

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

Volume 9, Number 2

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

March 1986

The Extraordinary Synod — A Summary

[Editor's Note: Three members of the Fellowship's Executive Board attended the Extraordinary Synod, held in Rome, November 25th-December 8th, 1985. The insights of Fr. Kenneth Baker, S.J., Fr. Michael Wrenn, and Professor Ralph McInerney follow. Mr. Robert DiVeroli is a syndicated columnist for several West Coast daily newspapers.]

The Synod interpreted Vatican II in a particular way—in three documents.

First, the message to the world's faithful proposes the Church as the Body of Christ with the faithful called upon to place themselves

- in communion with this Church (*Lumen Gentium*),
- as hearers of God's Word (*Dei Verbum*),
- participating in the holy liturgy (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*),
- and serviceable to mankind, especially to the poor (*Gaudium et Spes*).

Notice the hierarchy of values.

Secondly, "The Final Report" celebrated and confirmed the Second Vatican Council on its 20th anniversary. The participating bishops experienced, what they called, "communion in one spirit, the one faith and hope, and in the one Catholic Church." Unanimously, they willed to translate that Council into the life of the Church.

- But they also admitted the estrangement going on in the "First World" and the paradox of a faith enriched by Vatican II in places where people are oppressed.
- The Synod spoke, too, of the temptation of consumerism and the misreading of Council documents to explain "shadows in the Council's reception."
- Too much renewal identified with external structures and too little with God.
- The pastoral character of the Council documents cannot be separated from their doctrinal vigor.
- In response to the challenge of secularism, the faithful were called upon to look to God and for the Church to manifest better "the sense of the sacred,"
- To offer mankind "the preambles of faith, to announce Christ's divine sonship and salvation through him."
- The Church must call people to holiness by promoting a sense of prayer, adoration, sacrifice, self-giving, charity, justice. We have a tremendous need, said the bishops, of saints and training for spiritual life.
- "In the first place it is necessary to promote conjugal spirituality."

(Cont. on Pg. 3)

WHAT TO EXPECT IN THIS ISSUE?

On a Universal Catechism

On November 24, 1985 John Paul II, opening the Extraordinary Synod said that the heart of the Second Vatican Council was the Church's "one, holy, Catholic, apostolic faith." Continued the pope:

"Faith is the basic principle, is the foundation, the essential criterion for the renewal desired by the Church. From this faith comes the moral norms, style of life, and the practical orientation for every circumstance."

On Fundamentalism

"Do you really believe?" (John 16,13)

On Selective Teaching

"How I wish you were one or the other — hot or cold? But because you are lukewarm, neither hot nor cold, I will spew you out of my mouth." (Rev. 3:15-16)

p. 4

p. 13

p. 14

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars - Board of Directors 1986—1988

President

Rev. Msgr. George A. Kelly
Editor, The FCS Newsletter
St. John's University
Jamaica, New York 11439

Past President

Rev. Earl A. Weis, S.J.
Department of Theology
Loyola University
Chicago, IL 60626

Vice President

Dr. Joseph Boyle
Department of Philosophy
University of St. Thomas
3812 Montrose Blvd.
Houston, TX 77006

Executive Secretary and Treasurer

Dr. Joseph P. Scottino
President, Gannon University
Erie, PA 16541

Directors:

Mother Mary Assumpta, O.P.
St. Cecilia Convent
Eighth & Clay Streets
Nashville TN 37208

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

Dr. Anne Carson Daly
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556

Dr. James Hitchcock
Department of History
St. Louis University
St. Louis, MO 63103

Rev. Ronald Lawler, OFM, Cap.
Director, IASCD
St. John's University
Jamaica, NY 11439

Dr. William E. May
Catholic University of America
Department of Theology
Washington, D.C. 20064

Prof. Ralph McInerny
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556

Rev. Richard Roach, S.J.
Marquette University
Jesuit Residence
1404 W. Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53233

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

Rev. Thomas Weinandy, OFM, Cap.
10200 Battleridge Place
Gaithersburg, MD 20879

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

Dr. Robert V. Young
North Carolina State University
Box 8105
Raleigh, N.C. 27695

The Synod — A Summary

(Cont. from Pg. 1)

- The sources of Church life are spelled out in *Lumen Gentium*, *Dei Verbum*, and Paul VI's *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, all read (especially Scripture) within the living tradition of the Church. "The theological discussions of our day have sometimes occasioned confusion among the faithful," said the final report, which proposed a catechism as a guide for the world's bishops.
- Bishops are to correct liturgical abuses.
- The pluralism of opposed positions leads to destruction and loss of identity.
- Episcopal Conferences must serve the good of the entire Church and the inalienable responsibility of each bishop. Their theological status and their doctrinal authority must be studied further.
- In dealing with the Modern World (*Gaudium et Spes*) preaching should include the theology of the cross and the social doctrine of the Church, especially its "preferential option for the poor."
- The Church must defend and promote the fundamental and inalienable rights of the human person.

The third document was John Paul II's closing address, which took note of the "substantial unity" of the Synod.

- Emphasizing the Church as "the mystical Body of Christ," the pope underlined the Synod's call for a universal catechism, a study of the nature of episcopal conferences, and the publication of the Oriental Code of Canon Law.
- It will be the function of the Secretariat of the Synod to see that the Synod bears fruit.
- John Paul's closing words referred to Vatican II as "a witness concerning Christ, Word Incarnate, who died and has risen from the dead, concerning Christ in whom the Father has loved the world, concerning Christ who has revealed man to himself and his exalted vocation, outside of whom there is no salvation."

A Call to Action

A veteran on the Roman scene was heard remarking at the close of the Extraordinary Synod: "The documents will not be so important as what somebody does about them." That "somebody", of course, is John Paul II and the bishops who are in communion with him.

No one can be sure what the Holy Father had in mind when he called for a Synod. Dissenters feared he was about to dismantle Vatican II. (How that could happen is hard to conceive.) Followers of John Paul II hoped he would bring the real Vatican II out of the

closet. The Synod seems to have done precisely this. Henceforth, Vatican II will have to be understood as the Synod Fathers interpreted it in 1985.

The Council's distortions took many forms. Among the most widely disseminated distortions, those which have weakened the faith of many Catholics, the following are typical.

- "The vocation of the priesthood is not to save souls but to build up the community of Christ on earth."—To this the Synod replied in the name of Vatican II that the Church's vocation is to be the sign and instrument of holiness. The Church's character is eschatological. (*Lumen Gentium* Nos. 5 and 7)
- "The Catholic Church has abandoned her claim to be the one, unique church established by Christ."—To this the Synod replied in the name of Vatican II that the Church is Christ's body ever present in the midst of humanity. (*Lumen Gentium* Chapter I)
- "The Council created a horizontal Church—the people of God church—no longer the pyramid Church with bishops and popes at the pinnacle."—To this the Synod replied in the name of Vatican II that the pope is the 'subject of supreme and full power in the whole Church.' (*Lumen Gentium*, 22)
- "The Council's declaration on religious liberty legitimized the right of the faithful, especially theologians, to be selective in their obedience to Church doctrinal and moral norms."—To which the Synod in the name of Vatican II responded—that it is not licit to choose one document over another, to separate pastoral practice from doctrinal truth, to justify "fundamentally opposed positions." Indeed, Bishops are told correct abuses and protect the faithful from dangers to their faith.

La Repubblica, the journal of the anti-clerical Republican party in Rome, within a few days of the close of the Synod, interviewed Cardinal Oddi to discover that the Prefect of the Pope's Congregation of the Clergy, which supervises catechesis worldwide, reported that a "new catechism" had been in the works for five years. Actually, Cardinal Oddi does not have a catechism at all, but "an outline (schema) of Christian doctrine." Factually, it is a compilation of 160 propositions, each followed by dozens of references to the Scriptures, the Councils, etc. The dogmatic part is ready but only 40 of the 60 moral propositions were completed by the Synod's end. What the Pope will do with it remains to be seen. (Jesuit editor George W. Hunt was surprised that the Holy Spirit managed to work so fast. *America*, December 28)

The Synod — A Universal Catechism

It had rained in Rome ten straight days prior to my arrival there Friday morning November 22nd and would continue on and off right through the opening Synod mass, November 24, con-celebrated with John Paul II by Cardinals and Bishops and priest participants.

At the first press briefing in the *Sala Stampa* (Press Office) situated at the end of the *Via Della Conciliazione*, I was happy to meet a priest whom I hadn't seen in several years, who also had come to be present in Rome during the Synod. I had been told by a colleague of his that he had just come from a meeting of members of *Concilium* in Paris. He was of the opinion that what seemed to be at issue at the Synod was a move on the part of some circles, who had accepted a certain amount of ambiguity in the final drafts of the documents of Vatican II, twenty years ago, to remove the ambiguities to which they had originally agreed.

A little bell sounded in my head when I recalled that in the formulation of our own *National Catechetical Directory* between 1973-1977 that some ploy of ambiguity and a desire to satisfy all the various liberal and conservative currents of thought in the Church in the United States was operative in this major religious education enterprise. With one difference, however. By the time the Bishops voted on the final draft, they managed, by means of their amendments, to approve a document which realistically represented the Faith of Our Fathers!

A few days later in Rome, one can well imagine my surprise - as I read the excellent article by E. J. Dionne, Jr. on the subject of Cardinal Ratzinger in *The New York Times Magazine* for November 24, 1985 - when I came upon the following: "The appeal to literalism is only meant to obstruct or impede a reading of the Council Documents which is sensitive to their history" says Giuseppe Alberigo a Catholic Theologian, at Bologna's Institute for Religious Sciences.¹ Today's Conservatives, Mr. Alberigo argues, are seeking to use phrases inserted in compromise Council texts by yesterday's conservatives to win battles their side lost twenty years ago. I wondered if Mr. Alberigo had been at this same meeting in Paris with my priest friend of years gone by. Our young Times' reporter E. J. Dionne further observed, "If such an argument does take place, in however guarded terms, the Synod could have a profound effect on the history of the Church. Figuring out what Vatican II *really* meant, as the Pope has made clear, is a key to charting the Church's course into the third millennium."²

The first week of General Interventions went along as scheduled but with more complete details provided by the English speaking briefer, Father Diarmuid Martin, than normally appeared in the printed

bulletins a day later. Thus, Cardinal Law's intervention, in an early general congregation of the Synod, spoke of the problems of dissent and the need for clear identity in Catholic institutions of higher learning. Cardinal Baum's plea for a proper interpretation of *Dei Verbum* which would consider the limits of the historical-critical method in Scripture research, and present a correct understanding of Revelation and Inspiration, were in line with a number of other interventions from Cardinals and Bishops throughout the world who also were openly calling for a definition of terms consistent with the authentic interpretation of the Second Vatican Council.

But by Tuesday of the second week when the *Circuli Minores* (the language discussion groups) began to report out, a number of developments began to take place which, for the sake of brevity, can be described quite simply as the Tiber beginning to flow back into the Rhine. In addition, Bernard Cardinal Law would call for a Universal Catechism of the Second Vatican Council to deal with doctrine regarding Faith and Morals. By the end of the language group discussion reports, 8 out of the 9 groups would be echoing a similar appeal. On December 7th, during the Discourse of the Holy Father to the Synod, Pope John Paul II declared: "As to those valuable suggestions made in the Synod, I wish to extol in the first place 1) the desire of preparing a Catechism or Compendium of the whole of Catholic teaching, to which catechisms or compendia of particular Churches may be referred; which desire altogether responds to a genuine necessity of the Universal Church and particular Churches."³

Why Then a Catechism?

