

FELLOWSHIP OF CATHOLIC SCHOLARS

NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 3, NUMBER 2

MARCH 1980

Letter from President James Hitchcock

The Vatican's censure of Father Hans Kung just before Christmas has aroused more public interest in questions of Catholic scholarship than any event in years, and it might be said that reactions are divided between those who are outraged that it should have occurred and those who wonder why it took so long.

Shortly after announcement of the censure, the Fellowship drafted a statement of support of the Holy See which was cabled to Rome with about thirty signatures on it. Since it was the Christmas vacation, people were often hard to locate, and the officers also made the judgment that a statement sent off relatively quickly, even with fewer names on it, was preferable to one which might not be ready for weeks.

Since announcement of the statement, however, we have received numerous communications from people eager to add their names to it. This response itself perhaps shows why a statement of this kind is important – there is a strong desire to claim that all Catholic scholars support Father Kung and reject procedures like the Vatican censure. The reality, as we know, is quite otherwise.

Perhaps the most disturbing thing about the reactions of those who have supported Father Kung and attacked the Vatican is their irresponsibility about basic facts. Often using loaded terms like "inquisition" and even "auto da fe," they have taken their stand on matters of procedure, claiming that Father Kung was dealt with arbitrarily, was given no chance to defend himself, etc. All this sounds ominous to democratic American ears. Surely, however, his defenders are aware of his own repeated and contemptuous refusal to cooperate in any process of evaluation of his work. Surely also it is not unreasonable, given this attitude, for the authorities to take a large and for the most part quite clearly written body of theological works as a sufficient basis for evaluating him.

Father Kung seems to want it both ways. On the one hand he engages in the theology of contestation in an almost systematic way. Neither the depth nor the originality of his theology, nor even particularly the provocative nature of some of his ideas, account for his public vogue. It is because he has, seemingly consciously, made himself into the Peck's bad boy of the post-conciliar Church that he has achieved a world-wide reputation. But he also demands the rights of the scrupulously academic theologian.

His defenders also claim that, if he has disturbed some believers, he has made Christianity credible to many of the margins of the Church. But it is worth asking exactly what he has made credible? Is it Christianity, much less Catholicism, or is it a kind of counterfeit of Christianity that caters to prevailing modern cultural prejudices?

The issue is really larger than the role of one man in a particular university, or the influence of his writings. The real question in the Kung case is whether the Church has the ability to recognize what is or is not authentic Catholic theology or is somehow obligated to accept everything which presents itself under that name. And if the Church does have the competence so to discern, does it not also have an obligation to proclaim what it discerns, both to its own flock and to those who may wish to engage it in dialogue?

Friends of the Fellowship

We are grateful to our benefactors. The work of the Fellowship has in the last year expanded greatly. Its activities are subsidized by the contributed service of many devoted scholars and universities. We also are grateful to our friends.

Terence Cardinal Cooke
Humberto Cardinal Medeiros
Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle

Archbishop James J. Byrne
Archbishop John Whealon

Bishop William Connare
Bishop Gerard Frey
Bishop Eugene Gerber
Bishop Robert Joyce

Bishop Charles J. Maloney
Bishop John Russell
Bishop Joseph McShea
Bishop John Scanlon
Bishop Thomas Welsh

Fr. (Maj.) Alfred M. Croke
Msgr. Francis M. Costello
Msgr. Edward Egan
Fr. Michael M. Ferraro

Msgr. Laurence Gardiner
Fr. Walter Kern
Fr. John Masterson, O.P.
Fr. Christopher O'Toole
Fr. Joseph Roach
Fr. Robert Vincent
Fr. George Violand
Sr. Mary Christopher, SND
Mr. John Gonoud
Dr. John Masterson

The Third Annual Fellowship Convention — 1980

GENERAL INFORMATION

- Dates: March 28–30
Place: Sheraton-O'Hare Hotel (Near Airport)
Theme: Christian Faith in a Neo-Pagan Society
Chairman: President James Hitchcock
Keynote Speaker: Bishop Austin B. Vaughan, S.T.D.,
Former President of the Catholic Theological Society of America
Special Guest: John Cardinal Cody, Archbishop of Chicago

GENERAL SESSIONS

Saturday,

March 29 – Professor Paul Vitz (NYU) and William A Stanmeyer (Lincoln Center) will discuss the relationship of moral values to modern psychology and law.

Professor Glenn Olsen (Utah) and Fr. Donald J. Keefe, SJ will give an historian's against a theologian's view of Christianity and Paganism.

Professor Joseph Boyle will relate these values to philosophical systems.

Sunday,

March 30 – Fr. Michael Wrenn (Dunwoodie) will talk about paganism and Catholic education

SPECIAL SESSIONS

1. Fellowship committee meetings will be held at times designated in the program. By this time all members will have received the program.
2. There will be a short general meeting Friday evening at 7:30 p.m. and a full session on Sunday morning at 10:45 a.m.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Return *registration form to Executive Secretary* with declaration of intention and \$15.00 fee.
2. On the same form indicate intentions about taking meals with delegates. The high cost of catering makes advance planning important.
3. Return *hotel registration form to hotel* if you intend to stay there. Rates are reasonable – \$35.00 single or double.

Items of Interest

- In commemorating Karl Rahner's 75th birthday *The Tablet* (London, March 10, 1979) had Peter Hebblethwaite do a testimony. Citing Rahner's 1971 visit to Britain, the English journalist writes of Rahner: "On one occasion he produced a letter from the then aging Rudolf Bultmann. Bultmann explained that he had read Rahner's critique of Kung on infallibility and approved of it." "How fortunate you must be," Bultmann wrote astonishingly, "to be able to appeal to the Pope: appeal to the Lutheran Synods merely leads to greater disunity."

- W. Daly of Australia writes: "The most effective reformers during other troubled periods of the Church, like James Lainez of Trent and Vincent de Paul, gave time to prayer and personal good works. Most of the best analysts of post Vatican II troubles attribute the underlying cause to pre-Vatican II weakness in prayer, holiness and faith." Daly also thinks the Church is presently short on good Catholic literature and libraries. Solid Catholic books are in short supply in stores, while dissenting publications are featured. He recommends renewed attention to this problem by the authentic forces of the Church.

- The Institute of Spirituality (founded by Dominicans in 1952) confers a certificate upon those who complete three full courses of their summer sessions. The Institute is open to priests, deacons, brothers and seminarians who wish to review or deepen their theology of Christian Spirituality. The 1980 sessions will be held June 23-July 11.

For information write Fr. Victor S. LaMotte, O.P., Dominican Priory, 7200 West Division Street, River Forest, Illinois 60305.

- Rev. Louis P. Rogge, O.Carm., Loyola University of Chicago, read a paper "The Woman Called Mary" before a general session of the Ninth Annual Convention of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, September 30-October 2, 1979, Vancouver, B.C. The paper dealt with the place of the Virgin Mary in Scripture and in Salvation History. The S.P.S. is made up principally of theologians from the Classical Pentecostal Tradition.

- President James Hitchcock begins in March a regular column "Vatican Watch" for the *New Oxford Review*.

- In June 1979 Cardinal William Baum sponsored a Workshop on Principles of Catholic Moral Thought at The Catholic University of America. Distinguished Catholic scholars from around the world were invited to lecture. The Workshop was

distinguished both by the excellence of the lectures and by this unfortunately too rare feature: all of those who spoke were strong supporters of the received teaching of the Catholic Church in moral matters.

Over 200 people attended the Workshop. Now the talks are available on tape from: Ministr-o-Media, c/o of St. Joseph's Church, Pomfret, MD 20675. The 17 tapes, in two albums, cost \$60.00.

Speakers at the Workshop included Rev. Louis Bouyer, Prof. John Finnis, of Oxford, Prof. Germain Grisez, Prof. William May, Fr. John Connery, S.J., Rev. Ronald Lawler, O.F.M. Cap., Rev. Joseph Mangan, S.J.

A book containing the lectures will also be published in the Spring by the Franciscan Herald Press.

- Rev. Ronald Lawler, O.F.M. Cap., of The Catholic University of America, has been named the Director of the new *Center for Thomistic Studies*, at the University of St. Thomas, Houston. The Center will inaugurate a graduate program in philosophy in the Fall of this year. It is planned to have a very distinctive graduate program, making special use of the classical tradition and the distinctive thought of Thomas Aquinas in facing the live philosophical questions of our time. The Center is expected to encourage philosophical research also in a variety of ways.

The late professor, Anton Pegis, was the First Director of the Center. He began formulating plans for the Center and Professor Vernon Bourke succeeded him as Acting Director.

Brochures on the Center and its programs are available from Rev. Victor Brezik, C.S.B., Department of Philosophy, University of St. Thomas, 3812 Montrose Boulevard, Houston, Texas 77006. Superior students are being sought for the program; some financial assistance is available.

- *Pastoral Renewal* is a monthly journal for people who have some actual involvement in pastoral care — priests and ministers and lay leaders of communities, prayer groups, renewal organizations, and the rest. The journal seeks to share practical wisdom that addresses the fundamental issues that pastoral leaders encounter in various forms in virtually every Christian body in every tradition, such as how to help people come into a solid relationship with Christ, how to give people practical instruction about handling their lives and relationships in a Christian way, how to structure Christian groups to develop mutual support, how to lead Christians into responsible service in God's kingdom, how to manage one's own priorities and relationships as a pastor.

An important concern of *Pastoral Renewal* is to analyze the sources from which pastoral care is drawn and to distinguish Christian from non-Christian presuppositions. For example, they have recently been examining how some presuppositions in the field of psychology can affect pastoral practice, and have been looking at the question of

how pastors should be helping people handle their emotions in this period of excessive self-analysis and preoccupation with feelings.

Contact Mr. Kevin Perrotta, Managing Editor, Pastoral Renewal, Box 8617 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107.

Fellowship Supports Pope on Kung

President James Hitchcock on behalf of more than 500 members of the *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars* cabled Pope John Paul II January 7, 1980, the following statement in connection with the Holy See's discipline of Swiss theologian Hans Kung:

"The recent declaration of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith contends that the teachings of Fr. Kung on the infallibility of the Church, on the divinity of Jesus Christ, and on various doctrines concerning the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, have, for a long time, contradicted the solemn teaching of the Catholic Church, (and of the official doctrine of many other Christian churches and communities as well). By his writings and lectures Fr. Kung has unsettled the faith of innumerable numbers of the Christian faithful.

"It is also a known fact that Fr. Kung was offered every opportunity to defend his positions, to modify them, and, when necessary, to correct them in light of the official teaching of the Church whose teaching as a Catholic theologian he claimed to represent. All these opportunities he spurned, thus vitiating his repeated and unfounded charges on an 'inquisitional' process.

"Therefore, we, as Catholic professors and theologians, fully endorse the disciplinary action taken against Fr. Kung by the Holy See. We also welcome and support the statements on this same question by William Cardinal Baum, Archbishop John Quinn, and Bishop James A. Hickey, endorsing the action of the Holy See."

The following are some of the signatories to this cablegram which was directed to the Pope through the office of Cardinal Casaroli, Papal Secretary of State.

Dr. James Hitchcock, St. Louis University; Rev. Ronald Lawler, O.F.M., Ph.D., Dr. William May, Ph.D., Catholic University of America; Dr. Marie Lescoe, Central Connecticut State College; Rev. Matthew E. Creighton, S.J., Ph.D., President of Creighton University; Rev. Frederick M. Jelly, O.P., The Josephinum School of Theology; Rev. John D. Baggaly, S.J., S.T.D., Rev. Francis L. Filas, S.J., S.T.D., Rev. David J. Hassel, S.J., Ph.D., Rev. Joseph T. Mangan, S.J., S.T.D., Rev. John J. Powell, S.J., S.T.D., Rev. Charles E. Ronan, S.J., Ph.D., Rev. Raymond V. Schoder, S.J., Ph.D., Rev. Joseph F. Small, S.J., Ph.D., Rev. Leo Sweeney, S.J., Ph.D., Rev. Earl A. Weis, S.J., S.T.D., Loyola University of Chicago; Dr. Eugene F. Diamond, M.D., Loyola University School of Medicine; Sr. Janet Fitzgerald, O.P., President Molloy College, Rockville Centre; Rev. John B. Mulgrew, O.P., Molloy College; Professor Robert E. Joyce, Ph.D., St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota; Dr. Joseph Califano, Rev. Joseph I. Dirvin, Rev. Msgr. George A. Kelly, Ph.D., Rev. Msgr. Eugene Kevane, Ph.D., St. John's University, Jamaica, New York; Rev. William Hart, Rev. Francis J. Lescoe, Ph.D., St. Joseph's College, Connecticut; Rev. James O'Connor, S.T.D., Rev. John McIvor, S.T.D., Rev. William B. Smith, S.T.D., St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie; Rev. Timothy J. Holland, S.S.J., St. Joseph's Seminary, Washington, D.C.; Rev. Paul M. Quay, S.J., Ph.D., St. Louis University; Rev. Henry Sattler, C.S.S.R., Scranton University; Dr. George Dietz, M.D., Dr. Joseph Kiefer, M.D., Dr. Gregory White, M.D., University of Illinois School of Medicine; Rev. Joseph Farragher, S.J., S.T.D., Mrs. Mary Joyce, author; Rev. Robert E. Shea, Fr. Donald O'Keefe, S.J., Fr. Richard Roach, S.J., A Gaggioli and Christopher Wolfe, Fr. John P. Donnelly, S.J. of Marquette University, David Murphy, Leslie Benofy, John E. Dunsford, Gerald T. Dunne of St. Louis University, Etc., Etc.

Editorial — Natural Family Planning

The *Sixth International Conference on Natural Family Planning* was held in Los Angeles from January 26 to February 2. The Conference was directed by Rev. Msgr. Robert E. Deegan, of the Department of Health and Hospitals of the Los Angeles Diocese.

Speakers at the Conference included Drs. John and Lyn Billings, founders of the ovulation method of natural family planning, and scientists who have done much to develop its effectiveness, like Dr. Kevin Hume and Dr. Thomas Hilgers. Rev. Ronald Lawler, O.F.M. Cap., of Catholic University, spoke on the relationship between natural family planning and the Christian vision of sexuality.

The Conference brought to light again one of the very puzzling features of Catholic pastoral life. It is now well established that natural family planning methods are extremely secure for motivated and instructed couples. Experience has found that the practice of it, far from being a burden, promotes in many ways the happiness of married life.

Yet the fact is that in the typical American diocese and parish natural family planning is only slightly known.

While natural family planning is available, many Catholic pastoral organizations implicitly support contraception. They do this although they are fully aware that authentic Catholic teaching insists that the practice of contraception is gravely sinful. Many marriage preparation courses in this country tell young couples of their responsibilities to have effective family planning, teach them about contraceptive means (many of which are certainly abortifacient), speak slightly of natural family planning, and tell couples to follow their own consciences, regardless of Church teaching (implying that every Catholic has the right to reject Catholic teaching if he or she chooses). And they do this with no "pastoral need" to do so, because natural family planning provides effective means

for avoiding the harms that contraception is intended to avoid. It does so without the disastrous side effects, physically and spiritually, that contraception involves.

Bishop Stewart of the Chun Cheon Diocese in South Korea, recently told an international conference in Melbourne, Australia of the astonishingly positive affects of introducing the Having Family Movement in his diocese. Every parish in the Diocese was required to have a comprehensive family program, which included competent teaching of natural family planning. Though there was some resistance to the movement at the start, its success overcame all objections. People were happy to learn that there was an effective means of family planning that did not contradict the faith they wished to live. The return to the Sacraments among young married persons was startling and heartening. Christian education became more spirited and successful when one of the wounds, a "need" to defend practice Catholic faith cannot defend, was cleared away. When Catholic parishes made available to non-Christian people their skills in teaching natural family planning, very large numbers of the non-Christian population sought out this means of family planning which is so much more human and so much more reverent to life. It became a powerful source of evangelization, and brought many into the faith.

It remains a terribly puzzling problem in this country. How can the Church continue to teach that contraception is gravely sinful, and yet support teaching and programs that encourage people to do deeds that it counts mortally sinful? How can we implicitly support a contraceptive mentality, when we explicitly deplore the visible tragic effects of it in our country? Surely all pastoral leaders need to reflect on these matters with earnestness. Remedies are available if they wish to find them.

Fr. Ronald Lawler, OFM, Cap.

Book Review

Francis F. Brown, *Priests in Council: Initiatives Toward a Democratic Church* (Kansas City, Mo., Andrews and McNeel, Inc. 1979)

Fr. Brown, a Steubenville priest, has written as good a ten-year account of the *National Federation of Priest Councils* as one can expect this side of history books. This is a journalist's report by a priest involved in *NFPC's* early beginnings, and the organization's public relations director since 1970. The author is a partisan, but a good reporter too.

Unlike diocesan priest senates, which directly grew out of Vatican II's desire that priests collaborate more directly with their bishops in the conduct of Church affairs (see *Ecclesiae Sanctae*, August 6, 1966, No. 15), the *NFPC* was the brainchild of "the Chicago combine", a term coined by Manchester priest Colin A. McDonald to indicate how the organization got its start (p. 3).

When 284 priests gathered in Chicago's Sheraton-O'Hare Hotel on February 12, 1968 they could not know they were establishing the only national organization (still) of priests councils in the world (p. xxi). *NFPC* actually was a direct out-growth of another Chicago first (the *Association of Chicago Priests* founded in 1966). Vatican II had not anticipated a priest structure which, theoretically at least, could parallel and rival the council mandated national conferences of Bishops (*Christus Dominus* October 28, 1965, No. 38). Fr. Brown's book provides various rationales for *NFPC's* origins: it grew partly from "discontent and impatience with the slow pace of renewal" (Fr. Joseph Fichter, p. xvii); it "could not have happened without the civil rights movement" (Fr. Dennis Geaney p. xxiii); priests were resigning because of "the alleged failure of the Church at the diocesan level to implement Vatican II directives" (Fr. Brown p. xxiv); a mistake "for priests in a Vatican II setting, aware of the many injustices they were enduring, not to take every advantage of the era and thus strike out in pursuit of their own rights" (Fr. John Hill, p. 2). Although Fr. Fichter in his preface gives a positive focus to *NFPC* ("[it] had a much broader vision than the self-interest of the collective clergy", [i.e.] "a social awareness about the problem in a larger society" (p. xviii) this priests' group has endured a negative image from the beginning.

Third president Fr. Reid C. Mayo is still insisting in 1973 that *NFPC* "was not organized for protest" (p. 105). But at its first national meeting (1968) the specter of a "union-type" *NFPC* was raised and never apparently put to rest. (The parent *ACP* had earlier been likened to the Teamsters by reporter Nicholas Von Hoffman - p. 7).

The early difficulties of *NFPC* were exacerbated as much by its Chicago godfathers as by the concept itself. Windy City's Fr. John Hill (since laicized) is called by Brown the "brains behind the federation's organization efforts". That is unique credit, but the book fails to report that in 1968 Hill was actually curate to Msgr. John Egan (now at Notre Dame). Egan was the founding father and first president of *ACP*, with Hill as his immediate successor. By the time *ACP* (1966) and *NFPC* (1968) came into being, Egan was well known as much a disciple of Saul Alinsky (the master of Chicago confrontation politics) as of Reynold Hillenbrand (the father of Chicago's church based social action movement). Hill did not become *ACP's* second president nor *NFPC's* chief organizer without experienced guidance. Fr. Brown reports in several places (p. 17, p. 153) that *NFPC's* first and fourth presidents Fr. Patrick J. O'Malley (of Chicago) and Fr. James Ratigan (of Joliet) were also trainees under Saul Alinsky.

In 1970 when it looked possible that the nationally known Msgr. Alexander O. Sigur of Lafayette (La.) looked like he might take the presidency of *NFPC* out of Illinois, (and according to Brown run "a one man show" p. 68), Egan intervened directly in the San Diego convention to encourage the candidacy of Fr. Frank Bonnike (of Rockford), who then proceeded to take the convention away from Sigur, fully aware that he "had bulled his way up" to the presidency, (p. 64). Egan's personal secretary in Chicago moved on to serve as personal secretary to the four presidents of *NFPC* (p. 17).

Inevitably under this sponsorship, social issues as defined by Chicago's social actionists, dominated the *NFPC* agenda. Confrontation with officialdom was a favorite instrument for making points. First president Fr. Patrick O'Malley seemed at ease with the idea of revolution in the Church, arguing that theology follows happenings anyway (p. 33). Bonnike is described in this book variously as forceful, angry, a protestor, etc. (p. 61). Reid Mayo (of Burlington), although apparently unwelcome at first as immediate successor to Bonnike, soon proved (according to Brown, p. 106) "that his administration would be just as hard-nosed as those of his predecessors."

NFPC's agenda was consistent: support for Caesar Chavez' picket lines (p. 48), defense of the Berrigan brothers against government charges of sabotage (p. 67), the grape boycott (p. 71), challenge to cut-backs in poverty programs (p. 106), demand for president Nixon's impeachment, prison reform, end to B-1 bomber production (p. 125), etc. On matters of internal Church affairs

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

NFPC came down on the side of organizing brothers, sisters, seminarians (p. 57), optional celibacy (p. 21), Bishop Dozier's general absolution procedures (p. 162), the elimination of sexist language in liturgy and sexism in the Church (p. 164). Their first and most famous public intervention was on the side of Washington priests dissenting from *Humanae Vitae* (p. 22). In this case Bonnike thought the Church should live with ambiguity on the question of contraception (p. 31).

Brown reports "little enthusiasm" in the *NFPC* Board for Cardinal Krol's 1976 Eucharistic Congress because it would divide old guard bishops from social action bishops who preferred to attend Detroit's *Call to Action* — p. 139). This Board earlier agreed to write ex-bishop James P. Shannon calling for his return "because we need him and his leadership (p. 55)." When a friendly bishop informed a *NFPC* Board member in 1972 that Rome was restricting dispensations from the priesthood merely for purposes of marriage, Bonnike (with help from Eugene Kennedy) was afforded the opportunity to denounce the Roman decision. Brown reports some bishops as embarrassed by the Roman action (p. 99).

The ethos of *NFPC* is manifest not only in the causes it espoused and the issues it thought central to the priesthood, but also in the type of counselors it sought. Those to whom they turned for theological input or prudential advice included Carl Armbruster, Richard McBrien, Eugene Kennedy, Eugene Bianchi, Peter Chirico, Avery Dulles, Frederick McManus, Francis X. Murphy, George H. Tavard, Eugene I. Van Antwerp, Peter Henriot, Sr. Francis Borgia Rothluebber, etc. *NFPC* was distressed by advice from Fr. Theodore Hesburgh (1971) that priests who want to marry "let them marry and leave to a small but totally dedicated remnant the main and central work of the Kingdom of God" (p. 72). It seemed more at home with McBrien who calls naive the Vatican view of apostolic succession and the relationship of a bishop and his priest (p. 81), more with Henriot's understanding that active involvement in social justice was an essential role of the priest (p. 85).

The relationship of the *NFPC* with the *National Conference of Catholic Bishops* has been interesting. *NCCB* resisted giving recognition to *NFPC* — from the beginning. Indeed the bishops did everything they could to deny the organization tax-exempt status (p. 54). In 1970, for example, the Board was forced to go to Canada for a Bishop speaker (p. 59). In 1976 Reid Mayo complained to *NCEA* that "*NFPC*'s first ten years have almost been completely void of public pats on the back from hierarchy" (p. 114).

Yet in other respects *NFPC* was not without bishop friends or bishop influence. Manchester's Bishop Ernest Primeau (Chicago priest) arranged for O'Malley to address the 1969 bishops meeting (p. 36); when it wanted an American priest delegate to attend the 1971 Roman Synod the bishop gave them Chicago priest George G. Higgins called (by Brown) a "consistent *NFPC* supporter from the start" (p. 37). O'Malley was invited to give the homily at the ordination of Auxiliary Bishop William G. Cosgrove (Cleveland), an *NFPC* supporter, at which he called for tenure for bishops in the presence of 84 year old Archbishop Karl Alter. Orlando Bishop Thomas J. Grady (formerly a Chicago auxiliary) also "proved his friendship with the federation" by appearing at the 1973 meeting (p. 42).

New Orleans Archbishop Hannan invited *NFPC* to become a sub-committee of his *USCC* committee on priestly ministry (p. 66); Msgr. Colin A MacDonald of Manchester, *NFPC*'s first convention chairman, became Executive Director of the U.S. Bishops Priestly Life and Ministry Committee (p. 11). This committee reported in 1972 to the assembled hierarchy (*NCCB*) that "a bishop must give serious consideration to the views of those whom he consults and should not act contrary to them without a weighty reason." The same report added: "Only in exceptional circumstances should the judgment of councils or senates, especially those representative of the ordained ministry of the entire people of God in which the spirit resides, be rejected." (p. 67) In the same year Chicago Auxiliary Bishop Grady became chairman of a priest's standing committee (p. 77) and with Msgr. MacDonald on *USCC* staff (p. 78) helped shape *NCCB* policy toward priests. Later (1974) Grady announced Reid Mayo's membership on the Bishops priestly committee (p. 125). This priestly committee was (according to Brown p. 79) the creation of outgoing president of *NCCB* John Deardon, who believed his successor Cardinal Krol would not form such a committee.

NFPC officers counted on support from Cardinal Dearden and at times enjoyed homely hospitality not only in the dining room of Bishop Rausch's *USCC* staff house, but also in the home of Apostolic Delegate Jean Jadot (p. 118). Two of their Board members became bishops — Daniel Hart of Boston and William Hughes of Youngstown (now Covington). Yet *NFPC* did not always respond positively to these gestures — dissatisfaction being expressed at the way Jadot said Mass (p. 150) and at the Bishops' pro-life stance "to the neglect of other important social issues."

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

The issue for the Church raised by the very existence of *NFPC* is not raised in the book. In his more recent defense of Sister Theresa Kane's confrontation with John Paul II over women's ordination, Fr. Brown argued that "genuine obedience at times calls for respectful dissent, public if necessary." (*Our Sunday Visitor*, November 25, 1979, p. 4). That would be *NFPC's* view. Fr. Andrew Greeley makes another argument against Brown's book by asserting that *NFPC*, by doing battle on social issues almost exclusively, is out of touch with the real needs of both priests and faithful, viz. good professional service from priests (good sermons, for example). I would endorse the need for priest involvement in the social concerns of people and professional competency but the priestly ministry primarily is aimed (at least if one believes the Church) at leading mankind to the Kingdom of God – to eternal salvation. And that subject never comes up in Fr. Brown's book – nor sin, nor penance, nor personal virtue.

But if the reader wants to know what *NFPC* thinks the Church was, is and ought to be, Fr. Brown spells it out clearly. Bishops, no less than priests themselves, must decide for themselves whether *NFPC* advances the Catholic cause.

George A. Kelly

Human Love and Human Life, edited by J.N. Santamaria and John J. Billings. Melbourne: Polding Press, 1979, xxii + 274 pp.

This is a very important and helpful book. It contains the papers on *Humanae Vitae* and on the Ovulation Method of natural family planning given at the International Conference on these questions held at the University of Melbourne in 1978. They are uniformly excellent and merit wide readership.

Before describing the contents of the work in specifics, I want to note the overall impression given by the volume. While individual papers are concerned with descriptions of the ovulation method and its effectiveness, with an analysis of the encyclical *Humanae Vitae's* reasons for rejecting contraception, with a critique of the superficial character of the "dissent" against the encyclical, and with pertinent observations on the deleterious social and physical sequelae of contraceptive practices, the work as a whole and in its individual parts is basically a thoughtful and faith-filled reflection on the meaning of human life and of human love. Thus the volume is appropriately named. No one who reads this volume can fail to come from it without a deeper appreciation of the awesome mystery of human life, a priceless treasure and a gift from a loving God, a gift that is

meant to be given in and through acts of spousal love.

The work consists of three major sections. Of these the first is devoted to a consideration of the scientific aspects of the ovulation method. Contributing to this section are Drs. John and Evelyn Billings, Dr. Thomas Hilgers, Dr. John H. Casey, Dr. K. Barham, and Professor Henry Burger. The papers in this section are excellent sources, as one might expect, for anyone interested in discovering how effective and easily teachable the ovulation method of fertility awareness is. But the papers in this section are of even greater significance. They note, as does the one by John Billings, quite clearly the significant difference between contraceptive intercourse and respect for human fertility as means of exercising intelligent control over human fertility. The contraceptive method, which in principle sunders the intimate bond (within genital coition) between the deep expression of spousal love and an openness to the gift of life, inevitably results in a loss of respect for the virtue of chastity and is the gateway to abortion. A love for and an appreciation of human fertility, of our power to give life in an act expressive of the exclusive love that spouses have for each other as unrepeatable and nonsubstitutable persons, deepens respect for this great virtue and keeps spousal love from being closed in upon itself and eventually dying.

In one of his two contributions to this section Hilgers provides (a) a perceptive analysis of the reasons why *Humanae Vitae* met with the reaction it did, (b) a devastating critique of the view, naively held by many theologians, that over one-half of newly conceived children fail to implant, and (c) a thoroughly scientific destruction of the claim, made by Bernard Haring and heralded by others as a scientific fact, that periodic continence is the cause of "defective" children and spontaneous abortions. Hilgers, in addition, offers some stimulating ideas about the meaning of human sexuality, pleading for a liberation from the tyranny that obsession with genital sex has exerted on Western thought.

Section II of the volume, concerned with an historical, philosophical, and theological assessment of *Humanae Vitae* and its aftermath, is truly superb. It contains papers by Jerome Lejeune, Elizabeth Anscombe, John Finnis, Thomas O'Donnell, S.J., Ronald Lawler, O.F.M. Cap., Br. A. Santamaria, and Mgr. M. DeCastro. Anscombe and Finnis show quite clearly that the reason why contraceptive intercourse is immoral is by no means rooted in the "physical structure of the act," as those who piously aver (even now, eleven years after *Humanae Vitae* and after many philosophers and theologians have responded) that the

(continued on page 13)

Statement of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars on the Catholicity of Catholic Universities and Colleges

Issued by the Fellowship's Board of Directors November 11, 1979

The *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars*, a society of Catholics working mostly in higher education, is convinced that a suitable time has arrived for Catholic universities and colleges once more to express their commitment to the Catholic faith.

The history of Catholic intellectual life shows that there is a distinct vocation for a Catholic institution of higher education. From the Middle Ages onward outstanding scholars have been persons of committed faith and intellectual integrity. Institutions have also been faithfully Catholic and responsibly committed to the intellectual enterprise. The first universities of modern civilization were authentically Catholic whose leaders and scholars saw no conflict between adherence to the teaching of faith and responsible intellectual life. Recently (October 6th, 1979) at the Catholic University of America Pope John Paul II speaking to academic leaders said that the term "Catholic", in their case, was no mere "label" but a qualification "of affirming God, his revelation and the Catholic Church as the guardian and interpreter of that Revelation."

The religious confusion of recent years has imposed new strains on Catholic Colleges and universities. Moreover, fear for economic survival, fear that governments, foundations, and private donors would not support religiously committed institutions, and new emphases in Catholic thought itself, ecumenical outreach being one of these, new stress on conscience and freedom being another, have suggested to some Catholic educators that institutional commitment to the truths of faith is no longer possible. These posed problems still confound elements within the Catholic community.

There are other Catholic scholars who believe that Catholic universities and colleges will not survive, ought not to survive perhaps, if they do not remain authentically Catholic. It is these latter convictions that *The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars* share.

It is incorrect to assert that corporate commitment to Catholic faith need impair genuine academic freedom in a Catholic university. The fact is that legitimate freedom ought to be exercised and respected better by people of conviction than by those whose guiding principle is unending uncertainty. Perhaps the time has come to work out a truly Catholic understanding of academic freedom, which encompasses responsible use of rights and respects not only the common good of civil society but the truths of human existence and of the divine revelation proclaimed by the Catholic Church. Such an understanding should promote a more honest freedom for scholars and yet demand of them responsibility toward the legitimate purposes of the institutions to which they belong and responsibility in matters of Catholic faith toward the distinctive reality of that faith.

John Paul II came to grips with this issue in his Catholic University address (October 6, 1979):

"True theological scholarship, and by the same token, theological teaching, cannot exist and be fruitful without seeking its inspiration and its source in the word of God as contained in Sacred Scripture and in the sacred tradition of the Church, as interpreted by the authentic Magisterium throughout history." (Cf. *Dei Verbum* 10)

"True academic freedom, must be seen in relation to the finality of the academic enterprise which looks to the total truth of the human person. The theologians' contribution will be enriching for the Church only if it takes into account the proper function of the Bishops and the rights of the faithful . . .

"It is the right of the faithful not to be troubled by theories and hypotheses that they are not expert in judging or that are easily simplified or manipulated by public opinion for ends that are alien to the truth."

Catholic scholars of sincere faith wish to recognize another important freedom – that of the Church family to establish institutions in which its teachings are proposed and explained authentically and in a spirit of devotion to the Church itself. This includes the right to have this done correctly. Catholic institutions contain teachers and students who, though not sharing the Catholic faith, choose the Catholic college or university because of its stated espousal of religious faith in general, and Catholicism in particular. These members also expect that the presence of the Catholic majority among students and faculty will reasonably guarantee the Catholic university's distinctive nature.

Statement of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars on the Catholicity of Catholic Universities and Colleges

An authentic Catholic university of necessity is concerned about the faith of young people who come to study in it. An institution of higher learning can also legitimately form the Catholic character of its students as the life history of American Catholic colleges have demonstrated. Those who administer and teach in these institutions have also found them to be a liberating force from many false suppositions of secular culture, and a distinctive way of discovering the true and the good in society.

Objections are still being raised to the two major documents issued in recent years having to do with the Catholicity of Catholic colleges and universities. Certain points raised by these documents will undoubtedly be occasions of ongoing discussion in the academic community, if only because there is a certain complexity in balancing the variety of competing academic interests, even on a Catholic campus. However, it is an undeniable fact that Catholic universities recently have understressed the importance of witnessing the Catholic faith, choosing instead to adopt a university model designed mostly by unbelievers. For this reason the Catholic intellectual community ought now to give the most serious consideration to and respect for the official documents concerned with furthering the Catholicity of Catholic universities and colleges, a concern which is a high priority of *The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars*.

The two pertinent documents which now call for implementation were the product of intensive academic consultation, one "The Catholic University in the Modern World", resulting from the *Congress of Delegates of the Catholic Universities of the World* (November 29, 1972) with an accompanying letter from the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education applying to all Catholic institutions of higher learning; the second an *Apostolic Constitution* entitled "Christian Wisdom" (*Sapientia Christiana*) promulgated by John Paul II (April 15, 1979), the outgrowth of a meeting three years earlier of *The Congress of Universities and Faculties of Ecclesiastical Studies*, setting out norms for universities and faculties which grant pontifical degrees. (Only eight such ecclesiastical institutions have been chartered in the United States, but what the *Congregation for Catholic Education* says in the second document merely rephrases the philosophy of education underpinning the earlier 1972 statement of IFCU.)

The essential points of "The Catholic University in the Modern World" can be summarized as follows:

1. *Institutional Recognition of the Church in Doctrinal Matters*

"Every Catholic University's fidelity to the Christian message as it comes to us through the Church involves a recognition of the teaching of the Church in doctrinal matters." (No. 15)

This statement was deliberately inserted to express the view that all Catholic universities — including those which lack canonical ties to hierarchy — relate to the Church in a way no different — as far as doctrine is concerned — from those which have such ties.

2. *The autonomy of the Catholic University does not remove it from the scope of Catholic law.*

"When we reaffirm the autonomy of the University we do not mean it stands outside the Law: We are speaking rather of the internal autonomy and integrity which flows from its very nature and purpose." (No. 20)

The proper autonomy of an institution to run its own affairs (selection of staff, admission of students, curriculum planning, allocating funds, granting degrees) does not mean that the teaching of theology or the pastoral ministry is free from expected Catholic norms (No. 21). This section is intended to suggest that the autonomy of the Catholic university does not place the institution, its administrators or faculty, outside the scope of Catholic law.

3. *Academic freedom goes hand in hand with faculty responsibility to the Catholicity of the University.*

"The statutes of each institution should safeguard such freedom, taking due account of the religious inspiration which characterizes a university precisely as Catholic." (No. 28)

This statement was written to reinforce the Catholic view that the right to academic freedom, like any human right, is not absolute but is limited by the requirements of the common good, which in the Catholic situation ordinarily precludes the right to teach against the magisterium.

Statement of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars on the Catholicity of Catholic Universities and Colleges

4. *University officials are the normal custodians of Catholicity on campus, but hierarchy is not without rights and duties.*

The first responsibility for furthering the goals of a Catholic university or college lies with the academic community itself which should guarantee the fidelity of the institution to its objectives, to its authentic Catholicity and to its legitimate freedom. Should the academic community fail in these responsible exercises of Christian autonomy, the hierarchy must exercise its own responsibility. While bishops are counselled to respect the academic and administrative procedures of the university, yet when the truth of the Christian message is at stake (and the university administration remains passive) bishops have the right and duty to intervene (1) by advising the person or persons involved to correct their errors, (2) by advising the administration of their concern about the integrity of the faith, and (3) in an extreme case by a public declaration of the bishops' public position. The voice of the bishops may also be heard when the pastoral work of the Church is adversely affected by the work of any university "committed to fidelity to the Christian message." (Nos. 58-60)

When several American university representatives, involved in the preparation of this document misused its content (to claim a larger independence from Catholic authority), Gabriel Cardinal Garrone issued a subsequent letter (April 25, 1973) which challenged the validity of their misinterpretation of what was considered a carefully worded document:

"Although the (above) document envisages the existence of university institutions without statutory bonds, linking them to ecclesiastical authority, it is to be noted that this in no way means that institutions are removed from those relationships with ecclesiastical hierarchy which characterize all Catholic institutions."

Cardinal Garrone thereupon added two new requirements for the protection of the identity of a Catholic college or university.

1. "The necessity for each Catholic university to set out formally and without equivocation either in statutes or in some internal document, its character and commitment as Catholic."
2. "The necessity for every Catholic University to create within itself appropriate and efficacious instruments so as to be able to put into effect proper self-regulation in the sectors of faith, morality and discipline."

A second document resulted from the *Congress of Universities and Faculties of Ecclesiastical Studies* (November 1976). By a strange concatenation of unusual circumstances three pontiffs – Paul VI, John Paul I, John Paul II – were destined to sign the one document, now named *Sapientia Christiana*. This papal letter reaffirms the traditional understanding of what a Catholic University is.

Concerning freedom in research and teaching

"True freedom in teaching is necessarily contained within the limits of God's Word, as this is constantly taught by the Church's magisterium.

"True freedom in research is based upon firm adherence to God's word and deference to the Church's magisterium, whose duty it is to interpret authentically the word of God." (art. 39)

Concerning Student and Teachers Responsibility to the Church

"In studying and teaching Catholic doctrine, fidelity to the magisterium of the Church *is always to be emphasized.* (italics added) In carrying out of teaching duties . . . those things are, above all, to be imparted which belong to the received patrimony of the Church. Hypothetical or personal opinions which come from new research are to be modestly presented as such."

The philosophy which underline these principles of Catholic higher education, and the principles themselves, are accepted without reservation by the Board of Directors of the *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars*.

The *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars*, recognizes that institutions which function in two worlds or with two loyalties, not excluding a university, by the nature of its affiliations undergoes strain. Wherever two or three people gather together in a single community, so that individual rights, personalities, differences are competing values, there is tension. However, principle must determine the general policy of every institution, and a university's guiding principle ought to be the reason for its

Statement of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars on the Catholicity of Catholic Universities and Colleges

existence (*finis operis*). The Catholic college or university, for example, owes its being to the intent of its founders, sponsors, or owners to communicate the truth. While it wishes to communicate every kind of truth, it has a primary concern with communicating the truth it has received from Jesus Christ and to reflect on all other truth in the light of that revelation. A Catholic institution of learning, therefore, if it is Catholic in reality and not just in name, begins with a mission based on Christ's gospel mandate and growing out of Christ's Church, whose hierarchy is the divinely appointed guardian of His revelation. If a Catholic college cannot accept this conception, it ought not claim the name Catholic, nor should the Church permit it to make this claim. In order that this commitment to the Catholic faith be maintained some sacrifice of support or approval may be necessary. The founders of most prominent Catholic colleges endured similar difficulties. Catholic institutions today can enjoy a wide body of support, including government money, precisely because they are open and direct in maintaining their identity as private and religious schools. Even the *American Association of University Professors* admits in principle that this open commitment is acceptable. Accrediting associations, also, permit educational institutions to define their own nature, evaluating them only on the basis of how well they effectuate their self-proclaimed objectives.

Why the corporate body of Catholics that constitutes a university community cannot make a Catholic commitment is difficult to comprehend. Personal witness to the faith by Catholic academicians at secular and state universities is commonplace. This private witness is not, however, what defines a Catholic university. By definition a Catholic university must be a corporate moral person committed totally to the mission of the Church – the pastoral mission no less than the intellectual.

To this end the *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars* endorses both "The Catholic University in the Modern World", the Apostolic Constitution "Christian Wisdom" and calls upon all Catholic institutions of higher learning to make that commitment without equivocation.

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF CATHOLIC SCHOLARS, NOVEMBER 11, 1979 AND SIGNED,

Dr. Eugene Diamond Loyola Medical School	Fr. Ronald Lawler, OFM, Cap. Catholic University of America	James Hitchcock, President University of St. Louis
Fr. Joseph Farragher, S.J. University of Santa Clara	Sr. Carolyn McGinty, C.S.J. Rosary College	Fr. Henry Sattler, C.S.S.R. University of Scranton
Sr. Janet Fitzgerald, O.P. Molloy College	Fr. Joseph Mangan, S.J. Loyola University	Fr. James Turro Darlington Seminary
Fr. Frederick Jelly, O.P. Josephinum School of Theology	Dr. William May Catholic University of America	Fr. Earl Weis, S.J. Loyola University
Mrs. Mary Joyce Author	Fr. John Miller, C.S.C. Provincial Superior Holy Cross Fathers Southern Province	Msgr. George A. Kelly Executive Secretary St. John's University New York City

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles*(continued from page 8)*

“basic flaw” of the encyclical was its “physicalism.” As Anscombe and Finnis note, what makes contraceptive intercourse immoral, and what the encyclical taught made it immoral, is the human *intent* to do evil, i.e., to repudiate the goodness of sexual coition as an act that is open to the transmission of life. They likewise show that those who shout “physicalism” are themselves the ones who develop a truly dualistic view of human life and human love. In his contribution Ronald Lawler shows how the teaching of *Humanae Vitae* leads to a richer and more human life. It does so because it is rooted in the truth that the three great goods of marriage, the indissoluble bond between the spouses, their unique kind of human love (one that is exclusive yet open to embrace others), and procreation, go together. To attack one is to threaten the other; to foster love for all leads to a society in which everyone is wanted, everyone loved.

The final section of the volume is called “An Appraisal of Fertility Awareness,” and contains papers by Evelyn Billings, Drs. John Broomhead, Maurice Catarinich, Colin Clark, J.N. Santamaria, Kevin Hume, and a message from Mother Teresa and a pastoral reflection by Bishop T. Stewart of Korea. Of special significance, it seemed to me while reading this section, were the papers by Dr. Broomhead on the “husband’s appreciation of the ovulation method” and by Dr. Catarinich on the sub-fertile couple. Broomhead articulates in a moving way the “intangible” goods possible to couples who respect their fertility and seek to regulate conception by respecting it and each other that are not open to those who seek sex closed to the transmission of human life. What he has to say communicates to us a deep appreciation of the full significance of spousal love. This is most necessary today, when too many seem to equate spousal love with genital sex. Catarinich shows how fertility awareness can be very helpful to couples who have been having difficulties in conceiving. The papers in this section by Drs. Santamaria and Hume on the social and physical consequences of contraception should be must reading for ardent champions of contraception as the way of “saving” marriage.

All in all, this is an excellent volume. It is unfortunate that it is not published in this country and that it may be difficult for people to obtain. It debunks many popular myths, particularly those naively entertained by some theologians and, unfortunately, by too many in the pastoral ministry in our country today.

William E. May

THE ACTING PERSON, by Karol Wojtyla; translated from the Polish by Andrzej Potocki. Dordrecht: Holland/Boston: USA, London: England, D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1979, pp. 367.

Ten years ago Karol Wojtyla’s *Osoba i Czyn* appeared in the Polish language. It is only now that the English translation of this memorable work reached the English-speaking world. Recognition for this translation is due to the Editor of the *Analecta Husserliana*, who by making Karol Wojtyla’s *Acting Person* available to the many readers unfamiliar with the Polish language, enabled them not only to get acquainted with his original philosophical concept of man, but to familiarize themselves with the new Pope’s thoughts, which will accompany him during his pontificate.

Being deeply concerned with defending the dignity of man, and seeing the need for updating St. Thomas’ metaphysics of human person, Wojtyla was searching for an adequate philosophical language in which to properly describe the moral experiences of man. His previous critical studies on Scheler’s ethical system, enabled Wojtyla to recognize the phenomenological method as a most suitable tool for constructing a new Christian humanism, both personalistic in nature and existentialistic in character. Wojtyla’s anthropology, then, can be defined as existential personalism, which a careful reader can detect in the first encyclical of the new pontiff.

Wojtyla’s method, however, evoked among professional philosophers some misgivings as to the very possibility of combining the traditional teaching on man of St. Thomas with the phenomenological description of moral experience of man. Card. Wojtyla himself “admitting the analogy of the metaphysical terms in their fulness”, attempted at the same time” to bring about some sort of translation from one philosophical language to another one.” As for myself, having sent to the publisher my monographic study on the philosophical contributions of Card. Wojtyla, and being honored to be his previous student, I can honestly conclude that our philosopher from Krakow and Lublin not only avoided a simplistic syncretism, but arrives at an interesting new integrated philosophical vision on man, solidly based on the system of St. Thomas, and vividly described in a language akin to phenomenology.

Highly recommending to the readers the English translation of *Osoba i Czyn* (strictly translated as *Person and Act*), this reviewer, however, feels obliged to point out, that the too heavy phenomenological undertones, found in this translation

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

may have derived from rendering of certain Polish words used in the original text, e.g., 'substance' translated as 'being, and 'metaphysical categories' as 'metaphysical expressions'. To support my claim, that Card. Wojtyla cannot be considered a strict phenomenologist, let me quote his own words: "A Christian thinker, and especially a theologian, availing himself in his works of phenomenological experience, cannot, however, be a phenomenologist."

With misapprehensions of phenomenology set to rest – readers – and they need not be students of philosophy alone – will find *The Acting Person* an amply rewarding way to appreciate Pope John Paul II's understanding of the human person and conditions.

Andrew N. Woznicki
University of San Francisco

Whitehead, K.D., *The Need for the Magisterium of the Church*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1979. 57 pp.

With every year since Vatican II it has become increasingly clear that the real problem the dissenters have with the Church is not about what the Magisterium is *doing*, but about what the Magisterium *is*. Not the content but the very fact of the Magisterium: that there is, in other words, an official teaching office in the Catholic Church, which authentically witnesses to the revealed truths of salvation, and authoritatively enjoins by that witness an "obedience of faith." This authenticity and this authority, which together constitute the credentials of the Magisterium, also constitute the great "scandal," the great stumbling block to those who would be "Catholics" without it. But they can't have it both ways: to be Catholics and at the same time to be "out from under" the Magisterium.

Not that there can't be, for these dissenters, *some* kind of "teaching office" in the Church. Being in great part teachers themselves, i.e., professional academicians, they are quite willing to have teaching in the Catholic Church – provided *they* do the teaching. Thus, it is not really so much *what* the Magisterium teaches that they oppose. There can be (and is) substantial agreement in many areas of the total content of the faith. What they oppose, rather, is the *why* and the *how* of the Magisterium: the "why" of its being the official witness authenticating truths which transcend mere human discovery or verification, and the "how" of its declaring that witness authoritatively, i.e., as commanding our assent in faith.

In view of such a problem it is no wonder that the Magisterium has had to take almost as much time in this past decade teaching about *itself* as it has about all the rest of the salvific truths. This is not really a digression from its task, for the fact of the Magisterium is itself a revealed truth for our salvation. We can in fact be almost thankful to the dissenters for providing this renewed occasion for the Church to emphasize this truth, and for reminding us that without this truth securely in place, all the other truths which make up the Creed are in real danger of being denied or ignored. This has certainly been the experience of the past, and can well be a warning for the present. Hence the need for a timely reminder of "the need for the Magisterium of the Church."

The Need for the Magisterium of the Church is the title of a booklet recently published by the Franciscan Herald Press, as part of its "Synthesis Series." The author is K.D. Whitehead, Executive Vice-President of Catholics United for the Faith, and editor of its recently refurbished monthly newsletter entitled *Laywitness*.

What we have in this 57-page booklet is a superb "little catechism" on the Magisterium. The title of each chapter is in the form of a question. The ten chapters are thus "catechism answers," honed and to the point, yet remarkably nuanced and comprehensive for their brevity. The key distinction, for instance, between "authority of knowledge" and "authority of function" is soundly analyzed and aptly illustrated (pp. 11-16). Likewise, the strange misunderstandings regarding the connection between infallibility and "non-infallible" statements of the Magisterium are expertly handled (pp. 44-46). Other instances could be cited, but one in particular must not be overlooked, viz., the strain put on logic (and credibility) by the dissenters' treating of some questions as though they hadn't already been addressed – and decided – by the Magisterium (pp. 34-38).

This last phrase suggests what may well be the most incisive and valuable comment in the entire essay, viz., that the Magisterium is *essentially* a power and a mandate to *decide* (pp. 41-43). It is a *jurisdictional* function: the Magisterium "commands" assent. This may sound scandalous to non-Catholics; it would be rather surprising if it didn't. But for Catholics to find it scandalous? Well, either they don't know what the Magisterium *is* (and are therefore not really Catholics to begin with), or they have forgotten that the act of faith is essentially a free assent (and have therefore ceased to be Catholics).

As to what we who are members of the Church but not members of the Magisterium – as to what

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

we can and should do about this problem of dissent, and how we are to do it, Mr. Whitehead gives here an admirable example. We can give "witness" to the faith. This means, first, a witness to the faith as a whole — in whose light alone the Magisterium is seen for what it is. Then, secondly, it is a witness to this Magisterium — by whose direction and decision alone (at least ultimately) the wholeness of the faith is preserved and lived. And we should give this witness as Whitehead does in this booklet: forthrightly, respectfully, and with great charity.

Robert I. Bradley, S.J.

Francis J. Klauder, S.D.B. *The Wonder of the Real. A Sketch in Basic Philosophy.* North Quincy, MA.: Christopher, 1979, 161 pp. 2nd Ed., \$8.95.

This attractive little book is written as a textbook in "general metaphysics." Its stress is on such questions as the starting point in philosophy and the grasp of being as such; the analogy of being, the one and the many, and the transcendentals. There is an attempt to give clear accounts of the physical notions that would be important for the study of classical Christian theology.

The author has a clear, easy style, and the book is made more serviceable to students by the presence of a number of outlines, schemata, charts, and the like.

A textbook is intended to be a tool for the use of the teacher and students. This gracefully written book covers most of the issues treated in an elementary metaphysics text in a short space. It is to be noted that it does not give much treatment to causality, and treatments of God's existence and nature are reserved for another course.

To read the text is to gather the impression that Fr. Klauder would be an interesting teacher. In the text itself difficult areas are covered quite briefly, and clearly need supplementing by the thoughtful work of the teacher. But, supplemented with other readings, and used by a competent teacher, it could indeed be a serviceable work in these days when philosophy textbooks are not much in style.

This book might be especially recommended for philosophy programs prepared for students coming toward the priesthood as later vocations.

Fr. Ronald Lawler, OFM, Cap.

Bernard N. Nathanson, M.D. (with Richard N. Ostling) *Aborting America: A Doctor's Personal*

Report on the Agonizing Issue of Abortion (Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday and Co. 1979).

Shortly after the publication of this book, a Doubleday editor said that this book was running into difficulties in the bookstores, because bookstore owners, not liking its thesis, were not stocking it or not featuring it near the cash register. And this is not surprising since the book runs against the grain of so many in the field of communications.

The story is not pleasant, especially on collusion of clergy and educators with what more and more looked like a sordid cause. Politicians were never worse than splitting in half the difference in the life span of a fetus (20-28-24) like they split a voting age or a dollar bill. Apart from the callousness and crassness of those who, speaking publicly of their concern for women, privately toted up their incomes, the commentary on the idealism or its lack of American political leaders is must reading. The hypocrisy of the attack on the Catholic hierarchy is laid bare. Nathanson makes obvious, too, the hypocrisy of abortion as a "Catholic issue": Says he (p. 175): "[Before the Supreme Court] only three of the twenty-eight major religious bodies had endorsed secular laws to permit total freedom [for abortion.]" Nathanson is no partisan of Catholic ethics but his book belongs in the library of anyone who wishes to speak of the ethics of abortion at all.

A mimeographed book entitled "Present Dutch Catholicism in Historical Perspective: 1919 to the Present" by Fr. J. Bots, S.J. has recently arrived in the U.S. It is available from Fr. Bots at Van Wevelickhoven Straat 1, 5931 KS tegelen, Netherlands. The price is 10 Dutch guilders or \$5.50.

Apart from the fact that the English used is awkward, making it difficult at times to grasp the full meaning of important sentences, Fr. Bots does give valuable historical notes on the Dutch Church and has some strong comments on the disintegration of the Dutch Church, which recently brought Pope John Paul II into the situation.

In view of the attention given Schillebeeckx's recent meeting with Roman officials, Bots reporting S. makes interesting reading. Among other things B. has S. writing off Church renewal, declaring the right of Church communities to appoint priests, celebrating the Eucharist with two married priests and two women, comparing the rise of John Paul II to the rise of Hitler, reversing his own theological positions on secularity, priestly celibacy, etc.

Periodical Review

"Brain Death – An Opposing Viewpoint", Paul A. Byrne, Sean O'Reilly, Paul M. Quay, S.J., *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 242, 1985-1990 (Nov. 2, 1979).

This article seeks to show that all the various actual and proposed statutes defining death or setting forth "brain-related" criteria of death (so-called Definition-of-Death legislation) are based on medically invalid assumptions, are philosophically unsound, and in opposition to the major religious traditions of this country. On this basis it urges repeal or radical revision of all such legislation, a further effort for the Right-to-Life Movement.

Given the current use of criteria of death (to enable aggressive action, such as transplantation of

organs or immediate autopsy, which will be lethal if the patient is not dead already), Definition-of-Death legislation makes legal the killing of patients in a fair number of situations.*

The article is sufficiently controversial to have received an editorial comment in the same issue of *JAMA* a third as long as the original article. Reprints can be obtained from: Paul A. Byrne, M.D., Neonatal Intensive Care Unit, Cardinal Glennon Memorial Hospital, 1465 South Grand Blvd., St. Louis, Missouri 63104

*This is all the more objectionable in view of the discovery in the last couple of years of brain-resuscitation techniques.

Paul M. Quay, S.J.

Publications of Interest

- Fr. Daniel S. Hamilton's, "A Catholic Response to the Augsburg Confession" is available from *The Long Island Catholic*, P.O. Box 700, Hempstead, New York 11551, 75c per copy. During 1980 – the 450th Anniversary year of the Confession – there will be much dialogue on the issues raised by the Lutherans on June 24, 1530. Recommended.

- Andrew Woznicki, *Karol Wojtyla's A Christian Humanism: Existential Personalism* (New Britain, Conn., Mariel Publications, 196 Eddy Gloven Blvd.)

- John Noonan's *Private Choice* (Free Press) remains the best book on the market for evaluating how the Supreme Court changed the pace of America on abortion.

- David Knight's *The Good News About Sex* (Cincinnati, St. Anthony Messenger Press \$3.95). Knight writes this book from Christian realism. Written for the young he points sex toward marriage and the family, considers all sexual intimacy proper only for the married, homosexual intimacy is rejected, etc. It is a refreshing contrast to other books aimed at young audiences.

- Those interested in Catholic higher education ought not miss Russell Kirks critique of *Decadence and Renewal in the Higher Learning* (South Bend, Gateway Editions, 1978 \$15.00).

- Henry R. Stern, "The Changing Language of American Catholicism," *American Speech*, LIU (Summer, 1979), pp. 83-9. Based mainly on research conducted in North Carolina, the article shows how much of Catholicism has abandoned any distinct language of its own and uses a religious language largely borrowed from popular Protestantism. The author discusses the implications of this for ecumenism, the Church's own identity, and other considerations.

- Gerald Groves, "The Gregarious Hermit," *The American Scholar*, Winter, 1979-80 pp. 89-93. Written by a former monk of Gethsemane Abbey and one of the first Trappists given permission to become a hermit, the article is a reminiscence of Thomas Merton by one who knew him well and shared many of his concerns. Groves, now returned to the lay state, regards himself and Father Merton both as romantics who had no real affinity for or commitment to the Trappist life and says Merton systematically looked for ways to avoid living the Trappist life to the fullest. In the end Groves found the eremitical life equally illusory, and he suspects Merton would have done the same.

The Hans Kung Situation

For at least ten years the German hierarchy in collaboration with the Holy See has engaged in an intensive study of the theological opinions of Hans Kung with a view toward working out an accommodation. The chairman of the German Bishops Conference only recently rued the fact that during this entire decade the Vatican's effort to talk with Kung was unsuccessful.

As this *Newsletter* goes to press the news agencies are reporting that the Catholic Theological Faculty at the University of Tubingen issued a six page public statement withdrawing their support for him, accusing Kung not only of causing "a crisis in the German Church" but also of engaging in a controversy which has "hurt the theological faculty" at Tubingen.

Although his friends are amassing thousands of signatures in support, Kung himself has cancelled his lectures, expressing "deep disappointment" with the lack of support from his peers.

There is a 200 page report containing all the relevant documents from 1967-1979 available from the *Secretariat of the Conference of German Bishops, Kaiserstrasse 163, D-500, Bonn Germany.*

What Kung Says

Hans Kung: "I am deeply ashamed of my Church. Even in the 20th century it is conducting secret inquisitorial proceedings." (*New York Times*, December 19, 1979 p. A-6)

Hans Kung on John Paul II's First Year in Office

"I will ask six questions with regard to Karol Wojtyla and attempt to answer them.

- "1. A man open to the world? . . .
- "2. A spiritual leader?
- "3. An authentic pastor?
- "4. A true fellow bishop?
- "5. An ecumenical mediator?
- "6. A genuine Christian?"

[Generally Kung answers these questions negatively.]

After John Paul II's discipline Hans Kung is quoted as follows: "I think if I had written about the first year saying it was great, they would have said: 'Well, let's forget about the books on infallibility. He'll find his way.'" (*New York Times*, February 1, 1980)

Hans Kung – Why I Remain a Catholic

"Catholic Church, yes! Roman Inquisition, No.

"I know that I am not alone in this controversy about true Catholicity. I shall fight against any acquiescence together with the many people who have hitherto supported me. We must continue to work together for a truly Catholic Church that is bound by the gospel. For this, it is worthwhile to remain a Catholic." (*New York Times*, Monday, January 28, 1980 A-17)

Hans Kung – *On Being A Christian* (Doubleday, 1976)

1. Christ is not simply God. (p. 130)
2. The idea of incarnation is nothing more than a theological theory. (pp. 440-41)
3. Jesus did not see "the law" as positively revealed by God or as permitting no dispensation. (p. 240)
4. What is the basic will of God? Man's well-being. (p. 253)
5. "Miracles in the strictly modern sense of breaking through the laws of nature cannot be proved." (p. 233)
6. The resurrection is not historically verifiable. (p. 350)
7. Jesus did not found an institutional Church in his lifetime. (p. 199)
8. Jesus did not found a new liturgy at the Last Supper. (p. 323) Etc.

SYMPATHIZERS OF HANS KUNG

Fr. David Burrell CSC (Notre Dame)

"Theologians teaching in Catholic Universities and colleges see their mission as serving the teaching mission of the Church, yet find themselves better able to fulfill it without official approbation. Fidelity is their watchword: approbation is distracting." (*National Catholic Reporter*, January 18, 1980, p. 12)

60 Catholic Theologians

"We publicly affirm our recognition that he is indeed a Roman Catholic theologian." (*New York Times*, December 20, 1979, p. 1)

Commonweal

"Who's disturbing the faithful? . . . Kung's provocativeness helped build support for reform during Vatican II, and both his outspokenness and his recent apologetics have been the source of renewed faith for many. The 'disturbance of the faithful' that is being produced by Rome's treatment of Kung is greater by far." (February 1, 1980, p. 37-38)

Bernard J. Cooke

"We Catholics today are faced with the need to believe in the midst of less certainty than we thought we had. Our faith must involve more personal decision, therefore more risk and more commitment of our individual and corporate freedom . . .

"One has authority to speak in proportion to the knowledge and experience he or she has. Truth cannot be legislated, even by one who has the highest legitimate official authority in the Church; truth must be discovered." (*Commonweal*, February 1, 1980, p. 41)

Avery Dulles

"[The Vatican decree] doesn't specify what he has done that makes him not a Catholic thinker. This has to be spelled out . . . Many theologians are urging points not yet accepted by the official teaching Church. At what point does that become unacceptable? Some big questions are unanswered." (*New York Times*, December 21, 1979 p. A-9)

Reviewing Kung Fr. Dulles earlier said:

"My difficulties with certain of Kung's doctrinal positions are not peculiarly my own. They have already been voiced by other Catholic theologians in Europe. But let the prospective reader

not be deterred. Kung has every right to a fair hearing. His positions are consistent, forcefully argued, and merit serious consideration. Perhaps in the course of time these positions will win and acknowledged right of existence within the Catholic community. If so, Kung himself will deserve a large share of the credit." (*America*, November 20, 1976)

Fr. Andrew Greeley

"The Vatican no longer has much control over what Catholics think or do.

"Who will no longer consider Kung a Catholic theologian? . . .

"John Paul is the real loser in the Kung affair." (*New York Daily News*, December 23, 1979, p. 54)

Nine Lutheran Theologians

"Secretive and nondialogical ways of exercising teaching authority — as the congregations are, rightly or wrongly, widely perceived as being — endangers the mutuality, trust and openness which has characterized our dialogue with Roman Catholic theologians during the past 25 years." (*National Catholic Register*, January 27, 1980, p. 3)

Fr. Richard McBrien

"Unquestionably, there is a difference between Catholic and non-Catholic theologians, but on what basis is the line of demarcation drawn? . . . The document insists that the teacher of sacred doctrine must conform to the 'thought of the Church'. Reading between the lines, the authors mean here 'the hierarchy'." (*Brooklyn Tablet*, January 26, 1980 p. 22)

The New York Review of Books

"Who is the real Karol Wojtyla? . . . Is he a new Torquemada on the Tiber, determined to force Catholicism into a Procrustean bed modeled after the conservative Polish Church?" (February 7, 1980 p. 1)

Fr. Charles Curran

"All I can say is to me it is clear. My understanding — and obviously that's mine and I cannot speak for others — is that he theologizes within the pale of Roman Catholic orthodoxy. He has the right to raise the questions he does, and therefore is not beyond Roman Catholic theology in so doing." (*National Catholic Reporter*, December 28, 1979 p.2)

CRITICS OF HANS KUNG

Fr. Kenneth Baker S.J.

"I think Kung was on a collision course with the teaching authority of the Church. The Church was very patient with him. Pope Paul VI liked to reason with people, hoping they would come to agree with the Church's view. Pope John Paul is more realistic. Having given Kung enough rope for ten years, the Pope has said 'enough'." (*New York Times*, December 20, 1979, p. 1)

Fr. Hans Urs von Balthasar

"His (Kung's) technique of prolonging the proceedings is, to say the least, provocative; he answers invitations too late or with a curt 'I have no time' . . .

"The central difficulty is fundamentally simple: To Kung Church authority derived from Christ is an unproven belief . . .

"He questions the continuity between Christ and the Church (echoing Bultmann) and therefore 'a theologian' (read here 'Karl Barth') stands only under the Word of God and not under that of the Church." (*National Catholic Register*, February 3, 1980 p. 1)

* * *

Fr. John E. Komar (Newark priest)

"If in this modern free thinking Church it is permitted to disobey the Holy Father in matters of faith, then why cannot I disobey the American bishops?" (*Our Sunday Visitor*, January 20, 1980)

* * *

Long Island Catholic Editorial

"The Church's pastors have more than once called Father Kung to a genuine dialogue with them on disputed issues. He has more than once declined. The highest Church authority has now withdrawn a privilege granted him, that of teaching Catholic theology with the Church's mandate. But it has not assailed him, banned him, silenced him, defamed him, discredited him, condemned him or deprived him of any right. Its action has been, with reason, notably milder than the suspension from the priestly and episcopal ministry imposed on Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre." (January 3, 1980)

Timothy Cardinal Manning

"The Vatican has decided that Father Hans Kung can no longer be considered a Catholic theologian. This news has been both substantiated by a record of events which brought on the announcement and also accentuated by the hue and cry of liberal theologians who have been at large in the ranks of believers in sheep's clothing." (*Los Angeles Tidings*, January 4, 1980, p. 1)

* * *

Patrick Riley

"What may prove to be the most momentous confrontation between a pope and a theologian since Martin Luther defied Leo X is materializing beneath the glare of television lights. At stake, both sides agree, is the Catholic Church's credibility." (*Wall Street Journal*, January 16, 1980, p. 14)

* * *

Bishop Austin Vaughan

"I don't think there is any kind of due process that would be necessary in this case. If it were a matter of Kung's teaching being misunderstood, that would be a different situation. But nobody including Kung himself claims that he has been misunderstood. He says flatly that the First Vatican Council was wrong and explicitly rejects the doctrine of that Council on infallibility. That has been brought to his attention in public documents at least twice by the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, and at least twice by the German bishops." (*Our Sunday Visitor*, December 30, 1979 p. 8)

* * *

Time Magazine Reviewing On Being a Christian

"Throughout the book Kung urges his readers, in effect, to trust the authority of a new magisterium of university scholars on what should be believed about Jesus and what should be discarded. In doing so, Kung has become the leading theologian of what could be called the Liberal Protestant Party within the Roman Catholic Church." (January 3, 1977 p. 79)

Miscellaneous

(An anonymous California priest who calls himself "Brendan Newbreed" has entertained West Coast priests with his popularization of process theology.)

UNBECOMING

I'M NOT HERE, I'M NOT THERE, I M NOT ANYWHERE.
 I'M JUST BECOMING, BECOMING, BECOMING
 BUT ALAS I NEVER COME.
 I AM NOT BORN, I DO NOT LIVE, I DO NOT DIE.
 I'M EVER ON THE HORIZON
 BUT I NEVER ARRIVE.
 I AM EVER IN PROCESS BUT NEVER PROCESSED.
 I'M ALWAYS BECOMING BUT NEVER BECOME.
 IT'S A SAD LIFE NEVER TO REST, TO SIT, TO SLEEP,

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

TO EAT, TO START, TO END, TO ARRIVE, TO BE.
 BUT, ALAS, THAT IS THE FATE OF US CONDEMNED
 EVER TO BE IN PROCESS, BUT NEVER TO BE.
 CURSE HERAC, GREG, LES AND THE REST,
 MAY THEY FIND NO REPOSE UNTIL THEY SET US DOWN
 AND LET US BE. AMEN.

BECOMING

GOD IS BECOMING, MAN IS BECOMING.
 THE WORLD IS BECOMING, EVEN BECOMING IS BECOMING.
 ERGO.
 GOD DOES NOT EXIST. MAN DOES NOT EXIST.
 THE WORLD DOES NOT EXIST. EVEN BECOMING
 DOES NOT EXIST.
 FOR IT IS NOT HERE YET.
 SO NOTHING EXISTS. ALL IS BECOMING.
 ALL IS IN PROCESS. AND PROCESS IS ALL. AMEN.

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

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars

- A youth minister is needed in Blessed Sacrament Parish 2233 Diamond Ave., N.E., Grand Rapids, Michigan 49505. Variable salary scale especially if layman or woman. Person would be dealing with 9th graders and up (13, 14 to 30 years of age). Would be responsible for the parish Confirmation program, working with the DRE for its religious content plus other religious session that should or might be held especially for this age group. Confirmation, now at least, once a year for 9th graders. Other things involved: retreats (high school) working with public schools where necessary, prayer evenings once a week for youth, Youth Choir, and other activities to get youth involved and active in parish community. Work with DYMO (Diocesan Youth Ministry, Office). Contact before June 1980 Fr. Louis LaSarge (616) 361-7339.

- Any Fellowship member — especially one already holding office in a university or community which is properly staffed can assist with some of the expanding functions of the Fellowship. Please contact Executive Secretary for further information.

- The 1979 Proceedings have gone to press. As you may remember the papers covered the general theme "Historicism and Faith". The cost of this volume will be approximately \$8.00 a copy. Because of inflation the members are requested to pick up the overall cost of this publication. Kindly send your orders to the Executive Secretary.