

# FELLOWSHIP OF CATHOLIC SCHOLARS

---

# NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 6, NUMBER 2

MARCH 1983

## Letter from Father William B. Smith

March 25-27, the Fellowship will hold its sixth annual Convention in Washington, D.C. The Convention theme is "Faith and the Sources of Faith."

True to our interdisciplinary nature, papers will be given on two of the sacred sources of theology – Sacred Scripture and Catholic ecclesiology. Fr. Rene Laurentin of France will address "The Historical Critical Method," and Fr. James O'Connor of Dunwoodie will address the question of the "Church of Christ and the Catholic Church."

The treatment of faith, its sources, or their absence, in the more important cultural forces of History and Literature will be addressed. Professor James Hitchcock will present a paper on "Americanism" and Professor Anne Carson Daly will speak on "The Roots of Pseudo-Faith in the 19th Century."

This year, the Faith and Literature colloquium will be more accessible to the whole membership as it richly deserves.

The recent promulgation of the New Code of Canon Law (1983) presents a certain practical immediacy for all of the continuing Fellowship Workshops – Family Life; Catholic Higher Education; Religious Life; and Social Action.

The promulgation of the new Code presents both immediate and enduring concerns. Faithful to our charter and our purpose, the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars has a responsibility to "wholeheartedly accept and support the renewal of the Church of Christ undertaken by Pope John XXIII, shaped by Vatican II, and carried on by succeeding pontiffs."

Clearly, the present Pope, John Paul II, has promulgated the new Code to continue the achievement of the recent Council and to embody those modes of worship and ways of Catholic life and practice which the universal law of the Church governs.

One of the post-Vatican II syndromes was the tendency of some to interpret the Council rather than implement it. The same challenge faces and follows the promulgation of the new Code – some have already escalated interpretation prior to any implementation.

Thus, our upcoming Convention provides a splendid opportunity not only for Fellowship but also the opportunity for interested Catholic Scholars to reflect on and contribute to both individual and collective efforts for the correct implementation of the now revised universal law of the Church in areas of keen interest.

I hope to see you in Washington, D.C. . . .

William B. Smith

## Sixth Convention of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars

March 25-27, 1983

Ramada Renaissance Hotel  
1143 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, C.D. 20037

### Theme — Faith and The Sources of Faith

#### PROGRAM

#### Friday, March 25th

Arrival Time — at will

3:00 p.m. to — Registration

8:00 p.m.

4:00 p.m. — Meeting of the Board of Directors

7:45 p.m. — General Meeting of the Membership

8:00 p.m. — First Plenary Session

Address: THE HISTORICAL-CRITICAL METHOD

Rev. Rene Laurentin

Professor of Theology

Catholic University of Angers

9:30 p.m. — Reception

#### Saturday, March 26

9:00 a.m. — Secondary Plenary Session:

Address: THE CHURCH OF CHRIST AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Rev. James T. O'Connor

Professor of Dogmatic Theology

St. Joseph's Seminary

Dunwoodie

10:45 a.m. — Third Plenary Session:

Address: THE ROOTS OF PSEUDO-FAITH IN THE 19th CENTURY

Anne Carson Daly

Professor of English

University of Notre Dame

12:30 p.m. — Lunch

2:00 p.m. — Fourth Plenary Session:

Address: FAITH IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Rev. William B. Smith

St. Joseph's Seminary

Dunwoodie

3:30 p.m. — Colloquium: Faith and Literature:

(Papers on Anglo-Welsh poets David Jones; Simon Weil;  
& Flannery O'Connor)

- 5:30 p.m. – Celebration of the Liturgy St. Matthew's Cathedral  
 7:00 p.m. – Convention Dinner  
 8:45 p.m. – Workshops  
 9:30 p.m. – Reception

**Sunday, March 27th**

- 7:00 a.m. – Concelebrated Liturgy (private)  
 9:00 a.m. – Fifth Plenary Session:  
     Address: AMERICANISM  
             James Hitchcock  
             Professor of History  
             St. Louis University
- 10:45 a.m. – Business Meeting for Fellowship Members  
 12:30 p.m. – Lunch (ad libitum)

Convention Workshops will deal with the requirements of the New Code of Canon Law as they affect the following areas of Catholic life: Family, Catholic Higher Education, Religious Life & Social Action. Chairmen specifically chosen for their competence in the Canon Law for these areas will organize and lead the workshops.

---

### Friends of the Fellowship

Terence Cardinal Cooke	Bishop Hilary Hacker
John Cardinal Krol	Bishop Charles Helmsing
Timothy Cardinal Manning	Bishop William H. Keeler
Humberto Cardinal Medeiros	Bishop Charles R. Koester
Archbishop James J. Byrne	Bishop Daniel W. Kocera, O.S.B.
Archbishop James A. Hickey	Bishop Vincent M. Leonard
Archbishop Oscar H. Lipscomb	Bishop Thomas W. Lyons
Archbishop John F. Whealon	Bishop James Malone
Archdiocese of Louisville	Bishop John A. Marshall
Bishop Richard H. Ackerman	Bishop John McCarthy
Bishop Anthony G. Bosco	Bishop Joseph A. McNicholas
Bishop Warren L. Boudreaux	Bishop Joseph McShea
Bishop Joseph Brunini	Bishop John J. O'Connor
Bishop L. Abel Caillovet	Bishop Joseph T. O'Keefe
Bishop Mark Carroll	Bishop John Paschang
Bishop William Connare	Bishop Lawrence J. Jiley
Bishop Joseph R. Crowley	Bishop John J. Russell
Bishop Justin A. Driscoll	Bishop George Speltz
Bishop Joseph A. Fiorenza	Bishop Joseph Sullivan
Bishop Glennon P. Flavin	Bishop Fremiot Torres
	Bishop Thomas J. Welsh

#### Special Note

Please remember in a special way Sr. Rose Eileen Masterman, CSC who is seriously ill at St. Mary's Convent, Notre Dame. She has suffered a stroke.

## Items of Interest

● Chauncey Stillman writing in the December 1982 issue of *The Oxford Review* (pp 7 ff) adds a postscript to Christopher Dawson's explanation of "Why I am a Catholic". Dawson entered the Church in 1914 and wrote the following paragraphs to the Catholic Times (England), May 21, 1926:

"In the latter part of the nineteenth century the foundations of this (Protestant) religious tradition were being undermined. Not only the different schools in the Church of England, but all the Nonconformist sects as well, had in common with one another an intense faith in the Bible. It was accepted by all as an absolutely infallible supernatural authority, and however much interpretations might differ, at least there was the bond of a common allegiance.

"All this was imperilled by the process of the new Biblical criticism. If it had been a frankly hostile attack from without, it might have been successfully resisted, but the critics themselves were often men of high character and position in the Church, who could not lightly be dismissed as infidels. They did not question the truth of the Christian revelation, but in their hands the infallible Scriptures became a collection of historical documents of varying degrees of authenticity, so that the one standard of authority in the Protestant religious world lost its objective character.

"... The Anglo-Catholic position was weak in the very point where it claimed to be strongest. It was lacking in authority. It was not the teaching of the official Church, but of an enterprising minority which provided its own standard of orthodoxy. All one's official pastors and masters — bishops, headmasters, clergymen and tutors — looked askance at it, and this naturally weakened one's confidence, for there is no one to whom the maxim — '*securus judicat orbis terrarum*' — makes a stronger appeal than the schoolboy.

"The result of this conflict of authorities was that I lost faith in religion altogether for the time being . . .

"... The turning point for me came after I had left the University . . . It was by the Study of St. Paul and St. John that I first came to understand the fundamental unity of Catholic theology and the Catholic life. I realized that the Incarnation, the Sacraments, the external order of the Church, and the internal working of sanctifying grace were all parts of one organic unity, a living tree, whose roots are in the Divine Nature and whose fruit is the perfection of the saints."

● *Dissipated Charism* (Lead Editorial from Journal Do Brasil, January 6, 1983, p. 10)

"The National Conference of Brazilian Bishops (NCBB) promises to continue evaluating, in 1983, "all of the social, economic and human problems of the country". The current President is also concerned with the law regulating salaries, with the elections and with other events.

"No one would deny the Church the right — and even at times the duty — to give opinions on these matters. But it does not take great effort to realize that when an institution preoccupies itself with so many matters and is quite willing to issue frequent judgments on them, its word becomes diluted, losing its strength in proportion to the great number of matters treated.