It is important to remember that a French Bishop, Jean Marie Lacoite, during the Second Vatican Council, spoke against the advisability of such a universal Catechism because of cultural and ethnic differences among nations. A General Catechetical Directory, which was to be the basis for the elaboration of catechisms and directories by local Churches, was considered to be the answer to these difficulties.

We might well ask ourselves why, the Universal Church having published a *General Catechetical Directory* (1971) and national hierarchies after having published their own directories, the Fathers of the Extraordinary Synod now in 1985 are calling for a Universal Catechism or Compendium of doctrine regarding Faith and Morals with approval of the Holy Father.

Had it not been for the Bishops of the United States who, by means of the amendments which they proposed, sought to remove ambiguity in the final draft of the National Catechetical Directory Book in

The Synod — A Universal Catechism

1977, this document might well have been a case in point. What follows is an analysis of a rather glaring and persistent case in point. It concerns *Pierres Vivantes* (Living Stones) intended by the French Hierarchy to be a "Collection of privileged documents of the faith."

In 1983, the Sacred Congregation For the Doctrine of the Faith presented its preliminary observations on a number of inaccuracies and ambiguities contained in this "texte de reference." A new edition was planned following upon deliberations by the French Bishops at Lourdes in October 1984. In a letter to the French Hierarchy in 1985, Cardinal Ratzinger indicated that the present intervention of his Congregation does not amount to a formal approval by the Holy See according to the provisions of Canon 778, paragraph 2 of the Code of Canon Law since *Pierres Vivantes* is not a Catechism.⁴ Cardinal Ratzinger then mentions the note attached to his letter to the French Hierarchy.

Bearing the Protocol number 277/67 of the Sacred Congregation For the Doctrine of the Faith, the note reads: "As in the preceding note of the S.C.D.F. annexed to the letter of July 14, 1983, the present observations on the new edition of *Pierres Vivantes* are in two parts: 1) *Changes demanded by the Congregation*; 2) *Suggestions proposed for improving the text.*"⁵

1 — Changes Demanded

In part one — it is demanded that an explanation of the notion of biblical inspiration be modified in a sense more in conformity with *Dei Verbum* — that is to say mentioning God as author in the first place and suppressing the expression "it can be said."

In the Vocabulary

p. 18 Original Sin — In conformity with Scripture, it is important to characterize the first sin as disobedience (to which the perfect obedience of Jesus stands in contrast). The original sin "originatum" is indicated in too vague a fashion. Certainly the first paragraph describes the human condition after the sin, but with an exaggerated expression and as for death which strikes everyone, it can then appear as a natural fact. The inclination to evil and to death would need to be mentioned precisely under R in order to describe original sin according to the teaching of Saint Paul and the Faith of the Churches.

Finally, among the words of cross-reference, there is place for putting "Baptism" and also "Mary" (to understand the Immaculate Conception).

Proposed Text

"From always, God loves us. God wishes to make us his children. He created man and woman good and destined them then to live forever in friendship with him. But from the beginning, tempted by Satan, they hadn't confided in God and, by disobeying him, they refused his friendship and covenant they wanted 'to be like gods.' Since we are marked, as wounded by this refusal, we are no longer born into the friendship of God, but inclined to evil and subject to death. This is what is called original sin (In the end)... we are saved. This deliverance from sin and this new birth as children of God are given to us in Baptism."

p. 38 — Justice — According to Scripture, we may not omit speaking of God's justice as retribution to each according to his good or bad deeds.

Proposed Text

"The Bible speaks to us of the justice of God who rewards the good and punishes the evil but it speaks to us also of God's justice in an altogether new sense."

p. 47 — The Pope — His role is expressed in too subdued a way.

Proposed Text

"He is the first of the Bishops. He has the responsibility for the entire Church throughout the world. He is the Pastor of all the Faithful. He teaches and sustains all his brethren in the faith and watches over the communion between the Diocesan Churches.

p. 56 — Grace — Mention also "actual" grace, the help of God when we need to do good and avoid evil.

p. 65 — The Covenant — In the Third Paragraph, it is important to express the conversion of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ and say, "Do this in memory of me" "Under the action of the Holy Spirit, the bread and wine become really the Body and Blood of Christ."

At the end of paragraph 4, suppress "By the action of the Holy Spirit, he is really present under the signs of bread and wine."

p. 67 — The Cross — The word obedience does not figure in the whole vocabulary, and is moreover a biblical term, designating a fundamental attitude first of all in Jesus. It is also necessary to express sacrifice of Jesus as offering of his life (Of Mark 10, 48) and therefore to say these lines 12-13: "By the offer-

The Synod — A Universal Catechism

ing his life through obedience and love, Jesus has reconciled us with the Father."

p. 110 — Churches — It is necessary to add to line 7, in conformity with *Lumen Gentium* n. 8 "This unique Church of Christ is found (or/subsists) in the Catholic Church directed by the Pope, successor of Peter, and by the Bishops united to him."

p. 113 — Memory — It is important to speak of the presence of Jesus in the Sacrament.

II — Suggestions For The Improvement Of The Book

In the first part

It is truly regrettable that the request of the *S.C.D.F.* for a presentation of Biblical texts according to the Order of the History of Salvation, welcomed in the Old Testament, has not been entirely so for the New Testament, and that the latter begins with the Kerygma without presenting, in the beginning, the texts on John the Baptist or even a complete account of the birth of Jesus.

It would be truly desirable that a title or a typographical device clearly indicate the transition between the Old and New Testament and the passage to the New Covenant.

It would be preferable to begin the Old Testament with the account of Creation in Genesis I.

p. 15. — According to Genesis, the sacrifice of Isaac is not an initiative of Abraham; it is demanded by God.

p. 20. — It is debatable to say that this account of Genesis I has been recorded in the 7th Century in a period of trouble and threats. Moreover the purpose of this passage cannot be reduced to the affirmation of God's faithfulness to His Covenant.

p. 72. — Isn't it possible to reproduce the same account of the Ascension according to Luke or Acts.

In the Vocabulary

p. 16 — Lord — The revelation of Jesus as Lord is complete in His Resurrection but it begins with the announcement to Mary and continues in the words and actions of Jesus up to the Cross.

p. 18 — Original Sin — This note should, by preference, be referred to the text of Genesis 2 rather than to the 10 Commandments.

p. 50 — Miracles — One would be able to mention the idea of divine "power" and say "it is a sign of God; it shows the power of God and his love for men."

p. 53 — Resurrection/Cure — "There were resurrections, but they resemble cures." Children are not going to understand that Lazarus or the son of the widow were not really dead.

p. 135 — Mary — What is proper to Mary, is not merely to trust in God, but according to the doctrine of the Church expressed in *Lumen Gentium* 53-63, her close and indissoluble bond with her Son and his mission.

It would seem quite apparent just from these two analyses that in the area of the teaching of matters of the Faith, the Catechism or Compendium is really necessary. In the light of ongoing dissent regarding questions having to do with morality, it would seem all the more necessary and urgent. What is at stake is the unity, identity and uniqueness of the Roman Catholic Church throughout the world. That uniqueness is to be found in the Church's difference from all other ecclesial bodies. Ambiguity in statements about her faith and moral practice will always be counter-productive to that unity, identity and uniqueness!

Fr. Michael Wrenn

N.Y. Archdiocesan Catechetical Institute

FOOTNOTES

1. E. J. Dionne, Jr. "The Pope's Guardian of Orthodoxy," *The New York Times Magazine*, November 24, 1985 page 168.

2. *Ibid.*

3. Pope John Paul II, *Discorso Del Santo Padre Al Sinodo*, 7 December 1985, (Latin Text) *Sala Stampa, Santa Sede, Vaticano*, pg. VI.

4. "Pierres Vivantes," in *L'Homme Nouveau*, Juillet-Aout 1985, page 8.

5. *Ibid.*

The Cardinals' Meeting

The College of Cardinals, 150 or so strong, met to discuss a proposed reorganization of the Roman Curia and Vatican finance. They did not have any final answers to the \$52,000,000 shortfall, although there was sentiment for better disclosure procedures, if Catholics worldwide were to be motivated to contribute more generously to the Papal economy. Curial reform does not interest many outside of those immediately concerned with proposals to consolidate or reassign functions. The so-called "reform" deals mostly with the redistribution of responsibilities among the various Roman offices e.g. shall the Congregation for Doctrine still be responsible for granting dispensations from priestly obligations? (Practically none are presently given.) Shall catechesis be moved from Clergy to Education? (Education seemingly has declined the offer.) The Cardinals sent the proposed draft with their suggestions back to the committee.

Bless Me Father For I Have Synod

Six hundred special press credentials were issued for the Second Extraordinary Synod and Archbishop Foley, Prefect of the Pontifical Commission for Social Communications, guessed that half these went to Americans. Since there are two hundred regular members of the Vatican press corps, this made for a crowd in the *Sala Stampa*. More reporters, in fact, than had covered Vatican II and if you laid them end to end Dorothy Parker would not have been a bit surprised. To have been numbered among this throng was not, then, the distinction one tried to make it seem but, for all that, it was instructive.

I was there as a representative of *Catholicism in Crisis*, not *The New Scholasticism*, but was not offended when the regular reporters regarded such interlopers as myself as, well, interlopers. Actually I found the secular press less alien than many in the Catholic press. It is not that the former snickered less than the latter when, for example, the Church was referred to as a mystery, but the quality of the ignorance or hostility or amazement seemed mitigating.

I wish to draw attention to two things. First, the make-up of the press corp that covered the Extraordinary Synod. Second, the phenomenon of press coverage of such ecclesial events.

It was difficult not to wonder what prompts a person to become a religious reporter. That is what most of these people, though not all, were: religious reporters. From news magazines, newspapers, wire services. There were columnists, straight but by-lined reporters, radio and TV interviewers. By and large, they were representing the secular media.

Now if such professionals were a bit disdainful of *aficionados* like myself, it occurred to one to wonder how they were regarded by others in their own profession. Sports, political news, movie reviewing, outer space, sure, but religious reporting? It did not take an effort of imagination to guess the professional status of the group.

The main reason for this can be found in the profile of the people in the media, of the "elite" studied a few years ago. To say that the center of gravity of the Third Estate makes it of the earth earthy is an understatement. As a class reporters espouse, in morals and general outlook, the viewpoint that has come to be called Secular Humanism. To such minds, religion has whatever residual importance it has to the degree that it supports the liberal agenda. Bultmanian at bottom, they would assume that all the talk of grace and mystery and miracle and the next world can be made to stand for something intelligible, i.e., secular.

Imagine yourself a member of the class that covers religious news. The workaday skepticism of the press as it covers secular news must be manifest in your manner. Briefings are concealings, handouts are coverups,

the real news is hidden. Ideally, you want to get hold of secret or unreleased documents, not merely for a scoop, but to expose and uncover the inner suspect workings of the centers of power. You made a preferential option for the little guy, the marginalized, anyone not at the top. In the case of the synod, this meant championing the bishops, as representatives of the people, against central authority, the Curia, the Pope.

The model is political, secular and adversarial. And God bless it. After three months in Argentina, where the government controls TV, I will happily put up with Sam Donaldson. The question arises as to what the press so understood is doing at an event like the Second Extraordinary Synod.

The problem is not the press's. To call a press conference and tell the assembled reporters that the Church is not to be regarded as a political entity involves a paradox. It is political entities that call press conferences. Why expect the press to react to this claim otherwise than as a plea for special treatment?

It will be said that the Fathers of the Synod wished to communicate with the faithful. Fine, but a major source of difficulties in the Church is that most Catholics, including the clergy, get most if not all, their Church news through the secular media. This is a distorting, hostile lens. The problem cannot be overcome by denials that the Church is merely a human society, and it is exacerbated by attempts to cozy up to the press—as a cloacal remark by a tough broad in reaction to Bishop Malone's attempt to be chummy in his conference made clear.

