

Newsletter

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars

Volume 8, Number 1

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

November 1984

The Liberal Consensus

The radical possibility that there is no historical truth to the claims of the Church about Christ was raised by Professor Thomas Sheehan earlier this year in the *New York Review of Books* (June 14, 1984). Sheehan, a professor of philosophy at Loyola University in Chicago, was almost immediately dissected by fifteen well-known Catholic commentators (*Commonweal*, August 10th, September 21st, October 5th).

The Loyola professor was not speaking of truths of faith *per se*, i.e. those truths we accept on someone else's authority (e.g. "It is raining in Tokyo."). He was speaking about foundational facts or reasons which make it possible to trust someone else's judgment about truth (e.g. Frank Field's training in meteorology, CBS's reputation for responsible journalism, etc.)

What did Thomas Sheehan, considered by *Commonweal* to be a spokesman for post-Christian agnosticism, say to create a stir among Catholic intelligentsia?

He said the following:

1. The present Catholic crisis is not the result of the Church's sexual ethics nor of the revolt of religious women nor of declining numbers, etc. These are only symptoms of a more fundamental sickness.

2. The root cause, instead, is the discovery by modern biblical research that there is no solid foundation for the doctrines of the Catholic Church. Jesus went to his death without knowing (or wishing) that his followers declare him the founder and titular head of a new religion, let alone the consubstantial Son of God. Jesus knew no-

thing about the Trinity, never mentioned it in his preaching, did not know his Mother was a Virgin and, though a faith-healer, did not perform miracles, ordained no priests, consecrated no bishops, did not know he was supposed to establish the Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church with Peter the first in a long line of infallible popes. He is supposed to have instituted the Eucharist and Holy Orders but he would not be allowed in the modern Church (should he somehow be re-incarnated) to receive first communion or priesthood because he would fail the required examinations, and might even be condemned by the Holy See for not believing that he himself was God.

Modern biblical research conclusions, which Sheehan calls "the liberal consensus," demonstrates that the Christian Church was really instituted by Simon Peter, not by Christ. The Church's doctrines derived not from Christ, but from those who came after he was buried.

3. Sheehan asserts further that the revolutionary approach of the "liberal consensus" dominates modern Catholic theology, even the seminary teaching of future priests. On a lower level what he calls the "folk religion of most practicing Catholics still lives on the prerevolutionary fare that generally is served up from their local pulpits and especially from the one currently occupied by the conservative Pope John Paul II."

4. What should Christians do about this? Should they bury the Church, as the followers buried Jesus and

(Continued)

WHAT TO EXPECT IN THIS ISSUE?

On Equal Rights — p. 8

"Many Christians give the impression of striking their colors and throwing open the gates to their citadel just at the moment when the enemy, exhausted and discouraged, was on the point of withdrawing."

Malcolm Muggeridge

On Jesuits — p.

"The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing."

Edmund Burke

On Exegesis — p. 9

"The assured results of exegesis are very valuable for a deeper understanding of the biblical witness but they cannot take the place of the concrete text. They must rather remain analysis and introduction to it."

Cardinal Ratzinger

The Liberal Consensus (*Con't*)

move on to do what Christ (and the Church) best symbolize - works of mercy, justice, compassion? Sheehan does not expect this will readily occur, because the "liberal consensus," though agnostic as a result of modern exegesis, i.e. it knows nothing of historical value about Christ or the early Church's foundations, still remains piously agnostic. Its constituent members are so emotionally attached to the Church that they prefer to tinker with Church structures in the hope of keeping her going (like "an exercise in polishing brass on the Titanic," says Sheehan). But the tinkering is hopeless. Not even pious agnosticism will save the Church.

Fifteen respondents were chosen by *Commonweal* to react to Sheehan's blunt assertions. The *Commonweal* respondents were careful in what they did not say.

1. They did not say the historical-critical method of exegesis is only one method of biblical study, not the only method, not the latest method, nor is it considered by all as the best method of gleaning biblical meaning. They did not allude to the method's critics in Protestant and Catholic circles. The *Commonweal* respondents take for granted that the critical conclusions of modern biblical research are true and that those who hold otherwise are fundamentalists, traditionalists, no longer acceptable role-players in enlightened Catholic theological circles.

2. No *Commonweal* respondent contested Sheehan's claim that the "liberal consensus" dominates Catholic higher education, including the formation of priests.

3. No *Commonweal* respondent, in arguing with Sheehan over the details of his sweeping denials, made reference at any time to the *magisterium* of the Church or to its pronouncements on Jesus, Mary, and the origins of the Church.

Jack Miles of the University of California makes a factual point that Sheehan reflects the choice already made by many good Catholics (i.e. pious agnosticism). Those who hold on to their Catholic membership card without necessarily knowing why.

Fr. Gerald Sloyan, who trained religious educators at CUA for almost a generation, wishes Rome would desist citing Fathers of the Church in favor of discussing the "mythos" underlying Christianity, vis., the case of love. Preachers should also stop speaking as if the "mythos" were true in all its details. *Fr. John Jay Hughes*, director of the St. Louis' *Renew* program, thinks the Catholic tradition is ambiguous but he trusts it. He says: "Where the tradition must first prove itself worthy of trust, we have left the realm of historical Catholicism." A new Catholic theology is bound to emerge, he says, but he is not clear about what the future holds. Sulpician *Peter Chirico*, whose *nihil obstat* for *Fr. Keane's Sexual Morality* was invalidated by Rome, cavils with Sheehan but agrees that "in accord with the

biblical evidence one may hold that by his activity with his followers, Jesus set in motion the movement that developed into the structured Church." This is not exactly what Vatican II asserts when it says not only did Christ establish the Church, but he set up as well the hierarchy of bishops with Peter as their head (LG No. 18) *Fr. Andrew Greeley's* Christian faith relies on his grasp of the sociology of religious knowledge, not on what he calls "the hammer of the magisterium."

The most detailed answer to Sheehan was assigned by *Commonweal* to *Fr. David Tracy*, who unhesitatingly affirms his belief in Christ's divinity, in his resurrection and in the Trinity. He agrees, nonetheless, with Sheehan's assessment of the contemporary biblical situation, believing it a rarity to find a Catholic biblical scholar who maintains that Jesus thought of himself as the Son of God, Second Person of the Blessed Trinity. Scripture cannot assist the pursuit of the real Christ because Jesus' statements in the NT are not Jesus' statements at all. Faith, therefore, rests on trust in the Christian tradition, which regularly acquires new meaning through scholarly effort. *Fr. Tracy* does not spell this tradition out in terms of the doctrines central to that tradition viz., Original Sin, Jesus' sacrifice on the Cross, the Church and its sacraments, and the **Last Four Things**. Whatever else the future Catholic faith will be, it seems to be a self-willed *fideism*, the kind lacking any verifiable motives of credibility. The only non-Catholic consulted by *Commonweal* posed this question: "I would like to ask *David Tracy* and *Andrew Greeley*: When all is said and done do you believe?" It is not clear that "liberal consensus" represents the understandings about Christ held by the Catholic Church from its beginning.

Milwaukee's Bishop Richard J. Sklba, the only prelate consulted by *Commonweal*, concurs with Sheehan that the historical evolutionary approach to biblical texts and contexts is one of "the primary contributions of the past forty years of Catholic exegesis." He adds: "These insights may result in the restatement of commonly held Catholic doctrines in more nuanced and existential terms." He admits, however, that Sheehan's sweeping generalizations "were unfairly projected into the classrooms of universities and seminaries." The *Milwaukee* prelate dismisses Sheehan's broadsides because they lack nuance, a word used in recent years to soften the implications of a broadside. For example, we are told by biblical authority that Vatican II was "biblically naive" when it called Catholic bishops "successors of the Apostles."

The Sheehan article and his replies to his *Commonweal* critics will be with us for a long time, if only because he obviously is not a fundamentalist.

Is *Thomas Sheehan* correct in his estimate that "the liberal consensus" dominates the Catholic education machinery? The U.S. is too large for one answer to this

The Liberal Consensus (*Con't*)

question. The presence of such a view of NT Christianity in Catholic courses is not unknown. It is well known that ex-priest Wilhelm's *Christ Among Us* was a catechetical leader in many diocesan adult education courses. Material from John Tully Carmody and Denise Lardner Carmody (Harper and Row 1980) *Contemporary Catholic Theology: An Introduction* can also be found required for the "spiritual formation" of diocesan trained catechists, defended as an example of what contemporary theologians are saying about the Church. What does this book say to catechists?

- "The strata of the NT that go back to the historical Jesus contain little that deals with 'a church'." (p. 144)
- "Apostles...were not primarily Church governors, that the Churches described by Acts reached their decisions democratically, that we have no assurance a definite officer led the community in prayer, and that there was no *magisterium* - no ministry of authoritative teaching such as that which later Roman Catholicism developed. On the other hand, there was a permanent deaconate, a married clergy, and a corps of female ministers — the problem for Roman Catholicism is

to explain how it could develop traditions that curtailed the original NT diversity and freedom." (p. 117)

- "Where Jesus made it clear that his followers ought not to lord it over others, as the "Great Men" of the world do, the church has built guided thrones." (p. 119)
- "Reformation controversies hardened the Catholic position on "transubstantiation," so that the symbolic character of the bread and wine grew flat. Too easily, therefore, ordinary Catholics saw the consecration as something magical."
- "The code now likely to emerge remains impersonal, legalistic, a series of letters choking Christ's Spirit." (p. 129)
- "Whether a church has an episcopal, presbyterial, or congregational authority, for instance, could be a matter of free choice." (p. 134)
- "The rights of the unborn, however pressing, are not the only consideration. There are persons of good will who believe abortion moral." (p. 138)

And so on.

Items of Interest

- *The Human Life Review* (Fall 1984) reports on the basis of 1982 tax returns that Foundations provided more than \$36 million to population studies and control, a large amount of which went to abortion causes. PP and its allied organizations received about \$20 million, NFP groups \$140,000 while Catholics for a Free Choice received \$199,000 (90 per cent of their income). Right to Life groups were granted \$237,000, enough to have them attacked by their adversaries as "wealthy tools of the New Right."

- Daniel Maguire commenting on the reaction to his crusade for abortion (WTMJ-TV, Milwaukee, October 10th, 5 p.m. news) said: "I've been very happy at Marquette University to find our administration behaving like a genuine university and proving that you can have those two words together. I've had a lot of support from Catholic theologians around the country. A number of us signed a statement in the *New York Times* last Sunday. I don't think it does the Church any good to pretend that we're bringing simple answers to complex problems, so I feel my work is service to the Church."

- A Reverend Joseph F. Costanzo, S.J. Memorial Foundation, was established in Tucson, Arizona on October 20th. The Foundation is designed to continue the research, together with the publication of the results of this research, begun by Father Costanzo, in the areas of the Petrine-Papal documents; to conduct annual symposia — nationally and internationally — on the relationship of the Petrine-Papal documents to the cotemporary problems in religion, education, and political philosophy; and to establish a Chair in these research areas at a large private university. Those interested in its projects may write to P.O. Box 12546, Tucson, Arizona 85732-2546.

- Catholic chaplains assigned to military recruit centers in the United States estimate that of all the baptized Catholics who enter the armed forces only 10 per cent (approximately) had been attending Mass and receiving Communion prior to their entrance into military service. About three quarters of those who had been neglecting their faith return to the practice of faith during their recruit training (c. 80,000 adults per year).

The President's Corner

The annual convention of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars will be held the second last weekend of March, that is, Friday March 22, Saturday March 23, and Sunday March 24, 1985. The place will be in the Chicago area, at a hotel still to be named.

Matters relating to this convention were discussed at the semi-annual meeting of the board of directors held at the Sheraton International at O'Hare, September 22. There was a good turnout of the directors: Father Kenneth Baker, Dr. Carson Daly, Dr. James Hitchcock, Msgr. George Kelly, Father Ronald Lawler, Dr. William May, Father Richard Roach, Dr. Joseph Scottino, and Father Michael Wrenn. Father Joseph Mangan was also invited to attend, and, of course, I was there. The meeting began informally on the night of the 21, when a good number of the board were already present; the formal session lasted all day Saturday.

Discussion of possible themes for the annual meeting took a good deal of the time. Some felt that the content of the papers has been too theological for an interdisciplinary organization such as ours, and the suggestions for improving the content and diversifying the subjects as well as for possible speakers fell thick and fast. One member did not feel that a central theme was important for our convention. Some of the themes suggested were so recondite that I had never even heard the words before, let alone made myself acquainted with possible speakers. You can see it was a very high level discussion indeed. Msgr. Kelly wrote me later that he was glad I was the recipient of all this good advice and not he.

Probably by the inspiration of my guardian angel and by the exasperation of my sense of order, I brought the

group back to earth and parcelled out the responsibilities of contacting some of the possible presenters mentioned and getting commitments from them. The reports of these contacts have been coming in, and when the semester comes to a close and the demands for my presence in the classroom are less stringent, I hope to make further progress with the scheduling and other convention arrangements.

I told the directors that two of our suggestions were accepted for posts of consultant to committees of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. This is a very positive and heartening development, not only for the input made possible but also for the recognition it gives the Fellowship as an organization that has help to offer the American hierarchy in the studies it makes of current problems.

The day following the meeting of the board, the sixth Annual Cardinal Wright Award presentation was made to Father John A. Hardon, S.J. in a ceremony at the Hotel Continental on Chicago's Magnificent Mile. The event drew the largest audience ever, nearly 300 people I estimated at the time. The subsequent report of ticket sales bore out this figure. After the presentation, Father Hardon gave a stirring address on the subject "Progress and Fidelity". "Not only does true progress depend on the world's acceptance of the Church's teaching," Father Hardon believes, "but the very survival of human society." At this event the benefaction to the Fellowship of Father Raymond T. McCarthy, a priest of the Archdiocese of Chicago, was also specially recognized. All the arrangements for the award ceremony were handled by John and Eileen Farrell, to whom I extend warm thanks in the name of the Fellowship.

Earl Weis, S.J.

Items of Interest

- Fr. Owen Campion, president of the Catholic Press Association disowned a speech at a CPA regional meeting in California criticizing the U.S. Bishops' opposition to abortion. The speech was "completely unexpected," he said. Barbara Honegger, a former White House policy analyst, told the Catholic journalists that the 1973 Supreme Court decision on legalized abortion should stand and bishops should not promote a human life amendment. Honegger had been invited to speak to CPA about her experience working for women's rights in the Reagan administration and why she resigned her position over that issue.

- The University of Navarra Press wishes to publish a Spanish edition of Germain Grisez's book, *The Way of the Lord Jesus*, vol. 1, *Christian Moral Principles*. To carry out this project, a competently translated and edited manuscript will be needed. Grisez is looking for a donor either of the required work or of a \$15,000 subsidy to cover its cost. Please send any suggestions to Grisez at Mount Saint Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Maryland 21727.

Meeting of the Learned Societies

The Joint Committee of the Catholic Learned Societies and Scholars met in Washington, D.C. on Tuesday evening, September 18th, at Whitefriars Hall. Present were the chairman, Msgr. Frederick McManus (representing the North American Academy of Liturgy), Rev. James Provost, the secretary (representing the Canon Law Society of America), Rev. Donald Buggert (representing the Catholic Theological Society of America), Dr. William Loewe (representing the College Theology Society), Rev. Emmet Curran (representing the Catholic Historical Association), Rev. Joseph Jensen (representing the Catholic Biblical Association), Sister Mary Brady (newly appointed representative of the American Catholic Philosophical Association), and William E. May (representing the Fellowship). The representative from the Mariological Society of America was absent.

A request was considered from Fr. Thomas P. Ivory of the National Conference of Diocesan Directors of Religious Education regarding the withdrawal of the imprimatur from some works, specifically Wilhelm's *Christ Among Us* and Keane's *Sexual Morality*. Msgr. McManus formally proposed that the JCCLSS write to Bishop James Malone, president of the NCCB, and to Archbishop John Quinn, chairman of the NCCB committee on doctrine, to express its "grave concern" over the Sacred Congregation of the Faith's instruction that imprimaturs be removed from these books. Dr. May argued that there was no cause for grave concern insofar as there seemed to be ample reason for the Congregation to ask that the imprimaturs be withdrawn. The works in question advocated positions that did not conform to Catholic teaching on faith and morals. Others argued that there was cause for this concern because the Congregation, in their opinion, was arbitrarily changing the rules on the granting of the imprimatur. According to Fr. Provost, a work can be given an imprimatur even if it holds positions opposed to authentic Catholic teaching so long as the work describes the relevant teaching and makes it clear that the advocacy of contradictory positions is the personal opinion and choice of the author and not "authentic" Catholic teaching. Dr. May expressed wonderment at this understanding of the imprimatur. The printed imprimatur makes no such allowance. Provost and others claimed that according to SCDF's understanding of the imprimatur the only work that could get the imprimatur would be Denzinger. A formal vote was taken. The only negative vote, against the proposal was cast by Dr. May.

The Committee considered a request of the College Theology Society regarding implementation of Canon 812 in the New Code concerning the necessity of those teaching theological disciplines in institutes of higher studies to have a mandate from competent ecclesiastical authority. No action was taken on this request, al-

though it was discussed. According to McManus and Provost implementation of this canon will not be feasible in this country. Provost claimed that the Southern Accrediting Agency (sic) has already served notice that, should this canon be implemented in this country, it would not be able to give accreditation to institutions acting in conformity with it. Cardinal Bernardin has established a committee to investigate the implications of this canon, although nothing is known as yet of the work of this committee. But McManus and Provost opined that the canon would in effect be a dead letter in this country. Hence, the issue was shelved, as no action was judged necessary at this time.

The Committee then discussed the relationship of the JCCLSS with the NCCB. Originally, the Committee reported to the NCCB's Committee on Doctrine, and with the cooperation of this Committee sponsored joint "colloquia" between scholars and bishops over a period of years. After that 1982 colloquium the JCCLSS concluded that it was time to devise new ways of "dialoguing" with the bishops. The reasons which emerged were chiefly that most JCCLSS members desired that bishops come to accept the "consensus" of theologians on critical issues in the Church, a desire not being realized. In 1983 JCCLSS suggested that it relate to the NCCB through an "ad hoc" committee of selected bishops who were themselves interested in furthering dialogue between bishops and scholars. The NCCB rejected this proposal and instead said that the JCCLSS should relate to the NCCB through the Committee on Pastoral Research and Practice. However, in 1984 troubles appeared over this matter. Msgr. McManus reported that he was not successful in contacting Archbishop Law. Fr. McManus, Provost, and others (chiefly Buggert and Loewe) suggested that the JCCLSS still work at trying to get the NCCB to establish a special "ad hoc" committee of bishops to work with the scholars (e.g., bishops such as Untener, Skiba).

The Committee then discussed its "project on women in the Church." In 1983 the Committee, proposed that the JCCLSS "dialogue" with particular bishops in various parts of the country, suggested that meetings be held in different regions concerning the position of women in the Church. Member societies were asked to supply names for such dialogue. At the September 18th meeting the JCCLSS decided to drop this project. The reason is simply that pressure is currently being put on the bishops by the Woman's Ordination Conference.

The Committee discussed briefly the CLSA/CTSA joint proposal concerning "Doctrinal Responsibilities," as published in the 1983 proceedings of the Canon Law Society. The CLSA, CTSA, CTS had already approved this document in its entirety (including appendices).

William May

“Subiectum” in Familiaris Consortio

John Paul II's exhortation on the family contains a puzzling code word: *subiectum*. Generally, the Pope uses the word in its Roman law sense - owner or possessor. Associated meanings are; independent agent, the person with authority, the one who makes decisions (the decision maker) or the one who does something. Thus, the subject of loving is the one who bestows love - in ordinary English, the lover.

Several of these meanings become apparent in *Familiaris Consortio*, but only once, in the Vatican Press English version, is the word actually translated; elsewhere it is left simply as subject.

In n. 7, *subiectum* is rendered *active agent*. “...the faithful do not always set themselves up as ...active agents in the building up of an authentic family humanism.” Left unsaid is the obvious continuation ‘...although they should.’

At n. 46, we have “Thus the family... a subject of rights and duties before (i.e. prior to) the state...” Here, subject plainly means *possessor*.

At n. 70 we read “...particular churches... remain the more immediate and more effective subjects of operations for putting the pastoral care of the family in practice.” Here, subject seems to mean *the one who carries*

out... So the lines become “...particular (i.e. local) churches remain the ones that carry out the more immediate and effective operations for putting the pastoral care of the family into practice.”

At the opening of n. 72, we read “...within the Church, which is the subject responsible for the pastoral care of the family...” Here, subject clearly means *authority*; it could also mean decision maker. The lines would then read: “...within the Church, which is the authority responsible for the pastoral care of the family...”

Finally, just before n. 73, we read: “As well as the family, which is the object but above all the subject of pastoral care of the family...” Here, object is complementary to subject. The object is the recipient of the care, the subject is the bestower of the care. So a variant translation of the lines would be: “...the family is the recipient of pastoral care, but it is also, above all, an *administrator of pastoral care...*” The Polish version is here more emphatic; “...sama w sobie podmiotem...” (the family is itself an administrator.)

Once acquainted with the meaning of subject, you can return to *Laborem Exercens* with a much more even chance of catching its message.

John Doeble

Fr. John Hardon, S.J.

On September 23rd Jesuit theologian John Hardon became the sixth recipient of the Cardinal Wright Award, established after the death in 1979 of one of the Church's distinguished Prelates who served ten years as Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Clergy. The one-time Boston priest, bishop of Pittsburgh as well as Worcester, was admired for his ready wit, respected for his learning, and revered for his faith. The Cardinal Wright Award is given annually to a Catholic adjudged to have done an outstanding service for the Church.

Fr. John Hardon is one of the Church's most distinguished priests whose academic and pastoral accomplishments were mentioned in the September *Newsletter*.

The following is an excerpt from his address to an audience of more than 500. The title of his talk was “Progress and Fidelity.”

What, then, is our responsibility? As faithful sons and daughters of Mother Church, we have the awesome duty of witnessing to Christ's teaching to the world.

The world in which we live is not only hungry for this teaching, but positively starving for Christ's truth. What must we do?

Understand the Faith. Gone is the day when Catholics could be satisfied with a rote knowledge of the Church's teaching. In a country where some five million people are in college every year; where literacy is the highest in the

world; where thousands of pages of print daily and thousands of hours of media are pouring undiluted secularism into people's minds - a Catholic must, and the word is *must*, grow in his understanding of God's revealed word at the risk of otherwise losing the faith.

Over the years, I have been telling my students that Christ's parable of the sower is poignantly true. Remember the first of the three kinds of soil on which the seed of God's word fell without producing any yield? In Christ's own words, “When anyone hears the message about the kingdom and does not understand it, the evil one comes and snatches away what was sown in his heart” (Matthew 13:19).

Understanding what we believe, therefore, is essential, absolutely essential to keep the faith in every age, and with imperative necessity in our age of academic idolatry.

Practice the Faith. It is a commonplace in the Church's history of evangelization that those who spread the Gospel must also live the Gospel, if they expect to bring people to the fold of Christ.

Actions speak louder than words and, in fact, actions will deafen the sound of our words if our lives contradict what we teach.

But I think there is a special urgency today for those in leadership positions in the Church - whether bishops or priests or religious or the laity - to live up to the doctrines, particularly the moral doctrines, they profess to believe. The urgency is the rise of a whole new vocabulary that has

Fr. John Hardon, S.J. (*Cont'd*)

entered Catholic literature. I call it the vocabulary of unrealism. It reduces the hard sayings of the Gospel to romantic poetry, and changes the uncompromising laws of Christ into dreamy ideas that no one is expected to attain.

Take Christ's teaching on monogamy. In one publication after another, including religious education manuals, the Gospels are interpreted to imply that lifelong fidelity in marriage in countries like the United States is practically impossible.

There is more at stake here than meets the eye. Whatever else Catholicism teaches it is the power of divine grace to enable us to rise above our weakness and literally do the humanly impossible. Never has the meaning of the supernatural been more clear. The supernatural is what God can achieve in human beings who believe, with St. Paul, that in Christ they have the strength to overcome the most demanding passions of their fallen human nature.

But - and what an important adversative this is - but the power of grace must be made credible. Those who believe in Christ must show by their conduct that their faith really works. The proof of this is a life of virtue that no one can doubt could ever be practiced by human nature alone; that only the grace of Christ and the use of His sacraments makes possible and, what is more wonderful, even enjoyable.

Proclaim the Faith. Living the Catholic faith is already a form of proclamation. Whatever a person deeply believes in, he will put into practice. And the evidence of a good Catholic life is an eloquent testimony of its truth.

But proclaiming the faith here means something quite distinctive. It is the answer to St. Paul's question in his letter to the Romans. He first declares that, "Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved." Then he asks, "How then can they call on the one they have not believed in?" (Romans 10:13).

Someone who already believes must proclaim his faith in Christ. Why? So that others might come to believe.

This is the law of supernatural generation. Only believers can reproduce other believers. No one reproduces himself in the order of grace, anymore than he can generate himself in the order of nature.

But then comes an embarrassing question. Is reproduction in spirit an option or an obligation? Are we morally free, as believing Christians, to keep our faith to ourselves or are we obliged to share this faith with others?

We are obliged to share our Catholic faith. St. John Chrysostom goes so far as to say that our salvation depends on this fundamental practice of charity. Here is how he explains Christ's prediction of the last day when He will come to judge mankind. Our primary duty, says Chrysostom, is to feed those who are hungry for God's truth, and thirsty for the knowledge of God's love. Feeding the hungry and thirsty in body is not to be neglected. But more basic and more necessary is to share with others the riches of God's revelation and thus nourish human souls with sustenance for eternal life.

This again reminds me of a story, this time about St. Francis Xavier. In one of his letters from India to St. Ignatius

in Rome, he says, "Sometimes I wish I could go back to the University of Paris and shout like a madman. I want to tell those savants on the faculty, whose learning is greater than their zeal, how many souls here are being lost because of them. Souls are hungry for Christ and His truth. But someone must proclaim Christ and His Gospel to those who do not believe because no one has shared his faith with them."

Defend the Faith. Defending the faith means protecting our virtue of belief in Christ and His Church against hostile forces bent on destroying what we hold to be true.

There is a titanic struggle going on today for the mastery of the human mind. On the one hand, the Catholic Church is proclaiming the Lordship of Jesus Christ. She is telling people there is one God, who sent His only Son into the world to teach the world about sin, and conversion and the Cross as the pathway to peace on earth and life everlasting after death.

On the other hand, the followers of antichrist are telling people just the opposite. There is no God outside the world of space and time, and there is no life either to fear or desire beyond the grave.

No amount of mere scholarship or erudition is enough to defend what we believe. Not today. We must join scholarship with constant prayer for divine light. We must combine erudition with meditation in God's presence on the mysteries of our faith. The alternative is to become another academic casualty in the Church Militant of our day.

Suffering for the Faith. We began this lecture by saying that the world's greatest need is to listen to the teaching of the Catholic Church, whose visible head on earth is the Bishop of Rome. And we identified, so far, four aspects of our responsibility. I would like to identify our fifth responsibility with a sober reminder from the present Bishop of Rome. The normal condition, says Pope John Paul II, for the church to fulfill her mission of proclaiming Christ's truth is persecution.

How we Catholics need to hear that statement from the Vicar of Christ.

We sometimes, correctly, speak of the first three centuries of the Church's history as the centuries of persecution. So they were. But there have been more priests and religious, more men, women and children who were martyred for Christ since 1900 than in all the nineteen centuries before put together.

Our century, more than any other since Calvary, is the Age of Martyrs.

The late Cardinal Wright said that, in his judgment, the devil speaks to each generation in the terms most likely to seduce it. What is the principal approach which Satan makes in order to tempt our modern generation of Catholics? It is discouragement that would lead to despair. Then the cardinal concluded: "In order to rouse our flagging spirits in a generation where Satan attempts to seduce believers by defeatism, discouragement and worry, the Church offers us "Mary of the Magnificat" (*Mary, Our Hope*, San Francisco, 1984, p. 84). Her unwavering trust in God gave happiness to her soul, in spite of everything that seemed to go wrong. So will our confidence in God's mercy be rewarded, in His own time, by an uncommon spiritual joy.

Equal Rights Amendment

ERA, which was first proposed in 1972 by the Congress as the 27th Amendment to the Constitution, later to fail passage, is likely to surface again. In substance it reads: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

The questions raised by this proposal: Is ERA an effective instrument for the achievement and protection of the rights of women? Does it deserve endorsement? What would its impact be on Catholic institutions?

It is commonly understood that the equality demanded by ERA must be absolute. The law must deal with the individual attributes of the particular person and not make any broad applications based upon the irrelevant factor of sex. Opposition to ERA is based on this conclusion of legal experts that it will mandate gender free absolute equality and annul every existing law making any distinction between men and women however reasonable.

All agree that the Amendment would apply to governmental action, not to the private sphere, except when private groups exercise a public function, i.e. subject to state licensing or regulation, government funding, etc.

The practical effects of the ERA seem to be the following:

On Military Service: No exceptions in the military between male and female, whether relative to the draft law, special occupations therein, promotions, combat, dependent children. (There is a controversy of how the legal rights would actually work out in practice.)

On Employment: The invalidation of labor laws discriminating against or conferring benefits on women, with impact on the private sphere. The social issues involved: maternity leave, child-care leave, dependency benefits, conditions and types of work, veterans' preferences, etc.

On the Family: Proponents foresee egalitarian partnership as a future blessing; opponents see the rise of government control of the day care of children and the weakening of family ties. The areas likely to be affected include: age at marriage, the domicile of wives and children, change of name at marriage, children's names, mutual rights of spouses to common life and sexual relations, marital property, family support, child custody, grounds for divorce or annulment.

On Homosexuality: Proponents say ERA does not demand any change in state laws forbidding the marriage between homosexuals; opponents argue that the Amendment will require the legal recognition of such "marriages".

On Abortion: Among supporters there is a tendency to underplay the connection, although it seems likely that ERA would provide a definite constitutional right to the pregnant woman to determine whether or not to have an abortion.

On Right to Privacy: Supporters admit ERA calls for absolute equality. In practice the issue involved includes segregation of the sexes in prison, schools, public rest rooms, public facilities, etc.

On Catholic Law: There are no instances where government has regulated the religious doctrine of any group, nor has government intervened where Church tribunals have determined disputes in accordance with Church law, nor in Church government. It is unlikely that any court would consider an action brought by women for admission to the Catholic priesthood or to hold specified decision-making posts. The amendment may have an indirect effect on policies and activities of Church administered institutions, leading to the denial of government funding, but not on tax exemption. (While no one yet has studied the New Code for its differentiation of men and women engaged in Catholic ministries, the 1918 Code had more than 100 such distinctions.)

Is ERA the proper vehicle of existing inequalities between the sexes? Proponents say yes because neither executive nor judicial action has eliminated discrimination; opponents say women are already under the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, even if all discrimination has not thereby been eliminated for men as well as women. Proponents say we need a coherent theory of women's equality before the law and because previous relief has been inadequate; opponents prefer the equal protection route because it permits selective interpretations on a case to case basis concerning the intricate male-female relations of marriage, alternative remedies are available and more suitable than an absolute ban, ERA's long-range effects are uncertain, suitable protections for women would be eliminated, etc.

The best concise summary of the question is a booklet entitled *The ERA in Debate: What Can It Mean for Church Law?* by Bishop Anthony J. Bevilacqua of Pittsburgh and published in 1978 by the Canon Law Society of America. The study was not intended to give any recommendation for or against the ERA but to provide a basis on which Church lawyers might resolve some of the issues in controversy.

There is still no consensus that an ERA amendment is necessary to protect legitimate equal rights of all the people. Serious concerns exist that such an Amendment would have negative effects, especially on family life. Why? Because proponents of ERA assume as a given that men and women are not only equal but similar, save in genital respects. This not only is the philosophical underpinning of the ERA proposal but the social objective, viz., that in all areas of social life men and women are to be considered the same, all evidences of biological and psycho-social differences to the contrary notwithstanding.

Meaning and Scripture: Some remarks on a dubious meaning postulate

Many theologians¹, and among them many Scripture Scholars, have accepted a dubious theory of meaning which threatens to undermine their conclusions concerning God and His Revelation. For instance, Fr. Raymond Brown announces his acceptance of this suspect view of meaning when he says, that "a writing, once composed, has a life of its own and so the literal sense of the author's intent cannot absolutely control meaning."² This suggests a version of meaning which the philosopher Richard Rorty has called textualism. Its claim is that an adequate theory of meaning must assign a quite central role to the intentions of the reader (interpreter) of the language for which it is a theory.

First of all, one should be clear that this is a view about linguistic meaning; it is a view about the meaning of words and sentences. It is not a view about meaning in the sense of the message or point of a text, although it is a way of getting at the point of a passage *from* its linguistic meaning. Rorty puts it this way.

Alternatively, however, the textualist may brush aside the notion of the text as machine which operates quite independently of its creator, and offer what Bloom calls a "strong misreading." The critic asks neither the author nor the text about their intentions but simply beats the text into a shape which will serve his own purpose. He makes the text refer to whatever is relevant to that purpose. He does this by imposing a vocabulary - a "grid" in Foucault's terminology - on the text which may have nothing to do with any vocabulary used in the text or by its author, and seeing what happens.³

Given this view of linguistic meaning the textualist can "pride himself on not being distracted by anything which the text might previously have been thought to be about or anything the author says about it."⁴ Thus he can "get more out of a text than its author or its intended audience could possibly have found there."⁵

Textualism, then, is a view of linguistic meaning which has an important implication for getting at the meaning (message) of a text. At the heart of textualism is the belief that significance - linguistic meaning - is relative to choice of vocabulary; "any specification of a referent," Rorty says, "is going to be in some vocabulary." Since vocabulary, words, are time and culture conditioned so is linguistic meaning. The only way to avoid the apparent relativism of meaning is to make the reader the sole arbiter of the linguistic meaning, and hence of the meaning (message) of a text. A worthy goal, but one with disastrous consequences. To see what some of these consequences are we can look at the view of the nature of man and of truth that accompanies it, according to

Rorty. It is a view he calls new romanticism in his recent book *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*⁶ and which he describes as holding that, what is most important for human life is "not finding out whether a proposition is true but whether a vocabulary is good."⁷

The argument for the new romanticism is, fundamentally, that one must give up the classic view of man as a knower of essences, "as realizing his essence by knowing essences" (the Mirror of Nature), because such a view of man depends upon a now discredited foundationalist epistemology.⁸ I do not wish to dispute this premise, although I think it demonstrably false, for to do so would take us too far astray and perhaps be counter-productive. For, it might be said, such an objection would be just one more attempt to do philosophy in the classic, now *demodée*, fashion. So instead I shall look at some consequences of the positive account Rorty has to offer. My claim is that anyone who buys textualism as I am discussing it here will have to follow Rorty's lead, and that such a path is wrong-headed. In other words, if this new view of what is important for man is to come to the aid of textualism its consequences must be acceptable, and they are not.

The romantic view which the textualist asks us to accept is no more and no less than "a redescription of man which tries to place the classic picture of man within a larger one, and thus to 'distance' the standard philosophical problematic rather than offer a set of solutions to it."⁹ The cornerstone of this view — established negatively by a critique of foundationalism and positively by a theory laden account of observation — is the "holistic point that words take their meanings from other words rather than by virtue of their representative character."¹⁰ It is clear that were this holistic view of meaning accurate textualism would be correct. Let us assume for the sake of argument that this holistic view is correct and that it does enable one to "distance" the standard philosophic problematic. But what of the consequences of such a view, especially the consequences for a redescription of man, a view, that is, of the nature of man. For that is what is being proposed.

From the holistic premise, Rorty says, it follows that "we will not be able to substitute 'accurate representation' (element by element) for successful accomplishments of a practice. Our choice of element will be dictated by our understanding of the practice rather than the practice's being 'legitimated' by a 'rational reconstruction' out of the elements."¹¹ In other words, knowledge is no longer the accurate representation of the way things are, but the successful practice of "getting it straight" from any chosen starting point.

Meaning and Scripture (*Cont'd*)

Since there can be no accurate representations the notion that truth is correspondence must go. In its place we are told that truth is "no more and no less than the best idea we currently have about how to explain what is going on."¹² Knowledge is not having an accurate representation (having a concept or essence) because such things are not possible to have at all. It is, rather, having a right, by current standards, to believe.¹³

This view of the intellectual life from which the acquisition of truth dwindles in importance¹⁴ issues in the inability to rationally agree or disagree. For,

If there is no such common ground, all we can do is to show how the other side looks from our own point of view. That is, all we can do is be hermeneutic about the opposition - trying to show how the odd or paradoxical or offensive things they say hang together with the rest of what they want to say, and how what they say looks when put in our own alternative idiom.¹⁵

In this view, to insist on obtaining agreement on propositions simply shows lack of tact and poor taste.¹⁶ It sins against the cardinal philosophic virtue: civility.¹⁷

There is an obvious difficulty with all this. If there are no accurate representations then how does this view of man and his intellectual activity have any claim on us at all? As Rorty puts it, edifying philosophers — those who practice the new hermeneutics — "have to decry the very notion of having a view, while avoiding having a view about having views."¹⁸ His answer to this "awkward, but not impossible position" consists in distinguishing between saying something and expressing a view. Might it not be, he says, that "saying things is not always saying how they are. Perhaps saying *that* is itself not a case of saying how things are."¹⁹

Again, it seems to me that any sense in which this distinction is legitimate is one in which it will not do the job Rorty needs it for, and in any other sense is mistaken. But I do not wish to engage the argument here for reasons I have already given and because I think there is a deeper and more important point that needs to be focused on.

The point is this: On this view, (the new romanticism,) the good life, the good for man, can no longer be the examined life championed by Socrates, Plato, Aristotle and others. The flourishing human is no longer to be viewed as the thoughtful person acting virtuously. For this assumes the possibility of accurate representations whose possession would allow us to "realize our essences by knowing essences." Instead, the good life consists in "finding new and more interesting ways of expressing ourselves, and thus of coping with the world."²⁰

So the view of man and his relation to the world that the textualist is proposing is not really such a new one after all. It is, as Rorty calls it, a romantic view according to which becoming fully human is not so much a matter of gaining objective knowledge in order to know what to do as it is a matter of choosing one's project.²¹ To be fully human is to be self-creative. And so it must be. For, given the holistic view of meaning and truth outlined above, the notion of knowledge as an accurate representation rather than successful conversation is beside the point. From this it follows that values to live by can never be discovered but only invented, or as Rorty puts it:

The assemblage, **per impossible**, of all these objective truths would still not necessarily be edifying. It might be the picture of a world without a sense, without a moral. Whether it seemed to point a moral to an individual would depend upon that individual. It would be true or false that it so seemed, or did not seem, to him.. But it would not be objectively true or false that it "really did," or did not, have a sense or a moral. Whether his knowledge of the world leaves him with a sense of what to do with or in the world is itself predictable, but whether it **should** is not.²²

Here, then, is the final unpacking of the view of the nature of man implied by textualism. It is not at all a new picture, as Rorty is aware, nor is it one without difficulties. In his essay on textualism Rorty concedes that such a view of man and his world is questionable on moral grounds.²³ I think he is right although I do not share his optimism that such a view of the nature of man can be rehabilitated by integrating it into a theory of man in relation to his fellow men (a theory of justice he calls it). I shall terminate by briefly explaining why.

Suppose, with Rorty, that one does have all the objective truths. One still has no values, either because there are none there (as the above passage seems to indicate) or because although they are there they cannot be accurately represented. But now where do moral points of view come from? This is the moral objection Rorty sees as so important. How do we rule out certain behaviors and not others? What is to prevent anyone from just doing any old thing that comes to mind, or desire?

Rorty claims in the passage on textualism referred to above that the answer is to be found in a theory of justice. But I think not. For how could one find any moral rules binding the behavior of individuals in society if one cannot have any accurate representations of the way things are that imply these rules? The standard response to this objection is to say that one's actions are limited by concern for others. One can do whatever one

Meaning and Scripture (*Cont'd*)

wishes so long as it harms no one else. Morality enters only when I collide with another person, or when my wishes collide with his.

It is certainly the case that there is a moral or ethical dimension to my dealings with other people. But the view now under examination can provide no better account of that than it can of my personal morality. For without the possibility of an accurate description of one's self in relation to others how could one have any description at all that would provide moral guidelines for behavior towards others? And barring this an appeal to a morality based on one's being other directed is in no better position than is a morality based on my selfish self.²⁴

So the moral objection seems decisive. Textualism leads to a view of man and his relations with others which is ethically self-destructive. The attempt to save textualism from the charge of self-refutation by incorporating it in a larger framework which would "distance the standard philosophic problematic" issues in a view of man which is ethically objectionable. Theologians would do better than to uncritically assume such a view of meaning in their discussions.

J.M. Hubbard
College of St. Thomas
St. Paul, Minnesota

¹See A.C. Thiselton, *The Two Horizons* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1980).

²R. Brown, "The Meaning of the Bible," *Theology Digest* 28:4 (Winter, 1980), p. 311; see also the companion piece, "And the Lord Said"? Some Biblical Reflections on Scripture as the Word of God," *Theological Studies* 42 (March, 1981), pp. 3-19.

³R. Rorty, "Nineteenth-Century Idealism and Twentieth-Century Textualism," *The Monist* 4:2 (April, 1981), pp. 168-69. It has been argued that the textualists, by practicing what they preach, have reduced literary criticism, and literature itself, to the lamentable state they are currently in. "The real challenge comes from the theorists - let me call them *indeterminists* - who argue that meaning is conferred not by authors but by readers, and that a work's meaning is therefore constantly subject to change." F. Crews, "Criticism Without Constraint," *Commentary* 73:1 (Jan., 1982), p. 65.

⁴*Ibid.* p. 167.

⁵*Ibid.*

⁶R. Rorty, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1980), p. 319.

⁷*Art. cit.*, p. 158.

⁸Rorty, *op. cit.*, ch. 8.

⁹⁻²²*Ibid.*, p. 358, 368, 319, 358, 389, 372, 318, 371, 329, 360-361, 388

²³Rorty, *art. cit.*, p. 173.

²⁴As Henry Veatch points out so very well, even if one *did* have accurate representations of other directed relations they, in and of themselves, would not be able to ground an ethic. "Is Kant the Gray Eminence of Contemporary Ethical Theory?" *Ethics* 90 (Jan., 1980), pp. 281-38.

Books Received

- Peter J. Cataldo (ed.) *The Dynamic Character of Christian Culture* (University Press, 229 pp. \$10.75)

A series of essays based on themes developed by Christopher Dawson. The authors include Russell Hittinger, Paul Quay, J.S., Glenn W. Olsen, R.V. Young, John J. Mulloy, Richard Roach S.J., Chauncey Stillman. The subjects: Dawson's metahistory, cultural understanding, Christian culture, economic life, war and peace, American recollections.

- James Schall, S.J., *The Politics of Heaven and Hell: Christian themes from Classical, Medieval and Modern Political Philosophy*, (University Press of America, 360 pp., \$13.50)

Addresses the relation of reason and religious revelation to political philosophy. Emphasizes the history of this relationship in order to understand the development of central ideas in political philosophy arising from classical or religious traditions. This important work will be useful to the student of political theory and religion.

- Thomas Mary Sennott, *The Woman of Genesis*, (Cambridge, Mass., The Ravengate Press 85 pp. No Price)

A commentary on Genesis 3:15 using two protagonists - one Modernist, one Catholic — to explicate the role of Mary. The author is a Religious Brother.

Ave Maria Press (Notre Dame)

- Rev. Stephen V. Doughty, *Ministry of Love: A Handbook for Visiting the Aged*, (94 pp. \$3.95)

A how to booklet for family and clergy.

- Rev. Paul A. Feider, *The Journey to Inner Peace*, (110 pp. \$3.95)

Counsel, readings and prayers for the peace of Christ.

- Ann Johnson, *Miryam of Nazareth*, (127 pp. \$4.95)

Reflections on Old Testament women, among which are meditations on the various magnificats and on the Resurrection-Pentecost mysteries.

- Svetozar Kraljevic, *The Apparitions of Our Lady of Medjugorje* (edited by Michael Scanlon, T.O.R. for the Franciscan Herald Press, 202 pp. \$9.50)

This book presents a truthful historical account of the extraordinary events that occurred in Yugoslavia during the years 1981-1983. Fr. Michael Scanlon, president of the Franciscan University of Steubenville was in Yugoslavia and in the parish in 1983 at the time of the reported Marian apparitions so similar in message to those of Fatima. Those of great faith have some more inspiration here, those of little, a lot to chew on.

Book Reviews

Harold O.J. Brown, *Heresies*. (New York, Doubleday, 1984 477 pp. \$17.95)

This is a good book for priests and those engaged in teaching Catholic theology, even advanced catechists. It is an impressive book for Catholics although it refers to the Church only incidentally in relationship to particular Protestant concerns. Dr. Harold O. J. Brown, presently engaged in pastoral work in Switzerland, is an evangelical theologian, a professor of biblical and systematic theology in one of America's largest Protestant Seminaries.

The 21 chapters cover the gamut of theological issues from Gnosticism through doctrines concerning the Trinity, Christology, Predestination, Iconoclasm, the Eucharistic Controversies, Scholasticism, Protestantism, Pietism, the Enlightenment, Methodism, etc. The last chapter is entitled "The Resurgence and Relapse of Orthodoxy". Not only is a wealth of scholarship reflected on every page but the book zips along smoothly because Dr. Brown knows how to write.

The foreword by Harvard's Divinity Professor George Williams calls *Heresies* "the work of an irenic Evangelical scholar who deplores the cruel treatment meted out to past heretics and heresiarchs with torture, fire, and sword but also strongly deplores heresy and the facile toleration of it". (p. xxi) The author himself, in the *Introduction*, justifies his work on the ground that "the history of Christian theology is in large part a history of heresies because Jesus and the claims he made... seemed to be incredible." (p. xxiii) He warns the reader early: "Roman Catholicism ceases to play a significant part in our history (after Trent). This is in part due to the good sense that Catholicism had in avoiding those particular heresies that are our chief concern: heresies affecting our image of Christ." (p. xxvi)

He returns to the Catholic Church toward the end of the volume with a few well-pointed salvos. A few citations will suffice to whet a potential reader's appetite.

Concerning Catholic Orthodoxy: "In view of the fact that Roman Catholicism survived the challenges of the nineteenth century and was maintaining and even reinforcing its own distinctive position in 1950 — it would have been natural to expect it to enter the 1980's still intact. Instead, the reaffirmations of the early postwar era seem to have been a kind of last hurrah, a sort of Picket's charge of the papacy, just prior to the beginning of disasters..."

Concerning Catholic Bultmannism: "Rudolph Schnackenburg's suspicion and rejection of Bultmann and his approach does not characterize the Catholicism of the 1960's and beyond. Quite the contrary: Roman Catholic theologians accommodated themselves to Protestant heresies, both old and new, with astonishing rapidity — It may soon be necessary to say of mainstream Roman Catholic theology that it, like most Protestantism, is neither orthodox, nor heretical, but another religion." (pp. 445-446).

Jaroslav Pelikan, *Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300-1700)* (University of Chicago Press, pp. 424 \$27.50)

This monumental work is the fourth volume (of five) in a highly praised series dealing with the Christian tradition from its emergence in the early centuries through Eastern Christianity and the Medieval period. This volume deals with the issues taken up by Martin Luther, John Calvin, radical reformers, and the Catholic response at Trent. The final volume is to be entitled *Christian Doctrine and Modern Culture (since 1700)*. There are only seven chapters but they average fifty pages each and his primary sources are twice as extensive as his secondary bibliography. Jaroslav Pelikan is a Lutheran scholar of no mean reputation, whose fascination with the Catholic and Christian tradition is well known. He is presently Sterling Professor of History at Yale University.

Dr. Pelikan begins with the understanding that the Protestant Reformers, despite their protestations of "sola Scriptura," were never "sola" - Scripture was always part of the Protestant tradition. He traces here in great depth the origins of "the crisis of orthodoxy" which did not really show itself until after 1700. He is especially good because of his sources which during this period (and because of the printing process) came into existence for the first time.

The gravest peril to the "one true faith" in the 14-15th century, he reports, come from the loss of oneness in the "one Church," for the two were perceived as inseparable. Unity of faith meant unity of doctrine; no variety of doctrines was permissible. With the Protestant Reformation the Catholicity of doctrine came to be defined in a way that had not been deemed necessary before. Protestantism was an unprecedented threat by virtue of the sheer number of doctrines brought into dispute.

All in all a remarkable book by a learned Lutheran who provides the scholarly data for all the controversialists currently dividing theologians in the Catholic Church.

On Abortion

"Those who hold the reins of government should not forget that it is the duty of public authority by appropriate laws and sanctions to defend the lives of the innocent, and this all the more so since those whose lives are endangered and assailed cannot defend themselves. Among whom we must mention in the first place are infants hidden in the mother's womb. And if the public magistrates do not defend them, but by their laws and ordinances betray them to death at the hands of doctors or of others, let them remember that God is the Judge and Avenger of innocent blood which cries from earth to heaven."

Pius XI in Casti Connubii

Book Reviews (*Cont'd*)

Likoudis, James. *Ending the Byzantine Greek Schism: the 14th c. Apologia of Demetrios Kydones for Unity with Rome*. CUF, Box S, 222 North Avenue, New Rochelle, NY 10801. PB; \$6.95 plus \$1 postage.

There are not and there never were insuperable doctrinal disagreements between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches to justify a long and apparently intractable schism. There are no really insuperable problems that need stand in the way of reunion now. The Second Vatican Council assumed this to be the case, in fact; and successive Popes since the Council have continued to urge the practical steps that could lead back to unity.

Many Orthodox continue to believe, however, that the Catholic teaching about the primacy of jurisdiction of the Pope in the universal Church does constitute an insuperable obstacle to reunion. These Orthodox believe that the Popes have illegitimately sanctioned additions to the deposit of faith as formulated in the great historic Creeds of the Church that grew out of the great early ecumenical councils in the East, especially in the Nicene Creed, which we still recite at Sunday Mass and which was substantially formulated by the Council of Nicaea in AD 325 and the Council of Constantinople in AD 381.

In this climate a clear discussion of what is really at issue in the schism between East and West is badly needed. Hence the value of this little volume. This book outlines an approach to the problem that, if pursued seriously, could result in the obstacles to reunion coming to seem considerably less formidable. The author of this book has gathered together some materials which throw considerable light on the points at issue in the schism and on the road that has to be traveled on the way to reconciliation. Himself a convert from Orthodoxy to Catholic obedience, James Likoudis is able to deal with the issues from inside *both* traditions.

The entire volume thus constitutes a compact but still authoritative and complete discussion of the principal issues involved in the schism that has separated the Catholic and Orthodox Churches for so long. These issues need to be understood before we can move forward to that "brotherly reconciliation" and "full communion" which Pope John Paul II declared to Patriarch Demetrios I ought to be our common goal. This little book points a way both Catholic and Orthodox can move - together.

K.D. Whitehead

In 1983 when the Bishops issued their 'peace' pastoral Gov. Mario Cuomo wrote the Archbishop Joan Roach to say, "As an American and as a Catholic I am proud of you. It would have been so easy to compromise your position so as to offend no one. You chose instead to...teach moral law... Our Church has sometimes been accused of not having spoken out when it might have..."

Robert M. Augros and George N. Stanciu, *The New Story of Science: Old Meets New*, (Regnery-Gateway, Inc., 234 pp., \$6.95)

This latest addition to Gateway Editions, augments five years of collaborative effort by theoretical physicist George Stanciu and philosopher Robert Augros. Documenting the most recent scientific developments, it develops and explains the implication of the new physics for psychology, religion, and the fine arts. It articulates the unexplained, acknowledging what cannot be sensed or imagined but what must be understood.

The authors maintain that there are two contending world views or stories emerging from contemporary science. The Old Story is scientific materialism: "It holds that only matter exists and that all things are explicable in terms of matter alone." The Old Story is not functioning properly, and we have not learned the New Story.

The authors document the dramatic revelations that have come about in twentieth century science, drawing from the "writers" of the New Story, which include Einstein, Bohr, Heisenberg, Sherrington, Maslow, and others. A chapter on God shows the theological implications of astrophysicists' investigation into the origin of the universe.

Psychologist Frank Severin argues in his discussion of free choice and values, "any science that imagines itself to be value-free is long outdated."

Robert Augros holds a Ph.D. in philosophy from Laval University, Quebec. George Stanciu earned his Ph.D. in theoretical physics from the University of Michigan.

Raymond F. Collins, *Introduction to the New Testament*, (Doubleday, 449 pp. \$24.95)

This is a valuable manual about the mysteries of modern exegesis. A thoroughgoing advocate of historico-critical analysis of the biblical story, this Rhode Island priest, who teaches at Louvain, knows his subject and with remarkable clarity writes about all that one has to know about the formation of the NT, the historico-critical method, textual, source, form and redaction criticism, about structural analysis (a newer method), inspiration, magisterium, almost any aspect of the modern biblical controversies one needs to explore.

Fr. Collins is what his method makes him ("today we know of the existence of the Q collection" p. 293 when it is only an unprovable theory). He would "contraindicate a Christianity which withdraws from the world" or "which refuses to come to grips with the moral issues of the world in which it exists." He is not averse to reinterpreting dogma to mean what it never meant before e.g. on divorce.

A remarkably detailed book for the beginner, instructive as long as you know where the author is going.

Book Reviews (*Cont'd*)

Leonardo Boff, *Saint Francis. A Model for Human Liberation*. (Crossroad/Continuum, 370 Lexington Ave., New York, NY 10017, 1984) 176 pp. PB \$8.95

George Bernard Shaw once confided that he continued to be fascinated by Karl Marx long after he was convinced that the latter's abstract theories of economics were wrong. It is to be regretted that in the face of overwhelming, scholarly opinion, Father Boff continues to be credulous.

Saint Francis is a series of episodes and commentary rather than a biography in the strict sense. The author's obvious devotion to the Poverello does not prevent him from positioning the founder of the Franciscan family as a religious backdrop for liberation theology. Notwithstanding historical evidence to the contrary, Saint Francis was a rebel who opposed the Roman Curia possibly because Father Boff wants him to be a rebel who opposed the Roman Curia. The fact that he was not, seems to make little difference concerning this *idée fixe*.

Despite the religious tone and occasional flashes of a persuasive prose style, the author's true heroes continue to appear with depressing frequency. Gustavo Gutierrez, Che Guevara, Herbert Marcuse and the sociologist Houtart manage to remain front and center. There is no mention of any of the classic biographers of Saint Francis - Jorgensen, Raymond and the English Capuchin, Father Cuthbert - to cite but three of them.

There is a heavy reliance upon a well known Protestant expert on the Thirteenth Century, Paul Sabatier, the Calvinist pastor who wrote a controversial life of the saint. Many of Sabatier's theories about Francis were discredited even during the author's lifetime because of a proven bias which often descended into bigotry. It is something of a puzzle why one of Brazil's best known theologians would have recourse to such an outdated work.

Saint Francis was very likely a model for human liberation but certainly not in the sense that Father Boff has envisioned it. Students of all faiths and of no faith see in the Poor Man of Assisi a true ascetic, a mystic, a poet and a loyal son of the Catholic Church. One searches in vain to find substantiation for Father Boff's conviction that for Saint Francis, any free enterprise ownership of the means of production was an almost unforgivable sin. And to state that the ecclesial dimension of the Franciscan Rule was practically dictated to the Founder under duress by the Roman authorities is nothing more than a tall story. Once again, this is very likely how Father Boff would like to see it. To make his point effectively, the author will have to disprove the recorded history of eight centuries.

Apart from having trifled with history, the book can be flawed most directly for its philosophical imbalance. Any

approach which employs a philosophical method to address a theological objective is a disordered one. Leonardo Boff uses Marxist analysis to implement a kind of theological liberation which from any theological point of view, seems very vague. The overall subject matter is much more concrete in political terms - which brings it back into the realm of philosophy. But this is how Boff focuses his intellectual vision; almost completely within the framework of political categories.

This book is almost dangerously misleading. In spite of the obvious cosmopolitan credentials of the author, the book never manages to escape from the horizon of a Latin American perimeter. This could be a regression into nationalism. And it could also serve to fuel the ideology of expansionism in an international thrust that would reduce sovereign peoples to colonial status or even serfdom. Witness Afghanistan. Or closer to home, take a look at Cuba.

Those who revere the Franciscan ideal will remain convinced that the Poverello would never have countenanced any such infringement upon the dignity of the human person.

Rev. John F. Ferry
Warwick, Rhode Island

(*To be published later in the Homiletic and Pastoral Review*).

René Laurentin, *Is the Virgin Mary Appearing at Medjugorje?* (Washington, D.C. *The World Press* \$6.95.

"Peace, peace, peace! Reconcile yourselves!" These were among the first words spoken by the Blessed Virgin Mary as reported by a group of young people in Medjugorje, Yugoslavia. According to them, Mary has been appearing to them on a daily basis since June 24, 1981. They saw that the heart of Mary's message is that the human race is in desperate need of peace and Christians must pray and fast, be reconciled to one another, and be converted to Jesus Christ.

In a new and easily-read book entitled *Is the Virgin Mary Appearing at Medjugorje?*, Father René Laurentin takes up the question of whether Mary is truly appearing and speaking to these six young people (two boys and four girls ranging in age from 13 to 24). This book is more than a translation of the French edition. It contains recent data which have been developed right up to the time of publication. The French edition sold 75,000 copies in the first five months after printing and is now in its fourth press run. Father Laurentin states that his express purpose in writing this book is "to bring to these events the clarifying aid of a knowledge of history and theology which is the fruit of some thirty years of study."

Book Reviews (*Cont'd*)

Some of the subject matter includes a description of past apparitions, theological skepticism about such spiritual phenomena, and the reasons why Mary might have chosen to appear at this time. The first seven appearances took place on a hill outside of Medjugorje. During these initial apparitions, Mary revealed who she was and began to tell the youngsters of her Son's desire for world peace which would only be possible if people were more deeply converted to Jesus through prayer, repentance and fasting.

By the time of the seventh appearance on June 30, 1981, the crowds had become so huge and the police authorities had become so agitated that the young people asked Mary if she would come to them in the parish church where there would be greater order, peace and safety. Since that time until the present, Mary's appearances have been in a room next to the sacristy in the parish church in Medjugorje.

Father Laurentin describes the spiritual growth of the children, the radical transformation of the local parish and the community that has ensued, and the message which Mary is conveying. Besides the primary message of the urgent need for peace and conversion, the young people say that Mary is also revealing to them ten secrets concerning Medjugorje, Yugoslavia and the world. While the secrets cannot be revealed until Mary permits, the tenor of them is that some terrible catastrophes are imminent. Mary has urged that people pray, emphasizing that prayer and fasting can prevent wars. Mary has promised that after the apparitions cease, a permanent sign will be left at the place on the mountain where she first appeared.

In a forthright manner, Father Laurentin presents the major criticisms, concerns and questions regarding the authenticity of the apparitions. He explains with sympathy and objectivity the local Bishops' present apprehension. Nonetheless he then concludes: "While reserving judgment to the episcopal authority responsible in this matter and simply in my capacity and competence as an expert, well aware of my limits, I would say that my analysis leads me to a positive evaluation of the apparitions."

Besides many photographs, the book has several helpful appendices (i.e. the letter sent to the Vatican by the pastor of the Medjugorje church which contains the Virgin's message to the Pope, and the reports of some forty healings that have reportedly taken place).

More will surely be written about the events at Medjugorje but this book by Father Laurentin will undoubtedly serve as the foundation for all future works. The book is now available from The Word Among Us Press (\$6.95 plus \$1.50 handling). For copies write to The Word Among Us Press, Box 3646, Department C, Washington, D.C. 20037 or call toll free 800-638-8539.

Fr. Tom Weinandy OFM, Cap.

Sex and Gender. A Theological and Scientific Inquiry. St. Louis: The Pope John Center, 1984. pp. xvi, 386; paper \$19.95.

Technological Powers and the Person. Nuclear Energy and Reproductive Technologies. St. Louis: The Pope John Center, 1984. Pp. xii, 500; paper \$15.95.

These two books provide reports on workshops held for the bishops of the United States in Dallas, Texas, the first in 1981, the second a year later.

The first volume is concerned largely with questions of gender identity, in its relationship to homosexuality and to the problem of transexualism. "Gender in this context refers primarily to the psychological dimension, the perception of one's self as being a man or woman. Sex is a more anatomical term..." (p. viii)

The second volume treats technical and moral questions related to the use of nuclear energy in our time, various concepts of the person, and a study of new technologies of reproduction.

These books are especially interesting because they provide a detailed report on meetings about serious contemporary questions attended by most members of the American hierarchy. Scholars should be interested in seeing whom the officials of the Pope John Center chose to address the bishops, and in criticizing their work. The books, however, (while they include also reports on questions-and-answer sessions) are not simply "Proceedings" of the meetings. Some of the papers given at the meetings seem to have been omitted; and certain other papers were added to the report, to comment on papers that raised difficulties, and to provide balance.

There is considerable unevenness in the papers themselves. The contributions of the staff scholars of the Pope John Center (especially those of Fr. Benedict Ashley and of Fr. Albert Moraczewski) are, as one would expect, excellent. Papers by Fr. John Harvey, Frederick Carney, Paul Vitz, and Fr. Donald Senior are among the best in the two volumes.

Some of the papers are disappointing. Perhaps William Masters and June Reinisch should have been invited, as spokespersons for visions of sexuality the Church must address. Other papers simply were not as excellent as the circumstances demanded. Critical questions debated intensely in our time were discussed. On those points in which there is authentic Catholic teaching, that teaching should be presented and defended splendidly, and the arguments current against these positions should be presented with vigorous forcefulness. Everywhere there should shine that Catholic spirit which gladly faces every difficulty, yet firmly and intelligently assents to all insistent teachings of the Church. Much work in that spirit will be found in these volumes.

—Ronald Lawler OFM, Cap.

Book Reviews (*Cont'd*)

James Hitchcock, *The Pope and the Jesuits*, (New York, *A Catholic Eye Book*, 210pp. \$3.95)

Manfred Barthel, the German Lutheran scholar, observed in his study of *The Jesuits* that St. Ignatius organized his company in such a way "that every word that was spoken, every deed that was undertaken, every breath that was drawn by a Jesuit could have only one purpose — the advancement of the Roman Catholic Church." A book on the thousands of Jesuits still walking in the footsteps of their Master is overdue.

Professor Hitchcock has written another book covering some of the reasons the Jesuits came into conflict with the Holy See.

This book had difficulty finding its way into print. The publisher of first instance, a non-Catholic who sponsored its writing, backed away in the face of a U.S. prelate's threat to blackball him and his work among Catholics if he proceeded with the book. The prelate in question, a well-known promoter of pluralism in theology and politics, argued that Hitchcock was targetting "liberals" in the Church who disagree with him and was manipulating his evidence at the cost of maligning individual Jesuits. That is all James McFadden had to hear. Thanks to the editor of *Catholic Eye* the book is now published and a frequent lesson of our time learned once again, viz., pluralists in theory are often bullies in fact.

What does Professor Hitchcock say about Jesuits? Where does he get his evidence? Does he manipulate his evidence?

The investigation of the Jesuits by Pope John Paul II, one which followed many years of Paul VI's unhappiness with the Society's behavior, is well known. Not so well known is what the Popes were angry about. The Holy See has handled its grievances against Jesuits with great circumpsection and for the most part in private. Now we have a private investigator in James Hitchcock exposing some of his observations drawn from close relationship with Jesuits over many years. Historians will be dissecting the 1964-84 Jesuits long after the present actors are dead. Why not, then, the testimony of a contemporary witness, even if the pluralist prelate thinks the presentation is "tendentious", "wild" and "irresponsible". Especially if the witness in question has spent all but six years of his academic life in a Jesuit University and still serves there as a distinguished professor of history.

Professor Hitchcock's opening chapter speaks of Jesuits as an "honored society", honored for their Catholicity and for their obedience to religious superiors, especially the pope. In Chapter Two he moves on to "the unravelling" of the Church after Vatican II which, he says, began "primarily among priests and religious" (p. 17). Hitchcock seems surprised, as were many others, that Jesuits who maintained their

traditions were often on the defensive within their own Society immediately after the Council. Uncertainty about the nature of the Catholic faith and religious life, humanist concerns, and pop psychology took precedence in official Jesuit circles over commitment to Pope, to Catholic doctrine and to Rule. When John Paul II called the Society to account for their stewardship, the common response of Superiors was that whatever internal and external problems existed were caused by Jesuits who abandoned the priesthood. Yet, in spite of disclaimers, those same ex-Jesuits enjoyed the confidence of their superiors, even of bishops, right up to the moment they chose to depart. Bernard Cooke and Carl Ambruster, for example, were commissioned by the NCCB to study the priesthood, a report the bishops later rejected because it demeaned the Catholic understanding of the priesthood.

Whereas Jesuits were once accused of catering to the wealthy, they were being charged now with cottoning up to all the destructive forces in American society and the world. Timothy Healy said John Paul II did not understand American higher education. Walter Burghardt "choked" on the Vatican's view of contraceptive sterilization. John A. Coleman attacked the Holy See's attempt to bring order to the Dutch Church. Joseph O'Hare wants to disabuse American Catholics of "papolotry". James Di Giacomo endorsed much of the new permissiveness among adolescents. Jesuit psychiatrist James Gill warned bishops not to lay sexual burdens on their people.

Most forms of dissent were encouraged or tolerated in Jesuit circles to the point where strongly orthodox Jesuits began to feel that something was wrong with them simply by being faithful to Church teaching and to Jesuit traditions, one of which is that you do not criticize fellow Jesuits publicly. Quite to the contrary, a large majority of delegates to the 1974 General Congregation disbelieved in adherence to doctrine for its own sake, deemphasized hierarchical structure and authority or specific modes of religious life. The ruling Jesuits were definitely at odds with the Holy See in these areas. One of their own, Cardinal Danielou defended Catholic beliefs with increasing vigor, only to find himself ostracized by his own brethren in the Jesuit house where he lived.

Other Jesuits in the U.S. had no difficulty criticizing Church doctrines, Church institutions, and Church hierarchy without the restraints from Jesuit superiors imposed on Jesuits who objected to the conduct of their dissenting confreres. (Joseph O'Rourke was the exception; William Callahan and John McNeill were quasi-silenced at the request of the Vatican.) Jesuit defenders of the faith have been chewed out by superiors and placed under obedience for criticizing the Society's seminaries or their Marxists, even for standing up to Richard McCormick. The most notorious case of

Book Reviews (Cont'd)

"silencing" occurred in 1980 to San Francisco's Cornelius M. Buckley who, beside criticizing one Jesuit's public criticism of John Paul II, satirized the illicit liturgical practices going on in the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley (a seminary for Jesuit candidates to the priesthood). Berkeley's president Richard Hill complained to Provincial Terence Mahan and Buckley was forbidden to write any more, except on scholarly matters and only after clearance by his superior. Hill previously had protested *Humanae Vitae* and defended the legitimacy of dissent. Two years later (1982), with the Jesuits already under investigation by Rome, at an ordination liturgy for Berkeley's Jesuit deacons, a drama group paraded through the Church setting led by a Jesuit priest, holding aloft banners advocating gay rights and various forms of social and sexual liberation. That was too much even for the *National Jesuit News* which protested such behavior during Mass. The criticism was rejected by 18 of the 22 newly ordained Jesuit deacons on the ground that "the Eucharist is always social and political!"

Professor Hitchcock's critical chapter is No. 7, where he takes up the Jesuit role in "a systematic effort to redefine the very nature of the Catholic Church." John O'Malley's doctrinal pluralism and Gerald O'Collins "case against dogma" became arguments for reversing Catholic doctrine — on contraception, divorce, women priests, homosexuality, and on the Church itself. Jesuits, happy to accept the Pope's charge to promote social justice, stonewalled the other papal command to combat atheism. Says Hitchcock: they no longer possessed "the intellectual certitude, corporate and personal self-confidence, and cohesive discipline" which a systematic attack on atheism would have required. Even their militant campaign for social justice failed to satisfy Paul VI. For one thing, certain kinds of social doctrine were turned into an all-encompassing orthodoxy. Transformation of society in the name of justice subsumed apostolates dealing with personal salvation, forgiveness of sins, and reconciliation with God. Even though Jesuit educational institutions resisted, the social activists, by incessant in-house lobbying pressured priests engaged in other ministries to reorganize their institutions around justice. Social transformation, however, usually meant radical politics and doctrinal heterodoxy with rebellion against Church authority. Since all "systems" were unjust for these reformers, so was the Church with its suppression of the legitimate aspirations of scholars, women, homosexuals, divorced etc. At this point Hitchcock makes a startling observation. No one could ever say of the social activists of another era — the John A. Ryans and Dorothy Days, or Jesuits like Robert Hartnett, William Smith, Benjamin Masse, Philip Carey, John Corriden, Dennis Comey, John La Farge, what Hitchcock says of the present crop

of Ignatians activists: "No contemporary Jesuit political activist takes a firmly orthodox stance in doctrine and practice." (p. 84) The new reformer was also likely to be intolerant. When the *National Jesuit News* asks "What the hell is Jeanne Kirkpatrick doing at Georgetown?", when Georgetown Jesuits are moved to "anger, dismay, and disgust" at Jesuit James Schall (also of Georgetown) for his conservative political theories, when Jesuits ridicule Jesuits who defend the "just war theory", intolerance of pluralism where pluralism has Catholic justification has reared its ugly head — and among Jesuits who are ambivalent toward the Catholic Church's basic claims to be the voice of Christ.

The chapters on Robert Drinan and Daniel Berigan are deadly, a story of two priests convicted by their own words and deeds. Drinan's rejection of the "just war theory", his sneering at American anti-Communism, his pro-abortion voting record over ten years are hardly the tradition of U.S. Jesuits. Here again Jesuit superiors failed to repudiate Robert Drinan as they properly did in the case of Nixon aide, John McLaughlin. The toleration was contagious. Richard McCormick found time to praise Drinan (and Georgetown's Timothy Healy) for translating "moral concern into lived reality". When the Michigan nun Agnes Mansour was forbidden by Rome as a Religious to cooperate in the public funding of abortions, Drinan was bold enough to tell the press "only the fanatic fringe of Catholics opposed her stand." (McCormick said Rome was operating in violation of Vatican II.) On a different occasion he called the attorney general of the United States a right wing radical! Hitchcock describes Drinan as the supreme case of a cleric who began by positing the obligation to bring morality into politics and ended equating religion with a rigid secular ideology.

Daniel Berrigan was exiled once to South America by his Jesuit Superiors after an acquaintance immolated himself in front of the United Nations (for which Cardinal Spellman was falsely blamed). The exile made him a hero to Jesuit enemies of the Vietnam War. Berrigan, later arrested and jailed, went to Hanoi to find the Vietnamese officials self-effacing, defended John McNeill and Joseph O'Rourke, denounced all holders of public office, including ecclesiastics, as corrupt and cowardly, called Billy Graham "a charlatan", celebrated deviant liturgies, was uninterested in repression beyond the Iron Curtain, thinks America is wholly sick, while still maintaining favor in Jesuit circles.

Liberation theology also became a natural for Jesuits. Uruguayan Juan Luis Segundo defined the true purpose of the gospel and the Church to be the liberation of the human race in social and political terms. Spanish Jesuit Jon Sobrino fashioned Christ in much the same mould. Pedro Arrupe in 1981 warned Jesuits that Mar-

Book Reviews (*Cont'd*)

xism was incompatible with Christianity but Brazilian Jesuits found Marxism to be of great value in their work. A U.S. Jesuit held office under a leftist government in Jamaica; a Jesuit bishop savagely complained about the U.S. policies; an anti-Communist Belgian Jesuit in Chile was bitterly attacked by American Jesuits, etc. Six Jesuits who signed a 1981 statement supporting U.S. policy in El Salvador, received a strong five page rebuke from Fordham's Joseph F. Fitzpatrick. In view of the concerns of Nicaraguan bishops about cruelty and hostility to the Church there, one would think Jesuits would mute their pro-Sandinista ideology. Not so. Fordham's new president, Joseph O'Hare, who once denied that Sandinistas imprisoned any of their critics, seemed almost to rejoice that some Nicaraguans were "talking back" to their archbishop. Jesuit reformers of an earlier generation hesitated to make alliances with Marxists, but the "new breed" Jesuits consider these as foolish scruples. They also dismiss religious leaders who refuse to see God's will in the revolutionary wave of the future, some berating the Pope for his criticisms of Nicaragua. How smitten Jesuits are with Marxism remains to be seen, but the Holy See has maintained a book on some of them going back more than ten years. In 1975 Gregorian Jesuits held a conference and produced a book on the *New China*, edited by Michael Chu, Arrupe's principal adviser on China affairs. Absent from the volume was any mention of mass slaughter, terror, or police-state methods under Mao — exactly the kinds of moral issues Jesuits raise continually in Latin America.

Professor Hitchcock's "denouement" of the Jesuits is more of the same — members of the Society rejecting the Church's sexual moral code, criticizing the Pope, Richard McCormick's support of contraceptive sterilization, and so on. Most Jesuit troubles are caused by reactionary Jesuits unable to move with the times, so said the editor of *National Jesuit News*. This analysis cannot be defended.

What the regime of Peter Hans Kolvenbach, the new General of the Jesuits, will accomplish remains to be seen. But Hitchcock's final questions are pertinent. "If there were indeed abuses serious enough to warrant that (papal) intervention, and to call forth public acknowledgements (of defects) by the new general, why had Jesuit superiors, over a period of two decades, failed to identify them and take action against them? Why did the official leadership of the Society, on the contrary, seem to find in those "abuses" precisely a model for the future? Why were dissident Jesuits not only rarely disciplined but often praised and given positions of greater responsibility?"

No author can cover his subject in a small volume such as this. So it is not surprising that one does not find

here an in-depth report on the post-Vatican II revolution in the policy of Jesuit publications (*Theological Studies*, *America*, *Jesuit Studies*, etc.), of Jesuit colleges, universities and seminaries. The publications in question tend to be revisionist of Jesuit history and that of the Church. The well-known 1967 Land O'Lakes Declaration of Independence by Catholic Universities from the Church, usually associated with Notre Dame, is considered by some to have been a Jesuit invention. Four of the seven large institutional signers of Land O'Lakes and 10 of the 26 individuals were Jesuits, only five from Notre Dame. The question, still to be researched is this: Was the Jesuit hierarchy really responsible for taking the lead in secularizing our 250 Catholic colleges, with Notre Dame only the front? Another dubium pertains to the revolution in U.S. seminary training, beginning with aspiring Jesuit priests. Hitchcock deals lightly with the Berkeley theologate but a recently ordained Jesuit thinks the voice of novices who want and deserve a better theological training is not being heard within the Society. Jesuit superiors preoccupied with trendiness are not listening. And Jesuits like him dare not challenge the heterodox system in public. He thinks Jesuit theological training is unsystematic without in-depth training in christology, ecclesiology or sacraments, not even on Holy Orders — the warp and woof of priestly formation anywhere. Spiritual direction tends to be encouragement to open-mindedness, rather than intimacy with God. A great deal of time is spent on the trendy issues (women's ordination, lay ministries, political agenda, etc.) with the sacramental priesthood hardly considered. Women professors and women "deaconesses" are commonplace.

The collapse of Woodstock College in New York was only an omen of worse things to come for Jesuit training. Cardinal Spellman asked the Jesuit provincial in 1967 why he would contemplate moving Woodstock to New York considering its illustrious accomplishments in Maryland. The provincial's reply caused the aged Cardinal, who had he lived would likely have blocked the move, to reply: "Your predecessors twenty-five years ago gave me opposite reasons for keeping their seminaries out of places like New York. I wish you people would make up your mind." Spellman's judgment proved correct. Woodstock slipped into New York in the middle of the night after Cardinal's death only to die itself in a few years. The early 1968 negotiations between Jesuit authorities and Archdiocesan officials about guidelines for seminarian life-styles and liturgical experimentation, though friendly, resulted only in violations of those guidelines by the Jesuits and subsequent departure from the priesthood of several well known Jesuit leaders who had participated in framing the guidelines.

Book Reviews (*Cont'd*)

John Courtney Murray was one of those who foresaw trouble for Woodstock in New York. Murray, who died August 16, 1967 (apparently a bad year for the U.S. Church), was unhappy with some of the things already going on in Maryland, prior to the move. Murray could at times be testy about Church authority, but a generation earlier (1941) Murray preached an ordination retreat for New York priests, in which his best remembered meditation was on fidelity, a virtue, he thought, in short supply among diocesan priests by comparison with its deeply rooted presence among Jesuits. A few weeks before his death he was reminded of that meditation causing Murray to shake his head and say: "I would not say that today."

Professor Hitchcock has given a one-sided picture of contemporary Jesuit thinking and behavior but he does not manipulate his evidence. After all a papal investigation, an almost unheard of procedure, is hardly a sign that post-Conciliar Jesuits are simon-pure. Many of those mentioned in this volume — McCormick, Burghardt, Dulles, O'Hare, Coleman et al. — make no bones about the fact that they are at odds with Church teaching and practice — and teach views against Church hierarchy. What is more they have been successful. The Church is in shambles over important doctrinal issues. Young Catholics in particular believe in the faith statements of dissenters more than in the faith taught by the successors of Peter and the Apostles. This is an ecclesiastical imbalance as old as Peter, Paul and John. Know-it-alls in dissent do not like people like Hitchcock pointing the finger at them and they have long since stopped worrying about the penalties prepared for those who -scandalize the faithful. But they would make Hitchcock the heavy, not those who are laying the burden of weakened faith in the Church and lower morals on the back of the Catholic community.

An additional point: James Hitchcock is no right-winger, a charge (among others) that will be hurled by those who can be expected to savage his offering. When several millenia ago the Church came on the scene abortion and infanticide were, by modern definitions, the right-wing political position for the Roman elite. In 1931 when laissez-faire capitalism ruled international economies, *Quadragesimo Anno* was hardly a right-wing encyclical. Hitchcock accepts the Church's teaching on the Apostle's Creed and the Ten Commandments as readily as he accepts her social doctrine, whether the world calls them right or left. This is more than can be said for most of those who will attack. For all I know he may even have voted for George McGovern, if that is the acceptable norm for being a Catholic liberal.

The contemporary crisis of the Catholic Church is directly related to the crises in religious communities, not-

ably the Jesuits. It would be a better world if the Jesuit Educational Association, or NCEA, or any of the traditional Church agencies which are now bastions of dissent would invite him to share his insights on their problems. Unfortunately, the Church is afflicted with the same sickness as the nation, those who break the law have control of the streets. The Hitchcocks of the world stay home or turn up under guard at meetings of the *Consortium Perfectae Caritatis*, which do not need to hear his message, since they already know it from their own experience. How he and commentators like him can break into the chain of command of the Church's power brokers is still something of an unknown. The doctors think the epidemic will cure itself, while the germ carriers roam the streets without quarantine.

Lutheran Manfred Frankel in *The Jesuits* penned this sentence, which may interest somebody:

"In the Netherlands, where Jesuit theologians have been especially audacious in suggesting radical changes of course for the Order and the Church as a whole, one Jesuit residence is supposed to have a sign posted by the door: 'Will the last one leaving the Order kindly remember to turn out the lights.'"

He also observes about the present-day descendants of the Church's great Counter-Reformers: "In the United States the question of whether the Jesuits are really the Protestants of the future is already being discussed."

Dr. Hitchcock's book of horror stories would have benefited from light touches. There are scores of prominent Jesuits actively supporting John Paul II's objectives for the Society, who are highly critical (privately) of what is going on within the Order's institutions. The author apparently did have something like this in mind but was warned by Jesuits not to give favorable treatment to any Jesuit. To do so would only cause trouble for those so identified. How the Jesuits have changed.

One question can be asked legitimately. Now that Catholic bishops have begun to dispute Catholic politicians publicly about Catholic doctrine, about its denial and misrepresentation in the marketplace, has the time come for Bishops to turn their debating skills on priests, religious, and professors in Catholic institutions who subvert Catholic doctrine, Catholic policies and in the words of St. Pius X vent all their bitterness and hatred on "Catholics who zealously fight the battles of the Church."

Shortly after its publication Hitchcock's book was given to a veteran Jesuit who has been around many Ignatian tracks over many decades. "What did you think?", he was asked. Silence. After a moment: "It's all true." More silence: "But it's only half the story."

George A. Kelly

Items of Interest

- Joseph I. Dirvin, C.M., *Saint Catherine Laboure*, (1984, Tan Books, 245 pp. no price)

This book is a reprint of a 1958 volume with pictures and documentation added. It is the story of the Saint through whom we received the devotion to Our Lady of the Miraculous Medal, the most popular Catholic devotion in the U.S. Fr. Dirvin, a Vincentian with a fraternal interest in a saintly Daughter of Charity, writes out of long research and with easy style.

Correction: The September Newsletter incorrectly titled the St. Paul Catachetical series as: "In Christ Jesus" when in reality, the series' title is "Way, Truth and Life" grade school series and the "Divine Master" high school series. The full title of the grade school series is: The St. Paul Way, Truth and Life Series.

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter
Published by St. John's University
Jamaica, New York 11439

Non-Prifit Org. U.S. Postage P A I D Jamaica, N.Y. Permit No. 451

Items of Interest

- NCEA Notes for September 1984 reports on an attitudinal study of CATHolic high school teachers: Religious were more likely to favor a nuclear freeze, peace efforts, government intervention in social areas, civil rights for homosexuals than lay teachers. All teachers, however, were generally favorable to most of these causes. With the statement asking whether Catholics should be permitted to practice contraception 79 per ccent of the lay Catholics, 78 per cent of the lay non-Catholics and 52 per cent of the religious agreed. Twenty-two per cent of all Catholic high school teachers believe abortion is morally permissible when the chance of a serious birth defect is great (6 per cent of the Religious).

A new organization named *Women for Faith and Family* has come into existence for the purpose of giving witness to the Catholic faith as represented by John Paul II. They are circulating an *Affirmation* for Catholic women which specifically addresses contemporary concerns about the family, roles for women, abortion, etc.

For further information call or write Box 8326, St. Louis, MO 63132 or telephone (314) 863-1654.