall's is the kind of lifeline we avidly grasp for.

Be advised: Despite the charming title, this book is not a featherweight churn-out. It demands hard work to see what Father Schall believes about joy and how the aura of joy affects everything we are and try to be. I had to work hard when, for example, I read Father Schall discussing, regarding Greek teachers (pp 12-15), "... the fact that man is a mere plaything of God is indeed the "best" thing about him."

The Greek teacher, Father Schall goes on, doesn't mean there is nothing serious about man's affairs, but rather that they pale compared to the "madness of the divine being breaking into the world; there is something more wondrous"---that the affairs of God are "infinitely greater than the most fascinating of human affairs."

A number of writers influence the way Father Schall thinks

about joy, notably Josef Pieper, who wrote that joy is a result of what we do, that it comes from, in Pieper's words, "our receiving or possessing something we love.... One who loves nothing and no one cannot rejoice no matter how desperately he wishes to ..."

If you welcome good natured quarrels and debates, whether with students or colleagues or friends, then *Unseriousness* is for you. Get them to read Father Schall's new book, George Weigel's biography of the Holy Father, Chesterton's *Orthodoxy* and Ron Hansen's latest volume of essays, *A Stay Against Confusion*.

Then watch the adrenaline-caused sparks fly. All four works are rich in the compelling matters of pride; why too much of the wonderful material things God has given us can be, well, wonderful; why if you are wrapped up in yourself you are indeed a very small package; the phoniness of state organized or compelled charity; the bankruptcy of utopianism; how you cannot attack poverty unless you understand what creates wealth; whether we are helpless, as Father Schall puts it, "to eradicate our intellectual poverty," and where to go to learn the "whole truth about man."

Father Schall is an optimist, since he sees that life is good by the very fact that God gives it to us, but I believe he

is a realist because he sees our prosperous civil society as declining and corrupt. In thinking about Aristotle, Father Schall says that "our only charter of freedom, our only avenue to both joy and happiness" may be in seeking to do what is virtuous.

If you are not teachable, if you are not enchanted hearing Belloc saying he had love in youth and memory in old age, if you do not believe we deal ourselves our own punishments, if you don't agree with Father Schall that man is a question-posing creature, then *Unseriousness* if not for you.

If you like Father Schall's saying that when the Greek gods knocked off for the day, they saw there was no one to praise what was created so they came up with the muses, whence song, poetry, dance and the arts—if you fancy that then *Unseriousness* is for you.

Father Schall doesn't say it but he could well have. This book, addressed to question-asking creatures, as it is, is a soul friend to The Tragic Sense of Life by the Spaniard Miguel de Unamuno. Its last sentence says: May God deny you peace but give you everlasting joy.

*John Adam Moreau, Ph. D.  
Richmond, VA*

\* \* \*

McDonough ,Peter and  
Bianchi.,Eugene C.  
*Passionate Uncertainty: Inside the American Jesuits.*  
(University of California Press, 2002.), 380 pp.

Co-author McDonough is Professor of Political Science at Arizona State University. He spent nine years in Jesuit schools, has written a history of the Jesuits in America, and has specialized in the transition from authoritarianism to democracy in political regimes. Bianchi is Professor Emeritus of Religion at Emory University, co-edited *A Democratic Catholic Church* (1992), was a founding member of CORPUS, and contributes to the *National Catholic Reporter*. After 20 years as a Jesuit he left the Jesuits in 1968.

In the United States there are today about 4,000 Jesuits and 5,000 ex-Jesuits. This book tries to give a picture of them. The authors obtained information from over 200 in each group from interviews or from written reports on submitted topics. The book presents very many quotations from these two sources.

This sociological study is not easy to summarize because of the complexity of the situation. It is a very important book because what it says of the Jesuits is true at least to some extent of most of the religious communities of men in the United States and Canada and, no doubt, *mutatis*

*mutandis*, also of the large communities of nuns. It is concerned chiefly with the problems that present-day American Jesuits have to contend with. They are as follows:

1. The most basic one, it seems to me, is that, though there is a minority of Jesuits in sympathy with the Church's Magisterium, the majority are dissenters, that is, they either contradict or doubt the Church's teaching. "Dissent from the Magisterium is a fact of life in the Society of Jesus" (p. 290). There are not many who dissent in a very public way, out of prudence, or because their Superior General has told them not to, or because they think they can do little about changing things, or because they are too busy with the work they're doing. Some of the chief matters they find hard to accept are the Church's teaching on sexuality (particularly concerning contraception and homosexuality), the ordination of women to the priesthood, and the divinity of Christ. There is also dissent about topics which are not matters of faith, such as clerical celibacy and the ordination of married men.