The solution to this problem is not to be found in the Catholic press as it now is. It is not simply that the *National Catholic Reporter*, represented by the ineffable Peter Hebblethwaite, and others, and old stalwarts like *Commonweal* and *America*, are all but indistinguishable in their hostility from their secular brethren, the diocesan weeklies seem little better. There are many disaffected believers and ex-clerics in the secular press corps, but to have an axe-grinder like Hebblethwaite covering Rome (from Oxford) for a purportedly Catholic publication is comic. It is serious, however, that those in control of diocesan papers seem for the most part in thrall to the very "spirit" of Vatican II the extraordinary synod was called to check.

The Synod Fathers advocated a more effective use of the media. Imagine what that sounds like to the surlier types in the *Sala Stampa*. I see here one more extremely difficult task for our bishops, and for Archbishop Foley. Communication with the faithful must be through trustworthy media—meaning that bishops are going to have to monitor more carefully their diocesan papers.

The NCR and its ilk will fade away at an even faster rate as time passes. Perhaps some of yesteryear's

(Con't on Page 8)

The Synod — From the Sidelines

The depth of the Catholic problem can be measured by the resentment of opinion-molders entrusted with important roles in the Catholic media. What should one think of the Jesuit editor who, hearing an official explanation of Cardinal Baum's schema on Catholic higher education, responds aloud: "Absurd?" Or, the diocesan editor, who during the Synod reacted to Rome's appointment of an auxiliary bishop to Seattle: "If JP II continues with that kind of thing, he'll ruin the Church." To which a veteran syndicated columnist added: "He (the future bishop) better not step out of line." The Jesuit editor of *America* even permitted his venom to spill over into print. Identifying the Vatican as the Church's Navy, George Hunt wondered aloud whether the Holy See (read JP II) is more concerned with "the security of the fleet or just the flagship." Hunt also concluded that during the Synod Ratzinger was "trampled to death." (*America*, December 14, 1985, p. 413)

Almost no one but the press spoke of the Synod in these terms. Kenneth Briggs of the *NY Times* solemnly declared a split among the Synod Bishops, which never took place. One Roman daily went so far as to say: "Ratzinger line triumphed." The British Broadcasting Corporation announced that the Synod "gave no comfort to reformers and liberals in the Church." Another Italian newspaper, *Il Messagero*, headlines the news, "People of God Church entombed."

However this is not how most Romans saw the Synod, perhaps because they do not look at the Church as just another institution, vulnerable to twists and turns decreed by elites. The Synod paid more attention to God than to man, an emphasis hardly likely to make headlines. Although the Synod's recognition of Catholic laity and especially of Catholic women, was clear enough, the editor's lust for women priests (the news story) was not satisfied.

When all is said and done why should Bishops trim Catholic policy to please the press? One columnist found it incredible that U.S. media men were so illiterate about the Church doctrines they were expected to report on. They would be barred from the Pentagon if they did not know the difference between a bullet and a bomb, but here they were in Rome covering a Catholic Synod without knowing the difference between a sacrament and a sacramental. But, then, many of these seculars, simply by reading leading Catholic journals, had been led to believe that the primitive Church was primitive, until Constantine came along, leading to Roman Imperialists, Emperor-Popes and ultimately to monarch bishops. The centerpiece of Christianity, Rome, therefore, had to be wrong—about its foundations (in Christ), about its

constitution (hierarchical), about its function (holiness here, salvation hereafter) and about its creed, code, and cult, which contained disagreeable absolutes, which must be eliminated.

So the questions remaining may be, not what to do with the secular press, but with Catholic opinion molders who have no intention of permitting the Church a fair hearing? How long, O Lord, do you dialogue with hostile priests and religious? And, what is the significance of the fact that the English-speaking bishops, of all the world's hierarchy, were the only bishops opposed to a universal catechism.

When all is said and done these may be the questions crying for immediate answers.

— George A. Kelly

Msgr. Philip Delhaye, Secretary of the *International Theological Commission*, was the only intervenor at the Extraordinary Synod, who thought important misconceptions derived from several things the Council did and did not do—overemphasis on the grandeur of mankind, a failure to include a section on the Church's moral teaching, and to develop the role of the priest in the Church.

(Con't from Page 7)

giants in the Catholic press will regain their souls. In the meantime, thank God for the unprejudiced reporters in the secular press (E.J. Dionne of the *New York Times* is an improvement over Ken Briggs now with, surprise, surprise, the *Reporter*. On the West Coast, Bob Di Veroli of the *San Diego Tribune* is a standout.) Thank God for the *National Catholic Register* and *Fidelity* and *Catholic Eye*. There is another one, too, a monthly, with a somewhat hysterical name, founded by Michael Novak and... But you know the one I mean.

—Ralph McInerney (Member of the Fellowship Board, Michael P. Grace Professor of Medieval Studies at the University of Notre Dame.)

Lenten Lecture — CUA

Fr. Kenneth Baker will lecture at Caldwell Hall of CUA on March 15th, 7:30 p.m., immediately following the Spring Meeting of the Fellowship's Board. His subject: *The Extraordinary Synod: Meaning and Direction*. Fr. Michael Wrenn and Prof. Ralph McInerney, who also attended the Synod, will be asked to react to Fr. Baker.

The Board meeting will discuss the 1986 and 1987 Conventions, local Fellowship Chapters, finances, the future of the *Newsletter*, Church relationships, etc.

The Extraordinary Synod: The Church, Mystery and Communion

During the 1985 Synod on the Second Vatican Council the Fathers, as might be expected, used many images to describe the Church. One heard the expressions: body of Christ, temple of God, people of God, and even family of God (especially from the Africans). But by far the most common expressions were that the Church is "mystery" and "communion." The image of the Church as "the people of God," common during Vatican II and enshrined as the title of chapter II of *Lumen Gentium*, was rarely used.

No one image can express the whole reality of the Church; many are required; they complement each other, since each one brings out a different aspect of the many-splendored reality which is the Church of Jesus Christ. There is no doubt that the image "people of God" has had great influence on ecclesiology and theology in general during the past twenty years; it brought out aspects of the Church which had been neglected for centuries. At the same time, a one-sided use of the expression tended to obscure the essential role of the hierarchy. Some have used the expression to portray the Church as a democracy, or worse, to describe it in marxist terms in support of the ideological "Popular Church" of Central America and elsewhere.

There was a noticeable tendency at the recent Synod to avoid using the image "people of God." Images of the Church manifest a certain ecclesiology. The preferred terms for the Church at the 1985 Synod were mystery and communion. This signals, it seems to me, a shift in ecclesiology on the part of the bishops representing all the episcopal conferences in the world. Let us consider what they said and what they meant. (All references are the "The Final Report" of the Synod, abbreviated as FR; see *Origins*, Dec. 19, 1985, Vol. 15, No. 27, pp. 444-450.)

The Mystery of the Church in Christ

A mystery is that which is hidden; it can be something that is not now known by human intelligence but basically knowable through research (like certain life processes), or something that is completely incomprehensible — something that cannot be known by human reason. In the latter category are the mysteries of the Trinity, Incarnation, and grace. So God Himself is mysterious. Since Jesus Christ is both God and man, He is mysterious; He is mystery. The Church, as St. Paul says, is the body of Christ. He is the Head, and those who are incorporated "in" Him through faith and baptism are the living members of His body, the Church. In a certain sense, the Church is the presence of Christ in history, past, present and future. Therefore, since Christ is mystery and since the Church is the presence of Christ in time and space, it follows that the Church is mystery.

The Church is not just an external institution. The Bishops at the Synod take responsibility for the fact that the young "consider the Church a pure institution." They then ask: "Have we not perhaps favored this opinion in them by speaking too much of the renewal of the Church's external structures and too little of God and of Christ?" (FR, I, 4). What the Bishops admitted in the Synod, therefore, is that there has been an overemphasis on "external structures" (synods, episcopal conferences, diocesan and parish councils, committees and commissions) and a neglect of proclaiming the Gospel of Jesus Christ. "The Church makes herself more credible if she speaks less of herself and ever more preaches Christ Crucified (cf. 1 Cor. 2:2) and witnesses with her own life" (FR, II, A,Z).

The Fathers then go on to say that "The whole importance of the Church derives from her connection with Christ... Jesus Christ is ever present in his Church and lives in her as risen... there are always present within the Church the mystery of the Cross and the mystery of the resurrection" (FR, II, A,3). From these statements, and from others like them, one detects a strong emphasis in this Synod on the *spiritual-mysterious* dimension of the Church, with a corresponding de-emphasis on the *socio-political* aspects. For this reason, I think the Synod signals shift in ecclesiology among the Bishops.

Because the Church is mystery, "she must be considered a sign and instrument of holiness" (FR, II, A,4). The Fathers then stress the call of all to holiness (cf. LG 5). "The Church must preserve and energetically promote the sense of penance, prayer, adoration, sacrifice, self-giving, charity and justice." (FR, II, A,4). They say that *popular devotion* "is very useful in nourishing the holiness of the people" and therefore "merits greater attention on the part of pastors" (*Ibid.*).

Speaking about themselves, the bishops say: "It is extremely necessary that the Pastors of the Church excel in the witness of holiness" (FR, II, A,5). This is followed by a brief exhortation to holiness on the part of priests, religious, laity, and married couples. Since the Bishops see the Church as mystery in Christ, they move immediately to the universal call to holiness. So we have four ideas closely linked together: Christ, mystery, Church, and holiness.

The Church as Communion in Christ

The Church was frequently referred to as "communion." The term of course is related to "Holy Communion" (Body and Blood of Christ), but in this context it means more than that. When the Church is called "mystery," it is the internal nature or structure

The Extraordinary Synod: The Church, Mystery and Communion

that is being considered. When the Church is called "communion," our attention is directed both to our union with God through divine grace and our union with one another since, being united in God, we are also thereby united with one another; in this sense the Church is "we"; we are together in the same divine reality so we are "communion" or "union with others."

The section in "The Final Report" that deals with the Church as communion is the longest in the document. The Fathers say in the first place that "The ecclesiology of communion is the central and fundamental idea of the Council's documents" (FR, II, C, 1). And what is communion? "Fundamentally it is a matter of communion with God through Jesus Christ, in the Holy Spirit. This communion is had in the Word of God and in the sacraments... The communion of the eucharistic Body of Christ signifies and produces, that is, builds up, the intimate communion of all the faithful in the Body of Christ which is the Church (1 Cor. 10:16)" (FR, II, C, 1).

The ecclesiology of communion is more than just a matter of external organization, or a question of powers — what belongs to the Pope, what to bishops, what to priests, and so forth. Since the Church is also a society with human persons as members, the ecclesiology of communion is the foundation for order in the Church, or, more properly, for the Sacrament of Orders; it also is the basis for the correct relationship between unity and pluriformity (or diversity).

One baptism and one eucharist signify and build up the unity and uniqueness of the Church. Hierarchical unity is guaranteed through mutual love of the Bishops with one another and their union with Peter, who is the center of unity given to us by Christ. Since the one Eucharist is celebrated in various places, "the unique and universal Church is truly present in all the particular Churches (CD 11)" (FR, II, C, 3). From this we derive the true theological principle of variety and pluriformity in unity, excluding all pluralism of fundamentally opposed positions. Here we find the theological basis of different rites and customs in the various particular Churches.

The Fathers also say that "The ecclesiology of communion provides the sacramental foundation of collegiality" (FR, II, C, 4). This means that, from a theological point of view, there is more to collegiality than its juridical codification. The Fathers make an important distinction between "collegial action in the strict sense" and "the collegial spirit." The former means the activity of the whole college, together with its head, the Pope, over the entire Church. This is found primarily in an ecumenical council such as Vatican II. From such collegiality the Bishops distinguish a number of partial realizations of collegiality, which are signs of the collegial spirit. In this category we

find the Synod of Bishops, episcopal conferences, the Roman Curia, "ad limina" visits to Rome. These actualizations of the *collegial spirit* "cannot be directly deduced from the theological principle of collegiality; but they are regulated by ecclesial law" (*Ibid.*). Therefore, there is no necessary connection between collegiality and episcopal conferences; this would seem to contradict those who claim that episcopal conferences have a theological basis in collegiality. What they do is manifest the "collegial spirit" as instruments of collective pastoral activity. Thus the Synod says: "The collegial spirit has a concrete application in the episcopal conferences the bishops of a nation or a territory jointly exercise their pastoral service (CD 38; CIC can. 447)" (FR, II, C, 5).

Since the Church is communion, the Bishops conclude that "there must be participation and co-responsibility at all of her levels" (*Ibid.*, 6). This regulates the relations between a bishop and his priests, and between the laity and clerics. One point that came out often at the Synod was the increased involvement of the laity in all aspects of Church life — and the Bishops welcomed it. Women are encouraged "to play a greater part in the various fields of the Church's apostolate," and pastors are encouraged to "accept and promote the collaboration of women in ecclesial activity" (*Ibid.*).

Finally, the Fathers say that the ecumenical consciousness and activity of the past twenty years are based on the ecclesiology of communion. Following their treatment of the Church as communion, they offer three suggestions to the Holy Father: 1) that the Code of Canon Law for the Oriental Church be completed as quickly as possible; 2) that the theological "status" and doctrinal authority of episcopal conferences be studied further; 3) that a study be made to examine whether or not the principle of subsidiarity (now applied to human society) can be applied to the Church, and if so, in what way (*Ibid.*, 8).

Because of its emphasis on the Church as "mystery" and "communion," the 1985 Synod on the Second Vatican Council may represent a turning point in the theology of the Church which has been dominant since 1965. Now the signs of the times are different. It seems to me that there was a psychological shift at the Synod away from intense concern about external structures and activity to a more interior, spiritual understanding of the Church as the mysterious presence of Christ in history — a presence that calls all to be saints. In time, this new understanding will work itself out in practical applications, such as the recommended universal catechism of doctrine and morals, the theological status of episcopal conferences, popular devotions, and emphasis on the call to holiness for all Christians.

— Kenneth Baker, S.J.

The Extraordinary Synod: A Reporter's Assessment

What happens next?

That's the question that faces the Catholic Church today in the wake of the recent extraordinary synod of bishops.

The bishops had their say. The pope had his say. And after nearly two weeks of talk, the most important thing they said was that the church needs a catechism or compendium of theology to state Catholic teachings clearly for all to see. This was nothing less than an acknowledgment that many Catholics today no longer know for certain what the Catholic Church teaches on a variety of doctrinal and moral matters.

This state of affairs cannot be blamed on Vatican II because Vatican II changed no doctrines.

It can be blamed on a false interpretation of the so-called "spirit," of the council by which theologians, seminary faculty, college professors and parochial school teachers felt justified in discarding traditional church teachings in favor of their own.

Implicitly, the bishops also acknowledged their own responsibility to see to it that what is taught in Catholic educational institutions is what the church says should be taught rather than what the theologians say should be taught.

Catholic college professors openly dissent from church teachings on contraception, abortion, divorce and pre-marital sex. Doubts are cast on Jesus' divinity and Resurrection. The supernatural elements in the Bible are explained away. Jesus walked on water? Never happened. Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead? Never happened. The Ten Plagues in Exodus? Israelite inventions, all having a "natural" explanation. The Tenth Plague, in fact, might have been the work of an Israeli terrorist band!

Lots of Catholics have lots of horror stories to tell. They can also cite chapter and verse why the new catechism is so desperately needed. But at this point it is not at all certain that such a catechism won't end up like Pope Paul VI's "Credo for the People of

God": largely ignored.

It is sometimes said that it's up to the laity to stiffen up church resolve. That may be true, but the plain fact is that Catholics — even those who recognize the crisis facing the church — are too passive to do anything about it.

The synod did other things besides call for the new catechism. For one, it ringingly endorsed Vatican II. It also dealt a blow to the democratic model of the church by repeatedly distinguishing between the church as a "communio" and a "mystery" and those social institutions which man can make and remake at will. You didn't hear much about the "people of God."

The synod gave short shrift to liberation theology. Episcopal conferences - a promise was made to study the matter further. But it's doubtful that the study will center on "greater authority" for the conferences.

Although the synod said women should have "a larger part in the various fields of the Apostolate of the Church," this is unlikely to dispose of an increasingly troublesome issue: feminism in the church. Much grief lies ahead for the church on this front.

Bernard F. Law of Boston was impressive. He corrected the notion that Cardinal Ratzinger was a "pessimist," describing him instead as a "realist" in his assessment of the crisis facing the church.

Law said the episcopal conference study would probably zero in on the role such conferences play, not on whether they might acquire even greater authority.

It was also Law who advanced the idea of a "universal catechism" for the entire church.

For those with eyes to see and ears to hear, a new star for the American hierarchy was born at the synod. Its name is Law.

— Robert D. Veroli
The Tribute (San Diego)

Items of Interest

- A little more than ten years ago Apostolic Delegate Jean Jadot requested American bishops to "follow more closely the teaching of theology in Catholic colleges and universities" and where necessary to establish an episcopal vicar for doctrine who would do this for them.

In this he was reinforcing a point Paul VI made clear to the Rector of the Catholic University of Louvain (September 13, 1975):

"Theology is not a private affair: what is not in the Church and for the Church is no longer theology. The theologian's responsibility lies with the 'communio ecclesiae'."

- "Scholars Put Jesus' Quotes to Test," ran the headline in the *St. Louis Post Dispatch*. Thirty bible scholars met at St. Meinrad's Seminary at last year's end to decide which sayings of the Sermon on the Mount belong to Jesus and which were the make-ups of the gospel writers. "Blessed were the peacemakers" was out, so were most of the "Woes." "The meek shall inherit the earth" received only 6 votes out of 30 cast. "Blessed are the poor" was resoundingly in. The organizers wanted biblical scholarship to reach the Church's mainline.

Ninth Convention — Fellowship of Catholic Scholars

September 26th, 27th, 28th, 1986
The Roosevelt
Madison Avenue at 45th Street
New York City, New York 10017
(212) 661-9600

Theme: The Spiritual Life of Catholics

Program Chairman
Fr. Kenneth Baker, S.J.

Friday, September 26th, 1986

- 1 p.m.-4 p.m. Registration — Promenade Suite (Mezzanine)
2 p.m. Meeting of the Board of Directors
4 p.m. *Spiritual Renewal and the Reform of Social Institutions*
Professors Christopher Wolfe (Marquette), Chairman
"Ratzinger and Liberation Theology" Brian Benestad
(Scranton) and John Guegen (Illinois State); "U.S.
Economic Pastoral" Carl Anderson (White House)
and Regis Factor (South Florida); "The Synod and
Social Teaching" (TBA) — Oval Room (Main Floor)
4 p.m. *Spirituality and the Catholic Literary Tradition: Percy,
Houselander, Newman*
Professors Carson and Maura Daly, Chairpersons —
Madison Room (Mezzanine)

Friday Evening

- 8 p.m. Keynote Address:
Trends in Catholic Spirituality Since Vatican II — Oval
Room
The Most Rev. Edward Egan, D.D., J.C.D., Vicar for
Education, Archdiocese of New York — Oval Room
9:30 p.m. Oval Room — Reception

Saturday Morning, September 27th, 1986

- 7 a.m. Concelebrated Mass — St. Patrick's Cathedral
(Lady Chapel)
9 a.m. *Spirituality and the Sacramental Life of the Church* —
Oval Room
Moderator: Rev. H. Vernon Sattler, C.S.S.R., Univer-
sity of Scranton
Presentation: Fr. Thomas Weinandy, OFM Cap.
Loyola College (Baltimore)
Discussant: Mother Assumpta Long, O.P.
Prioress General, Nashville Dominicans
11:00 Coffee Break
11:15 *Spiritual Direction in the Church* — Oval Room
Moderator: Professor Paul Vitz
New York University
Presentation: Fr. John Sheets, S.J.
Creighton University
Discussant: Fr. John McIvor
John Neumann Seminary
12:30 Lunch at will

Saturday Afternoon

Spiritual Life in the Family — Oval Room
Moderator: John Shea, M.D.

- Scarborough Centenary Hospital, Toronto
Presentation: Professor Rhonda Chervin
Loyola-Marymount College, L.A.
Discussant: Mr. Kevin Perrotta
Center for Pastoral Renewal, Ann Arbor
2:30 *Morality — The Basis of Spirituality* — Oval Room
Moderator: Sr. Miriam Paul Klaus, M.D.
National Planning Center, Washington, D.C.
Presentation: Professor John Haas
Josephinum Seminary, Columbus
Discussant: Professor Joseph Boyle
St. Thomas University, Houston
4:15 Coffee Break
4:30 *Spiritual Direction Through Catholic Education* — Co-
lonial Room - Main Floor)
Moderator: Fr. Brian Van Hove, S.J.
St. Francis Xavier Church, St. Louis
Presentation: Professor Jude Dougherty, Catholic
University of America
Discussant: Professor Joseph Schwartz
Marquette University

Saturday Evening

- 5:30 Reception — Colonial Room
6 p.m. Banquet — Cardinal Wright Award — Oval Room
8:30 *The Church's Spiritual Mission to the Poor* — Colonial
Room
Moderator: Professor Charles Dechert
Catholic University of America
Presentation: Fr. Bruce Ritter, OFM Conv.
Covenant House, New York City
Discussant: Fr. Francis Canavan, S.J.
Fordham University
10 p.m. Reception

Sunday Morning, September 28th, 1986

- Morning Prayers and Meditation* — Oval Room
Introduction: Sr. Theresa Catherine Shea, O.P.
Molloy College
Bishop Sean O'Malley, OFM Cap.
Bishop of the Virgin Islands
10:00 Mass — St. Patrick's Cathedral
John Cardinal O'Connor - Chief Celebrant
and Homilist
12:00 Lunch at will
1 p.m. Business Meeting — Oval Room
3 p.m. Closing

Special Notice

Formal invitations for Fellowship members to the 1986 Convention will be mailed later in the year. At the present time 130 members have already registered as a result of an advance registration effort. Anyone seeking further information at an early date may write to the *Newsletter Editor*.

Germain Grisez on Fundamentalism

[*Editor's Note:* In recent months the word "fundamentalism" has surfaced in several Catholic controversies. Customarily, fundamentalists are called bible Christians because they interpret the sacred books literally or strictly. Fundamentalists are mostly Protestants who claim or have no authority for their faith other than the Bible. It is not unusual for that word to be applied, also, to Catholics who believe it is objectively true that Mary was a real virgin, that Jesus actually founded the Church. The Spring 1985 issue of a new magazine called "Church" identifies fundamentalism with rigidity and conservatism. Says author Fr. Thomas O'Meara, O.P.: "The life of such a conservative is a lazy one in which thin beliefs and vague pieties replace theology. Those who welcome this new conservative are encouraging men with little maturity or talent for serving as priests in today's church." Fr. O'Meara, who has been substitute rector of Notre Dame's seminary, was supported in these views by Fr. Richard McBrien in his weekly diocesan newspaper column (November 5, 1985), which was introduced with the headline: "Rectors advised to diligently weed out fundamentalists in ranks since 'rigid people' have no value as pastoral ministers."

It is common knowledge that some major seminaries and religious communities are already weeding out candidates who manifest an interest in the Church's authentic teaching or in magisterium, that the Holy See is already conducting an investigation of U.S. seminaries with a view to rooting out inauthentic teaching. We have asked Dr. Grisez to answer the question: "What is fundamentalism?"

What follows here is an abridged version of chapter twenty, appendix two, of his *The Way of the Lord Jesus: Christian Moral Principles* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, \$35.00)

The quest for the understanding of the faith presupposes the acceptance of the truths of faith. One cannot undertake to understand what one believes unless one believes some propositions.

Although this position might seem self-evident, some today deny it. Noticing that faith is a personal relationship with God, they exclude from faith itself all propositional content. To the extent that faith pertains to the mind, they reduce it to a kind of experience of God, a preconceptual and extrapropositional religious sense. The propositions which the Church believes and hands on as truths of faith are, on this view, only symbols or inadequate representations, which never fully express faith itself.

Those who advocate a nonpropositional notion of faith should be asked several questions. First, precisely what is faith on this view, and how can one tell whether one has it or not? Second, can an individual refuse to believe? If so, how? Third, how can anyone communicate the faith? How can any group hold the same faith? Fourth, how can any proposition symbolize or express faith? Exactly what is the supposed relationship between faith and expression? Fifth, how can one tell whether one or another expression is more or less appropriate?

Careful reflection upon such questions will make it clear that, although Christian faith is much more than assent to a set of propositions, anything called "faith" which does not include propositional content will be something completely different from what is called "faith" in the Bible and in the whole of Catholic tradition. It is possible for a person, like Plato, to carry on dialectical inquiry without accepting many propositions as certainly true; indeed, Plato perhaps assumed as truths which could never be contradicted only the things which must be so if dialectical inquiry

is to be possible and worth carrying on. But usually those who engage in dialectic are not purely seekers of wisdom as Plato was; rather, they think that in some way they have ultimate truth.

Christians believe God has given humankind wisdom in the person of our Lord, Jesus Christ (see 1 Cor. 1.18-2.16); Catholics believe that truths which belong to this wisdom are present in the belief and teaching which come to us in the Church from the apostles (see DS 1501/738, 3006/1787; DV 7-10). Therefore, Catholic theology is a dialectical reflection which begins not only from the belief that the quest for wisdom is possible and worthwhile, but also from the belief that God has mercifully responded to humankind's quest for wisdom. In theology, every past linguistic expression is open to examination and improvement; every proposition which does not somehow pertain to faith is open to denial if it should turn out to be incompatible with a truth of faith; every truth of faith is open to development as the Church gradually grows in understanding of God's revelation in Jesus. But not every proposition is open to denial, for then the proposition that God has revealed himself would be open to denial, and one's inquiry would not be theological.

Similarly, in Catholic theology, the truths the Catholic Church proposes for belief cannot be denied. Some today, however, seem to reject certain truths of Catholic faith, yet say they do not deny what the Church believes, but only reinterpret it. What are we to make of this?

Certainly, more careful interpretation of the documents of faith can throw new light on old truths without contradicting them. But some people actually do deny the factual content of faith and continue to accept only certain general propositions entailed by

Germain Grisez on Fundamentalism

the Church's beliefs. They seem to feel a need to eliminate from faith everything which is factually unique, since the factually unique cannot be reduced to a phase in a rational system. For example, some writers say they reinterpret the doctrine of the resurrection of Jesus; they fail to affirm (or they even deny) that he is not dead now; they accept a general proposition, such as that Jesus plays a vital role in the religious lives of his followers, which is entailed by the traditional teaching; and they claim that their account of the role Jesus plays in the lives of his followers is a reinterpretation of the traditional doctrine of the resurrection—a reinterpretation which at last arrives at its true meaning, after nearly two thousand years of naive misunderstandings.

This procedure is deceptive. Catholic faith is not simply belief in a system of general propositions, but in the flesh and blood reality of the revelation of God in the Lord Jesus. We cling to the Word Incarnate, to the intactness of his mother's virginity, to the bloody reality of his death, to his fleshly risen life, to his bodily presence in the Eucharist, to the death-dealing effect of our first parents' sin, to the life-giving power of our Lord's risen body for our dead bodies, and to the confident hope that we shall embrace him in the flesh. Catholic faith is not afraid of what is too concrete to be intelligible. We kneel before matter: the Word made flesh.

Vatican I already condemns anyone who "says that as science progresses it is sometimes possible for dogmas that have been proposed by the Church to receive a different meaning from the one which the Church understood and understands" (DS 3043/1818). In a famous statement at the beginning of Vatican II, John XXIII calls for a suitable restatement of Catholic teaching. But he points out that this is only possible because "the deposit or the truths of faith, contained in our sacred teaching, are one thing, while the mode in which they are enunciated, keeping the same meaning and the same judgment, is another." By making this statement its own (see GS 62), Vatican II enhanced its importance.

However, this statement of Pope John's often has been mistranslated and misrepresented. He is making it clear that the propositional truths of faith are distinct from their linguistic expression. The phrase, "keeping the same meaning and the same judgment," usually is omitted by those who misinterpret this statement, because it would block the misinterpretation.

This phrase is a clear allusion to the classic statement of St. Vincent of Lerins (see FEF 2174) which Vatican I cites when it teaches that the "meaning of the sacred dogmas that has once been declared by holy Mother Church, must always be re-

tained; and there must never be any deviation from that meaning on the specious grounds of a more profound understanding" (DS 3020/1800; cf. 3043/1818). Plainly, John XXIII is not opening the door to a merely verbal fidelity which would give the Church's definitions of faith and her common, even if nondefinitive, ways of expressing her belief a meaning different from the one the Church understood when those expressions were used prior to the opening of Vatican II.

Anyone who claims only to reinterpret the Church's beliefs yet seems to deny any aspect of them should be asked: Is yours the only reinterpretation of this doctrine or are there possibly others? In any case in which the deceptive procedure is used, there can be plural stories, each of them inconsistent with the others. The next question is: By what standard is your reinterpretation to be judged better or worse than any alternative? If the answer is: By the standard of the witnesses of faith, interpreted as the Church understands them, then one is dealing with a legitimate theological effort. If the answer is: By the standard of modern science, or by the standard of credibility to the contemporary mind, or by the standard of relevance to current problems, or anything of this sort—anything except the witnesses of faith understood as the Church understands them—then one is dealing with something other than a legitimate theological effort.

Often enough, those who claim to reinterpret the Church's beliefs but really deny them fail to ask themselves the question about a standard; they offer no decision procedure for one who wishes to compare and critically evaluate so-called reinterpretations. In the absence of a decision procedure, reinterpretation is not science, not dialectic, not a disciplined form of inquiry at all. Rather, it is a form of storytelling, a poor kind of fiction.

—Germain Grisez

Teaching the Faith Selectively

One theology school on the West Coast responded to a challenge to its Catholicity by a prominent Catholic layman as follows:

"We don't teach anything against *Humanae Vitae* or *Familiaris Consortio*, even if we don't beat the drum for them with great gusto. This is our privilege as a Roman Catholic people freed from the law under the Holy Spirit. We lay no burden on our hearers' backs that neither our fathers nor we were able to bear, as we do when we teach anti-contraception doctrines promulgated in the face of dissent by those same people. We all must look forward to judgment day."

Second Draft of Bishops' Economic Pastoral

A Review by Professor Charles R. Dechert

It is clear that careful attention has been paid to critiques of the First Draft, released in November 1984. The more specific and focussed the critical comment had been — the more likely it was accepted. The revised draft is appreciably shorter, more clearly concerned with the moral and religious implications of economic activity, somewhat less tendentiously collectivist in orientation, far more cautious in its analysis and in its use of statistical and other "factual" data.

The Second Draft is divided into five Chapters. The first two are largely unexceptional statements of modern Catholic social teaching, and the last an exhortation to a change of heart. The third chapter "Selected Economic Issues" comprises about 40 percent of the text and, as before, the Drafting Committee's perspective, analysis and recommendations continue to be the focus of outside criticism. A fourth chapter recommends a move toward broader cooperative and consultative institutions at the national and international levels.

The American "liberal," that is Social Democratic, orientation of the Drafting Committee (and of the professional support staff responsible for responding to criticisms) remains clear, but the rhetoric that could be interpreted as a call for class warfare and a repudiation of the institutional bases of American affluence have been replaced by a more eirenic, communitarian, even populist rhetoric closer to the mainstream of modern Catholic social analysis. There is an increased emphasis on the human dimension of the economy, the need for limits (as opposed to "amassing as much as possible" p. 60) for social solidarity at the face-to-face and local community levels, for family, for enterprise on a modest scale widely diffused in society.

Interestingly enough, early criticism of the second draft by the American business community is focussing on the Bishops emphasis on economic *rights* and participation in economic decision-making. This seems odd at a time when U.S. business is beginning to recognize that Japan's competitive edge is in part due to worker motivation based on participation, and in adopting participative mechanisms like productivity committees. The Draft Letter's support of initiatives like worker ownership of plants acquired from large companies (e.g. Ford) and reorganized to make them globally competitive, in part through modified work rules, indicates an increased awareness of economic realities in America. On the other hand, the American Catholic Church's institutional support of organized labor, certainly justified in the heroic hundred year struggle for social justice in an industrial society, has

hardened into an uncritical support of labor unions, even in situations where their institutional power has been used to create an extremely highly paid industrial "labor elite" that is increasingly non-competitive, resulting in the "de-industrialization" of America as industrial products are imported and Americans ever more provide services rather than goods.

The Second Draft, even more strongly than the First, demonstrates an animus against military and defense spending. It reemphasizes its demand for "infrastructure" projects that can provide *public* employment to large numbers of unskilled and uneducated persons under controlled conditions.

Business-oriented critics see in the Letter's equation of economic and civil rights, coupled with a demand for "economic participation," a thinly disguised plea for a state-controlled economy that would lose its flexibility, efficiency and market responsiveness in the service of utopian goals. They deplore the Bishops' seeming acceptance of the American "liberal" thesis that men are the plastic products of social forces, that poverty, squalor, moral misery, family dissolution, disease, ignorance and incompetence are, by and large, somebody else's fault.

The American public at both the policy and popular level is now in the midst of a critical re-evaluation of America's experience with the Welfare State which the Bishops consider an overall success. There is a growing awareness of the increasing importance of the "Underground Economy"—a novel (for the U.S.) response to a tax/state-spending structure deemed inequitable, of staggering balance-of-trade deficits and of the non-competitiveness of some unionized industry. Most Americans are concerned about national security and a "correlation of forces" increasingly favoring the geopolitical pretensions of the U.S.S.R. None of these concerns finds resonance in the Bishops' statement. Quite the contrary. Many of the policies supported by the Bishops seem to reflect and justify past policies that have produced a social and moral malaise without precedent in America.

Some American Catholics are fearful that the valid content of Catholic Social Teaching will be lost in and confused with policy analysis and recommendations that reflect a commitment to positions on issues of defense, welfare, taxation, and ever-more intrusive government, that even the Democratic Party finds unappealing.

Perhaps the Bishops would be better advised to restrict themselves to general moral principles, encourage serious scholarship and policy analysis in America's Catholic universities and eschew the temptation to be political movers and shakers, while risking their credibility as moral leaders.

Books Received

- Mathew F. Murphy, *Betraying the Bishops: The Teaching of the U. S. Bishops*, (Ethics and Public Policy Center, D.C., 1030 15th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.)

Matthew Murphy, a member of the Fellowship, is also a Public Information Officer with the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. As a visiting Fellow with the American Enterprise Institute he developed the thesis that many of those responsible for teaching the Pastoral Letter of War and Peace are betraying the bishops' purpose in writing it. After detailing the process by which the "peace pastoral" came to be, he examines the material used by the USCC, the various dioceses, and the NCEA over eight chapters.

Fellowship members can obtain discounts for bulk orders. Mr. Murphy has a book which will raise interest and not a few hackles.

- P. J. Kavanagh, *A Chesterton Anthology*, (515 pp. \$16.95) Ignatius Press

Those old enough to be Chestertonians and those young enough to have been improperly educated in ignorance of "the great one" will appreciate these five dozen excerpts from G. K.'s disquisitions on poetry, literature, England, man, woman, philosophy, politics, the Church.

Fr. Fessio has made a valuable contribution to culture with this one.

- Henry Hyde, *For Every Idle Silence*, (Servant Publication, 135 pp.)

Congressman Hyde eloquently lays out his views on abortion, religious freedom, school prayer, and other conflicts between Church and State. The book demonstrates anew that Henry Hyde is an unusual politician, a devout Christian who bases his political views on Christianity and a sophisticated politician.

Seven chapters range from religion and politics, the U. S. Constitution, clergy and politics, ending with "Some Thoughts on Liberation Theology."

- Vlastislav J. Chalupa, *Catholic Politics, An Examination*, Regnery Gateway, Inc., 47 pp. \$2.00.

Catholic Politics, An Examination examines the Catholic Church's relationship to society and matters of the state. This essay not only addresses the special needs of Catholic laypersons, but readers of all faiths, who find themselves bewildered by a tolerance toward vice in American society. Chalupa articulates Church laypersons' need to stand against moral infringements by the State "into areas traditionally in her domain." In short, Chalupa introduces ideas and reforms for politics "that are in accordance with the Catholic faith."

In nine penetrating sections, Chalupa outlines political reforms which are both compatible and complementary to a Christian moral order. Highlighted issues include discussions on "State-Church Relationships," "The State," "Economy," "Population Policies & Ecology," and "International Relations."

Vlastislav J. Chalupa, a political refugee, has published *The Rise and Development of a Totalitarian State*.

- Humberto Belli, *Breaking Faith: The Sandinista Revolution and its Impact on Freedom and Christian Faith in Nicaragua*, (The Pueblo Institute, P.O. Box 520, Garden City, MI 48135, 271 pp., \$8.95, discounts available)

Mr. Belli's second book on Nicaragua is more compelling than his first. A one-time editorialist for *La Prensa*, and a supporter of social reform, the author puts together sixteen well developed chapters on Nicaragua's two decade struggle for freedom, the rise of Sandinismo power, with successive chapters dealing with the Soviet connection, state unionism, state press, managed economy, human rights, conflict with the Church, the Pope's visit, before and after. Richard John Neuhaus says: "North Americans must simply attend to Humberto Belli's argument."

- *Palladius: Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom* (translated by Robert T. Meyer - Newman Press, 249 pp., no price)

This volume is part of the *Ancient Christian Writers*' series initiated four decades ago by Fr. Johannes Quasten. Palladius was an eremite of the late fourth-early fifth century, a contemporary of St. Jerome, who went on to be consecrated a bishop by John Chrysostom, whose defender he became when the saint was deposed. His dialogue on Chrysostom is intended to clear his patron's name, to provide evidence in the record of what a true Christian bishop should be. Palladius was biased in favor of John, admittedly.

St. Paul Editions

- *The Roman Catechism: Translated and annotated in accord with Vatican II and Post-Conciliar Documents and the New Canon Law*, (586 pp. \$15.00)

Fr. Robert I. Bradley, S.J. and Msgr. Eugene Kevane, veteran leaders in the field of Catholic catechetics, have done yeoman service in retranslating from the Latin what is sometimes called "The Catechism of the Council of Trent," updating the language, adding suitable notes, and otherwise working with the St. Paul publishers to make this monumental source book available to contemporary catechetical leaders. Cardinal Ratzinger has called *The Roman Catechism* "a summa of Christian knowledge" and Cardinal Oddi who writes the foreword of the new edition said the book has special significance for family catechetics.

The volume has four parts—on the Creed, the Sacraments, the Commandments, and on prayer.

In a Church which has renewed interest in a new universal catechism, the contribution of Msgr. Kevane and Fr. Bradley will be appreciated.

Review Essay: Juan Segundo Responds

In November 1985, Uruguayan Jesuit, Juan Luis Segundo, published a book-length rebuttal¹ of an official document issued by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF) on August 6, 1984.² Segundo's frankly avowed purpose is to demonstrate that the CDF *Instruction* presupposes "a particular theology" which is neither that of the Church nor of the magisterium; nor is it, for that matter, reconcilable with "the theology of Vatican II." In fact, he maintains, it is out of kilter with Roman Catholic tradition; and its author, Cardinal Ratzinger, is lamentably ignorant about liberation theology. The stakes are high, for Segundo: "I understand that my theology (that is, my interpretation of Christian Faith) is false if the theology of the document is true—or if it is the only true one." The theology of the *Instruction* is doubly repellant for him because it was put together "not merely out of fear... A certain measure of malevolence was necessary." Further on, he also ascribes ignorance to Ratzinger.

The *Response* being a densely written book replete with intellectual turmoil, the most practical way of reviewing it is to explicate Segundo's basic theology in the *Response*. In Segundo's mind, the term salvation is usually reserved to mean the atonement that Christ by his life and sacrifice performed for the personal sins of each man and woman. But the term liberation covers that salvation secondarily; primarily, it covers socio-political liberation—a freeing from what Segundo calls "social sin," and which he trumpets as *the* sin effectively negated by Christ's action as savior of mankind. His thought would seem to be that there is no freeing from personal sin (i.e. no personal salvation) unless primarily there is a freeing from "social sin"—i.e. socio-economic liberation is the basis for salvation from personal sin.

The basic theological flaw in liberation theology, according to the CDF document, is that it is "reductionist" and "secularizing." In effect, the *Instruction* maintains, Christian salvation has always been and must always be understood as salvation from personal sin. For sin is a personal act. But Segundo's liberation theology understands Christian salvation as primarily socio-economic-political, and only secondarily personal. Segundo must deal with the reproach that liberation theology takes the sacred process of Christ's atonement for personal sin and "reduces" it to an essentially secular principle of action. For, if it does that, what then is the distinction between nature and grace? Did Christ die in order to sacralize the revolution and the nation state?

Segundo responds to this reproach in three steps. First, Latin American theologians like himself did not start from the abstract theorizing of traditional "Euro-

pean" theology. They started directly from the concrete *experience* by the Latin American people of oppression and slavery, and the people's spontaneous movements to liberate itself from this socio-economic and political injustice by whatever means—Marxist analysis of the class struggle, violent revolution, guerrilla warfare, the ballot-box—whatever. Second, he maintains that spontaneous movement of the people toward socio-economic-political liberation as well as the praxis of that liberation come from a supernatural urge, and are on the same plane as supernatural salvation. Third, how do we know that the liberation movement and its praxis are on a supernatural level? From the Second Council of Orange (Orange II)⁵ and from the teaching of Pope Paul VI, Segundo answers.⁶ Drawing on the theological studies of Leopold Malevez, S.J.⁷ and Karl Rahner, S.J.,⁸ Segundo quickly concludes that the Church regards as a preparation for the supernatural "everything that is good and true that is found among people who live according to their highest potential and in accord with their conscience." Segundo's quick conclusion: the liberation movement of Latin American people — and therefore the theology evolved by liberation theologians based on an analysis of the *shared praxis* of that socio-economic liberation movement — is supernatural, is the result of divine grace, is part of the road to sanctity. For who will deny that in liberating themselves the people are not living according to their "highest potential" and "in accord with their conscience"?

To bolster his argument Segundo refers to Pope Paul VI's statement: the Church, in Vatican II has definitively turned and adopted "the anthropocentric positions of modern culture," Segundo paraphrases and quotes Paul VI. Paul VI, Segundo concludes, returned to the Catholic religion its *instrumental* character. Religious faith, in Paul VI's optic, must be of practical use in establishing the anthropocentric positions of modern culture; religion, rightly understood, humanized the person. For our religion to be truly in accord with what Paul VI laid down, Segundo reasons, it must be *instrumental* in aiding "the anthropocentric positions of modern culture." Now, what position of modern culture is more anthropocentric and, at the same time, the follow-through of a definitely supernatural preparation and the beginning of true belief, than the self-liberating movement of the Latin American people and the theology based on their movement — liberation theology?

The *Instruction's* theology is wrong he says, because it separates and compartmentalizes the profane and the sacred, the natural and the supernatural, when it accuses liberation theologians of engaging in purely secular affairs and matters—the politics of revolution, and so on. In effect, the *Instruction's* theology is destructive of Vatican II's theology, deserts tradition as found in

Review Essay: Juan Segundo Responds

Orange II, and abandons the already supernatural movements of the people.

But, with this type of reasoning, Segundo has entered into a thicket of difficulties. Both Malevez and Rahner are almost boringly periphrastic and careful to point out that they are talking about the preparation for the beginning of *supernatural* belief, and not about anything consciously known or any physical and perceptible movement of body or mind. They must. For there is no way in God's world that Orange II's language can be brought to mean that a socio-economic movement—economic, social political or military in the means that it adopts—can be identified with what Orange II calls the *initium fidei*. The *initium fidei* is, first of all, a *spiritual* entity and supernatural in its *aim* according to Orange II. Secondly, its place of adhesion and of action is the soul. Thirdly, its proper effects are within the soul. Orange II was talking about supernatural salvation, i.e. the attainment of Heaven, by means of supernatural faith in God, in His Church, and in the Church's doctrines as a means toward that supernatural salvation. Neither Semi-Pelagians, nor Augustinians, nor Caesarius, nor Boniface II were thinking of socio-economic-political liberation movements then or at any time. The beginning of supernatural *faith* was their subject.

Segundo's use of Pope Paul VI's words amounts to a grave, self-serving distortion—one of the major distortions of Vatican II that has been skillfully used in the post-conciliar period. That Pontiff made his attitude quite clear in all his words: the Church will not baptize revolutionary movements—however justified—our socio-economic structures or political systems. All anthropocentric positions are the Church's interest because of redeemed man who is involved in those positions.

By now, it must become clear that Segundo espouses a theology which differs considerably from what would be readily recognized as the theology reflected in the documents of the papal magisterium for the last 400 years. Segundo, in fact, makes no bones about this: his theology *is* different, he says, and he describes it for us.

There has been in the past, he says "European" theology which contained "important elements common to the Christian faith" united with "elements proper to the context from which it emerged." Then there came a new theology "the theology of the Council (Vatican II)." That "European" theology united with "the theology of the Council" led him and his Latin American colleagues to "take new and often unexpected directions," and to develop a "post-conciliar North Atlantic theology:" liberation theology.⁹ It matters little to Segundo that Vatican II reaffirmed all that Vatican I and the Tridentine Council stated. How different this "post-conciliar North Atlantic theology" is from traditional Roman Catholic theology

can be gauged from its consequences in Segundo's reasoning. For it is shot through with a cunning ambiguity in the use of terms—theological and other.

You can see this in his use of the term magisterium. The *Instruction* is a document of the ordinary magisterium, therefore *fallible* and subject to error (emphasis is Segundo's); the function of the theologian is to mediate between the fallible formulae of the ordinary magisterium and the laity in order to detect the error in the ordinary magisterium and thus to find "the most human solution." This *Instruction* is Ratzinger's personal effusion as a "European" theologian. In fact, Segundo lauds Karl Rahner, S.J. as "the ideal judge of what is or is not in accord with the teachings of the Church's magisterium in the modern, post-conciliar period." Rahner has just been quoted by Segundo as guaranteeing the orthodoxy of Gustavo Gutierrez' liberation theology.

Here now finally is the theologian (Rahner, Gutierrez, or Segundo) mediating between the ordinary magisterium of Ratzinger (and presumably Pope John Paul II) and the very puzzled laity. And here also appears that very shadowy entity in Segundo's whole theology—"the Church's magisterium." The *Response* explains that this magisterium is not that of the Pope nor that of the bishops united with the Pope, nor of single bishops, but is to be found in the explanations and teachings of single theologians such as Segundo or Gutierrez who have had the inestimable liberation movements of Latin American peoples.

To "sin," Segundo ascribes a new primary meaning: social sin. Once he asserts that the primary liberation effected by Christ as the suffering, dying, and resurrected Savior of mankind is a liberation from socio-economic-political oppression, then it must follow that the primary sin overcome by that savior is a sin of the socio-economic-political order of human things. For Christ died specifically on account of sin. Segundo and his colleagues arrive therefore at that primary concept of "social sin:" "... the ruthless dog-eats-dog philosophy of capitalism." The System is the sinner—and all those who participate in the System partake in the System's sin. He derides the *Instruction* which states that "the full ambit of sin whose first effect is to introduce disorder into the relationship between God and man cannot be restricted to 'social sin.'" This theology of the *Instruction*, Segundo sneers, "is built on a kind of textbook Platonism," is a "particular new theology" containing "caricatures of some elements of liberation theology," and comes from a European (Cardinal Ratzinger) for whom "the 'really real' is the invisible world, while the world about us is mere shadow and simulacrum," and who "reads European phenomena and tendencies into a non-European context."

Review Essay: Juan Segundo Responds

"No one," he adds, "doubts that society is the 'subject' of social sin." The fact of this important theological matter is that the Church not merely doubts that society is the subject of social sin; the Church *denies* this, insisting that sin in its theological sense is a personal deviation of a personal will in man or woman. If ten million personal wills deviate in regard to one law—say, in procuring abortions, the Church says you have at least ten million personal sins, but not one collective or social sin. In no way can you speak theologically of one "social" sin for that ten million, unless you are speaking metaphorically. But Segundo is not speaking metaphorically. Nor is the Church.

He is speaking thus because he has unconsciously absorbed the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint of human society according to which human society is simplistically but lethally divided by the classic notion of class struggle into the "proletariat," one collectivity, which is sinned against by the other collectivity, the capitalist bourgeoisie. But Segundo's error here obviously depends on his antecedent notion of the relationship between nature and grace—his basic theological deviation.

Before he gets to his final goal—the Warning—Segundo proceeds to puzzle over, gnaw at, slice up, bother, suture together and tear apart, ridicule and minimize any one clear meaning for a whole series of concepts and terms. Marxism?—no one can really say what it is. Ideology?—this can be so many things that the *Instruction's* use is muddy. Orthodox?—it doesn't mean "true," whatever it means. Class struggle?—there's always been a class struggle, so what makes it such a typically Marxist concept? Poor?—of course it means economically poor when used by Christ or Vatican II; and proletariat can mean poor in spirit. Church?—this is "the People of God" who are Catholic and who are in the base communities and thus form "the popular Church," *the Church*.

Segundo's credo is rounded out with his concept of "the popular Church." The popular Church arose spontaneously among the people. It is made up of the base communities, all of whom are "ecclesial." If priests and bishops assume leadership roles in it, this is not a juridical relationship—just good leadership.

But, of course, all this is not very ingenuous on his part; and it simply flies in the face of known and widely published facts.

He cannot credibly present the base communities as spontaneous assemblies of simple Catholics discussing their problems prayerfully and peacefully, only rarely baking "workers' bread" or throwing a stone at a capitalist truck. The fact is that the base community network has been from the beginning and still is being deliberately established by instructed cadres imbued with the principles of Marxist-Leninist revolution.

Mustn't he know how much has been already publicized about the febrile activities of diocesan clergy—including bishops—of nuns and religious men (Carmelites, Franciscans, Jesuits, Maryknollers) in organizing the some 600,000 base communities throughout Latin America as political action committees and guerrilla fighter reservoirs? Mustn't he know of the role played by the religious clergy in doing the same in Sandinista Nicaragua? If Segundo wishes, one can even trace some of the "foreign" financing that certain base communities have received. The ribbon-trail always passes through Havana and over beyond the Iron Curtain.

Segundo, of course, does not quote his onetime papal idol, Paul VI, who spoke specifically about the base communities that "make up" the popular Church:¹⁰ "the followers of Christ are therefore not permitted to imagine that Christ's Church is nothing more than a collection (divided but still possessing a certain unity) of Churches and ecclesial communities."

So it will not do for Segundo to speak of the phenomenon of the popular Church and simply pass on. As a theologian, how does he judge it? Obviously, for him it is God-inspired and God-moved. What then of its submission to the successors of the apostles, the bishops, and to the ordinary magisterium of the Holy Father? Is the popular Church a new constituent part of the hierarchic Church? Has it teaching authority? If so, from whom? By what authority does each base community choose its own prayers, the type of "Mass" it accepts, the kind of bread and wine used for Consecration, the causes it supports, the priest who serves it? Theologically, one awaits in vain a judgment—or series of responsible judgements—from Segundo. None are forthcoming, for the simple reason that for a long time now Segundo, as is clear from his book, has no interest whatever in propagating the hierarchic Church of Roman Catholicism and its dogmatic teaching.

Clearly, from the entire context of his thought and these last few pages, Segundo believes in a "Church" magisterium that is not the exclusive domain of Pope or bishops. There is now since Vatican II the magisterium of "the popular Church," of "the People of God," under the impulse of the Holy Spirit. With that keystone in place, Segundo's view of what the Church is and does becomes clear. It is not the Church of the Council of Trent, of Vatican I or Vatican II. It is not the Church affirmed by the 1985 November-December Synod (which he feared so much). It is precisely what Paul VI, in *Mysterium Fidei*, denounced as impermissible: "a collection of churches and ecclesial communities." But it is also something more pernicious. It is a rogue "Church" stampeding hundreds of thousands of uneducated but faithful believers with un-Catholic doctrine and socio-political aims disguised as inspirations of the Holy Spirit.

Review Essay: Juan Segundo Responds

For the theologian, who reads the *Response*, there is a brittle quality to Segundo's theories, a sense that you are being asked to put together a jigsaw puzzle made from ice crystals; handling them, your fingers go cold on nothing cohesive. As a tract, Segundo's *Response*, in sum, will be seen as scarred and flawed. Ambiguity of words, disdain for the Supreme Pontiff, distrust for the CDF, ascription of base motives to his critics, tenuous theological grounding, selective and eclectic use of papal statements, theologically risqué aser-tions, and finally an arrogance knowing no bounds which impels him to take on the function reserved for the Supreme Pontiff or someone authorized by the Pontiff to speak to the Church Universal with the authority of Christ himself, and to warn the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church that the Pontiff and his CDF Prefect are endeavoring to foist on the Church a strange and peculiar doctrine, destructive of the Church's magisterium(!), contrary to papal teaching, rejected by the faith of "the People of God," out of step with "the new theology of Vatican II," and not in keeping with the action of the Holy Spirit. This is more than arrogance.

—Brendan Fitzmaurice

FOOTNOTES

1. *Theology and the Church: A Response to Cardinal Ratzinger and a Warning to the Whole Church* [hereafter: the *Response*]. A Seabury Book, Winston Press. Minneapolis, Chicago, New York. Translated by John Diercksmeier. Imprimatur by William N. Addley, S.J., Provincial of Upper Canada. Segundo composed his *Response* at Regis College, Toronto, in Addley's jurisdiction. Addley's imprimatur presupposes the imprimatur of Jesuit Father General, Piet Hans Kolvenbach. Segundo has already published several books on liberation theology, notably: *Open-Ended Theology*; *Grace and the Human Condition*; *Our Idea of God*; *The Sacraments Today: Evolution of Culpability*.

2. *Instruction on Certain Aspects of the "Theology of Liberation,"* [hereafter: the *Instruction*]. The Vatican translation into English was printed and sold in the U.S. by the Daughters of St. Paul, Boston MA. The *Instruction* signed by Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, Prefect of the CDF, carries the usual statement of Pope John Paul II's approval and command to publish the *Instruction*."

3. *Response*, p. 9

4. *Response*, p. 78

5. Convoked in 599 a.d. at Orange (then known as Arausio), in France, by Archbishop Caesarius of Arles, in order to decide definitively between the Semi-Pelagians (Cassian and Faustus of Riez) and the supporters of St. Augustine's teaching about grace. Orange II opted for a moderate Augustinianism. The Council's Canon and texts were confirmed by Pope Boniface II in a letter to Caesarius dated Jan. 25, 531 a.d., and the Canons of Orange II became normative and still remain so in the Church. Orange II, in Canon 5, lays down Church belief about the *initium fidei*. Canon 5 is really a masterful digest and brilliant summary

of St. Augustine's *De Praedestinatione Sanctorum*. Caesarius' feast day as a saint is on August 27.

6. Principally in his closing speech at Vatican II, on December 5, 1965.

7. Malevez's studies are to be found in his classnotes and in a 43-page article: *La Gratuité du Supernatural* in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, Juin-Juillet-Août 1953.

8. Rahner's chief contribution was in *Eine Antwort, Orientierung, Katholische Blätter für weltanschauliche Information*, Nr. 12/13, pp. 138-145; Zurich, June 30, 1950.

9. *Response*, pp. 74-75

10. *Mysterium Ecclesiae*, document published by the CDF with Pope Paul VI's approval and command, in June 1973.

Items of Interest

- Fellowship member Stephen Krason has launched *The Marian Institute for Advanced Studies*. This will be a Catholic Institute for Tutorial Graduate Study and Scholarship in the Humanities and Social Sciences. (21 Wellington Road, Upper Darby, PA 19082.) In many ways Krason's effort is unique because it will have no campus, while tutoring students toward the MA and Ph.D. under the direction of carefully selected and committed Catholic professors, it is modelled after some of the Medieval Universities and the present International College (LA).

- NYU's Professor Paul Vitz received surprising notice in *America* magazine (December 7, 1985) for a lecture he gave at the Princeton Club. What drew *America's* attention was Vitz's conclusion that the country's textbook writers and publishers who serve public education readily embargo religious subjects. None of the books he surveyed had any textual reference to actual religious beliefs and practices of the major Christian Churches and Judaism.

Translator/Publisher Wanted

An appeal has been made to the Fellowship to encourage the translation and publication of the following book: *Les Diaconesses: Essai Historique* by Aime George Martmort (CLU Edizione Liturgiche, Roma 00192 - Via Pompeo Magno 21-1982)

- Gloria Steinem, co-founder and editor of *Ms. Magazine* and Board member of the Ms. Foundation for Woman, the only national multi-issue grant-giving fund of its kind in the United States has joined the advisory committee of the Society for the Right to Die. The Society for the Right to Die was previously the Euthanasia Society of America. (Society for the Right to Die Newsletter, Spring, 1985)

Book Reviews

Michael Mott. *The Seven Mountains of Thomas Merton*. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1984, 690 pp., \$24.95)

Long before his sudden death in December, 1968, it had become a kind of standard response to Thomas Merton to remark on the ironic qualities of his life. Here was a man who left the world to seek solitude and anonymity in a Trappist monastery, and he ended up becoming perhaps one of the best known American Catholics in the 20th century. Here was a man who belonged to an order whose hallmark was silence, and he was anything but silent. Through his prolific writings, Merton talked almost non-stop from the late 1940's until the time of his death. We continue to hear his voice through posthumous publications, and apparently we will hear that voice saying new things for some time to come through manuscripts which will be published in the future. The recent biography of Merton, bearing the un felicitous title *The Seven Mountains of Thomas Merton*, tellingly brings home the fact that Merton's life was indeed paradoxical, and problematical as well. Thomas Merton had two essential selves. He was a monk. He was a writer. These two selves did not get along with one another.

This biography, sponsored by the Merton Legacy Trust, and touted as definitive, has been long awaited. It was begun shortly after Merton's death by John Howard Griffen, but unfortunately Mr. Griffen died before he was able to complete the work. The project was then reassigned to Michael Mott, a professor of English at Bowling Green University, and he brought it to completion very successfully. Given the mass of material Professor Mott had to contend with, his task could not have been an easy one, but he has given us a book which is well organized, well written, and filled with information which is always interesting if not always edifying. Toward the end of Merton's life things seem to have unraveled for him. In some respects he was a man seriously at odds with himself.

Had he lived, would Merton have remained a monk at Our Lady of Gethsemani? Would he have remained a member of the Cistercian Order? Given the restlessness that characterized the last years of his life, these are not simply rhetorical questions. The last few weeks of his life have about them for me an aura of unaccountable sadness. He was spending his time, most incongruously, flitting about the globe in jet planes, traveling alone, taking pictures and taking notes, and paying visits to an assortment of people and places; the importance of those visits, for Merton, for his Order, for the Church, is not self-evident. But apparently the primary purpose of this trip was to find

a place for a hermitage, the perfect place for the perfect hermitage. Was he attempting to realize an ideal beyond realization? Merton's writings reveal a man who seemed to be perennially beset by a kind of forelorn homelessness. Was he, perhaps, simply being driven to search out that which had evaded him all of his life — a place in which he could feel fully at home?

As I mentioned, this biography shows Merton's life to have been problematical. In this respect Merton's life was scarcely unique, of course, but nonetheless one can wonder if his life necessarily had to be as problematical as in fact it was. Could some of the problems which he confronted — problems which, I feel, had a profoundly disruptive influence on his life — have been avoided altogether? What I have in mind when I ask this question is Merton's writing. One of the most significant episodes in Merton's life, an episode to which none of the many people who have written on Merton have given the kind of attention it deserves, relates to his very early years as a monk when he was involved in an intense struggle with himself and with others over the matter of his writing. It makes an interesting point for meditation, especially in view of what Merton actually turned out to be, that when he first arrived at the monastery in December, 1941, he was determined to give up writing. His reasoning is revealing. Since the time he was an adolescent Merton had given serious thought to becoming a writer, and when he was a student at Columbia and, later, an instructor at St. Bonaventure's University, he made a concerted effort to establish himself as one. For about a four year period he wrote vigorously, producing fiction, poetry, and incidental pieces, mainly reviews. And then there was the journal; with Merton, there was always the journal. But in the aftermath of his conversion to Catholicism his attitude toward writing begins to change.

More particularly, he comes to see writing in a new light as he grows in the conviction that he has a priestly and religious vocation. At first, when he was thinking about joining the Franciscans his plans were to combine the writer's life with the religious life; in fact, one of the things that attracted him to the Franciscans was that they had apparently given him assurances that he could continue to pursue his writing career after he entered their order. Things changed dramatically when he decided to enter the Trappists, however. That decision constituted a second conversion of sorts. Though there is no question that his conversion to Catholicism represented *the* turning point in his life, still, in the months immediately following his entry into the Church, he was deeply unsatisfied with his life. He felt that he was making com-

Book Reviews

promises that he should not be making. The decision to join the Trappists signified a clean break with the world. There would now be no more compromising. He would give himself over to Christ completely, and all his energies would be devoted to the only thing that really mattered: the pursuit of perfection, the transformation of himself in Christ.

How did writing fit into this new plan of action? It didn't. Merton now regarded writing, not simply as a trivial pursuit, not simply as a possible distraction from his single-minded dedication to Christian perfection, but — and there is no mistaking his attitude in this — a downright impediment to sanctity. There is no good evidence that he was prepared to make generalizations about the matter, but it is abundantly clear how he interpreted his own case. Writing, for him, would be an obstacle to sanctity. Being a writer, in the only way he knew how to be a writer, and being a monk, in the only way he wanted to be a monk, were incompatible. This is what his instincts told him, and we have every right to suppose that they were his best instincts. When Merton was invested in the habit of the Cistercians of the Strict Observance he was committed to following his best instincts and to give up writing entirely, but he was subsequently persuaded to do otherwise.

He was not persuaded easily, however, and in fact it was some few years before he forsook completely, presumably, his original conviction that he should give up being a writer. This is another critical fact of his biography the full implications of which have yet to be fully explored. That Merton's desire to give up writing was not attributable to whimsy, that it cannot rightly be interpreted as an expression of strained piety on the part of an overly earnest young monk, is attested to by the length of time he maintained that desire, with ardor and tenacity, and in the face of what seems to have been united opposition on the part of his superiors. The situation was odd, to say the least. It was not a matter of Merton requesting his superiors for permission to write; rather, he was asking them for permission *not* to write. And they, for their part, were urging him to continue to write, telling him that writing was a proper component of his vocation. He tried to change their minds more than once, but to no avail. He even appealed directly to the Abbot General, but that too proved to be a fruitless gesture; the Abbot General simply confirmed what Merton's local superiors had already told him, that he was to consider writing as part of his monastic vocation. It was his duty to continue to write.

Merton succumbed, at first as an act of religious obedience. But eventually he succumbed in quite a different way. He became the consummate writer; he became a writer with a vengeance. Had this not been the case, unquestionably he would have been a dif-

ferent monk. But, had this not been the case, would he have been a better monk?

— D. Q. McInerney
College of St. Thomas, Minn.

The Christian Meaning of Human Sexuality by Paul Quay, S.J., Evanston, Ill.: A Credo House Book, 1985. v + 113 pp., \$6.95 paperback.

During the past decade and a half I have read scores of books and hundreds of articles on the subject of human sexuality, some atrocious, many banal, a few of exceptional value. Fr. Quay's book is definitely among the latter. In fact, it is one of the best books on human sexuality that I have had the opportunity to read.

It is a superb book not only because it is intelligent and realistic, rooted in a clearheaded appreciation for the dignity of human persons and for the previous goods of human sexuality, but also and above all because it is grounded in a profound faith in the truths about human persons and human sexuality set forth in divine revelation and proposed authoritatively by the Church.

Quay's work builds on the innate, natural symbolism of sexual coition. Sexual coition is a natural sign of the gift of a male-person to a female-person; it is a natural sign of the life-giving meaning of their one-flesh unity. It is a natural sign of their complementary sexuality, for in this act the male, because of his distinctive sexuality, gives himself to the woman and, in giving himself to her, receives her into himself, while the female, again because of her distinctive sexuality, receives the male and, in receiving him, gives herself to him. The act is a sign, a symbol, of their mutual self-giving. It is, moreover, a symbol of the life-giving character of their union, for in and through this act they open themselves to the gift of life, to the blessing of fertility (a theme of Pope John Paul II that is wonderfully captured by Quay).

The natural symbolism of the coital act, in which the complementary sexuality of male and female is so beautifully expressed, takes on, as Quay shows, an even deeper significance when we realize, in the light of God's revealing word, that it is a fitting sign of God's life-giving love for his people, of Christ's life-giving and redemptive love for his spouse, the Church.

The symbolism, the sacramental significance, of the coital act is, Quay shows, fully respected when this act is freely chosen by a man and a woman who have, through their own free and self-determining choice, made each other irreplaceable and nonsubstitutable spouses. In particular, when the man and woman who choose this act and respect its person-uniting and life-giving significance are already,

Book Reviews

through baptism, indissolubly united to Christ, it is a sign or symbol of Christ's indissoluble union with his Church. As such it is not only an act that is morally good, true to its symbolic significance, but holy, a sign of Christ's saving gift of himself to his Church.

As Quay shows, nonmarital and extramarital sex are falsehoods, lies that betray the symbolic significance of coital union. This meaning, Quay likewise shows, is not only falsified but aped and counterfeited by masturbatory, homosexual, and contracepted genital choices.

The fullness of being human is revealed to us in the mystery of Christ, who was himself a virgin and spoke to his disciples of those who become eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven, and in the mystery of his Mother, ever virgin. What this means is that virginity accepted as a response to the sovereign claims of God's kingdom is of transcendent significance for Christians, whether they be married or unmarried. Quay brilliantly develops this truth. Integrity, self-possession, is necessary if we are to be fully the beings we are meant to be and called to be in Christ. Such integrity is possible only if we have the virtue of chastity. Those who choose celibacy for the sake of the kingdom remind us of our vocation, which is a vocation to love, and to love as we have been and are loved in Christ. They freely accept celibacy, at the sacrifice of family life and the beautiful reality of marriage, in order to love more fully. But even Christians who do not choose celibacy must be integral, chaste. For them a 'situational' celibacy is required. Prior to marriage they must be celibate if they are to honor properly the precious goods of human sexuality and the human persons in whom these goods are meant to flourish. Even within marriage they must realize that marital love itself can at times require celibacy, when the genital embrace, far from being a sign of oblation marital love, is its betrayal (e.g., when a spouse is sick, absent, etc.). Self-possession, which is possible only if, through chastity, we come into possession of our sexual desires and do not let them take possession of us, is necessary for full human love and for fully reverencing the meaning of our sexuality. All this Quay develops in a vigorous, intellectually challenging, and faith-filled way.

This brief work is a magnificent and eloquent presentation of the Christian meaning of human sexuality, one grounded in a profound faith and respect for the great human goods toward which we are directed by our sexual nature. Quay's insightful descriptions of the complementarity of male and female, a complementarity that is psychological and spiritual as well as bodily, are exceptionally illuminating. It is evident that he has pondered the biblical teaching on human sexuality, that he has meditated deeply on the

magnificent "theology of the body" developed by Pope John Paul II, and that he knows whereof he speaks. His book, in my judgment, should be particularly appealing to young people who are seeking to discern the meaning of their sexuality; it will be of great value to married couples; and it should be read by all who want to minister, in the light of God's revelation as proposed by the Church, to the deepest needs of God's people.

— William E. May

Pennock, Michael. *Prayer and You: A Journey with the Lord*. Notre Dame, Indiana: Ave Maria Press, 1985.

Michael Pennock's textbook, *Prayer and You: A Journey with the Lord*, designed for high school students, is a thought-provoking and comprehensive presentation on Christian prayer. This book combines practical suggestions for ways of praying with a sensitive and deeply spiritual explanation of the importance of prayer in our lives. While much emphasis is placed on meditative and contemplative prayer, the importance of ritual and traditional prayer is clearly presented.

Mr. Pennock's use of developmental psychological techniques facilitates both the understanding and appreciation of the importance of God in our lives and the need to come to know Him through a conscious surrender to Him through prayer.

The teacher's manual presents clearly defined educational objectives for each lesson and many useful activities to reinforce the basic themes of each chapter. Lists of both bibliographic and audio-visual resources are also provided to enhance the teacher's understanding of the various aspects of prayer being studied.

— Janice D'Avignon

A Prayer for Catholic Scholars

O Lord of power and truth and love,
From whom all wisdom flows —
In whose eternal light man holds
Whatever truth he knows:
Sustain our work of scholarship;
Protect us from false pride;
Remind us that our feeble light
Must in your Word abide;
Remind us that the man of faith
Need not in darkness grope —
That Peter still confirms us
When we listen to the Pope.

— Owen Bennett, Ofm. conv.

Note: Fellowship Members

We are reminded that 1985-1986 dues — \$20.00 — are overdue in some cases. Since the costs of the *Newsletter* alone now totals \$4.00 per issue, it is important that one of our 1986 resolutions be "Pay the Fellowship" dues. Please send the appropriate amount to Dr. Joseph Scottino, Executive Secretary Treasurer, Gannon University, