

FELLOWSHIP OF CATHOLIC SCHOLARS

NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 3

JUNE 1979

Letter From President James Hitchcock

Comments on the recent convention have been uniformly favorable. The papers were of high quality, the workshops vigorous, the "fellowship" infectious.

However, one concern keeps coming through many comments I have received. The Fellowship, if it is going to justify its existence, has to be more than an annual meeting and a regular newsletter, valuable though both of these are.

The Fellowship was established in order to give service to the Church. All of us belong to a host of other professional associations. We do not need another one merely for the sake of more professional contacts and activity. The Fellowship justifies itself to the extent that it brings to bear on the life of the Church a wide range of scholarly and professional expertise.

At times all of us probably find committees the bane of our personal and institutional existence. However, they are really indispensable. Given the great variety of disciplines represented in the Fellowship, we have to find ways to focus our activities precisely and effectively. In response to repeated suggestions made at the convention, I am setting up a series of committees in various specialties. Let me emphasize the following points:

1) The chairmen or co-chairmen are people appointed to give leadership to others working in a particular field. While it is hoped that each committee will be communally active, special initiative is asked from the chairman.

2) For the time being membership of each committee will be left open. I will send to each chairman a list of prospective members drawn from current membership rolls and known interests. However, each member of the Fellowship is asked to volunteer for service on one or more committees. For that purpose the names and addresses of chairmen are given below.

3) Ordinarily committees will probably meet only at the annual convention. Otherwise they will communicate primarily by mail.

4) The major aim of the committees is to identify problems in their specialty which are of current concern to the Church, discuss appropriate responses, formulate position papers, and eventually make suggestions to the Fellowship as a whole concerning appropriate activity.

5) In addition to their official status as committees of the Fellowship, the committees will serve as vehicles whereby interested and like-minded people can contact one another and engage in unofficial cooperation and projects of common concern.

6) One of the aims of each committee should also be to identify people in their particular disciplines whose work and orientation is of interest to the Fellowship and to draw such people into membership or cooperation.

7) It is to be hoped that through the official and unofficial cooperation which the committees engender, the terms of discussion which prevail in each area will be positively affected and new directions given to scholarly and professional concerns. In other words, it is hoped that Fellowship members will be increasingly able to offer leadership in their particular disciplines.

8) Committee chairmen from time to time should submit brief reports to the Newsletter, a means whereby other interested parties can be drawn into the work.

9) The committee meetings at each annual convention can be a way of consolidating work done in the previous year and orienting the members toward important projects and concerns.

It is my hope that the committee system will be the principal means whereby the Fellowship and its members can begin to have an appropriate impact on Church and society.

The Second Convention of the Fellowship

Approximately 125 of our 400 members appeared in the Ramada Inn, St. Louis, for our second convention the weekend of March 30-April 1, 1979.

Appreciation everywhere was expressed to Fr. Ronald Lawler, O.F.M., Cap. for the two pioneering years he served as first president. He

brought intelligence, commitment and a warm heart to his presidency. He hands on to the new president, James Hitchcock, a healthy legacy. The election of Dr. Hitchcock was virtually unanimous. The elections of Sr. Janet Fitzgerald, O.P., Sr. Carolyn McGinty, C.S.J., and Mrs. Mary Joyce also broke the male dominance of Fellowship matters.

New Officers

President

Dr. James Hitchcock
University of St. Louis

1st Vice President

Fr. Earl Weis, S.J.
Loyola University, Chicago

2nd Vice President

Fr. Joseph Farragher, S.J.
Homiletic and Pastoral Review

Executive Secretary

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

Associate Secretary

Fr. Frederick Jelly, O.P.
Josephinum Seminary

Treasurer

Sr. Janet Fitzgerald, O.P.
Molloy College

Board of Directors (In Addition to Office Holders)

Fr. Ronald Lawler, O.F.M., Cap.
Catholic University of America

Fr. Joseph Mangan, S.J.
Loyola University, Chicago

Fr. John Miller
Provincial - Holy Cross Fathers

Fr. Henry Sattler, C.S.S.R.
University of Scranton

Fr. James Turro
Darlington Seminary

Sr. Carolyn McGinty, C.S.J.
Rosary College

Dr. Eugene Diamond
National Catholic Physicians Guilds

Mrs. Mary Joyce
Author

Dr. William May
Catholic University of America

Proposed Committees

The following nominations make up an initial list. Other can be and will be formed as the need arises.

Communications: Professor John Baker
School of Law
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808

Education: Rev. Michael Wrenn
St. Joseph's Seminary
Dunwoodie
Yonkers, New York 10704

Family: Rev. Robert Levis
Gannon College
Perry Square
Erie, Pennsylvania 16501
Rev. Henry V. Sattler, S.S.S.R.
University of Scranton
Scranton, Pennsylvania 18510
Mr. John F. Kippley
P.O. Box 11084
Cincinnati, Ohio 45211

Humanities: Sr. Carolyn McGinty, C.S.J.
Rosary College
River Forest, Illinois 60305

Liturgy: Professor John Hittinger
Department of Philosophy
Benedictine College
Atchinson, Kansas 66002

Philosophy: Professor Joseph Graham
Department of Philosophy
University of St. Thomas
3812 Montrose Blvd.
Houston, Texas 77026

Priesthood: Dr. Germain Grisez
Mt. St. Mary's College
Emmitsburg, Maryland 21727
Rev. Frederick M. Jelly, O.P.
The Josephinum School of Theology
Office of the Dean
Worthington, Ohio 43085

Rev. Kenneth Baker, S.J.
Homiletic and Pastoral Review
86 Riverside Drive
New York, New York 10024

Social Issues: Professor Charles Dechert
Department of Politics
Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C. 20017

Rev. James V. Schall, S.J.
Department of Politics
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C. 20007
Rev. Thomas Dubay, S.M.
4408 8th Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20017

Religious Life: Sr. Mary Christopher, S.N.D.
13000 Auburn Road
Chardon, Ohio 44024

Science and Technology: Rev. Robert Brungs, S.J.
ITEST
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri 63103

Theology: Rev. William Smith, Dean
St. Joseph's Seminary
Dunwoodie
Yonkers, New York 10704

Rev. Donald J. Keefe, S.J.
Department of Theology
Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

Women: Mrs. Mary Rosera Joyce
1248 13th Avenue North
St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301
Dr. Teresa Johnson
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Mo. 63103

Quotable Quotes from the Convention Lectures

● Bishop John B. McDowell –

“I think the Catholic scholar must have tremendous faith – maybe even a special kind of faith. The scholar, I believe, must work on it more than others, because historically it seems to be the scholar who has had the greatest problem with the faith. The faithful have never been misled by ordinary people, so far as I know; most of our Church problems have been caused by scholars, and especially by priest scholars. (I exclude Prelates from this discussion for obvious reasons.) The greatest heresies and schisms were created by those scholars within our own household – the bright, the promising, the great philosophers and theologians who suddenly found themselves in conflict with the Faith. A scholar can easily think that his area, his specialty, his science, can really make it alone and then suddenly finds himself at odds with the Faith of his Fathers. St. Augustine’s little axiom applies so clearly here, for in any case the Faith is really the important thing. *Crede ut intellegas – intellege ut credas* – faith is always the prime consideration. This faith, the true wisdom that St. Paul speaks of – not the wisdom of man – is what we are talking about – a wisdom that accepts God’s point of view rather than our own; and an understanding which means we can get a better grasp of the faith.

“Isn’t it interesting that Jesus never cured anyone because they understood who He was or what He was up to. But for those who simply believed, He did the most amazing things. “Your faith” has saved you – “Your faith” has made you whole – “I have never seen such great faith” – and then He did the most wonderful things.

Not once do we read “Your Knowledge”, “Your scholarship”, “Your study”, “Your footnotes”, “Your translation”, saved you, or cured you. This is not to put down scholarship by any means, because we need scholarship. We need the sort of explanations which you work on. The Holy Father said this so clearly in “Redemptor Hominis.” But the scholar must remember that his work is not the faith any more than his explanation is the faith. His work is *about* the faith and he must cherish that faith as much as anyone else – and believe perhaps more than anyone else before he can really inquire into the faith as the scholar should. The scholars with strong faith have always made the greatest contribution to the Catholic Church.”

● Glenn Olsen –

“Today we scientifically – at least so we think – study everything. Although the good scientist knows that the calculation of what percent of the

people are doing what should not become normative, on scientific grounds, for what percent of the people do what in the future, in fact we are so enchained by cultural relativism that this is almost always the path we take. If the scientists can show that such and such a percent of the population are performing such and such unnatural act, we have a new minority to be tolerated and for whom we must make appropriate legislation to dignify their behavior. Implicitly we vote time and again for a culturally determined truth. People see no alternative to being of one’s own time. Although we should know that no science has the power to generate norms, outside of ethics, politics, and revealed theology itself, we rarely behave this way. I write these words a day after having been told by a priest that the sense of the faithful means that if the majority of Catholics refuse to accept the teaching of a papal document like *Humanae Vitae*, this means that the teaching of the document will eventually have to be changed. Why the norm for teaching should be the sentiments of a bourgeoisie, materialist and an anti-ascetic culture rather than those truths about man which transcend time and place is of course never explained, but implicitly this priest – actually the catechist of my children – takes as his truth that of a particular culture, and prefers this to either the norm of a rational analysis of human nature or to the magisterium. I in my naivety had assumed that it would be as difficult for a nation of rich men to find the kingdom of God as for that one rich man of whom Christ spoke. But no, if the egotism of enough rich men is multiplied, it becomes the sense of the faithful.

Why we should see no alternative to being of our times is not very clear, but in the first instance it seems to me that, having lost the sense of how mysterious life is, we want to reduce it to false clarities. I recently received a questionnaire produced for the National Conference of Catholic Bishops intended to solicit my opinions on the question of the missions. Like every questionnaire I have ever received, this drove me to distraction. Somehow I was supposed to reduce what I thought were extremely complicated questions so that the surveyor could fit my view of the world to his, above all to find out if I was “liberal” or “conservative”, for or against liberation theology. I knew it would do no good to tell the surveyor that as a Catholic I could not be classified within the accidental framework of what liberal and conservative happened to mean within an American, or indeed any other, framework. So I did what I habitually do with such surveys, giving it a gentle push in the direction of non-being.”

● Dennis J. McCarthy, S.J. —

We *cannot* abandon criticism. It is part of the fabric of the modern world, part of the whole picture of temporal sequence and material objects and theories and ways of doing things which make the frame into which we consciously or unconsciously fit our lives and thoughts, the frame which three centuries ago replaced the "ages of the world" and the Ptolemaic universe. Like it or not, we can no more escape it than the air (which too nowadays we often do not like!). One could try a sort of isolation ward technique but that is the way of the Amish and the like, admirable testimony in its way to fidelity and firmness, but hardly the Church militant marching like an army with banners of truth. We must allow critical history the freedom of the Church, the stronghold of truth, for the Church is strong and the method deals with truth.

More, we cannot grow prissy and stop it when it seems to be doing messy things to texts we love. With all the failures and weaknesses of its practitioners, it is trying to add to our fund of knowledge about Israel, about Jesus, about the nascent Church. It has its successes and when it does we possess more of the truth which as we all know is convertible with the good. Can any man, any Christian turn away from the true and the good? Hardly, for this is specifically Christian: "I

am the truth . . ." The only real question is how to use criticism properly. Surely after three hundred years of struggling with it, we should be able to move distance in this direction.

It is certainly time that we begin doing so and one necessary approach is reflection on the ancient question of the division of the sciences, defined here both in terms of the object studied and the possibilities of the human instrument of study. It is encouraging that one hears from England, France, even Germany, murmurs of dissatisfaction with the limited historical methods and objects so far dominant. Another significant sign: the decline of "biblical archeology"; rather than being subordinated to the Bible, either to affirm or deny historicity, interest is not in "validating" the Bible but in the culture and history of Syria-Palestine for its own sake, as it should be. Even the use of the Bible for strictly historical purposes should have this aim: learning more about the past for its own sake. That is what history is all about, not defending non-historical ideas.

However, the movement is quite new and still tentative. One cannot plot its directions as though describing actual activities; one is trying to chart future developments. This can be difficult and unclear. Still, those three hundred years of experience should help to indicate some definite needs one hopes will be met."

Quotable Quotes from Workshop Reports

On Religious Education

The workshop heard two papers: *Religious Education at the Crossroads* (prepared by the Reverend Michael J. Wrenn, Director of the Archdiocesan Catechetical Institute, Graduate School of Religious Education at St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie) and *Catechesis From Above or From Within* (prepared by Reverend Robert J. Levis, Director of the Pontifical Center for Catechetical Studies of Gannon College, Erie, Pennsylvania).

The first paper sought to present to participants in the workshop an historical overview of catechesis in the United States during the last twenty-five years. Relying on the NCCB report for the recent Synod of Bishops on catechesis as well as on a recently published work, entitled, *The Resurgence of Religious Instruction*, by J. Piveteau and J. Dillon, which presents a valuable appraisal of the last twenty-five years of religious education in this country, positive and negative developments in this field were surveyed. The various consultative stages involved in the development of *Sharing the Light of Faith* were also considered as were the bishops' amendment process and the recent letter of the Sacred Congregation for the

Clergy approving the *Directory* this past October. *Sharing the Light of Faith* was presented as possessing a great deal of hope for the future of the religious education enterprise. Consideration was also given to thy analysis of results obtained from the *Religious Education Outcomes Inventory* of the National Catholic Educational Association administered to over 100,000 youngsters in the United States which indicates that a great deal of work should continue in the area of assuring religious literacy among young Catholics. Finally, since there are unresolved, and often significant differences in expectations among different segments of the catechetical enterprise, the interactional flow of communication between these segments, begun by the N.C.D. consultation, must continue to be nurtured.

Father Levis' paper addressed the tension, presently existing in the field of catechesis, between immanence and transcendence. Basing his philosophical analysis of the situation upon a thesis presented by Cornelio Fabro a relatively obscure philosopher, in a book entitled, *God in Exile*, published in 1968, which claims that modern thought is founded on the principle of immanence, which is the attempt of the human spirit to attain

total and absolute freedom and independence and to fashion thought within the confines of one's own self, Father Levis examined the influence of such an immanentistic thrust in contemporary religious education in areas of Revelation, Faith, Grace, the Church, Christology and Liturgy. Father Levis concludes by observing that an exceptional opportunity now presents itself for the evaluation of such an immanentistic approach with the publication of the *National Catechetical Directory, Sharing the Light of Faith*.

A brief period of questions and general discussion followed the presentation of the papers and two separate resolutions were framed for presentation to the Board of Directors and full membership of the Fellowship respectively. The first resolution asked that a standing committee on religious education be established within the structure of the Fellowship. The second resolution from the workshop expressed gratitude to the NCCB for the issuance of the *National Catechetical Directory* and expressed the willingness of the Fellowship to become involved both in the preparation of an official commentary on the document as well as in efforts at implementation and on-going evaluation. This second resolution which was addressed to the appropriate officers of the NCCB was overwhelmingly adopted by the full membership of the Fellowship after some discussion.

On Religious Life

In the first session of the Workshop on Religious Life on March 31, 1979, Father Thomas Dubay made a presentation of points amplifying the theme of FAITH AND HISTORICISM, and Sister Mary Christopher, S.N.D. acted as Chairperson. On Sunday, April 1, 1979, Sister Mary Christopher presented points on the theme, while Father Dubay acted as Chairperson. After each presentation on the two separate days, about 10 minutes being given to the presentors, the Chairperson entertained responses and/or questions from the participants.

Some of the discussion dealt with consideration of whether we are thinking and speaking of the same Church, of the matter of two distinct philosophies of religious life now clearly evident as life-styles are changing, and of the really drastic implications of renewal. One participant pointed up the importance of the spousal and covenant relationship in the life of a religious.

After the discussions of both the first and second sessions, it was clear that several practicalities had surfaced. They can be itemized as follows:

1. A group, sub-committee or commission from the FELLOWSHIP ought to be formed with the purpose of researching and communicating the values representative of authentic religious life.
2. Individual religious should take courage and work toward better and more harmonious relations with their Superiors, writing or facing them objectively.
3. Religious should work toward better relations with Bishops, perhaps studying so that Bishops and priests understand religious life more meaningfully.
4. Religious, and particularly Catholic Scholars, should be encouraged to greater activity and visibility. In other words, work to dislodge persons from immobility so that the cause of authentic renewal in religious life can be intelligently addressed.
5. Draw up a declaration of the new tasks facing religious leaders to bring religious life to that position asked for by the Church.
6. Recommendation was made for an intensive study of the recent document DIRECTIVES FOR THE MUTUAL RELATIONS BETWEEN BISHOPS AND RELIGIOUS IN THE CHURCH.
7. The FELLOWSHIP should work to be *heard*, not to be just a support system for its constituency.
8. Recommendation was made for improved procedures in the Formation Programs of religious institutes, particularly with the emphasis on *thinking* on the part of young religious.
9. Recommendation was made that a commentary perhaps should be made on the Schema of the New Code of Canon Law, asking:
 - a) What is religious life?
 - b) What is the charism of the institute, concretely and historically?
 - c) Have the canons been worked out well, i.e., from a good English edition of the originating documents of the Institute?
10. Recommendation was made that a study be undertaken regarding the right to indissolubility of the vows by decree of the Holy See.
11. The final suggestion was to search for a coordinator for the Fellowship through whom these preceding particulars or any subsequent work on them might be cleared, so that our good efforts and suggestions not be lost.

On Church and Public Life

James Hitchcock —

A number of immediate and long-range public issues confronting the Church were identified, including the life issues (especially abortion, euthanasia, and "test-tube babies"), church-state (including school aid and actual or potential control by government agencies over church institutions), anti-Catholic bias in the media and in various social agencies, and existing and proposed programs of sex education likely to be mandated by government agencies.

In each case the struggle involves the question of what moral values will be embodied in government policies or in legislation. Private social agencies tend to follow the government's lead.

So far Catholics have tended to allow others to frame the questions and to take the initiative, limiting themselves merely to reacting to what others have done. Thus Catholics have been constantly put on the defensive and have been made to appear merely reactionary. The need is for Catholics to take the initiative, to frame questions in such a way as to force others to respond to Catholic concerns. A major battle is developing over the moral contours of the society of the future.

In this instance Catholics have been badly served by their scholars, who often enough either fail to reflect any authentically Catholic way of thinking or else fail to analyze current social questions with any degree of penetration. There are many activist Catholics involved in social battles of one kind or another. What is often lacking is the broader philosophical understanding of issues which Catholic scholars could provide.

The secularists have preempted the banner of freedom for themselves, which gives them an automatic advantage in any debate. Among the things most acutely needed is a properly Christian understanding of freedom.

Although Catholics will necessarily play a major role in this enterprise, it can and must also be ecumenical in nature. There are many other Christians and Jews who share similar concerns and values. The sanctity and stability of the family is in many ways the central social issue.

Like the Fellowship as a whole, the workshop on public life wishes to translate its academic interests into programs and policy statements which are relevant to present Catholic concerns. In a permanent or semi-permanent form, it seeks to identify working Catholic scholars and their interests and then make their thinking available to the leadership of the Church. In the long run the aim must be to influence the wider intellectual community.

In the general discussion there was agreement on the above concerns and much vigorous debate on the ways they might be realized. Ties to various groups in the academic, intellectual, professional and business communities were suggested.

Despite some disagreement as to how this should be approached, most workshop participants were in agreement concerning the great importance of this aspect of the Fellowship's work and were anxious that machinery be set up which would regularize it in some way.

Charles R. Dechert —

We are dealing with a tradition going back 250 years to the early 18th century and beyond — yet a tradition whose power to erode the foundations of civic order has found confirmation in a newly discovered American civil right to destroy the unborn, in support for educator's right to impose course materials that gratuitously assault traditional values and standards of linguistic expression, in disdain for publicly inculcated and sanctioned standards of comportment that might provide some degree of security in person and goods from atomic violence. It is surely not by chance that the Catholic educator and leading spokesman for liberal causes in this country, a leading figure in the President's Commission on Civil Rights, left that post not long before the release of a report asserting the right to abort the unborn.

Here we are confronted with issues of the nature of man, dignity and destiny, about which Catholic scholars, representing a cultural tradition lying at the root of our national heritage, have much to say. But somehow we are not saying it as well and effectively as we might. "What is a person?" raises fundamental issues that cannot be answered adequately by a positivistic jurisprudence. Surely a person is more than a mere subject of right and duties as determined by a series of judges' definitions and decisions. Or have we already moved "beyond freedom and dignity" as German jurisprudence did in the 1930's to await decisions regarding the legal personality of the defective, the delinquent, the non-productive, the aged and infirm, the unassimilated or obnoxious minority, the seditious, the anti-social, the exploiters, or the poor. Is law to be considered merely "rules of the game" to be manipulated by the bright, ignored or broken by those who can get away with it, or changed to their own group advantage by those who have the "clout" or the physical force. Is the slogan to be: "Winners make the rules — be a winner!"

(Report of the workshops on the Priesthood, on Marriage and the Family will appear in the September Newsletter.)

Editorial — The Church's Management Problem

Two dogmas of modern culture make life difficult for preachers of Christ's Kingdom. (They haven't been much help to the Kingdom of Man either.)

One says: There shall be no authoritative decisions, i.e., from on high.

The other makes human enrichment depend on sexual orgasm absolutely.

The first dogma was defined in successive Councils of intellectual skeptics unsure they can know anything at all; the second was the Synodal decree of post-Victorian sexologists who believe men's minds are unbalanced by sexual repression.

Now, if nothing comes from on high, neither does the Word of God — nor the Gospel of Christ. If that be so, there is no revelation worth speaking of. In the absence of revelation, believers in God must turn perforce to themselves, to their traditions and their books, to their own experience in order to make educated guesses about divinity and man's revelation to *It*.

Theologizing of this sort is an open invitation to religious skepticism. Revelation, if it can be identified at all, is spelled with a small "r" and derives from study, not from God. All statements of scripture, or allegedly by Christ, or from the Pope are subject to personal reinterpretation as to what *his* personal religion teaches or requires.

The advantages of personal or scholarly study and reinterpretation are obvious as long as *Someone* (Christ perhaps or apostles or bishops) can verify with divine guarantees where God's Word objectively lies. If all we have is man's word, who need take religion, as a relationship with God, seriously?

If Christ or the Pope is dethroned, of what value to religious truth are scholars or students. In such circumstances religion is whatever opiated man chooses to make it.

The flight from authoritative decisions is a number one problem for the contemporary Catholic Church.

But the second is like unto the first. Running from authoritative declarations on sexual activity is now a popular Catholic pastime. The Catholic world, it is being suggested, must have sex on the secular world's terms. Since Vatican II told Catholics to join the world, Catholics, it seems, must enjoy the secular world's freedom to pursue sexual orgasm.

Fr. John L. Thomas, Jesuit sociologist, was recently reported both in the secular and Catholic press, as calling upon the Church to update its position on the family (*Brooklyn Tablet*, April 5, 1979). The Church must recognize, Fr. Thomas

argues, that American Catholics are increasingly expressing their freedom in their social lives. Issues of divorce, birth control, and abortion have been "pretty well worked out outside the Church," but official doctrines have yet to reflect these changes. "The official Church is hung up holding the line while the troops are making up their minds." Thomas, not expecting much from hierarchy, believes that change should come from thinkers who write. Only through such re-thinking can we achieve a "greater understanding of what religion is all about."

So we are brought back to the Word of God. Is there a Word of God on sexual exercise? Or only the word of disagreeing scholars? Believers have a right to know. Sex is fun, nearby, not very costly, and one of God's most important creatures. But if God is the final judge of what men do with their sex lives, believers need direction a little more authoritative than what they receive from itinerant theologians and psychologists, especially those who may have severed their roots in the tree of Catholic life.

Yet it is the same itinerant theologians who are having more success these days in Catholic college classrooms, better certainly than popes or bishops. Students frequently give five arguments why the Church's sexual ethic is wrong for every one reason they have for believing themselves bound by that ethic. None of this, of course, has happened all of a sudden or by accident.

A major management problem, therefore, threatens both Church purpose and Church effectiveness. It is the contemporary dissonance between doctrine and practice. The issue is not simply sex but the ability of the Church to make its doctrines underpin the lives of the faithful.

In 1958 one sociologist saw the problem clearly. He wrote:

"What does sexual freedom imply but the denial that this important area of human activity is subject to either right reason or the moral law? When modern popular reformers advocate so glibly such practices as contraception, sterilization, and therapeutic abortion, they never mention that these practices imply the belief that man is only a highly developed animal having no eternal destiny and no responsibility to God for his actions. In other words, they are advocating a set of practices that imply a view of the human person clearly opposed to the traditional Christian view."

Who said that? Fr. John L. Thomas in his book *The Catholic Viewpoint on Marriage and the Family* (p. 27).

George A. Kelly

Items of Interest

● About the time of his death and thereafter there was a great deal of rumor-mongering about the "liberal" birth control opinions of John Paul I, reminiscent of the years 1965-1968 when prominent academicians on both sides of the Atlantic were assuring their hearers that Paul VI was about to reverse *Casti Connubii*. Most of those who passed the rumors were already converted to contraception.

In John Paul I's case the rumors originated with the Italian press and ultimately found their way into *America* (March 24, 1979).

Origins contributed to the spread of this story on March 8, 1979 with several columns which repeat this story. *Origin's* editor cites a one time NC stringer as his source and a letter that Bishop Albino Luciani (then in Veneto) was alleged to have written to Paul VI in advance of *Humanae Vitae*. It is insinuated that Luciani opposed any statement on birth control.

Yet six months earlier, when that story was making its way into the secular press *Origins* (September 7, 1978) cited denials from two responsible Vatican sources. Fr. Henri de Riedmaten, secretary of the papal birth control mission, said not only would he have seen that letter but he never heard of such a letter. Msgr. Mario Ghizzo, who was Luciani's Vicar General in Veneto, bluntly remarked: "There was no letter."

Yet rumor-mongering persists even in official quarters, as if determination remains to blunt the doctrinal position of the Church.

● The workshop at the Catholic University of America on "The Principles of Catholic Moral Life" looks to be an important event in the life of the Church. One might almost sub-title the Conference "The Moral Theologians Talk Up". The list of lecturers is impressive: Richard Roach, S.J. (Marquette), Frederick Carney (SMU), John Finnis (Oxford), Francis McCoal, S.J. (Biblicum), Fr. Louis Bouyer (Paris Oratory), Joseph Boyle (St. Thomas), Fr. William Smith (Dunwoodie), Paul Philibert, O.P. (CUA), William E. May (CUA), Germain Grisez (Mt. St. Mary's), Joseph Mangan, S.J. (Loyola), Ronald Lawler, O.F.M., Cap. (CUA), John Connery, S.J. (Loyola), Jordan Aumann, O.P. (Angelicum),

All the critical questions are discussed from objective morality and conscience to mortal sin and the call to perfection.

For moralists and ethicists it is almost a must. \$70 for the entire program — \$10 a session. Write to Dr. Bill May at CUA, Washington, D.C. 20017.

● When Fr. John Dedek left CUA to become a pastor in Chicago, (the possibility arose he might not be granted tenure there) Fr. Charles Curran in CUA's student newspaper made this observation: "Judgments about orthodoxy cannot be made by the trustees and used as the basis of granting or denying promotion or tenure." Holy Cross Fr. John Reedy commenting on the Curran view (*Brooklyn Tablet*, April 12, 1979) thought CUA was a "special problem" because it was subsidized by bishops. When the day should come that such subsidy was not necessary, Reedy thought: "The Church receives many valuable contributions from schools like Georgetown, Marquette, Notre Dame. I don't think it is either necessary or desirable for the bishops to sponsor their own University."

● Making the first decision of its kind since 1967 and ordered by Pope John Paul II, the Vatican's Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, has condemned the views of a French Dominican theologian on Christ's bodily resurrection and the afterlife. In a declaration issued April 3, the Congregation said the book "Quand Je Dis Dieu" (When I Say God) by Dominican Jacques Pohler contains affirmations "manifestly not in conformity with revelation and the magisterium (official teaching authority) of the church." According to the Congregation:

"Among the more evident errors in the book are the intention on the part of Christ to give a redemptive and sacrificial value to his Passion; the bodily resurrection of Christ and his permanence as a real subject after the end of his historical existence; continued existence, resurrection, eternal life with God as the vocation of man; the presence in Holy Scripture of a true teaching, having an objective meaning, which faith can recognize and which the magisterium of the church, assisted by the Holy Spirit, can determine authentically," it said. The doctrines about which the book creates uncertainty, the congregation said, include: the transcendence of God; the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist; the specific role of the priest in bringing about this real presence; the exercise of infallibility in the church. "With regard to the divinity of Christ, the author expresses himself in such an unusual manner that it is not possible to determine whether he still professes this truth in the traditional Catholic sense," the congregation said.

The congregation called attention "to the gravity of the errors here denounced and to the impossibility of considering them as opinions left to the free discussion of theologians."

● Msgr. John F. McCarthy announces the opening in December 1978 of *Sedes Sapientiae Study Center* in Rome. The Center serves as a workshop for the Roman Theological Forum, which has undertaken the drawing up of a new synthesis of Catholic theology and philosophy. The first phase of the work consists in the compilation of an adequate bibliography and the formulation of the dispositive principles intermediate to the fixing of an integrated set of constituent principles of the synthesis.

The antecedent basis of the planned new synthesis is the corpus of writings of St. Thomas Aquinas, while the problematic is taken from significant contributions outside of those writings, especially those of the last seven centuries. Scholars interested in helping to build this synthesis are invited to write to Msgr. McCarthy at *Sedes Sapientiae Study Center*, Corso Vittorio Emanuele, 154, Rome, Italy 00186.

● Two members of the Fellowship – Fr. William B. Smith and Dr. James Hitchcock – are now bi-weekly columnists for the *National Catholic Register*.

● Dr. William May of CUA would like correspondence with people who are interested in doing some collaborative work on marriage and the family in so far as 1980 marks the 100th and 50th anniversary respectively of two papal encyclicals on marriage – Leo XIII's *Arcanum Divinae Sapientiae* and Pius XI's *Casti Connubii*.

● Three members of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars are featured speakers for the charismatic conference on "The Church, the Charismatics, and Mary" being held at the University of Dayton, July 13-15.

Sponsored jointly by the Marian Library at the University of Dayton and the Charismatic Renewal Services of South Bend, the conference is the first of its kind in the United States. "Reflecting on its relationship to the whole Church, this [charismatic] movement is turning its glance to Mary, the mother of the Church, who appears also as the woman of the Spirit," writes Archbishop Joseph L. Bernardin in his letter of support for the conference.

FCS members speaking at the conference are: Rev. Eamon R. Carroll, O.Carm., of the Catholic University of America; Rev. Frederick Jelly, O.P., of the Pontifical Josephinum School of Theology; and Rev. Louis P. Rogge, O.Carm., of Loyola University of Chicago.

Information about the conference can be obtained from:

Marian Charismatic Conference
University of Dayton
Dayton, Ohio 45469

Convention Resolution

By vote of the convention delegates Dr. Hitchcock was requested to communicate with Archbishop John R. Quinn, president of NCCB, the mind of the Fellowship which he did on April 5th in the following mailgram:

"As the newly elected president of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, I have been authorized by our membership to convey to you the following resolution passed at our recent convention: "The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars welcomes the issuance of the *National Catechetical Directory* and offers its assistance and support in the task of writing a commentary on that directory.

"The Fellowship looks forward to working with the American bishops on this and other matters of concern to the Church. Sincerely in Christ." (A comparable mailgram was dispatched to Bishop Thomas Kelly at the USCC.)

Board of Directors Meeting March 30

Approval was given to the following items:

1. The printing and mailing of a new inventory of the membership better to determine the expanse of talents within the Fellowship.
2. The establishment of committees.
3. Direct communication with the NCCB-USCC.
4. A search for a publisher to take care of the Proceedings of the 1979 Convention.
5. Development of better in-put into the Newsletter.
6. Presentation to delegates as amendment to the by-laws a new Statement of Purpose and new procedures for electing members. (This was unresolved by the convention and required a later mail balloting.)
7. Setting the weekend of March 28-30, 1980 as the time for the Convention without setting at this time the place of meeting.

The Mystique of John Paul II

The *Wall Street Journal* (April 4, 1979) published an article by their Vatican correspondent Jonathan Spivak, which asked the question: "A Pope for Our Time?" Spivak reports interesting things being said in Rome about the new Pope.

"John Travolta in a cassock", one priest remarked. "He reminds me of Lyndon Johnson in an election year" was the comment of an American seminarian. The crowds following John Paul are the largest ever. Says Spivak: "Wednesdays are pandemonium in St. Peter's Square."

John Paul seems very much the Bishop of Rome. Every Sunday he preaches at a different Church in Rome, as no other Pope in recent history has done. One Sunday after preaching at a neighborhood Church, he invited the Polish speaking pastor to lunch at the Vatican, where they ended up drinking the priest's homemade white wine and singing Polish songs, much to the visible discomfort (it is said) of Cardinal Poletti, the Vicar for Rome.

But Spivak considers more newsworthy the shock the Pope is having on those who expected him to bring peace in the Church by relaxing the Church's stand on abortion, contraception, women priests and married priests. The Pope has done nothing of the kind. Fr. Vincent O'Keefe, S.J. is quoted as saying ' [He] offers us the two D's: Discipline and Doctrine.' Fr. Robert Graham, S.J. forecasts the Pope may also seek to reverse the ease with which marriage annulments are being granted in the United States and a return to proper clerical dress for casually garbed nuns and priests. (Spivak reports one priest scoffing: "It won't work. Brooklyn is not Poland").

New Bishop Friends

Archbishop James J. Byrne of Dubuque
Bishop Justin A. Driscoll of Fargo
Bishop Henry J. Soenneker of Owensboro
Bishop James C. Timlin of Scranton

Foundation Member

Rev. Raymond T. McCarthy of Riverside, Illinois

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

- Arlington Diocese (Va.) has three parishes seeking Ministers of Religious Education. Call Sr. Mary St. Mark, I.H.M. (203) 841-2564.
- Teaching positions are available at the undergraduate Catholic college level both in theology and sociology in the East. Opportunity worthwhile. Write to Msgr. George A. Kelly, St. John's University, Jamaica, New York 11439.

He also seems to be discouraging the primary left wing Catholic political movements and keeping Italian politicians at a distance.

The *Wall Street Journal* story suggests that John Paul II's personality and mixture of congeniality and authority are strengthening the Church, at least in Italy, and especially among Italian youth. The last lines of the Spivak story read:

"How can a man so flexible and easy going in his personal behavior be so unbending in Church discipline and doctrine? It's a mystery that could make John Paul II at once the most popular and one of the most powerful Popes of recent times."

* * *

Another viewpoint on John Paul II was provided by Arthur Jones editor for the *National Catholic Reporter* (April 20, 1979). Calling the Pope's celibacy letter to priests "elitist" Jones advises his readers:

"John Paul may be stubborn, but the Church is not his alone. He has a particular authority in it, but others who may dissent love the Church as much as he does. Here, then, one sees in outline why U.S Catholics need to identify with one another (even where they don't always agree with one another). We are Catholics in a special tradition, that of the U.S. experience. U.S. Catholics are not better Catholics or worse Catholics than those of Poland or Czechoslovakia; they are different Catholics at a different time and place in national development."

(Editor's note: Others would make a similar evaluation of Christ's statement on the indissolubility of marriage.)

1979 Fellowship Dues Notice

There are 180 of the Fellowship members who have not yet remitted their 1979 dues. Would you be so kind to do so in the interest of saving special mailings. The annual dues for regular members and associates is \$15.00. Make check payable to the *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars* and send it to Msgr. G. A. Kelly, St. John's University, Jamaica, N.Y. 11439.

Question for June:

Why is it so right to be a "conservationist" of the physical environment and wrong to be "conservative" of the moral environment?

The Present Situation of Dogmatic Theology By Fr. Donald Keefe

To profess oneself a 'dogmatic' theologian today is to confess one's obsolescence; the term has come to denote an archaic fundamentalism. But even apart from that consideration, it is no longer quite *au fait* to use the Roman Catholic doctrinal tradition as a norm for theology, for the particularity of that norm is in considerable tension with the universalist thrust of today's ecumenical interest, as also with the historical consciousness which tends to relativize it in terms of socio-cultural historical conditioning. For a variety of familiar reasons, there is a felt need to de-confessionalize theological methodology. Lonergan does this in the name of ecumenism; Tracy does it in search of a secular relevancy; Kueng requires it in the name of human liberation. Those Catholic theologians, European for the most part, whose Thomist antecedents have required of them a submission of their theological methodology to a doctrinal norm seem incapable of making that methodology explicit. Rahner, forty years after *Geist in Welt* and *Hoerer des Wortes*, has proceeded no further in his statement of method than the "transcendental Thomism" of those works, a method firmly enmeshed in the traditional dilemma of obediential potency. The last exponent of *la nouvelle theologie*, Henri de Lubac, never resolved the methodological problem presented him by *Humani generis*, while his great friend, Hans Urs von Balthasar has denounced the entire systematic ambition of dogmatic theology as the product of obsolete cosmological or anthropological world-views. Twenty years ago the French Dominican, M-D. Chenu denied that Aquinas himself was a systematic thinker, a conclusion echoed today by those such as Lindbeck who see in his theology an uneasy mix of Aristotle and Augustine. However the problem of dogmatic theology be addressed, it seems to conclude to the incompatibility of Catholic doctrine and systematic thought.

Yet the distancing of theological method from dogma has lately been challenged, first by the Hartford Appeal, and more recently by some of its signatories, as against the 'revisionist' approach to theology elaborated by theologians associated with the University of Chicago such as David Tracy, Langdon Gilkey and Schubert Ogden. This dispute is finally over the normative role in theology of the doctrinal-ecclesial tradition. Although the ground has been fought over continually since Schleiermacher's *On Religion* and its revival by Bultmann's demythologization program, and so can offer little of novelty, the interest of the current debate is in this, that it signals a determination on the part of such opinion-makers as Avery Dulles and Peter Berger to reexamine the tension between the historical-critical methodologies and the Church's

tradition — a determination, then, to publicize the problem of theological historicism, which formed the topic of FCS meeting last month in St. Louis. To raise this problem is, in effect, to seek a properly dogmatic theological method, as Dennis McCarthy noted in a brilliant lecture.

The question before the dogmatic theologians is the one posed by von Balthasar: is systematic theological synthesis compatible with the doctrinal expression of the Roman Catholic faith? The question can be answered only by a systematic showing that such a synthesis is possible, even that a plurality of such syntheses are possible. This can be done by the construction of such a synthesis through the application of a dogmatically-normed methodology, and, as I think, not otherwise. The Thomist ontological method, caused as it is by the conversion of Aristotelian metaphysics to the Christian doctrines of creation and Incarnation, should be able to form such a synthesis; it has been prevented from doing so by a completely arbitrary and untheological insistence upon a "double gratuity" on the level of substance: a natural gratuity of creation, and a supernatural gratuity of Incarnation. This distinction is systematically untenable.

Its pervasive grip on the Thomist imagination has undercut the entire project of a Thomist theological synthesis, for it has forced upon the entire realm of grace the category of ontological accident: for "nature" has absorbed all of substantial contingency except in the one instance of the Incarnation — an instance which, in such a theological context, becomes an arbitrary event in "natural" history. This dissociates all created grace from its origin in Christ: participation in Him would be on the level of substance, not accident. The result is a "theology" of incoherence, its gaps plugged by recourse to such nominalist devices as divine decrees distinguishable from the Mission of the Son by the Father to Give the Spirit. In brief, a purely nominal and imaginative distinction between a natural and a supernatural contingency on the level of substance has forced theology to become nominal insofar as it is not "natural." And yet all of this is easily avoidable, simply by accepting the full impact of the dogmatic norm, the Chalcedonian definition, upon the Aristotelian ontology, and resisting all nominalist temptations to create a Thomist ontology, in Rahner's sense of the term, by preference to a Thomist theology. Such a theology would be an ontology of an absolutely Christocentric creation, and it would stand to the Revelation as potency to act, as hypothesis to the actuality of truth. This, it seems, would avoid von Balthasar's historically well-founded objection to the Thomist synthesis.

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

Book Reviews

Sullivan, Rev. Thomas F., *Discussion Guide to "Sharing the Light of Faith": National Catechetical Directory for Catholics of the United States*. National Conference of Diocesan Directors of Religious Education – CCD (NCDD); 1979

For anyone reading this work *after* having read the *National Catechetical Directory* (NCD) the only imaginable impression must be one of profound puzzlement. Is it really possible that Fr. Sullivan intended this work to be a "discussion guide" to the NCD as it is now, i.e., as amended and reamended after two elaborate consultations with the whole body of the faithful, and then approved after further revisions by the American bishops and the Holy See, and finally published as the authoritatively normative application of the General Catechetical Directory (GCD) for this country? In view of this history, Fr. Sullivan *must* have intended this contribution of his as input for, say, the *first* time around, i.e., back in 1975 when such items as First Communion before Confession, "ongoing revelation," learning without memorization, the role of the bishops and the pope in the community of faith, etc., could still be considered. At that time several of his positions were somehow "discussable." But *now!* How many more times must the bishops say, "This is *it*," before the fact and the content of their decision are finally understood and accepted?

A "discussion guide" to the NCD is not an altogether bad idea, even though there must be an end *somewhere* to guidelines to guidelines to guidelines. Part of Fr. Sullivan's work is not out-of-date. He discusses each of the eleven chapters of the NCD in a tripartite manner: first, he gives a summary of the chapter's content, then he poses a series of "discussion questions," and finally he recommends some "readings." The summaries that comprise the first part are adequately done. They might help synopsise for the reader the content of each chapter; and since the text of the NCD – even after the revisions – is still somewhat lengthy, such a synopsis is helpful. It might have been even more effective if these summaries had been put in outline form. But then, that might have injected a larger element of *interpretation* into them than they actually have. And interpretation is just what the NCD does not need from Fr. Sullivan!

Unfortunately, the other two parts of his work are pure Fr. Sullivan, not the Bishops' NCD.

The "discussion questions" which make up the second part of this *Guide* are, one suspects, the real centerpiece of his work. They are intended, as Fr.

Sullivan himself states in his Introduction (p. iv), to "promote understanding of the main ideas of the *Directory* and to stimulate discussion on how these ideas can be applied in actual practice to local catechetical programs." To "promote understanding" ordinarily presupposes that the questions will assume the *truth* of these ideas implanted by the Bishops in the NCD. But what in fact do we find? In roughly half of Fr. Sullivan's discussion questions there is an unmistakable suggestion that the ideas of the NCD are *not* to be accepted as they are presented by the Bishops. What he invites Catechists and students to "discuss" is not always the application of these ideas as true, but sometimes the repudiation of them as untrue – or, at best, a reservation about them as doubtful.

It is bad enough if all he does is to raise questions about certain positions held by the common doctrine of the Church. The NCD explicitly enjoins on catechists the responsibility to teach that common doctrine and not "theological opinions" (NCD, No. 16; p. 10.) An example of gratuitous questionings, which are neither infrequent nor particularly subtle, is his suggestions regarding Christ's human knowledge (Ch. V, quest. 4; p. 23). But what is worse is that he (again not infrequently and not very subtly) explicitly re-opens several questions explicitly closed by the bishops and/or the Holy See. E.g., he uses the term "revelation" in a sense that has been expressly forbidden (Ch. III, quest. 6 and 7; p. 12); he caricatures the traditional teaching on mortal sin, and thus re-opens the question closed by the NCD on the "fundamental option" alternative to that teaching (Ch. V, quest. 10; p. 24); he dismisses the frequently reiterated ruling on Confession before First Communion (Ch. VI, quest. 6; p. 29); he challenges the decision regarding memorization (Ch. VIII, quest. 5; p. 42).

If there is still any doubt about the overall thrust of these "discussion questions," even a cursory glance at the third part of his *Guide* will quickly take care of that. Fr. Sullivan's recommended "readings" reads almost like a "who's who" of the new "paramagisterium" of the "American Church: Greeley, McBrien, Dulles, Brown, Hellwig, Baum, Orsy, Marthaler. With these writers as sources, who really needs any NCD at all!

To what can we attribute such blatant defiance of the bishops' authority as expressed in their NCD? Why so by a priest associated with the office responsible to the bishops for the preparation and implementation of the NCD? I suggested earlier (not altogether facetiously) that Fr. Sullivan is

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

really out-of-date in pushing these questions of his. He, of course, must see it otherwise. The persons really out-of-date in his view must be the bishops themselves. For here they are, still insisting on unchanging doctrine (NCD, No. 59; p. 31), and part of that unchanging doctrine is that they — the bishops — and they alone are the Magisterium! Fr. Sullivan avers, however, (Ch. III, quest. 10; p. 12), that change (and not just in “disciplinary laws”) is here and is here to stay. If this fact of change is true, then why not treat this NCD in the same way in which the GCD was treated. Just ignore it and keep on with the “catechesis of change” so well established (and unchanging!) in so many Catholic places already.

In the light of this situation, there is irony (is Fr. Sullivan unaware of it?) in the question he poses under Chapter VIII (quest. 6; p. 42): “Are catechists sometimes tempted to manipulate learners to get them to agree with certain positions?” Fr. Sullivan surely must know what he is talking about.

Robert I. Bradley, S.J.

[Fr. Bradley is the founder of *Our Lady of Peace Institute in Catholic Teaching*, Beaverton, Oregon]

The Habit of Being, Letters of Flannery O'Connor, selected and edited by Sally Fitzgerald. 596 pages (Farrar, Straus & Giroux) \$15.00

This is a memorable book, a book to read and to keep, to lend (you will want to share it), but cautiously (you won't want to lose it), and to dip into again and again.

It may very well be the best thing Flannery O'Connor has done, if only because it is a marvelous key to her fiction, which no one can now read without better understanding; and a welcome expansion to the small output (two novels, 2 collections of short stories, and a book of essays) she was able to complete before her death of lupus in 1964 at the age of 39.

It is ironic that this important American writer was often misunderstood and unappreciated by secular critics. She knew why: “One of the awful things about writing when you are a Christian is that for you the ultimate reality is the Incarnation, the present reality is the Incarnation, and nobody believes in the Incarnation; that is, nobody in your audience. My audience are the people who think God is dead. At least these are the people I am conscious of writing for.”

It is sad, and must have caused her untold anguish, that she was usually misunderstood and regarded with suspicion by her fellow Catholics. “The silence of the Catholic critic is so often

preferable to his attention,” she confided wryly. And again: . . . the ironical part of my silent reception by Catholics is the fact that I write the way I do because and only because I am a Catholic. I feel that if I were not a Catholic, I would have no reason to write, no reason to see, no reason ever to feel horrified or even to enjoy anything.” Again, she knew why: “The stories are hard but they are hard because there is nothing harder or less sentimental than Christian realism. I believe that there are many rough beasts now slouching toward Bethlehem to be born and that I have reported the progress of a few of them . . .” Fortunately, she could laugh (she thought the most serious things had to be comic and the most comic things serious): “I wish somebody really intelligent would write me sometime but I seem to attract the lunatic fringe mainly.”

She knew her audience: “Right now the whole world seems to be going through a dark night of the soul.” And, “. . . if you live today you breathe in nihilism. In or out of the Church, it's the gas you breathe. If I hadn't had the Church to fight it with or tell me the necessity of fighting it, I would be the stinkiest logical positivist you ever saw right now.”

She was sure of her faith: “As for Jesus' being a realist: if He was not God, He was no realist, only a liar, and the crucifixion an act of justice.”

When Mary McCarthy, who “departed the Church at the age of 15 and is a Big Intellectual,” said at a dinner party that “now she thought of it [the Host] as a symbol and implied that it was a pretty good one . . . I then said, in a very shaky voice, ‘Well, if it's a symbol, to hell with it.’ That was all the defense I was capable of but I realize now that this is all I will ever be able to say about it, outside of a story, except that it is the center of existence for me; all the rest of life is expendable.”

“The truth does not change according to our ability to stomach it emotionally. A higher paradox confounds emotion as well as reason and there are long periods in the lives of all of us, and of the saints, when the truth as revealed by faith is hideous, emotionally disturbing, downright repulsive.”

She never felt fettered by faith or Church:

“When I call myself a Catholic with a modern consciousness, I don't mean what might be implied in the phrase ‘modern Catholic,’ which doesn't make sense. If you're a Catholic you believe what the Church teaches and the climate makes no difference.”

“For me a dogma is only a gateway to contemplation and is an instrument of freedom and not of restriction. It preserves mystery for the human mind. Henry James said the young women

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

of the future would know nothing of mystery or manners. He had no business to limit it to one sex."

"I have never had the sense that being a Catholic is a limit to the freedom of the writer, but just the reverse."

Lest you think that these letters are wholly concerned with serious matters, let me assure you that they are more often very funny (and when Miss O'Connor is describing the hired hands on her mother's farm, hilarious):

"... New York where the culture fog is thicker ..."

"Do you read the *National Geographic* or do you smell it? I smell it . . . It has a distinct unforgettable transcendent apothecic (?) and very grave odor. Like no other mere magazine. If *Time* smelled like the *Nat'l Geo.* there would be some excuse for its being printed."

"Mauriac recently made the statement that *Bonjour Tristesse* was written by the devil, so I read it. Well it was a very stupid remark for Mauriac to make because the devil writes better than Mademoiselle Sagan."

She found huge enjoyment in a daily columnist who "appears in the *Atlantic Constitution* on the same page as the comic strips": "Lately the doctor has been concerning himself with what to tell your child when he asks where he came from. I won't even repeat his advice as it is much too naturalistic for me. He says they'll ask the first question and then it'll be several years before they ask the second. I don't doubt it a bit."

When you finish this marvelous collection of letters, you know Flannery O'Connor very well, and are much the better for it. You even know something about her that she never suspected and would be angry at anyone who found it out, her very real holiness. It is evident from passages like this:

"It [her writing] is first of all a gift, but the direction it has taken has been because of the Church in me or the effect of the Church's teaching, not because of a personal perception or love of God. For you to think this would be possible because of your ignorance of me; for me to think it would be sinful to a high degree. I am not a mystic and I do not lead a holy life. Not that I can claim any interesting or pleasurable sins (my sense of the devil is strong) but I know all about the garden variety, pride, gluttony, envy and sloth, and what is more to the point, my virtues are as timid as my vices. I think sin occasionally brings one close to God, but not habitual sin and not this petty kind that blocks every small good. A working knowledge of the devil can be very well had by resisting him. However, the individual in the

Church is, no matter how worthless himself, a part of the Body of Christ, and a participator in the Redemption . . ."

By all means, get this delightful collection of letters and keep it. You might not always agree with Flannery O'Connor's opinions or likes or dislikes, but you will conclude about her what she said of the great Aquinas: "I feel I can personally guarantee that St. Thomas loved God, because for the life of me I cannot help loving St. Thomas."

Joseph I. Dirvin, C.M.

[Fr. Dirvin is the author on *Mrs. Seton* and *Louise DeMarillac*]

Benedict M. Ashley and Kevin D. O'Rourke
Health Care Ethics (Published by the Catholic Hospital Association 1978)

Health Care Ethics by Kevin D. O'Rourke, O.P. and Benedict M. Ashley, O.P. avoids the shortcomings of both deontological ethics and situationism. This book is a balanced text dealing with contemporary medical-moral issues. It is theoretically sound, yet practically oriented.

However, *Health Care Ethics* ought not be considered simply a book on medical ethics. Because of the foundation laid for the discussion of medico-moral questions it could actually serve as a general introduction to moral theology with most of the illustrations drawn from medicine. It embraces a remarkable breadth of topics, from a discussion of Josef Fuch's principle of proportion to the art of skin grafting. And it provides a SOCIAL context for the discussion of medical ethics by giving attention to the Church's social doctrine, including questions of the common good and subsidiarity.

The authors modestly state that Part I deals with "the dignity of the person in community and his or her right to health care and the responsibility for it" and then proceed to develop a sound, wholesome Christian anthropology.

In Part III the authors develop what they call their principle of Prudential Personalism, basically a Thomistic approach to morality. It draws on the best in the "personalist" orientation of the recent past without falling into the sort of subjectivism one encounters in the CTSA study *Human Sexuality*. The CTSA study claimed to base its morality on the directive in "Gaudium et Spes" that the Church's moral teaching be based on "the nature of the human person and his acts" but proceeded to develop a sexual ethic with little or no regard for the objective nature of the human person and his inherent ends. *Health Care Ethics*

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

also appeals to the same passage in "Gaudium et Spes" but avoids the decline into subjectivism largely because of its emphasis on the virtue of Prudence ("recta ratio agibilium") which faithfully perceives the reality of a given situation and is able, therefore, to choose the objectively appropriate means to the desired end. However the virtue of prudence also orders all the virtues toward the execution of a reasonable act by its awareness of man's final end and the general norms which must be acknowledged if man is to attain that end.

The authors incorporate most of the essential elements of traditional moral theology without ever sounding "textbookish." The role of moral circumstances, for example, is introduced and discussed almost casually, as though it were something any reasonable person would acknowledge if brought to his attention. The knotty question of what actually constitutes the moral object of an act is discussed in terms of a nurse bandaging a hand.

A particularly creative approach is used in the establishment of the norms for Christian decision-making in bio-ethics. These norms are established through a consideration of the theological virtues of faith, hope and love. Faith is used to give the authors' ethic a grounding in objective reality. It leads to the formulation of their "Principle of Moral Discrimination" which states, in part, that a "deliberate act freely consented to, is mortally sinful if it breaks our commitment to God directly or indirectly by doing serious harm to human persons (one's self included) who are his children." This is a sound personalism which reflects St. Thomas' assertion that God is offended by us only when we act against our own good. Such topics as the doctrine of double effect and formal and material cooperation are discussed under this virtue.

Questions of motivation and respect for the integrity of the person are discussed in light of charity. Hope gives rise to a reflection on growth, a Christian use of suffering and death, and human sexuality, all of which reflect different modes of Christian openness to the future.

In Part IV the authors apply to difficult bio-ethical questions the principles developed earlier in their book. Their approach is objective, principled and faithful to magisterial teaching. However, it is here that some might find a certain uneasiness with the book. The authors go to such great pains to present both sides of some current controversies that their own positions do not always stand out with the clarity for which one would hope.

The question of the cooperation of Catholic

health care facilities in direct sterilization is a case in point. The authors emphatically reject any kind of formal cooperation or immediate material cooperation in this objectively disordered act. However, the door does seem to be left open for *remote* material cooperation. Yet, even here, an occasional toleration of the act in terms of remote material cooperation can never become established as a "policy."

In the give and take resulting from a presentation of the views of the dissenters from and supporters of the prohibition of sterilization by the 1971 "Ethical & Religious Directives for Catholic Health Facilities," the reader sometimes wonders where Ashley and O'Rourke stand. However, they always do give their own conclusions on these controversial topics, and the magisterial position is invariably upheld, although perhaps not as forcefully as one might hope.

At the conclusion of their discussion of sterilization, for example, they state, "Catholic hospitals either must decide to hold the line

by adhering to a strict interpretation of the 'Directives' in order to give an unambiguous witness to a distinctly Catholic position, which has the risk of forcing such hospitals to gradually withdraw from serving the general public because of the lack of financial and professional support and earns for them the reputation of sectarian unreasonableness. Or they must allow a much broader interpretation of the 'Directives' that permits material cooperation (and the danger) of gradual secularization. . . Perhaps the only way open in some more difficult situations is a middle course in which material cooperation is kept strictly limited and under vigilant control. This approach, however, also has its difficulties. All in all, the authors feel the *stricter policy* should be maintained if at all possible." (p. 285-6)

Although the book is not directed to professional theologians, but rather to health care professionals, pastors and laity to help them understand and inform their consciences regarding many of the routine and even extraordinary problems facing modern man in his pursuit of good health, the authors do sometimes discuss issues which are controverted by ethicists and theologians and come to conclusions with which the reviewer would not concur. They suggest, for example, that it is not necessary to consider all sexual acts as grave matter. However, this reviewer believes that all sexual acts must be considered as grave matter because of their essential relationship to the supreme good of human life.

Also, after rejecting artificial insemination not only by donor, but also by husband (AIH) Ashley and O'Rourke rightly state that the immorality of AIH lies not in the method of procuring the semen,

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

but rather in the violation of the unitive dimension of the marital act. However, the authors then go on to discuss the possibility that the act of procuring a seminal specimen through genital manipulation need not be viewed as masturbation, but rather as a morally indifferent or licit act which they refer to as "induced ejaculation." The authors argue that the act is not masturbation because the actor's purpose is the obtaining of a seminal specimen with the accompanying venereal pleasure being tolerated as an unintended side effect. However, any sex act has an intrinsic finality ordered toward the procreative good quite apart from the intentions of the actor. This intrinsic finality must enter into a determination of the moral object and cannot be altered by the actor's intent.

Yet, in spite of these differences, it is the opinion of the reviewer that *Health Care Ethics* is basically a sound book, faithful to clear magisterial teaching, although perhaps not always adequate in the conclusions drawn on certain controverted issues. The book goes to great lengths (perhaps too great) in its attempt to discuss all sides of contemporary medico-moral issues, but its dispassionate, non-polemical approach is certainly a strength. It should be a valuable book for introducing laymen to many of the controversial issues in medical ethics today and for giving assistance to those who desire to form a Catholic conscience in the moral problems involved in procuring or providing health care.

John M. Haas

[Professor Haas teaches Theology at the *Josephinum*]

(Editor's Note: The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* March 30, 1979 reports Fr. O'Rourke as saying the following: "When Catholic couples are not motivated by selfishness, the use of artificial contraception is in the category of moral offenses and the 'lesser of two evils.'" Rarely, he suggested, would 'mortal' or serious sin be involved.")

Saint Thomas Aquinas, Orthodoxy, and Neo-Modernism in the Church by Renee Casin, translated and edited by James Likoudis, 150 pp., paper, Catholic United for the Faith, 222 North Avenue, New Rochelle, New York 10801. \$3.00.

This lucid translation of the work of the talented French Catholic writer, Renee Casin, brings to English-speaking readers what may well be termed a diminutive masterpiece. Its theme is not only timely, but urgent. The confusion and error which have spread so widely since Vatican II concerning the very nature and mission of the Church cry out for precisely this type of clear and

orthodox explanation of the main topics of current controversy. Its particular value arises from its detailed expose of and response to the present-day resurgence of the heresies of Modernism which were so properly condemned by Pope St. Pius X at the turn of the century. In redressing these errors which now seem to engulf the very life of the Church, the author makes use, not only of the authentic teachings of the Supreme Magisterium as well as an accurate sense of the living history of genuine doctrine, but also she skillfully interweaves in her analysis the teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas — so that the eternal truths perceived by his mind illuminate the Neo-Modernist darkness with the light of faith and reason. By creating, at least in part, a virtual "modern-day commentary by St. Thomas," Renee Casin has made a singular contribution to the much needed effort to dispel the confusion and doubt which have enshrouded Christendom since Vatican II.

This beautifully presented little work is highly to be recommended to any Catholic wishing to be well informed about the true teaching of the Church today. For the recent convert, its succinct expression of the eternal and living truth which is the Church might well prove essential to maintaining a balanced understanding of the chaotic times since Vatican II. The reader will find great solace and a deepened reaffirmation of traditional belief in the work and will surely agree that we owe a debt of gratitude to the author for sharing her insights on the faith and to the translator for having so adroitly rendered available in English this most important commentary on the Church in our times.

Dennis Bonnette

[Dr. Bonnette teaches philosophy in Niagara University]

Charles E. Rice, *Beyond Abortion: The Theory and Practice of the Secular State* (Chicago, Franciscan Herald Press, 1979).

Pro-life activists will find this work invaluable in showing *why* the abortion battle began and the direction in which it is heading. In his view the official establishment of the contraceptive ethic underlies the abortion problem.

Professor Rice of Notre Dame Law School is editor of the *American Journal of Jurisprudence*.

James V. Schall *The Praise of 'Sons of Bitches'* (St. Paul Publications, Great Britain 1978)

The unusual title to this book is drawn from an Arthur Miller smart alecky line: "Man is a social

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

animal or a son of a bitch, as God and the prophets warned since the beginning." This is a "personal" book by a very smart and very realistic Jesuit political scientist and moral philosopher.

Anyone familiar with Fr. Schall's writing will recognize his flitting style which trips the light fantastic over serious thoughts, only (in case you missed his meaning the first time) to trip again and again over the same thought (in a different context) until you get the message. One of his recurring thoughts is that modern man is engaged in a search for glory and an optimism about his possibilities which are unreal. Schall's chapters are really essays — on building Cathedrals and tearing them down, on the most dangerous virtue (which turns out to be sincerity), on boredom, on playing, on worship and God's jokes.

Fr. Schall's comments on the plight of the modern university are not without poignancy. Looking back on history he sees the university as a place where people sought knowledge even if it seemed irrelevant (e.g. of aorist participles) now vulgarized by its pursuit of "the now", which explains why "English professors and nuclear scientists have come forth in recent decades as the voices of contemporary politicking movements in the universities." Including Catholic professors, of course.

If a reader enjoys the trip of the light fantastic, they will enjoy this priest who trips regularly from Rome to Georgetown to San Francisco.

Claire Chambers *The SIECUS Circle: A Humanist Revolution* (Belmont, Mass., Western Island Publications, 1977)

This book should be in the library of every Catholic bishop responsible for the marriage preparation of Catholic youth. It also should be owned by Catholic teachers and research scholars who take the Church's sexual ethic as representing God's law or Christ's gospel.

It is surprising (or perhaps not so surprising) that a work such as this has received so little attention in the Catholic circle.

The book's value is in its documentation of the impressive victory of secular humanism in the United States, especially in the area of sexual behavior. (The scope of the research here is also impressive.)

Saying this does not mean that all parts of the book are evenly or even-handedly done. But the book starts with the boast of the American Humanist Association,

"Many innovative ideas on birth control, human rights, science for humanity, education, sexual equality,

humanistic psychology, and moral relativity, now commonly accepted and practiced, were first introduced and advocated by humanists." (p. 67)

and proceeds to demonstrate how this revolution began to spread.

The *SIECUS Circle* is only the latest and most influential instrument of the vast cultural change which has occurred within the last generation. SIECUS, standing for the *Sex Information and Education Council of the United States*, came into being only in 1964 as a spin-off of *Planned Parenthood-World Population*. Dr. Mary Calderone, medical director of the parent group moved to become the executive director of the offspring. The main thrust of this book is to trace SIECUS' influence within the circle of organizations which make up a network of instruments for social change, particularly in the area of sexual mores and family life.

The reader is enticed by the author to follow her tracing of cross-pollination of ideas from SIECUS through major (and respectable) social, education, and even religious organizations. Her outline of SIECUS influence on Catholic publishing houses, Catholic courses of sex study and official Catholic bodies is fascinating. And I, for one can vouch for the authenticity of the connections because as Family Life Director in New York up until 1966 I was there and saw it happen.

Almost by osmosis official Catholic programs draw heavily on SIECUS sources — even to this day. Recommended bibliographies in official Catholic texts dealing with subjects like responsible parenthood are weighted in favor of writings by those who are contraceptionist in their thinking.

This influence, by the way, is not conspiratorial if that means it was hatched, thatched, and dispatched in a smoke-filled room. It is the result of many committed secular humanists (who consider the Christian sex ethic and frequently Christianity, obsolete and mythological, p. 103) working as hard alone, as in concert, to propagate their message. The Humanists never planned to abolish the Churches, merely to humanize them, taking credit lately for "the liberalizing influences at work within Jewish and Protestant groups and the changing attitude of many Catholics." (p. 90)

A similar commitment and technical know-how was once credited to the Catholic Church.

There are somethings about this book which are annoying. Claire Chambers — its author — is never identified. Nor would the book, were it published by a large house, have an index containing references such as this, "SIECUS, passim", leaving the reader at sea trying to find specifics all over again.

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

A more serious defect is its overkill — unnecessary overkill. Chambers would make SIECUS into a world-wide conspiracy with “Socialism, Communism, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Tax-Exempt foundations, and occultism” (p. 393). In so doing the reader interested in her sex-education story (which is solid and only mildly polemical) can be led to dismiss even this account as unreliable. Granted that early birth controllers were socialists and that during the depression years particularly Communists used many social movements, including early family planning, as their sphere of covert action, it is silly at this state of history to believe there is any direct tie-in between John D. Rockefeller III and William Z. Foster. The use also of unreliable congressional documents to back up her reporting in this area is also silly, when done in 1977.

It would be too bad, however, if the misplaced polemics of an author “dedicated to the preservation of Christianity” should deflect a reader from the integrity of research in the subject area where she is most at home and most correct.

George A. Kelly

June Publications

Msgr. George A. Kelly, *The Battle for the American Church*, Doubleday & Co., Inc., 528 pages, \$14.95.

Contents — Who's in Charge?; Vatican II: Aftershocks of an Ecclesiastical Earthquake; Reading and Misreading the Council Documents; Of Modernism and Modernization: Alfred Loisy and Hans Kung; The Battle for the Catholic Campus; The Revolt of the Theologians; The Birth Control Battle; The Battle for the Catholic Child, or Psychology vs. Parents; Embattled Nuns; Embattled Priests or the Disorder of Melchisedech; The Defeat of the Bishops; The Sack of Rome, or Rome Has Spoken, The Case is Still Open; Whither Goes the Future of the Catholic Church?

* * * * *

James Hitchcock, *Catholicism and Modernity: Confrontation or Capitulation?* (New York, Seabury Press, No Price Yet)

Contents — The Flight from Eternity; The Loss of History; The Imperial Self; The Sensation of Movement; The Illusion of Pluralism; The Triumph of Bureaucracy; the Road to Utopia; The Kingdom of Politics; The Coming World Religion; The Future of Roman Catholicism.

Periodical Reviews

James H. Ford, M.D. and Michael Schwartz, “Birth Control for Teenagers: Diagram for Disaster,” *Linacre Quarterly* 46.1 (February, 1979) 71-81.

The Ford-Schwartz article is an incisive, devastating critique of the proposal that the most effective way to prevent teenage pregnancies is to give young people, in particular girls, extensive information about contraceptive techniques and to make these techniques, in particular the pill and IUD's readily available. This proposal has been widely promoted by Planned Parenthood, with the generous support of federal monies, and has, unfortunately, been reluctantly accepted by a great number of people. As Ford and Schwartz point out, a 1978 survey of middle-class parents showed that 80% thought that contraceptive services should be made readily available for teenagers, despite the fact that a solid 57% of respondents were opposed to premarital sexual activity.

To support their contention that ready access to contraceptives is the only way to bring about a decline in teenage pregnancies Planned Parenthooders bring out surveys of the sexual and contraceptive experience of American girls aged 15 to 19 conducted by Melvin Zelnik and John Kantner. Ford and Schwartz show that the Zelnik-Kantner studies, far from giving credibility to the proposal of Planned Parenthood, actually lead to the conclusion that easy access to contraceptives increases teenage pregnancies. What Zelnik and Kantner show in their surveys is that there has been a dramatic increase, from 1971 to 1976, both in the number of teenagers who are sexually active and who make regular use of contraceptives. Still, despite the fact that more sexually active teenagers regularly use contraceptives, the number of teenage pregnancies increased by 45%. Even Zelnik and Kantner find it difficult to explain what they euphemistically term the “lack of decline” in teenage pregnancies. Ford and Schwartz point out that this “lack of decline” is, in fact, an increase.

In short, what the Zelnik-Kantner studies demonstrate is that making contraceptives available to teenagers results in (a) an increase in the number of sexually active teenagers, (b) an increase in the number of teenagers who engaged in contraceptive intercourse who become pregnant, and (c) an increase in the number of abortions of pregnant teenage girls. Zelnik-Kantner note that girls who use contraceptives are far more likely to “terminate” pregnancies by abortions than those who do not.

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

In concluding their enlightening article Ford and Schwartz observe that "for generations, parents taught their children moral responsibility and gave them the foundation on which to build their own families. This system was not perfect, but it produced infinitely better results than the current programs. It gave children reasons for preserving their chastity and it supported them in doing so until they were mature enough to make responsible use of their sexual faculties i.e., until they were mature enough to marry. Parents could still do that. Indeed, many parents still are doing it . . . But if parents are to be effective in giving their children the moral training they so desperately need, they will have to be supported, not undermined, by their churches, schools, government agencies, and the medical profession."

The Ford-Schwartz article, based on irrefutable factual evidence, is most opportune. It gives the lie to those who proclaim that a teenage girl will not get pregnant if she takes the pill. The facts show that she quite likely will, and the facts also show that girls who take the pill and become sexually active also expose themselves to the risks of VD and cervical cancer.

William E. May

(In the same issue of *Linacre* there is an essay by Dr. May entitled "Fertility Awareness and Sexuality.")

activity. The curriculum guide for seventh and eighth grade children in Kasun's California residence area specifies that "the student will develop an understanding of masturbation" and "support [for] various forms of intimacy between members of the same sex." Planned Parenthood pamphlets are prominent in such instructions. The programs are now engaged in 'intention-changing' and 'mental conditioning exercises.'

The most sinister aspect of sex-education in the United States are the millions of tax dollars now poured into such programs by HEW. The ostensible justification is that they reduce illegitimacy and venereal disease. The facts seem to prove they do nothing of the kind, although the programs acculturate a pagan view of sexuality. Whereas "responsible parenthood" was once the professed objective, the trend is now toward "responsible sex", i.e. sex without parenthood.

Catholic pastors involved in sex education programs of their own will find this article valuable for its summary of contemporary secular doings. Perhaps more revealing is the exposition of how "developmental psychology exercises" (Piaget-Kohlberg-Simon) so clarify values that the choices are likely to be in a direction Catholic pastors do not anticipate.

George A. Kelly

Jacqueline Kasun, "Turning Children into Sex Experts", *The Public Interest*, Spring 1979, pp. 3-14.

This professor of Economics at Humboldt State University addresses questions rarely raised any more by Catholics. Indeed as the author astutely observes of the secular arena, "anyone questioning the value of sex education must be some sort of unenlightened crank."

Kasun sees the contemporary problem as follows: "The contemporary sex-education movement does not focus primarily on the biological aspects of sex. The movement's leaders and disciples are not biologists but mainly psychologists, sociologists, and 'health educators'. Their principal concerns are less with the physiology of procreation and inheritance than with 'sexuality', a very broad field of interest running the gamut from personal hygiene to the population questions, but largely concerned with attitudes and 'values clarification' rather than with biological facts."

Unsurprising to those who have been attentive to developments in this teaching field within the past quarter century, new sex programs are "rather thin on biological facts" and detailed about sexual

Publications of Interest

- The February 1979 issue of *Lumiere et Vie*, a Theological publication in France, has an article entitled "Marginaliser Les Geneurs Avec Le Sourire: Vers Une Typologie de L'Exclusion hors L'Eglise," by Alain Woodrow. The opening lines of the articles summary states the thesis: "The Council has exploded the myth of the unity of the Church. Pluralism is an uncontestable fact. Should one fix limits to this, and how? The conciliar declaration on religious liberty applies also to the internal relationships of the Church."

The final paragraphs define "L'Eglise orthodoxe" as one freed from Roman juridicism, with conscience liberated, with orthodoxy and unity preserved primarily around the Eucharistic table, although "L'Eglise orthodoxe est composee de plusieurs Eglises autocephales."

- Two articles by Theresa M. Crem, Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Francisco will be published by the *Laval Theologique et Philosophique*. "A Moderate Dualist Alternative to Cartesian Dualism" will appear in the June issue, and "A Thomistic Critique of the Identity Theory" in a subsequent issue. The former presents the

Thomistic vision of man as a matter-spirit substantial unity and the testimony of outstanding scientists supporting this position, and the latter criticizes the materialistic theory which identifies the mind with the brain.

- Russell Kirk, *Decadence and Renewal in the Higher Learning* (South Bend, Ind., Gateway Editions \$15.00) and Kenneth H. Ashworth, *American Higher Education in Decline* (College Station, Texas, Texas A & M University Press \$7.95) cover some of the same territory.
- Dr. James Hitchcock has co-authored a new book, *Catholic Perspectives: Divorce*, with Dr. Mary G. Durkin. It is published by the Thomas More Association. Hitchcock also has an essay in the new anthology, *Why Catholic?*, edited by John

J. Delaney, published by Doubleday.

- Fr. Manuel Miguens, O.F.M. has a new book entitled *Gospels for Sundays and Feasts: The Biblical Message* (Boston: St. Paul Editions 1979, pp. 268, Cloth \$7.50; Paper \$6.00). This particular volume provides material for homilies based on the gospels in liturgical cycle B. Cycles C and A will follow.
- Faith Press, an English publishing house, has provided a pamphlet, *The Language of Public Worship* by A.R. Walmsley. The author provides a critique of the current ICEL translations of the Liturgy. The address: Faith Press, Leighton Buzzard, Beds. LU7, 7 NQ, England. Price \$2.00. Discounts for group or bookstores are available.

St. John's University
Jamaica, N.Y. 11439

| |
|---|
| Non-Profit Org. U.S. Postage PAID Jamaica, N.Y. Permit No. 451 |
|---|

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars

- Ellen M. Wilson, "Catholic Education: A Backward Look at the Future", National Committee of Catholic Laymen, 150 East 35th Street, New York, New York 10016. 16 pp.

A very fine explanation by a young graduate of Bryn Mawr of what has happened to tear Catholic higher education from its roots. Her final page contains the following observation: "Secular colleges are not colleges lacking a religious or philosophical anchor, and hence free to follow truth wherever it goes; they are institutions anchored to their own set of philosophical assumptions — secular humanism. And to maintain that they are better equipped to think and educate is to concede that secular humanism is innately superior to Catholicism (at least as a system of thought.)"

- "Why don't bishops take action against

dissenters?" This courageous question is faced by Fr. Joseph J. Farragher, S.J. and answered with equal directness in the April 1979 issue of *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*. He also raises a little asked question. If dissenters in conscience really feel they must contradict Church teaching publicly, Fr. Farragher asks: "Should they not resign their position where they are considered a representative of the Church, or refrain from hearing confessions or preaching if that is their metier?" Then at the end he raises the conscience question for Catholic University presidents and bishops: "Shouldn't any professor in a seminary or Catholic college at least be required to teach in conformity with the Nicene Creed and with defined Catholic doctrine? I think they should. I fear that many young Catholics lose their faith because of the teaching of supposedly Catholic teachers in Catholic theology course."