2. The decline in numbers has put a strain on all existing apostolates. It also necessitates calling upon the laity to do most of the things the religious were doing, resulting finally in advancing some of the laity to positions

## BOOK REVIEWS

of leadership. At this point the question has arisen why priests are needed at all. This creates a crisis in the understanding of priesthood, and this, in a celibate clergy, in the understanding of celibacy. Why should a man sacrifice having a wife and family (the sacrifice involved in poverty and obedience don't seem to get mentioned) if he isn't really needed as a priest? The role of the parish priest is clearer, but the priest's role in schools is not as easily grasped.

"None of the men I know," a seminary official, deeply committed to social justice, observed, "care about being a priest. What matters is being a Jesuit." Such doubts reflect the declining acceptability of celibacy as a prerequisite for ordination. The problem has as much to do with the dubious link between celibacy and priesthood as with the customarily privileged connection between priesthood and ministry. In either case, the sacerdotal legacy has fallen on hard ground" (210).

And the authors here give us a warning: "A significant corollary of this reasoning is an idea that we cannot prove but that is sufficiently counterintuitive yet plausible to merit attention. As the role of celibacy in solidifying group solidarity has receded, the importance of sexual orientation – that is, homosexuality – has probably increased in same-sex religious communities.

The underlying hypothesis is that both celibacy and counter-cultural sexual orientation have social functions, setting groups apart from the mainstream. A queer subculture furnishes some of the social distinctiveness once provided in more institutional fashion, during the days of immigrant Catholicism, by the observance of celibacy" (108).

"The step form inching up to the abyss to peering into it is short. Some Jesuits have resigned themselves to the prospect of the extinction of the Society. The question is no longer survival but how long the death will take. Anger flares up not at the Society but at a Church that thwarts the new ideal of resignation and honorable withdrawal: the handover of once-clerical roles to the laity" (210).

"Jesuits comes close to being present as iconic decor, part of the atmosphere, for operations largely staffed and run by lay-people" (281).

3. American Jesuits are not given a picture of where they are going. They think that their superiors are in denial of the real state of affairs and unable to make decisions about what is going to happen and how to deal with it. And of course this has a great effect on recruitment of new members.

This question of "demoralization and self-doubt" is not faced directly but

is evaded in a variety of ways such as by having psychological therapy or by turning to counter-cultural pursuits such as fighting dissent, studying Eastern religions, helping the marginalized, or supporting the homosexual cause.

4. The application of the Jesuit decision to make a preferential option for the poor has become contentious. The high schools find it difficult to put it into practice and at the same time keep up the high standard of education they are known for. And it is hard to know how to work it efficiently into the universities.

5. Some Jesuits are able to be satisfied with the close friendships made in the Community, but most of them have friendships outside the Community as well. Some friendships arise naturally from the conditions of their work but others are sought to fill the need for intimacy. Often friendships with women are fostered, which may bring their own problems. The chief reason for Jesuits having left the Order is loneliness and the need for intimacy. Other frequent reasons are dissent and loss of the meaningfulness of the priesthood.

6. There is a homosexual subculture at least among the younger members. This can cause friction with heterosexual members, and also raise questions about the future of celibate community life.

7. With Jesuits now having to

contend with others for certain posts, it is more difficult to place men in Jesuit institutions.

8. The American immigrant culture which favored the growth of the Jesuits no longer exists. What was provided so admirably by the priesthood and the religious life can now be provided, at least in their non-supernatural aspects, in other callings. [This, of course, would apply to all Communities and yet not all are foundering.]

9. Concerning spirituality, "the Society of Jesus aims to provide meaning, fellowship, and work that, its members feel, makes a difference . . . In recent years, attainment of these ideals in unison has slipped out of reach. The context of Jesuit spirituality has been radically altered. The inherited system of beliefs has been shaken, the ties of community have been stretched thin, and Jesuits barely control ministries bent on going their own way" (130). Also, "we have seen repeatedly that for many Jesuits . . . the rejection of absolutes has encouraged a keener sense of gradations in spiritual life. The image of a fluid continuum fits much of their experience. The change has promoted the humanization of spirituality, and from this perspective the appeal of the psychological vocabulary and techniques that, some argue, have displaced 'the truly religious' seems straightforward. Evidently, religion has

been naturalized" (156-7).

10. "In addition, the more that Jesuits – especially but not exclusively those in higher education – get caught up in national job markets, the stronger their professional loyalties may be than their ties to local communities" (163).

On the whole this book portrays a pitiable portrait of religious life. It makes us cease to wonder why the periodical *America* is the way it is, why Jesuit universities could have fought *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* for so long, why Father Fessio could have been so badly treated, or why the Jesuit Father Rodger Charles in England was forbidden to publish his book about the English Jesuits.

I would recommend that the leaders of **every** religious community master the lessons that can be learned from this book and put into practice right away whatever is needed in order to remove the problems recounted here.

*Leonard A. Kennedy, C.S.B.*

\* \* \*

Edited by Stravinskas, The Reverend Peter M. J.  
*Priestly Celibacy Its Scriptural, Historical, Spiritual, and Psychological Roots.*  
(Newman House Press, 2002)  
172 pp.

Eight bishops, five archbishops, and two Cardinals highly recommend this anthology

defending priestly celibacy in the Roman Rite. I certainly do. Contributors are two lay theologians, the priest editor who has multiple degrees beyond his theological ones, a priest historian, a Protestant minister, his wife, and a lady doctor who is a professor of pastoral medicine in Poland who works with Pontifical Councils. Finally, a four-page excerpt of John Paul's "Letter to Priests" follows the full encyclical of Pope Paul VI's 1967 "On the Celibacy of the Priest."

Pope John XXIII expressed my own conviction and sentiments in his second address, 1/26/60: "It deeply hurts Us that . . . anyone can dream that the Church will deliberately or even suitably renounce what from time immemorial has been, and still remains, one of the purest and noblest glories of her priesthood."

Liberals have long claimed that medieval Councils invented priestly celibacy to keep church property from passing out of its hands to clerical heirs. Nonsense. Celibacy goes back to the beginning. Imagine any current Protestant (or orthodox) church today trying to introduce clerical celibacy. It would be as unsuccessful as it is unlikely. The first Council addressing it was that of Elvira representing all of Spain in 305AD. Its disciplinary canons, dealing as such do, with infractions of traditional imperatives, simply

## BOOK REVIEWS

forbad married bishops, priests, and deacons to have sexual relations with their wives. Imagine introducing that anywhere unless you can work miracles and call down heavenly fire! No, priestly celibacy goes back to both to apostolic times and to Jesus himself, as this book shows.

The Protestant minister and his wife are both wonderfully profound and practical. The Polish doctor has a good heart but a light head; her psychology is superficial. The theologians admit that celibacy is only a discipline and reversible, not a divine law, but they appeal, as do the two Popes, to a very rich and manifold theology, biblical, doctrinal, sacramental, anthropological, moral, ascetical, and mystical, to explain and justify the discipline. It has to be more than merely and arbitrary discipline. Read them and weep for those unappreciative.

But the book has some weaknesses. The editor remarks that the lack of priestly celibacy in Orthodoxy has inhibited missions and kept those churches ethnic. Latin priests have spread the faith through all nations. Sounds insightful. But he overlooks the married Protestant missionaries whose numbers overwhelm those of Catholic missionaries in the last two centuries.

Good language has long been a problem for Catholics here. Granted Trent defined that virginity and celibacy are su-

perior to marriage. But calling them perfect chastity make married chastity or single chastity or a widow's chastity imperfect. That's not really the message of the witness. And there are other frequent uses of terminology that have long been unsatisfactory. It might have helped us reach some clarity if the book had addressed the meaning of celibacy for homosexual clergy. It recalls that both Ordination and Matrimony occur at the altar, the sacred place of sacrifice. But giving up marriage, and even romantic relationships with females, is no sacrifice of a homosexual. Belonging to a male club, expected to socialize primarily with males and fellow priests, he is at play in the fields of the Lord. He might be chaste, but is he celibate, and if so, to what does his celibacy witness?

A celibate priest gives up not only marriage, children and a family, but even dating individual females. A single chaste person can date all his adult life, and even go-steady for years. The celibate priest has renounced any pursuit of some woman, any search for any one woman, plus all entertainment of those actions and desires for them. He makes himself a eunuch for the kingdom of heaven.

No one alludes to the meaning of celibacy practiced for millennia by many Hindu and Buddhist monks. And only Pope Paul even hints at the

Manichean tendencies among the Fathers of the Church which considered sex itself as unclean and the female as its source. The Old Testament itself is not free of such lack of respect for God's creation. Our theology and witness has not always been as glorious as Pope John XXIII thinks. But we can only say that because the mind of Christ progressively overcomes the Church.

The priest editor complained the never during this eight years in the seminary did he have a course in celibacy or a day of retreat about it, or even a spiritual conference about it. I found the last unbelievable until he continued, "The few times that the topic of celibacy did come up for discussion, we were told that, by the time we were ordained, celibacy would be optional." Is this book a Godsend or what?

*Richard J. Rolwing  
Reynoldsburg, Ohio*

\* \* \*  
Translated and edited by  
Peters, Edward N., JD, JCD  
**The 1917 or Pio-Benedictine  
Code of Canon Law**  
(Ignatius Press, 2001)

One gains a certain perspective on the antiquity and complexity of the Catholic Church through even a casual study of the history of canon law. At many different times and places the Church confronted concrete problems of all sorts and crafted responses as

wisely as it could. Mindful of its position as the possessor of a body of revealed doctrine and a tradition of living out the implications of that doctrine, the Church assembled a collection of the canons, decrees, and legislative bits and pieces of councils and popes. By the middle of the twelfth century this collection included thousands of items but was disorganized and discordant. At that time, Gratian, a brilliant scholar of whose life we know little, organized the legal heritage of the first millennium of the Church's history into a useful, coherent collection. Gratian's *Decretum* became the foundation for canon law for the next millennium.

Additional collections followed, but irregularly and without the coherence of Gratian's work. By the nineteenth century, the volumes of canon law were more a daunting reference library, requiring a great deal of patience and specialized knowledge, than a systematic body of law. Some laws had been abandoned, others were in conflict, and still others provoked questions about authenticity and authority. Bishops from around the world pleaded with the Holy See to do something to relieve them from the pastoral burden of laws piled upon laws.

In 1904 Pope St Pius X responded to these pleas by creating a pontifical commission to organize the laws of the Church: to edit them for con-

sistency, to arrange them in a clear and logical order, and to bring them up to date. The result was the first-ever codification of the laws of the Church, which was promulgated in 1917 and became effective the following year. The present volume is the first and only translation into English of the entire 1917 Code of Canon Law. Since the 1917 Code has been supplanted by the revision of 1983, it is quite natural to ask why a translation of the earlier Code would appear now. Who should be interested in an 85-year-old, obsolete collection of laws?

Clearly this is a volume that will not find its way into every Catholic home, nor even into the office of every Catholic theologian. Nevertheless, it is a valuable and exceptionally well-done contribution to legal scholarship.

Translations of the entire 1917 Code have not appeared before because they were prohibited on the principle that translations from the governing Latin text would create confusion and conflicts in application. Furthermore, it was (wrongly) assumed that anyone who needed to consult the Code would be able to read the Latin without difficulty. This, of course, is no longer the case, and Peters's work has made the Code accessible to many who are not confident of their ability to manage the original.

Far from being merely the

object of antiquarian interest, the 1917 Code is a particularly important moment in the history of the development of Church law. The current Code of Canon Law did not emerge full-grown from the minds of the commission charged with producing it. It is instead the latest refinement of one of the oldest possessions of the Church. If one genuinely wishes to understand the 1983 Code, it will often be necessary to investigate the origins of its provisions. The first step in such an investigation will usually be the 1917 Code.

Peters's translation is fluid, accurate, and eminently readable. He manages to preserve the clarity of the Code without falling into Latinisms that would distress modern readers. This alone would be worth the price of the text, but he provides much more.

Each article of the Code is cross-referenced in the text with other articles of the 1917 Code and with the 1983 Code. The reader is not forced to consult a cumbersome table to obtain the references. Furthermore, Peters provides at each canon references to pertinent articles in the *Canon Law Digest* and dissertations from the schools of Canon Law in Washington, Ottawa and Rome. Anyone who has attempted to research a topic in the law will immediately recognize how great a help this will be.

Nor is this all the volume pro-

## BOOK REVIEWS

vides. Peters has provided a number of important collateral documents, such as the Apostolic Constitution promulgating the text and Cardinal Gasparri's historical introduction.

Peters has done a fine job of translation and editing, and offered a quiet but very useful contribution to scholars who wish to understand better the mind of the Church in pastoral matters. There is no doubt that this will be the definitive English translation of the 1917 Code and that it will set a high standard for similar basic reference work in the future.

Robert G Kennedy, PhD  
Department of Catholic Studies  
University of St Thomas

\* \* \*

Ranft, Patricia  
**A Woman's Way: The Forgotten History of Women Spiritual Directors.**  
(New York: Palgrave, 2000).  
254 pp.

Consistently Patricia Ranft's volumes cover the impressive span of virtually the entire Christian era, demonstrating each time that biblical, patristic, and medieval Christianity acknowledges women as spiritually equal to men and consequently values women's intellectual and leadership abilities. And, one should note, Ranft has been severely put down by ideological feminists for her politically inconvenient research. Justly she faults analyses based on "anachronistic reading of

texts, a lack of appreciation for the historical context, and a failure to appreciate what the facts of these women's lives tell us." Further, she accurately identifies the reason for the modern surprise when the positive roles of women in Christianity from the start are demonstrated. The culprit is

the general framework that dominates contemporary thought patterns: the subtle pervasive belief in historical progress. Call it development, evolution, social Darwinism, progressivism, dialectic process, or whatever; most people in our culture possess a deep-seated belief that history is the story of all things eventually improving and advancing. If nineteenth- or twentieth-century women were not key agents in the history of their period, if they were perceived to be inferior to males in almost all realms, if they could not attain the chief goals of that society on an equal basis with men, then surely women were much worse off a thousand years ago. . . . Increasingly[, however,] historians are finding that women from antiquity and the Middle Ages possessed much more power in their society than previously thought— or than many possess in modern times. (*A Woman's Way*, p. 2)

In this and her other work, Ranft shows that modern problems are rooted in the

Reformation and Enlightenment. The Reformers, she shows, "attacked institutions within Christianity that fostered women's visibility and high status, specifically monasticism, saints, and Mariology." Next, the Enlightenment's attacks against religion hit at women by eroding the traditional recognition of their spirituality: as the *philosophes* reiterated their view that women were physically weak and incapable of rationality, "the position of women suffered accordingly."

In *A Woman's Way* Ranft examines a range of positive roles filled by Christian women from the Mother of God through Therese of Lisieux. An invaluable compendium of documentation of the intellectual and spiritual attainments of nearly two hundred women and of their use of these attainments for the good of others, this volume provides both a useful entree to primary and secondary sources and also provocative insights and reminders. A fine bibliography and index are included. Her study begins with many of the women recorded in the New Testament. Her treatments of "Woman" as a form of address and of the evangelical work of the Samaritan woman at the well are particularly perceptive. Holy female relatives and colleagues of the Greek and Latin Doctors of the Church are treated next. Three generations of saints (grandmother Macrina the

Elder, her daughter Emmelia, and granddaughter Macrina the Younger, eldest sister of Basil the Great and Gregory of Nyssa) are provided alongside others, such as Olympias of Constantinople, whose names are less familiar.

Marcella, a colleague of Jerome, was patently the spiritual director to the women associated with her in Rome, including Paula and her daughter Eustochium, who became the spiritual directors of the nuns in the double monastery Paula and Jerome founded in Bethlehem.

Indeed, abbesses are regularly spiritual directors, and Ranft rightly calls attention to Melanie the Younger, Melanie the Elder, and the amma Talis who directed some sixty nuns in twelve monasteries (54-55). The desert fathers patently included women, such as Syncletica, Theodora, and Sarah, who were spiritual guides. Ranft epitomizes their thought and notes that, in the Alphabetical Collection of the sayings of the desert fathers, “the ammas’ saying are listed in their normal alphabetical order, interspersed with those of abbas” (53), that is, it was a matter of course to treat these women as authoritative. The range of abbesses from Syrian to Anglo-Saxon and continental is well represented. Five future bishops were among the numerous men and women the abbess Hilda of Whitby ruled and instructed, as is known from the Vener-

able Bede in his *Historia Ecclesiastica* (60). Tetta and Leoba ably supported Boniface in his effective missionary work and were demonstrably the spiritual directors of their monastery. He praised the latter as having served God with zeal and sincerity equal to his (63).

Effectively Ranft juxtaposes two medieval women whose extensive spiritual direction used quite different modes: Hadewijch, a thirteenth-century Beguine who instructed men and women, including Pope Eugenius, through letters, and Hildegard of Bingen, a powerful abbess of the Benedictine order, whose instruction is more famous (Chapter 4). Mystics are well discussed, including Catherine of Siena, Julian of Norwich, Birgitta of Sweden, and Catherine of Bologna.

In the sixteenth century the linking of spiritual direction with confession led to the principle that nuns might select their confessors. Mary Ward, founder of the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, specified that women should choose confessors who believed in the spiritual equality of the sexes (108-09). Teresa of Avila is presented as the spiritual director of John of the Cross (110-11) and “Teresan direction” is treated in detail (129-41). The voluminous correspondence of Jane Frances de Chantal documents both her own direction of specific women and also

her advising other religious superiors about their direction in their own houses (116). Protestant women are considered in a full chapter, treating, e.g., Jane Ratcliffe who gave spiritual direction to a small group (159) and Susanna Wesley, who is described as giving spiritual direction to her children (167). In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Roman Catholic women, especially nuns, were conscious of providing spiritual direction (173), and details are given of the practices and spirituality of Madeleine Sophie Barat, founder of the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and others. The study culminates in Therese of Lisieux.

The laudable goal of *A Woman’s Way*, namely, comprehensive consideration of women’s equal ability with men to contribute in a ministry of service based on “a grasp of ultimate realities and the ability to communicate the grasp to others” (to quote the book’s final paragraph), led Ranft to a broadened definition of spiritual direction in order to include patristic and medieval women who lived before the time when the notion of spiritual direction was defined. Ordinarily “spiritual direction” implies a sustained, authoritative, and acknowledged relationship between a director and a directee. Instead, Ranft draws on logotherapy to posit that moving others to seek happiness in God constitutes spiritual

## BOOK REVIEWS

direction (5-6). Perhaps this definition was also intended further to demonstrate another area in which women from the start of Christianity had “private, informal (read ‘female’) power” (2). In any case, the too-inclusive definition, applied only to women, results in overstatements that pepper the first few chapters. Thus, Mary at Cana (John 2) is asserted to have given the “first spiritual direction . . . in Christianity” (10) and the evangelical work of the Samaritan woman in her community is deemed spiritual direction. Yet if proclaiming Jesus the Messiah, as the Samaritan woman did (John 4:28-30), is spiritual direction, then already Andrew and Philip had given spiritual direction to Simon and Nathaniel (John 1:40-45). Again, it is asserted that “Christian spirituality— indeed Christianity itself— formally begins with Mary Magdalene” (12) and that the “gospels offer women as the most responsive to Jesus’ directives and, therefore, the chief models to be imitated by all” (17). Such claims would have to be individually argued, impossible when treating two millennia in two hundred pages.

Similarly, chapter two (“Women Spiritual Directors of Church Fathers”) implies a greater authority for women than is warranted in most cases. The “reciprocal nature of spiritual direction” is treated only much later in the book (99); perhaps in most of

the early relationships discussed the phenomenon demonstrated is actually spiritual friendship, with its own reciprocal elements. Jerome certainly benefitted from the strong character of Marcella, who was much his senior in age, but it was he who urged her and several other women living a proto-monastic life in Rome to study Hebrew, he who taught them in this and biblical studies, and, probably, who determined to return to the Holy Land, rather than the women who gave spiritual direction to him in these matters (e.g., 40).

Whether mothers and sisters are spiritual directors of those they raise is a provocative question. In truth, “one of the most powerful and earliest Christian descriptions of the mystical experience” (46) is Augustine’s account of the mystical conversation he and his mother shared (*Confessions*, Book 9). Yet it seems that Ambrose, if anyone, was his spiritual director, not Monica. In contrast, Macrina the Elder and her granddaughter, Macrina the Younger, conducted the theological and spiritual formation of the latter’s younger brothers, especially Basil the Great and Gregory of Nyssa. Moreover, the elder Macrina clearly gave guidance to others outside the family circle and the younger significantly influenced her brothers as adults at critical points (34-35).

A fascinating leitmotif in the book is central biblical imagery used of women to affirm their spiritual equality with men. “Image of God” is used to describe a saintly woman by St. John Chrysostom and others including Olympias of Constantinople, Clare of Assisi, and Sarah Fell in the 1670s. Theodore the Studite’s applies to the abbess Euphrosyne and her nuns the Pauline metaphor of the body: the nuns “should act like true daughters toward the mother, like the members of the body towards the head” (56). Baudonivia, in her life of her abbess Radegund, describes her as “good shepherdess” in some detail (59). The book’s fine index directs one to the discussions of these images and others as well as to the women themselves.

*A Woman’s Way* narrates the history of women’s spiritual and intellectual attainments, used for the good of the Church, from the earliest times. Though the definition of spiritual direction proves problematic, the scope and documentation of the volume prove indisputably the valuable point with which Ranft concludes: “Throughout the centuries women have [evinced the abilities to grasp and to teach Christian truths] as often as men. It is time we give them the historical respect and attention that is their due.”

Catherine Brown Tkacz  
Gonzaga University

## BOOKS RECEIVED

Angrosino, Michael V. **Talking About Cultural Diversity in Your Church**  
(ALTAMIRA Press, 2001)  
108 pp. ISBN 0-7591-0179-5

Caterine, Darryl V. **Conservative Catholicism and the Carmelites Identity, Ethnicity, and Tradition in the Modern Church**  
(Indiana University Press, 2001)  
122 pp. ISBN 0-253-34011-X

Drake, Timothy. **There We Stood, Here We Stand, Eleven Lutherans Rediscover Their Catholic Roots.**  
(1st Books Library, 2001)  
140 pp. ISBN 0-75961-320-6

Kalpagian, Mitchell. **The Mysteries of Life in Children's Literature.**  
(The Neumann Press, 2000)  
143 pp. ISBN 0-911845-99-2

Kelly, George A. **The Second Spring of the Church in America.**  
(St. Augustine's Press, 2001)  
178 pp. ISBN 1-890318-79-5

Edited by Dovre, Paul J., **The Future of Religious Colleges**  
(William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002)  
368 pp. ISBN 0-8028-4955-5

Edited by Ford, David F. and Higton, Mike Jesus  
(Oxford University Press, 2002)  
525 pp. ISBN 0-19-289316-5

Edited by Olsen, Glenn W. **Christian Marriage - A Historical Study**  
(The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2001)  
359 pp. ISBN 0-8245-1886-1

Edited by Ramos, Alice and George, Marie I. **Faith, Scholarship. And Culture in the 21st Century**  
(American Maritain Association, 2002)  
321 pp. ISBN 0-9669226-5-4

Shaw, Russell. **Ministry or Apostolate? What should the Catholic Laity Be Doing?**  
(Our Sunday Visitor , Inc, 2002)  
122 pp. ISBN 0-87973-957-6

Stravinskas, Reverend Peter. **Advent Meditations Helps to 'Wait in Joyful Hope'**  
(Newman House Press, 2001)  
75 pp. ISBN 0-9704022-1-X

Tkacz, Catherine Brown. **The Key to the Brescian Casket: Typology and the Early Christian Imagination**  
(University of Notre Dame Press, 2002)  
189 pp. ISBN 0-268-01231-8

If you are interested in reviewing one of the **Books Received** please contact:

Dr. Larry Chapp  
Editor in Chief  
DeSales University  
2755 Station Avenue  
Center Valley, Pa 18034

610-282-1100 ext. 1264

Larry.Chapp@desales.edu

# ANNOUNCEMENT

**Fellowship of Catholic Scholars – 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Convention**  
**September 27-29, 2002**  
**Wyndham Franklin Plaza Hotel**  
**Philadelphia, PA**

The year 2002 marks the 25th anniversary of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars! To celebrate this historical milestone, we have chosen to focus our annual convention on the vision of "Springtime" - a dominant image in the teaching of Pope John Paul II with which to characterize the life and work of the Catholic Church in the 21st century.

Recalling the year 2000, we know that a "springtime of Christian life" has already been revealed in the celebration of the Great Jubilee of the Incarnation of Jesus Christ (*Tertio millennio adveniente*, #18).

With renewed belief in this revelation, life in the 21st century now holds the promise of becoming a "springtime of the human spirit," for our gifts of wisdom and virtue, along with the help of God's grace, give us the capacity to build a civilization worthy of the human person (*1995 Address at the United Nations*, #18).

Embodying a "springtime of hope" Christianity offers a counter-point to the century of tears that has passed and the new era of barbarism that threatens our future existence (*ad limina address to U.S. Bishops*, 10/24/98).

Yet, in the 21st century we continue to face a moral and spiritual crisis. For this reason we pray, together with the Holy Father, that humanity may experience "a new springtime of life, with respect and acceptance for every human being, in whose face shines the image of Christ!" (*Angelus*, 3/25/01).

As a Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, we rejoice in this new season and commit ourselves once again to being a scholarly association that "continue(s) to give the Church a vitality that is God's gift and a true 'springtime of the Spirit'" (*Novo millennio ineunte*, #46).

Accordingly, the 25th anniversary convention highlights several "voices" that contribute to the "new Springtime" of the Church as it brings hope to the world. Experts on the front lines of the Church's activity in the modern world will address the relevance and value of Catholicism as a herald in today's public square. Featured speakers include:

on *Higher Education* – **Rev. David O'Connell, C.M.** (President of the Catholic University of America)

on *Faith and Reason* – **Pia Francesca de Solenni** (Staff member at the Family Research Council and first American to win the John Paul II "Prize of the Pontifical Academies")

on *Corporate America* – **Gregory Floyd** (Northeast Regional Director of Legatus, the only organization in the world designed exclusively for top-ranking Catholic business leaders)

on *Religious Liberty* – **Robert F. George** (McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence and director of the James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions at Princeton University) [not yet confirmed]

on *Public Policy* – **William J. Bennett** (chair of the National Commission on Civic Renewal, distinguished fellow at the Heritage Foundation, and co-founder/director of Empower America) [not yet confirmed]

on *The Media* – **Kathryn Jean Lopez** (Executive Editor of *National Review Online* and Associate Editor of *National Review*)

*Keynote address* – **His Eminence Avery Cardinal Dulles, S.J.** (McGinley Professor of Religion and Society at Fordham University, and first U.S. theologian ever named to the College of Cardinals)

*Cardinal O'Boyle award* – to be presented to **The Honorable Rick Santorum** (Senator from Pennsylvania since 1995 and now the third-ranking Republican in the United States Senate)

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS – 2002

### OFFICERS

#### *President*

**Rev. Thomas F. Dailey,  
O.S.F.S.**  
DeSales University  
2755 Station Avenue  
Center Valley, PA 18034  
*Thomas.Dailey@desales.edu*

#### *Vice-President*

**Dr. Bernard Dobranski**  
(Ave Maria School of Law)  
6225 Webster Church Road  
Dexter, MI 48130  
*bdobralski@avemarialaw.edu*

#### *Executive Secretary*

**Dr. Christopher Janosik**  
Villanova University  
304 St. Augustine Center  
Villanova, PA 19085  
*Christopher.Janosik@villanova.edu*

#### *Editor of FCS Quarterly*

**Dr. Larry Chapp**  
DeSales University  
2755 Station Avenue  
Center Valley, PA 18034  
*Larry.Chapp@desales.edu*

### PAST PRESIDENTS

**Prof. Gerard V. Bradley**  
University of Notre Dame  
219 Law School  
Notre Dame, IN 46556  
*Gerard.V.Bradley.16@nd.edu*

**Rev. Msgr. George A. Kelly**  
107-10 Shore Front Parkway  
Rockaway Beach, NY 11694

**Rev. Ronald Lawler, OFM  
Cap.**  
St. Francis Friary  
2905 Castlegate Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15226

**Dr. William May**  
John Paul II Institute  
415 Michigan Avenue,  
NE - #290  
Washington, DC 20017  
*wmay975874@aol.com*

**Prof. Ralph McInerny**  
Jacques Maritain Center  
714 Hesburgh Library  
Notre Dame, IN 46556  
*Ralph.McInerny.1@nd.edu*

**Rev. Msgr. William B.  
Smith**  
St. Joseph's Seminary,  
Dunwoodie  
201 E. Seminary Avenue  
Yonkers, NY 10704-1896

**Rev. Earl A. Weis, S.J.**  
Loyola University  
6525 N. Sheridan Road  
Chicago, IL 60626-5385

### ELECTED DIRECTORS

*(1999-2002)*

**Dr. J. Brian Benestad**  
University of Scranton  
Scranton, PA 18510  
*benestadjl@uofs.edu*

**Dr. Stephen Krason**  
Franciscan University  
Dept. of Political Science  
Steubenville, OH 43952

**Rev. John Rock, S.J.**  
Gonzaga University  
Spokane, WA 99258-0001  
*jimr74720@aol.com*

**Rev. James Schall, S.J.**  
Georgetown Jesuit  
Community  
Washington, DC 20057  
*schallsj@gusun.georgetown.edu*

*(2000-2003)*

**Dr. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese**  
(Emory University)  
1487 Sheridan Walk  
Atlanta, GA 30324  
*efoxgen@bellsouth.net*

**Dr. Patrick Metress**  
(Catholic Research Center)  
9118 Steeplebush Court  
Annandale, VA 22003-4051

**Rev. J. Michael Miller, CSB**  
University of St. Thomas  
3800 Montrose Boulevard  
Houston, TX 77006  
*jmmiller@stthom.edu*

**Sr. Mary Judith O'Brien,  
RSM**  
St. John Vianney Seminary  
1300 S. Steele Street  
Denver, CO 80250-1645  
*sjobrien@archden.org*

*(2001-2004)*

**Prof. Stephen Barr**  
(University of Delaware)  
9 Wynwyd Drive  
Newark, DE 19711  
*smbarr@bartol.udel.edu*

**Rev. Peter Ryan, S.J.**  
Mount St. Mary's Seminary  
Emmitsburg, MD 21727-  
7700  
*pryan@mmary.edu*

**Mr. William Saunders**  
(Family Research Council)  
3201 Wisconsin Ave,  
NW - #408  
Washington, DC 20016  
*wls@frc.org*

Send Address Changes to:

**Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly**  
Box 495  
Notre Dame, IN 46556

E-mail to: Alice.F.Osberger.1@nd.edu

---

**Fellowship of Catholic Scholars  
Quarterly**  
DeSales University  
Larry S. Chapp, Ph.D.  
2755 Station Avenue  
Center Valley, Pa 18034

---

Nonprofit Organization  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Center Valley PA  
Permit No. 8

---

**Fellowship  
of Catholic  
Scholars  
Quarterly**