"One of the characteristics of our time is the cult of specialization. The background to what might be called a myth of our age is the old notion that every problem has its solution. Someone with a toothache goes to the dentist; someone with legal problems consults with a lawyer. As for problems of a more subjective nature, in the past people thought of going to see a priest. Today he shares the field with a large group of psychologists, analysts, therapists, etc. — which proves that the man of our times does not live on political, social or economic problems alone.

"If the priest, however, is perceived as spending too much time talking about the elections, ecology, social structures or multinational corporations, he can give the impression that he is not concerned about *his own* territory, or at least that he is spreading himself thin amidst many concerns. Then the traditional client (of the priest) can be led, by those instinctive actions of man, to knock on the next door down the street, to try another *parish*.

"The vitality of popular cults in Brazil was witnessed in the typical New Year's spectacles which went on in the heart of each big city. It can be argued that our age is more *relaxed*, less *prejudiced*; that the cults once practiced out in the countryside are now practiced in public plazas and on street corners. These cults are no longer confined to the lower classes, but are making inroads among the middle class and even beyond. On festive occasions, such as the recent holiday, they give rise to the impression that there are no

longer any obstacles to a total religious syncretism, to a spiritual Babel which characterizes times of decadence.

"This tide may not yet have the unyielding character of that which washed away the old religions of Greece or of Rome. But it points to a phenomenon which Pope John Paul II identified during his visit to Brazil: if this is a Catholic country, that identification poorly conceals a substantial ignorance of the depths of Catholicism. If the country is still basically Catholic, it is so in a way that is rather skin-deep and inconsequential, characterized by the multitude who call themselves Catholic but whose only contact with the Church is at weddings and funerals.

"In this area, the country does not differ from what it displays in other areas: lightweight ideas — when there are any — fickleness and a carefree attitude. Hence the ease with which Catholic beliefs or saints were assimilated into the popular cults and transformed into so many entities in the countryside.

"The Church can no longer wage crusades like those which decimated the heretics in the Middle Ages — and which in the time of Renaissance were not able to defeat the Protestant Reformation. But among the many problems which continually vex it, the NCCB (Brazil) could include this one — which does not seem to worry it too greatly. Between a priest who talks about everything — except the realities of his faith — and a *guru* who concerns himself with the terribly specific problems of each person the choice seems to fall many times on the second, no matter how strange might be his robes or his teachings."

*(Translated by Gerald E. Murray, Jr.)*

- 
- The Ethics and Public Policy Center (1666 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009, 202-328-7400) is sponsoring a Third Annual Conference on Religion and Politics April 21-22 — dealing with the question: "Who Speaks for the Churches?"

Among the speakers are James Hitchcock, Richard John Neuhaus, Seymore N. Siegel, Robert L. Wilson, Everett Carl Ladd.

Registration various from \$100 to \$60 depending upon the events to be attended.

The Conference will be held in the Washington Hilton Hotel on Connecticut Avenue.

- 
- Fr. Ronald Lawler, O.F.M. Cap., Director of the Institute for Advanced Studies in Catholic Doctrine at St. John's University, made a trip through four countries in Asia, and to Paris, from January 16 to February 6, to give talks on the family and on contemporary religious education. The chief purpose of the trip was to attend the First International Congress for the Family in Asia and Australia at Madras, India. There he gave talks on "Divorce Today" and on "Generosity: the Basic Foundation for Marriage." He also chaired a special program for priests of the Madras area, and spoke to the clergy there on the role of priests in promoting forms of family planning compatible with faith. Before the Madras meeting he visited Bangkok, in Thailand, Rangoon in Burma, and Kathmandu in Nepal. In Rangoon he spoke to the 239 major seminarians in Burma on "The Three Major Concerns of Pope John Paul II" (Catechesis, the family, and priestly formation.) In Kathmandu he spoke on "Contemporary Challenges to Religious Education" and on "John Paul II and the Family." At a meeting on Natural Family Planning held in Paris on February 5 he spoke on "John Paul II on the Importance of Natural Family Planning." At Rome, on February 3, he received from Cardinal Baum a diploma certifying his election to membership of the Pontifical Roman Theological Academy. In his visits to various countries he was especially impressed with the fact that pastoral leaders in Asiatic countries are far more vigorous and more successful in teaching Catholic positions on family ethics than those in this country. At the Madras meeting, for example, Bishop Stewart of South Korea reported that polls show that 80 per cent of Catholics in Korea prefer NFP over those forms of family planning that the Church has rejected as gravely sinful. In urban areas in the United States, by contrast, only about 5 per cent of Catholic couples choose NFP. The difference seems to be chiefly this: there is not nearly as much serious effort to encourage Catholics in this country to be faithful to the teachings of the Church in this area.

## Additional Comments on the War-Peace Issues

By Political Scientist Charles R. Dechert of the Catholic University of America.

1. The proposed pastoral letter "The Challenge of Peace" provides an opportunity for the American bishops to contribute both to the formation of consciences and to influence U.S. military and foreign policy in a manner consistent with a Christian view of man, men's responsibility and destiny. To the extent that it obfuscates issues, reveals unrealism regarding the use and consequences of the use of nuclear weapons, or is amenable to interpretation as suggesting unilateral nuclear disarmament it will be ineffectual domestically and may be exploited by America's adversaries to attempt to detach citizens, and especially members of the armed forces, from their duties and cast doubts on their reliability. I explored these issues several years ago in an essay published in *CIVILTA CATTOLICA* (21 Oct., 1978; No. 3080), "I Cattolici degli Stati Uniti e le Armi Nucleari."

2. In the new draft of the pastoral letter (*Origins*, 28 Oct. 1982) the term "nuclear war" is used ambiguously. Implicit in its use here is the notion of a global holocaust: "... nuclear war threatens the existence of our planet." "We can threaten the created order . . . We could destroy [God's] work." This is dramatic, certainly overstated and reduces the letter's credibility. The use of nuclear explosives may include the suggested high altitude blast to activate particle-beam weapons (designed to destroy salvos of ballistic missiles) and low yield tactical nuclear warheads (neutron or otherwise) deployed (by the U.S., the French and/or British) to defend Western Europe in the presence of a conventional attack an essential given current relative conventional force levels and makeup. These tactical nuclear weapons were adopted because they are cheap and have provided a strong defensive posture without undue burden. Acceptance of a firm "no first use" position by the U.S. and Atlantic Alliance countries would result (through intimidation and internal political pressure) in Europe's quasi-incorporation into the Soviet bloc on Soviet terms ("Finlandization"). An effort to invade Japan or the United States in a Normandy type operation would certainly be resisted by nuclear weapons which are peculiarly well adapted to counter efforts of this type. A blanket condemnation of such uses and so an implicit request for

the non-participation of U.S. Catholics in the U.S. Armed Forces would, I suspect, simply not be heeded by serious minded American Catholics, irreversibly damage the bishops' credibility (even with Catholics), and nullify the bishops' effort to have a constructive impact on policy.

3. That constructive orientation should be found in the explicit and unequivocal condemnation of "countervalue" and "deterrent" strategies based on the threat (which to be credible *must* be concretized in targeting) to destroy population centers and the accumulated heritage of civilization and culture *in retaliation* for attack on the U.S., its forces or its vital interests. The bishops' letter as currently written tends to confuse such a "strategy of deterrence" with the deterrent *effect* produced by simply possessing nuclear weapons and delivery capabilities (the way the term is used in papal documents).

Any effort to condemn passive defense against nuclear weapons as provocative or likely to create the impression that "nuclear war is winnable" might make the bishops appear naive in their placing confidence in the yet to be demonstrated good will of adversaries engaged in a massive buildup of their military capabilities. Prudence suggests the desirability of a responsible non-threatening civil defense posture. It appears that the Soviet Union has a massive civil defense program.

As Christians we cannot return evil for evil; we certainly cannot threaten to kill the innocent for the sins of their leaders even if they strike us massively. At the same time this nation's civic and moral leadership is under no obligation to bare its breast to potential enemies or to make its civil population hostage to an increasingly questionable "deterrent" capability.

4. Under attack we could, and surely would, *retaliate* against an aggressor's war-making capability; something once impossible without "city-busting" but now feasible — and that strategy will be employed by prudent men responsible for the national security. What this implies is:

a) vehicles that can be targeted precisely as opposed to the Polaris type missile intentionally kept inaccurate under the McNamara regime so as to be frightening, an homicidal deterrent "city buster."

b) that the explosive strength of such weapons must not exceed what is needed for their military targets. The posture is defensive; the effort

## Additional Comments on the War-Peace Issues *(continued)*

is to minimize evil (damage to persons, products of civilization, nature; responses are slow and deliberate avoiding "launch on warning" decision criteria (most nuclear weapons might well be kept unassembled as is the Israeli practice).

To encourage national politico-military policy statements along these lines would do much to avoid the conscientious qualms felt by an increasing number of Christians in the armed forces who may now be asked to assist in massive slaughter; at the same time there could be no question of the American Catholic Bishops' encouraging the U.S.' reneging on its plighted word abroad, its security commitments to other nations, or its responsibilities for the defense of North America.

5. The bishops must not be accused of fostering massive civil disobedience or asking nearly a quarter of the population to detach itself morally from the national leadership. To posit "just war" positions and the Christian pacifism of Dorothy Day as equally valid for the *commonwealth* is to deny civil authority's responsibility for the common welfare. Quakers and Dorothy Day's little band and 13th century Franciscan tertiaries can be pacifist; it is not a legitimate option for 50 million Americans.

6. Virtually all the bishops' letter says is true and valid but care must be devoted to avoid the impression of irresponsibility. Arms reduction, of course, but negotiated and mutual (indeed multilateral now, and the French don't seem to want to play the negotiation game, nor the Israelis nor the Chinese). It is clear that a massive and uncontrolled nuclear exchange *under present conditions* might well hasten the sunset of Western Civilization in its Anglo-American, Western European and Slavic manifestations. This would be tragic but serious questions may be raised whether the bishop's letter in its present form would decrease rather than increase the likelihood of all-out war. By strengthening the Soviet Union psychological-political advantage (they view military capability as only part of a global "equilibrium of forces") the bishops' letter, as currently written, may well hasten the neutralization and eventual economic/political incorporation of Western Europe into the socialist bloc, and a Pax Sovietica in the Middle East. Since the U.S. current military capability relies almost entirely on nuclear weapons, the U.S. will respond to aggression with these or not at all. Serious doubt

as to American intent or the reliability of the U.S. population in a crunch can only enhance an adversary's sense of confidence. Pragmatically, in terms of our own ease and comfort, retreating to a "fortress America" is not necessarily a bad idea, though the excesses of Pol Pol in Cambodia and the current Vietnamese regime should give pause when adopting moral stances of the type that led to the U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam.

7. Exclusive reliance on "conventional weapons" (including, presumably, fragmentation bombs and advanced air-fuel explosives) as recommended by the bishops would be incredibly expensive (undermining the argument that resources now used for defense are better used for human welfare and development), unconvincing without adequate checks on everyone else's nuclear capability, and would require a far better American conventional war-fighting capability than shown during the past 30 years. Most of all it could not win the political/psychological assent of most of our allies and friends (who wants more American troops in Europe?) nor of the bulk of Americans themselves (who wants a large draft army with the expensive technical means for rapid deployment anywhere in the world?). It would certainly lead to a frenzied pursuit of minimal nuclear defensive/deterrent capabilities by nations currently relying on the U.S. nuclear umbrella.

8. In brief I strongly advise that in the final rewrite the bishops:

a) avoid efforts at sophisticated strategic analysis or comment on technical issues as such.

b) avoid the essentially ambiguous terms "nuclear war" and "deterrence."

c) restrict policy recommendations to:

1) the absolute condemnation of the willful mass-destruction of people and the products of civilization.

2) deplore the use of decision-mechanisms or weapons deployment systems that might lead to over-hasty, excessive or mistaken military (and especially nuclear) responses. But stay general on this.

3) Repudiate any "first strike" or "disarming first strike" or "launch on warning" policy — This does not, however, imply renunciation of *any* first use. The statement "We do not perceive any situation in which the deliberate initiation of nuclear warfare, on however restricted a scale, can be

## Additional Comments on the War-Peace Issues *(continued)*

morally justified." simply shows a lack of imagination. Suppose at some point in a conventional war an invasion fleet approaches New Jersey? the Yorkshire coast? Tokyo Bay?

d) avoid the suggestion that pacifism or pacifity in the presence of evil is an acceptable Christian policy alternative at the national level as opposed to the individual or small group level.

e) avoid phrases or analyses that might damage or destroy the long term credibility of the bishops as responsible and realistic moral commentators with the right and authority to form the Christian conscience. As presently written this document relegates them to well-meaning irrelevance with bad effects for both consciences and national policy.

---

*By Moral Theologian Joseph T. Mangan of the Jesuit Community, Loyola University in Chicago.*

I would like to commend the Bishops for the job they are doing in upgrading awareness of the extreme dangers to man in any nuclear war, and of the very real moral issues related to such a war. But in the present state of theological discussion and controversy it does not seem advisable to make the definitive moral conclusions in the Bishops' *Second Draft*. They do not all express Catholic doctrine. I recommend that the Bishops consider publishing their statement as their opinion, but clearly not as Catholic doctrine binding on the Catholic faithful (much like their statement on capital punishment); or that they postpone publication of their statement, until they can publish it as Catholic doctrine with all the modifications that will be necessary.

The following criticisms and recommendations are aimed at a revision that will improve the Letter and bring it more in accord with present Catholic doctrine. I suggest that the Letter be re-written using more totally traditional Catholic ethical reasoning and using traditional terminology.

Mention should be made of the divine natural law at the center of the Church's teaching on peace and war (Vd. Vatican II: *Church in the Modern World*, nn.78, 79; *On Religious Freedom*, n. 3; et al). Mention should be made explicitly that according to authentic Catholic doctrine it is intrinsically evil directly to kill an innocent human person, e.g. in war, a non-combatant. In all honesty

mention should be made of those Old and New Testament passages which indicate God's approval of war and violence in the proper situations (Vd. *Joel 4/9, 10; Eccles. 3/1-8; John 2/13-22; Romans 13/1-7; et al*). The Draft's selective choice of Scripture passages seems to indicate that the Committee was interested only in showing the scriptural foundation for the pacifist position and not for the just war position or for the just defense against unjust aggression position.

In my judgment, when addressing the issue of "just means," a general statement should be made, e.g. "The just war must be waged by means that are not morally evil." Traditionally the principle of double effect has been used to sift out the just from the unjust means in the carrying on of the just war. My recommendation, therefore, is that this principle should be explained at this stage of the Draft. An example of a morally evil means is the direct killing of innocent people.

In estimating the good to be accomplished and the possible evil to be caused by engaging in war or by instituting a nuclear attack, we must consider much more than the number of human lives that may or may not be destroyed or saved. There are some things in life worth dying for and worth killing for.

Keeping well in mind the present state of world affairs, the only future war we now envision is one against atheistic and unprincipled forces of aggression. Should such a war develop, the United States may be obliged to use whatever legitimate means of warfare there are. For, victory in such a war would be of the utmost importance not only for the very existence of the United States as a democratic nation, but also for the good of the whole world at large and for the cause of Christianity.

It is not difficult to see that the loss of a war to these forces of aggression would mean the loss of civic and religious liberty for more than half the world. It would mean the complete subjugation, even possible extermination, of the vanquished nations. It could also mean the end of our Christian way of life and of Christian civilization as we now know it. The Christian churches could well be forced into a type of catacomb existence. Whereas, victory over these forces would mean the preservation of these liberties. To achieve this all-important victory necessary drastic measures could be justified.

In the event of war in the present state of

## Additional Comments on the War-Peace Issues *(continued)*

world affairs, the enemy undoubtedly would use whatever nuclear weapons he had at hand. Therefore, if the use of nuclear warfare can be judged morally lawful, we might be obliged to use it to the extent of military usefulness guided by the moral law. We certainly cannot, however, justify nuclear warfare on the morally false principles that: "The end justifies the means, even when the means are morally evil"; or "In wartime a warring nation may do anything whatever that will help win the war," or "In wartime a warring nation may use whatever means the enemy uses to win the war."

But a warring nation, according to the moral law, does at times have the right and the obligation to use force, even death-dealing weapons, against an unjust aggressor nation. Now, the specific question that needs to be answered is whether the use of nuclear weapons in a just war and the antecedent testing, stockpiling, and threat-to-use, those weapons is morally lawful.

Catholic theologians today are in active disagreement concerning the use of nuclear weapons in strategic bombing of military targets far behind the battle lines with anticipated vast destruction of civilian lives. Personally, I judge that the principle of double effect can be used to justify such bombing as a last resort.

In such an application of the principle of double effect, the bombing nation would be judged to have the right to destroy the military target as a legitimate means of self-defense. In the present world situations could arise in which the sudden destruction of a military target would be judged necessary for effective self-defense and in which less drastic means, e.g. precision bombing of individual factories or industrial areas, would be virtually ineffective. Such a military target in or near a large metropolitan community would have to be making a very important contribution to the war effort by way of industry, communications, or the like, without which the war effort would be critically handicapped. It would have to offer a legitimate military target proportionate to the destructive nature of the bomb used. Such use of nuclear weapons would be discriminate bombing of a military target, and not indiscriminate destruction of an entire city which is condemned by the Second Vatican Council.

The intention of the attack in self-defense would be directed toward a military target and not toward the civilian population. Vast concomitant destruction of human lives would be foreseen, but there would be proportionate reason for permitting the evil effect. Under these conditions the defending nation would be in a state of moral impossibility to prevent the foreseen but unintended evil effect.

To test, stockpile, and threaten-to-use, nuclear weapons, therefore, for such morally lawful use *per se* would be within the rights of the United States, if that were necessary for preparedness and/or as a deterrent against the likely aggressor nation. It seems that it is necessary.

*A fortiori*, I also judge that the use of nuclear warfare is morally permissible against large troop concentrations, against an enemy fleet at sea, and against other tactical targets of great importance, wherein there would be no question of vast destruction of innocent (non-combatant) human lives.

Now, even though I stand behind all of my previous explanations, I must admit (everyone must admit) that nuclear warfare is such a horror to contemplate, everyone in the United States (everyone in the world) should be willing to do whatever they can to prevent one from breaking out.

In my judgment, therefore, the Bishops in their Pastoral Letter, while approving an acceptable policy of deterrence, should concentrate some of their efforts on urging United States government officials to renewed negotiations aimed at realistic agreements for bilateral disarmament.

One final recommendation: The Bishops should appoint one or more reliable moral theologians loyal to the Magisterium of the Church to be the principal writers of the moral section of the Letter.

*Ecclesiological Implications of Consequentialist Theory Explained by Dogmatic Theologian Fr. Donald J. Keefe, S.J., Marquette University.*

If American Catholics accept without discussion the notion that intrinsic evil can be tolerated to gain some good end, then consequentialist moral theory is in place and, with it, the politicization of Catholic morality and worship. In such an eventuality an ideologically-grounded *praxis* will replace doctrine and this *praxis*, rather than the Church's worship in truth, becomes the one responsibility which remains to Bishops, whose magisterial function will have been abandoned. Consequentialism is not merely a moral theology; it is an entire ecclesiology, for it submits all the concreteness of the Church's historicity to the single notion of *praxis*. This *praxis* supplants morality, doctrine, and sacramental worship. Once admitted into the Church, it must dissolve the Church, and that dissolution begins, as it must, with the episcopal office.

It is true that the best-known names in Roman Catholic moral theology are converts to this consequentialist theology: Joseph Fuchs, Bernard Haring, Bruno Schuller in Europe, Charles Curran, Richard McCormick and Anthony Kosnick in this country are no more than the leaders of a school now including perhaps a majority of Catholic moralists. Nonetheless, the implications of consequentialism include a reduction of Catholic life to public irresponsibility. Bishops are being asked to abdicate their ecclesial and sacramental responsibility in favor of the one ideology and philosophy of history, which, having enlisted them in consequentialism, has eliminated their teaching office.

The theoretical ground for this destabilization has been prepared since the Reformation, and has recently been restated explicitly by Edward Schillebeeckx who has made the Eucharistic and sacramental responsibility of the priesthood into a consequence of and spin-off from a prior and primary political leadership role. Once this ideology triumphs the sacramental realism essential to Roman Catholic worship, the morality which rests upon that realism, and the historical concreteness of all Catholic life and worship are dismissed. Henceforth these matters are submitted to the secular historicity of political life and *praxis*. The sum of this aberration is that identification of the governance of Church and State, which is instinctive to pagan societies, which began to trouble the Church as soon as it gained public legitimacy under Constantine, which provoked the Gregorian reform at the end of the 11th century, which troubled the Church as "political Augus-

tinianism" during the high middle ages, which recurred in secular guise in the conciliarism crisis and in a triumphalist format in the baroque thesis-hypothesis theology, and was finally decisively rejected by Vatican II's recognition of the inseparability of public responsibility and the Catholic faith. John Courtney Murray taught American Roman Catholics of John Kennedy's generation to reject entirely the notion that the Church has any direct political responsibility, and at the same time taught them that the personal political responsibility of Catholics rose out of, was sustained by and was inseparable from their Catholic faith and worship. Murray's doctrine was expressly vindicated at Vatican II. Clearly, American Roman Catholics need to consider more fully than they have done the nature of the "Catholic" politics they would establish; it is not to be supposed that they have wittingly rejected what Vatican II so solemnly proclaimed.

There are nevertheless clear indications that some American bishops have given an unreflective practical consent to the new consequentialist and politicized ecclesiology which, proposed over the past fifteen years by Hans Kueng, Bernard Cooke, Edward Kilmartin, Joseph Martos, Richard McBrien and the various advocates of women's orders, is now a prime influence in the circles from which the bishops' machinery takes its theology.

The first casualty of any diminution or devaluation of lay responsibility and religious maturity is inevitably marriage. The Reformation, which condemned as "works" any confident public and sacramental expression of religious responsibility, rejected the sacramentality of marriage. This opened the way to the legitimation of divorce, for humanity across the board was held to be engulfed in a "total corruption" which made sacramental realism flatly impossible and even its assertion blasphemous. Humanity, from this Reformation stance, is incapable of that significant, meaningful historical activity and responsibility which is sacramental worship. Henceforth, for the Reformation, worship became the entirely passive hearing in faith of the preached word. A comparable mindset is now common in American Catholic circles. Troubled by the obvious difficulties inherent in the exercise of sacramental responsibility — difficulties radically inseparable from existence in a fallen world — American canonists have adopted a canonical practice which, on grounds of psychological incapacity to give marital consent, to enter into the marital covenant, grants

annulments on a scale which attests the absence of any effective presumption in favor of the capacity to marry and of the objective reality of any challenged marriage. No doubt the older practice exhibited an equally unjustifiably confidence in another kind of juridical rationalism, one equally unacquainted with sacramental realism, but the contemporary rationalism is widely and accurately seen, as the older rigorism was not, to involve the abandonment of the Catholic doctrine on the indissolubility of marriage. The problem is sufficiently real to have drawn expressions of concern from the present Pope, whose reassertion of the ancient tradition has been emphatic and continual.

Equally problematical is the practice, routine in most dioceses, of requiring a quite elaborate and prolonged showing of sacramental capacity before a Catholic marriage may be solemnized. An ordinary caution in such matters is well and good, but not to the point of putting a positive burden upon mature and practicing Catholics to demonstrate what should be presumed: that they are not so enmeshed in fallenness as to be incapable of fulfilling their baptismal character. Catholic adults are now placed in a position of submitting to an authoritarian oversight at the most fundamental level of their public responsibility: their capacity to marry or to have married. Latent in such restraints upon their sacramental dignity is a historical pessimism, an inchoate persuasion that salvation through the reality of sacramental worship places an impossible burden upon the people of God, of which it is the bishops' pastoral responsibility to relieve them. This pastoral responsibility becomes cosmological, no longer historical: it becomes a responsibility for removing sin from the world, whether by elaborate safeguards against the exercise of personal responsibility before the fact or by universal denials, after the fact, that in fact it was exercised. Such devices, if legitimate anywhere, are obviously capable of a further application, whenever and wherever sacramental realism is in question; the recognition that this is the case is finally indistinguishable from the acceptance of the Reformation doctrine of a people totally corrupt, incapable of sacramental worship, incapable of historical existence, whose salvation consists in a cosmos delivered from evil by its deliverance from all exercise of personal responsibility. The resonance of this pessimism with the consequentialist morality is obvious: the human situation is ultimately obscure; our imaging of God is so ambiguous, so riddled with contradiction, that no profanation of it is publically discernible as a matter always and everywhere a violation of that

imaging. This reduction of Catholic morality to the ineffable, the publically undetectable, to the nonhistorical, is of a piece with the doubt now cast upon the very possibility of sacramental marriage, and finally of any sacramental worship.

The doubt in which the realism of the Church's sacramental worship is today commonly placed had its first massive manifestation in the exodus from the seminaries and religious houses which began in the early nineteen-sixties and which has now reduced the Catholic clergy and religious to a vanishing species. The post-conciliar theological assessment (not, emphatically, the Vatican II assessment) of the priestly office concluded to a vastly reduced esteem for the priestly vocation and to a near-incomprehension of the religious life. The very possibility of such a high-profile and optimistic undertaking of a life-long historical responsibility was put in question by a rationale whose analogy is now operative in our marriage tribunals, and which had the same failure of historical nerve as its consequence. The bishops are now faced with the concrete evidence in terms of seminary populations and ordination and departure statistics that a most fundamental crisis now confronts the American Church. Yet this crisis leaves them strangely unmoved; a leisurely examination of seminary education is going forward, at the explicit instance of the Vatican, but no national program for dealing with this challenge to the existence of the sacramental Church is in being nor in prospect, as the bishops were sharply reminded on the last day of their recent meeting. The only conclusion which may be drawn is that they do not encounter this crisis as a real problem; evidently some solution is at hand, to the point that to speak of a crisis is to misunderstand the reality. Yet no such solution appears: those who would seek new candidates for the priesthood from those women who wish to be ordained have been rebuffed at the highest level, nor is there any encouragement for the prospect of a large-scale ordination of married clergy, or of a recall to active ministry of those priests who left that ministry for marriage. There is a certain amount of hope given a conventional expression that the explicit Vatican statements in these connections are a mere whistling in the dark, an obstinate but doomed refusal to come to terms with modernity, but it is clear enough that no episcopal policy concerning vocations can be built upon such velleities.

What then remains? The answer is not far to seek: the non-necessity for the Church of an ordained priesthood. Again, Schillebeeckx's recent book is in point because it is symptomatic; its argument has been made with growing frequency and is increasingly accepted in Catholic theology

journals and in Catholic seminary teaching over the past dozen and more years. It is routinely presented in our depopulated seminaries as the way of the future and in the theology schools whose clientele, in lieu of the vanished candidates for the sacrificial priesthood, is now composed largely of candidates for a lay ministry. Not many bishops, it may be supposed, are happy with this situation; none can be ignorant of it. That they accept it nonetheless, and are content to undertake a political pastorate, more willing to concern themselves with the suppression of Catholic political life than with the sustenance of the sacramental worship of the Church, forces a melancholy conclusion: increasingly the bishops have come to accept the view of the Church which sees its worship and morality as privatized, devoid of any really operative sacramental symbolism, dependent finally upon a faith possessed of no assured historical expression of its own, and therefore enlisted as an enthusiasm in causes not its own.

The sacramental authority of the Catholic bishops is indispensable to the Church. It is an authority which is convenantal, Eucharistic, Trinitarian. So understood, so implemented, its impact is profoundly political, profoundly liberating, for it amounts to the radical conversion of the notion of authority, the radical desacralization of all political authority. The convenantal notion of authority is one in which authority is creative and supportive of the freedom of the person under authority; this opposes absolutely the notion common to the pagan city in which authority is inevitably suppressive of the freedom of the citizen. The ultimate source of all freedom, of all authority, as of all worship, is the Trinitarian Mission of the Son by the Father to give the Spirit; in this Mission, the Son, obedient unto death, was not servile, though taking upon himself the form of the Servant. So understood, obedience is not other than covenanted love, nor is authority. To understand the bishops' authority, office and responsibility in terms of any other model is to reduce it to the despotism which, as in paganism, would strip the person under authority of all dignity, of all responsibility, of even a sacramental right to worship God in the sacraments of the Church. As has been said, the first victim of such despotism is always marriage, for this, the utterly basic political expression of the Catholic people and the ground of all free political life, can submit to no rationale, no dehistoricization, to no program for the excision of sin and evil from the world. The bishops, in their responsibility for the Church's worship, are responsible for the freedom

and the responsibility of that worship; they are not charged with the preservation of the race, the planet, the cosmos; it is not theirs to separate the tares from the wheat. Their sole responsibility is for the worship of the Church. This worship controls the meaning of their office; it is a concrete historical worship, and theirs a concrete historical responsibility. By this worship, the Lord of history is present to His people, offering them that future which is His gift alone, a gift by which they are freed from all those fears which would urge the foreclosure of the future and of its freedom as realities dangerous because beyond all human calculus, all administrative safeguard, all reduction to cosmic security.

The immediate implication of the worship of the Lord of history is the optimism otherwise groundless which finds in the covenanted people of God the sacrament of the future, of the Kingdom — *sacramentum futuri*. Every attempt to undercut or shortcircuit it or to bypass their free political responsibility bespeaks a radical distrust of the Lord of history, and a presumptuous usurpation of a transcendence which is His alone. There is no guarantee of the future of this earth, this people, other than that which is the presence, irrevocably given, among the people of God of their Eucharistic Lord. By their worship, they receive the Gift which only He can give, and all surrogates for which are finally idolatrous. From any conventional and secular viewpoint and wisdom, so to believe is madness, the foolishness which is the Wisdom of God. The need to flee from history, to annul freedom, to escape its obscurities by the rationalization of the world, this is paganism: it is also the secular instinct, the sophistication of the "new class" Catholicism. The elitist decision of the people in the pews, of the vagaries of a political distrust in which their spontaneity could be effective, these have their roots in an ancient infidelity, which the bishops, are urged to share, to institutionalize. But we are told that the fear of God, not of history, is the beginning of wisdom. By the fear of God, finally to be cast out by the love of God, we are embarked on a conversion, a metanoia which is ever incomplete in a fallen world. Divorced from this fear, this love, this conversion, all morality and all politics become demonic. We learned from Peter long ago that no other name is given us by which we may be saved than the Christ, whose presence in our time and space make of it a salvation history and a good creation, which we make our own by our worship in the Church. It is this worship by which the world is saved; it is by accepting their official responsibility for it that the bishops fulfill their office.

## Publications of Interest

- Rene Laurentin, *Les Evangiles de L'Enfance Du Christ* (Matthieu 1-2 et Luc 1-2) Verite de Noel au-dela des Mythes: Exegese et semiotique, Theologie and Historicité. Published by Declee (240 francs, about \$35.00)

Fr. Laurentin rehabilitates the true historicity of these narratives and explores their rich theological meaning. A masterpiece of scholarship with copious references to previous research, including that appearing in the U.S.

This book is being translated into English.

- Louis Bouyer, *The Church of God*, (Chicago, Franciscan Herald Press, 1982) 567 pp. \$25.00.

This is a big book about a big Church by a big scholar. In a real sense it is a survey of Catholic ecclesiology from primitive Christian days till now from a post-Vatican II perspective. Originally published twelve years ago in France (and now translated by a New York priest, Charles U. Quinn) the amount of learning contained therein is prodigious with Fr. Bouyer no scholar to mince words about his personal convictions.

The contents are divided into two parts of unequal lengths; 150 pages (approximately) devoted to the pre-modern Christian experience, including theologies from the early Fathers to 19th century Orthodoxy; and 250 pages of the doctrinal synthesis contained in Vatican II. This latter section is in many ways a masterpiece of review and analysis. The author balances the ongoing mystery of Christ's presence in the Church with the historical and existential realities of ecclesial forces in continuing tension. Chapter after chapter analyzes the Church as Mystery, People, Body of Christ, Apostolic, Hierarchical, Local, Terrestrial, and Mother. Fr. Bouyer writes with first drafts of Vatican II in mind compared to the documents finally approved by Bishops and Pope. The final pages are a spiritual nosegay about the Church as "Domus Sapientiae". This is a good reference book.

- Thomas Molnar, *Politics and the State: The Catholic View*, (Chicago, Franciscan Herald Press, 1980) 152 pp. \$7.50 This is an effort to develop Catholic political theory – or politics in the light of Catholic doctrine, an enterprise usually shunned in public and academic discourse, when it is not presented with a one-sided bias by social scientists who think sound modern political thought originat-

ed in Greco-Roman times or at least during the Renaissance. Dr. Molnar presents the neglected Catholic tradition with able argumentation.

- *God's Word to His Church*, published by Ignatius Press (San Francisco 94118-0390), is a Catholic workbook for the study of Scripture. It was prepared by missionaries over a ten year period. 145 pages \$6.95.

- *What Is Secular Humanism?*, a new book by James Hitchcock, has been published by Servant Books.

Enrique T. Rueda, *The Homosexual Network: Private Lives and Public Policy* (Greenwich, Connecticut, Devin-Adair Co. 1982 700 pages. No price listing. The central finding of this study on the social and political aspects of the homosexual movement in America concerns the unprecedented degree by which organized religion has been infiltrated by the homosexual movement. A Roman Catholic priest, he utilized his own church in a case study. In a survey of homosexual organizations, he found that most of them are politically liberal, not only concerning social issues but also concerning economic and foreign policy matters. His ultimate conclusion is that the homosexual movement has become part and parcel of American liberalism and that its leaders have learned to make common cause with a variety of liberal leaders, expecting and obtaining support from them whenever the interests of the homosexual movement are at stake.

Paul Johnson, *Pope John II and the Catholic Restoration* (St. Martin's Press, 1981).

Paul Johnson is a British politician and journalist who seems to have grown steadily more orthodox during the past few years. His earlier works, such as *History of Christianity*, seemed to have a decided bias against authority. This book, however, is a very sympathetic and quite perceptive discussion of the present pope, including very shrewd analyses of the problems facing the Church and how the Holy Father is responding to them. The Pope emerges from the book as something of a master statesman, despite the heavy odds against which he contends.

● Francis J. Klauder SDB *The Wonder of Man* is a study in philosophical psychology/anthropology seeking to answer the question "What is man?" Limited supply available from Don Bosco College, Newton, New Jersey 07860, \$9.95, 174 pages.

● John Witherspoon Mole OMI, *The ABC Catechism: A Method of Adult Religious Instruction* (Franciscan Herald Press) is an attempt to devise systematic instruction for adults from the three cycles of liturgical readings. Prefatory note by Silvio Cardinal Oddi. This volume covers the period from Advent to Pentecost. 347 pages \$9.50.

● Russell Shaw, *Choosing Well*, (University of Notre Dame Press, Indiana 46556, 96 pages \$2.95 paper)

How many people today are in a quandary over how to live their ethical lives? Absolute moral standards of only a few years ago appear gone by the board, to be replaced by a love ethic that seems to allow a person to choose what fits the situation of the moment.

In this well-written response to the needs of people for ethical guidelines, Russell Shaw offers an ethic based on human purposes, on the human possibilities that are within us and the people about us.

Russell Shaw is secretary for public affairs of the United States Catholic Conference. With Germain Grisez, he is a coauthor of *Beyond the New Morality: The Responsibilities of Freedom*, a successful college ethics text that provides the basis for the volume *Choosing Well*.

● From the *Ignatius Press* (P.O. Box 18990, San Francisco, California).

*Four New Publications:*

James V. Schall, S.J., *Liberation Theology* seeks to answer the question: What is the proper role of the Church and churchmen in solving worldly problems? A study of the Latin American experience. 400 pages, \$10.95.

Christopher Derrick, *Sex and Sacredness* is an attempt to lift the whole subject of sexuality out of the realm of morality and into the deeper realm

of religion. Derrick argues that men are never permissive about anything which they still apprehend as sacred. 220 pages, \$7.95.

Hans Urs Von Balthasar, *The Threefold Garland* presents a series of profound reflections on the mysteries of the Rosary. 146 pages, \$6.95.

Kenneth Baker, S.J., *Fundamentals of Catholicism* (Volume 1) is the first of a series which will present authentic Catholic doctrine on all important points of faith and morals. This volume deals with the Creed and the Ten Commandments. 240 pages, \$8.95.

● *The Chesterton Review* is publishing a special issue this November for the Eric Gill centenary. Gill (1882-1940) a world-famous artist and sculptor, was a close friend of G.K. Chesterton and a prominent member of Chesterton's circle of Distributist writers. Gill's work had a wide influence in the United States, particularly on groups like the Catholic Worker movement. This special issue of the *Chesterton Review* is of particular interest because many of the contributors to it were friends of Eric Gill and Chesterton. These include Sir John Rothenstein, Brocard Sewell, and Father Conrad Pepler, O.P. The issue also includes Chesterton's essays about Gill and reprints of various examples of Gill's own art. *The Chesterton Review* is an international literary journal devoted to a discussion of literature, social philosophy and theology. Founded in 1974, the *Review* is published four times a year with contributors from America, Britain, Australia, and other countries. It deals with current questions and with the work and thought of important twentieth-century Christian thinkers. A subscription costs \$12.00 per year and may be obtained by writing to *St. Thomas Moore College, 1437 College Drive, Saskatoon, Canada S7N 0W6*. New subscribers receive as a bonus a free copy of the Eric Gill special issue or a free copy of the special Christopher Dawson issue which is being published in May, 1983. The Dawson issue is being edited by Christina Scott, Dawson's daughter and the author of the new Dawson biography.

## Periodical Review

### A First Response to Hallet on the Ford-Grisez Thesis

In the June 1978 issue of *Theological Studies* John C. Ford S.J. and Germain Grisez argued that the Church's teaching on contraception is an exercise of the ordinary magisterium which meets the conditions set out in *Lumen Gentium*, 25 for infallible exercise of this teaching office. Garth Hallett S.J. has undertaken to refute this thesis in the December 1982 issue of the same journal. Hopefully a full scale response to Hallett's argument will be forthcoming; the remarks here are only preliminary.

To refute a position one must simply develop another position that is both more rationally acceptable than the one to be refuted and contradictory to it. Rational acceptability in a theological dispute depends on the theological warrants for one's position. Hallett's argument, however, is not strictly inconsistent with the Ford-Grisez thesis, and its own theological credentials are weak and suspect at best.

Hallett disputes the Ford-Grisez thesis on the grounds that the Church's teaching on contraception over the centuries is not really constant. The only constant factor is the purely prescriptive and contentless proscription of contraceptive acts. The meaning of the condemnation shifts because the criteria for right and wrong — that is, the features of acts which make them to be right or wrong — have shifted down through the centuries. The analysis of moral language developed by contemporary philosophers shows, Hallett maintains, that such shifts in criteria change the moral meaning of moral statements.

Hallett's proposal is not really contradictory to the Ford Grisez thesis because constancy of teaching is not essential for the ordinary magisterium's being exercised infallibly. Surely, it is a sign; but constancy of teaching is not among the conditions stated in *Lumen Gentium* 25; and it is therefore sufficient for the Ford-Grisez thesis that the bishops of the world at any given time should have been unified in condemning contraception in the appropriate way. If the bishops of the world in, say, Augustine's time or in the heyday of classical moral theology were of one mind on this, it would be infallibly taught, whatever shifts in moral meaning might occur later. We surely cannot assume that bishops alive at the same time — many of whom had contact with one another and shared common cultural assumptions — did not share common moral meanings.

Furthermore, it seems to me that the theological credentials of the view of moral language which is the basis for Hallett's position are remarkably weak. Hallett claims considerable authority for his view, but it is not the authority of the Church or of theological sources. Rather, it is the authority of contemporary philosophy. Aside from the fact that the view Hallett takes to be authoritative is widely disputed among analytical philosophers, it is a well known fact that much of modern thought is antithetical to Catholic belief; it is no secret that the work of many analytical philosophers is not an exception. In fact, the best known Catholics among analytic philosophers have seriously criticized the work of English moralist R. M. Hare on whom Hallett relies heavily. Of course, Catholic thinkers should make use of the best philosophy available, and linguistic philosophy has much that is of use to Catholic thinking — but analytic philosophy as a theological authority?

Some of the implications of Hallett's view lead to further suspicions about its theological credentials. Because of its generality Hallett's view of moral language is not limited to the teaching on contraception but would apply to all moral teachings. If Hallett's argument did show that contraception is not infallibly proscribed, it would equally show that no moral teaching, however general or specific, could be infallibly taught. And it would do this by an analysis that showed that there really is no moral tradition within the Church but rather a series of conceptually unrelated urgings, instigations, and disapprovals of various behaviors. There really would be no moral teaching common to St. Paul, St. Augustine, St. Thomas, St. Alphonsus, and us. Common prescriptions perhaps, but nothing like common moral propositions.

The main difficulty, however, lies in the fact that Hallett supposes falsely that differences in moral theory (as suggested by differences in moral arguments) indicate differences in moral meaning. The fact that there is no common moral theory does not imply that there is no unity at all in the Catholic moral tradition. This would be so only if moral theory in effect created moral meaning and was not a way of articulating something somehow given. Hallett sometimes writes as if he accepts a conventionalist account of how moral meanings come to be. In one place he states that criteria are not made in heaven. But this is false, for in a very important sense moral meanings are made in heaven. As St. Paul has said, the moral law is written in the human heart to be detected by conscience. The whole tradition of natural law is

based on this conviction, and whatever differences separate Catholic moralists, they are most reasonably understood as differences in articulating the moral law given within the human heart. There is simply no evidence for thinking that Catholic moralists understand their disagreements to represent radically different understandings of morality or of the basic meaning of right and wrong. Quite the contrary, all approved moralists have thought that moral norms are divine commands given to us for our good by a God who loves us and wants what is really best for us. The fact that there are moralists outside the Catholic tradition who think otherwise does nothing to compromise this broad agreement and the common understanding of the framework in which disagreements take place.

So, Hallett is faced with a dilemma: either there is more agreement in the tradition than his position can allow, or moral meanings must be created in such a radical way that the agreement there counts for little. But this understanding of moral norms is incompatible with Scripture and the entire tradition's understanding of how we come to know moral truth. Of course, Hallett can get out of the dilemma by claiming that the Church has simply been wrong in condemning contraception, and in making use of the criteria for morality it has used. But this does nothing to overturn the Ford-Grisez thesis, and turns the dispute instead to the issues of ethical theory. If this is what the debate is about it should be noted that there is simply no reason to think that the law of God written in our hearts is really the consequentialism Hallett seems to accept. This moral theory *is* a construct — made by modern non-believers and not by God — but this is a different argument.

Joseph M. Boyle Jr.

---

● *A closer look at the Roman meeting of Jesuits*

(by Fr. Eugene P. Finnegan, S.J., Rector of the Canisius Jesuit Community)

[Concerning the opinion that the Jesuit meeting with the Pope last February was an unfortunate misunderstanding perpetrated by unnamed enemies of the Society in Rome.]

"If that is the case, then there's a breakdown in communication also with the last two popes. Papal admonitions directed toward the Society in recent times did not begin with John Paul II. His

predecessor, John Paul I, in far stronger terms than the present pope, issued the same warnings.

"And before him Paul VI made very clear that there was much reason for concern about activities within the Order. 'Certain regrettable actions,' he said to the Fathers of the 32nd General Congregation, 'which would make one doubt whether the man were still a member of the Society, have happened much too frequently and are pointed out to us from many sides, especially from bishops of dioceses, and they exercise a sad influence on the clergy, on other religious and on the Catholic laity.'"

"The nature of some of those 'regrettable actions' was spelled out by Fr. Dezza in his meetings with the provincials. They include first of all, arbitrary changes in liturgical worship at variance with what is prescribed by the Church. It was pointed out that these liturgical aberrations in themselves may not seem to serious, but in many cases they have been interpreted by the faithful as a disregard for the authority of the Church."

"Much more serious are the areas of concern in doctrinal matters. They include: 1) Over-emphasis on the humanity of Christ to the detriment of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ; 2) a questioning of the doctrine of transubstantiation; 3) a watering down of the distinction between priesthood of the laity and the priesthood of the ordained."

". . . What I perceive in the articles of Buckley and Padberg (See June 1982 Newsletter) is the implication that Jesuits were almost always on the right side of their controversies with Rome. They seem to be saying that we were just misunderstood in our clashes with the Papacy and history vindicated us."

"The implication is that history will also prove us right in our unfortunate encounter with this present pope. But we must always keep in mind that history will never Vindicate public disobedience in serious matters to major superiors on the part of Jesuits who are convinced that God is on their side. The fact that St. Ignatius disagreed with the Pope does not justify activities of some Jesuits that have been of major concern to the last three popes."

"What then is the Pope's main concern? I believe it's that concern which also worried Paul VI so much: The Jesuits, and also many other orders, through misguided zeal, are suffering a loss of identity. Their concept of the greater glory of God is no longer found in obedience to their Jesuit superiors or to the Holy See, but in some private apostolate. The Holy Father is telling the Society this is not the kind of activity that distinguished the sons of Ignatius in their service to the church throughout the centuries."

(From Canisius College Chronicle, June 1982)

## Book Review

Rodger Charles, S.J. with Drostan MacLaren, O.P. *The Social Teaching of Vatican II: Its Origin and Development* (San Francisco, Ignatius Press 1982) pp 569.

Those Catholics brought up in the social teachings of the Church under the aegis of Oswald Von Nell Bruening, or even America's John A. Ryan, have reason to be ready for a new compendium of the Church's social thought at once contemporary and Catholic. The word "contemporary" means that the book deals with recent problems, the word "Catholic" suggests that it is not tied into the ideology of capitalism, however democratic, or socialism, however non-Marxist. Presumptively, Marxism is still verboten for Catholics.

The Charles-MacLaren book grew out of what we might have called a "labor school", the result over many years of teachers' interplay with students of social ethics. It considers the main principles of the Church's social doctrine as contained in the documents of Vatican II, centering on five main concepts: God's law as the ultimate ethical norm, conscience guided by certain Church teaching, the ethics of marriage, the role of politics and the state, the moral law and economic life.

The beauty of this book is that its only ideology is Church teaching, to which it is eminently faithful. It does not equivocate on subjects such as patriarchy or contraception, the neutrality of the Church in the face of purely political options, the materialism/consumerism of capitalism, private ownership as right and responsibility, population control, etc. Fr. Charles, the book's chief author, makes a concluding remark widely ignored today by dissenting moralists:

"There is an essential difference between the implications of the guidance given us on matters of personal ethics and that which is given us on social ethics. It does not effect the binding nature of the guidance, the principles of the social teaching itself. It effects rather the way we put them into practice. There can be no doubt how the Ten Commandments and their implications in our personal lives should be put into practice. There can be doubt, there is doubt, about how best to organize the state and the economy." (p. 379)

One of the valuable sections of this book is its concluding documentation and annotated bibliography (60 pages), covering the latest papal statements and the newest books.

*What Is Marriage? Marriage in the Catholic Church* by Theodore Mackin, S.J. New York/Ramsey: Paulist Press, 1982. vii + 366 pp. \$11.95.

Mackin has written a very interesting and challenging work. The problem with it, as I hope to show, is that it is predicated upon a misreading both of the Roman Catholic theological tradition and on the teaching set forth at Vatican Council II.

The principal claim Mackin makes is that a radically new understanding or definition of marriage emerged during the second Vatican Council in the pastoral constitution, *Gaudium et Spes*. This new understanding of marriage, which was accepted by Pope Paul VI in *Humanae Vitae*, differs profoundly from the understanding of marriage in the Church from the time of St. Augustine through the great medieval theologians and regnant during the first part of this century, when it was incorporated into the 1917 Code of Canon Law. The older understanding was challenged during the 1930s by writers like Herbert Doms and Dietrich von Hildebrand, and although their challenge was rejected by Pope Pius XII it was precisely their view of marriage that is central to the teaching of *Gaudium et Spes* (p. 235). This, I believe, is an accurate way to summarize the principal claim of the work.

But what, according to Mackin, is the older understanding or definition of marriage — the one regnant from Augustine until Vatican Council II — and what is the radically new understanding of marriage set forth in *Gaudium et Spes*?

According to Mackin the older view regarded marriage primarily as a contract between a male and female, obligating them to the pursuit of specific ends. Of these, the primary end was that of procreating and educating children, while the second was that of giving to one another mutual help and allaying concupiscence. On this view the marriage itself — the contract — was a good of an instrumental kind and ordered to extrinsic goods of a more substantive character, primarily the good of procreation and education.

On the newer view of marriage as set forth in *Gaudium et Spes* marriage is no longer a contract between a male and female but a covenant of love between a man and woman. It is thus no longer merely an instrumental good, but is something of inherent worth and dignity. The procreation and education of children, while still a valuable end toward which the marital covenant is ordered, is no longer a primary end. It shares primacy with the

deepening of spousal love. Moreover, Mackin claims, if the deepening of spousal love is of equal value to the procreating and educating of children, then it follows that contraception must be morally justifiable for the married if the deepening or fostering of conjugal love requires sexual intimacy at times when it would be irresponsible to beget (cf. pp. 237, 244). Finally, "since, according to *Gaudium et Spes*, a marriage is to be understood as an intimate community of life and marital love, *it can dissolve and disintegrate*" (p. 315, emphasis added). By this Mackin means that when the love meant to exist between the spouses ceases — for, he contends, the logic of *Gaudium et Spes*'s understanding of marriage requires that one consider love as essential to marriage (p. 332 ff) — the marriage "dies" or "dissolves." From this it follows, on this new understanding of marriage, the one set forth in *Gaudium et Spes*, that spouses who cease to love each other cease to be spouses and are, accordingly, free to find new spouses.

The foregoing paragraphs summarize Mackin's argument. What now can be said about it?

The first thing that needs to be said about it is that it is predicated upon a serious misreading of the theological tradition. As Mackin presents this tradition, marriage, regarded as the union between husband and wife (their *coniunctio*) is an instrumental good subordinated to substantive or real goods, primarily the procreation and education of children and secondarily the mutual help of the spouses. Yet the Catholic theological tradition did not regard marriage as a merely instrumental good subordinated to real goods extrinsic to itself. Thomas Aquinas, for instance, along with other great medieval theologians, made it quite clear that the goods perfective of marriage, including the good of procreation and of faithful love between the spouses, are by no means *extrinsic* to the marriage but are rather internal perfections of the marriage itself (cf. *Summa Theologiae*, Supplement, 49, 1 ad 2). For the Catholic theological tradition, the sacrament, or indivisible unity of the spouses rooted in their being, is the good that marriage *is*. The goods of children and of faithful love are not essential to marriage, in the sense that the marriage exists even if, tragically, these goods are not realized. Yet these goods are intrinsic perfections of the marriage and *are indeed made possible* by the marriage or sacrament itself. They inwardly perfect the marriage itself and are by no means extrinsic goods to which the marriage is related as a merely instrumental reality (for detailed commentary on this matter see, for instance, Fabian Parmisano, "Love and Marriage in

the Middle Ages," *New Blackfriars* 50, 1969, 599-606, 649-660; Germain G. Grisez, "Marriage: Reflections Based on Thomas Aquinas and Vatican Council II," *The Catholic Mind* 64, June, 1966, 5-19).

To put matters briefly, Mackin has, in my opinion, *selectively* presented material from the Catholic theological tradition to support his claim that in this tradition marriage was understood as a merely instrumental means to the attainment of substantive goods *extrinsic* to marriage itself. The tradition, properly grasped, taught with great precision that marriage is itself something very good — its essential good being the very *sacramentum* or indissoluble unity of husband and wife — capacitating the spouses to promote other goods, the procreation and education of children and the fostering of faithful love, and that these goods, far from being extrinsic to the marriage, are intrinsic perfections of it, just as making good moral choices and thinking clearly are intrinsic perfections of the human person.

A second thing that needs to be said about Mackin's argument is that it is predicated upon a serious misreading of *Gaudium et Spes*. According to Mackin this document *rejected* procreation and nurture as a primary end of marriage while retaining it as one essential end among others (see p. 269). Because the document, in Mackin's judgment, rejected the primacy of the procreative and it made its own the teaching of Doms that had been explicitly repudiated by Pius XII.

This claim on Mackin's part is, I submit, quite false. While *Gaudium et Spes* avoided the use of primary-secondary terminology in speaking of the goods or ends of marriage, it by no means rejected the primacy of procreation when viewing marriage from a certain perspective. To support his claim Mackin finds it helpful to call readers' attention to the editorial footnote of the Abbott edition of the documents of Vatican II in which the editors of this edition insisted that *Gaudium et Spes* wanted to keep this question open (cf. pp. 27, 36). Mackin fails to note that in paragraph 48 the Council Fathers, after noting that God had endowed marriage with various benefits (*bonis*) and end (*finibus*) in view, itself explicitly refers to the teaching of Augustine, of Pius XI in *Casti Connubii*, and of Aquinas in *Summa Theologiae*, Supplement, q. 49, a. 3, ad 1. Readers who may wish to pursue this footnote will discover that Aquinas, in his treatment of the issue, notes that either the sacrament or progeny or faithful love can be called "primary," depending on the perspective from which one is viewing the reality

of marriage. And this seems to be precisely the teaching of the Council itself. Moreover, in paragraph 50 of *Gaudium et Spes*, in a passage that Mackin notes and then seeks to explain away as not entailing, at least from some perspective, the primacy of procreation, the Council Fathers insist that the whole aim of marriage itself, of marital love, and the whole meaning of family life deriving therefrom, is ordered to, guess what, the generation and education of children! If this does not mean that the Council Fathers taught that, in some way at any rate, there is a certain primacy of procreation among the goods of marriage, then I find it difficult to understand what they do mean. True, this in no way entails a diminishing of the value of the other ends of goods of marriage, as the Council Fathers say, and indeed if we regard marriage not from the perspective of a community of man and woman summoned to cooperate with God in giving life to new human persons but from other legitimate perspectives from which this community can be viewed, these other ends can be viewed as "primary," just as Aquinas had noted long ago. But to conclude from this that the Council Fathers *reject*, with Doms, the idea that the procreation and education of children are primarily what marriage is all about in a very real sense, so much so that even the intimate union of the spouses is itself perfected by their loving begetting, humane nourishing, and Christian educating, is something else. Yet this is what Mackin asserts.

Finally, his contention that this document of Vatican Council II taught that marriages "dissolve and disintegrate" when the intimacy meant to exist between spouses ceases (see p. 315) is surely at odds with the explicit teaching of the document. The Council Fathers make it quite clear that the reality of marriage, the *sacrum vinculum* to use their own language (cf. *Gaudium et Spes*, n. 48), comes into being when a man and a woman give consent to marriage and make one another husband and wife by their own personal act of irrevocable consent. They likewise make it quite clear in this very paragraph that the continuation in being of this beautiful reality, this *sacrum vinculum*, is not dependent upon subsequent human choices but that it perdures so long as the individuals who have made each other irreplaceable spouse-persons by their acts of irrevocable personal consent continue to exist as persons, i.e., until death.

Mackin's work, while quite interesting and indeed very challenging, is ultimately quite erroneous.

*Sexuality: A Christian View. Toward Formation of Mature Values* by Rev. Gennaro P. Avvento, S.T.D. Mystic, Ct.: Twenty-Third Publications, 1982. 193 pp. \$7.95 paper.

Fr. Avvento, a Brooklyn priest who teaches at Fairfield University, studied under Bernard Haring in Rome, where he received his doctorate in moral theology. Haring provides a foreword, in which he avers that the controversial topics the author discusses are "handled with sober reflection, academic honesty, and pastoral sensitivity."

After initial chapters in which he surveys contemporary visions of sexuality and articulates an understanding of human sexuality stressing its relational character, Avvento then takes up specific issues such as contraception, sterilization, masturbation, artificial insemination, sex and single persons, homosexuality, abortion, etc. Since Avvento willingly embraces the "personalistic" understanding of human sexuality advocated by Haring, Kosnik and so many others, and since he adopts without question the position that one can freely choose to do "ontic" evil for the sake of greater "ontic" good to come, one is not surprised to discover that he thinks contraception is morally legitimate, that masturbation "of necessity," i.e., when relief from sexual tension cannot be found in "normal outlets," is prudent, that sexual congress between unmarried but "committed" couples is good, etc.

In many ways the work seems to be a scaled down version of the notorious Kosnik et al. volume. The same old complaint that *Humanae Vitae* rejects contraception because of its physicalistic understanding of moral norms is repeated, and the author confidently asserts that no competent biblical scholar today thinks that *porneia* in the New Testament refers to what is known as simple fornication or, to use the contemporary euphemism, 'premarital sex.' Perhaps he never read some of the scholars I have.

The author is either ignorant of a substantive body of literature critical of his presuppositions or chooses to ignore them. If he is ignorant of this literature he is incompetent. If he chooses to ignore it, he is simply dishonest.

In one footnote, where he refers to Haring's views (which he accepts) that periodic continence leads to the conception of abnormal children because of aging gametes, he likewise refers to Thomas Hilgers' article on the subject in the March 1977 issue of *Theological Studies*. His readers will easily infer that Hilgers' article supports Haring's contention. Of course, such is not the case, as what

(Concluded on page 20)

(Conclusion from page 19)

Hilgers did was simply to expose the fallacies and ignorance of Haring on a scientific question. If Avvento's choice to conceal the nature of Hilgers' article from his readers is an instance of his "academic honesty," then this tells us much about the book.

The "personalism" of this superficial volume is the kind of personalism to which Joseph Ratzinger referred when he spoke of a personalism that locates the real and important in what is consciously experienced here and now. This shallow personalism leads to the type of

sentimental slush that characterizes the work; it is a far cry from the personalism one finds, say, in Karol Wojtyla's *Love and Responsibility*.

Since the work says nothing new and costs \$7.95 in paper, one wonders for whom it was written. Those who like to substitute the vision of our contemporary culture, the vision we find in Ann Landers and Dear Abbey, for the challenging realism on matters sexual of the New Testament can slake their thirst more cheaply by buying the paperback edition of Kosnik et al.

William E. May

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

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

### Fellowship Officers

*President*

Fr. William Smith  
St. Joseph's Seminary  
Dunwoodie  
Yonkers, New York 10704  
(914) 968-6200

*Vice Presidents*

Fr. Earl Weis, S.J.  
Dr. Joseph Boyle

*Executive Secretary  
and Treasurer*

Dr. Joseph P. Scottino  
Gannon University  
Erie, Pennsylvania 16541  
(814) 871-7000

*Editor, The Newsletter*

Msgr. George A. Kelly  
St. John's University  
Jamaica, New York 11439  
(212) 990-6161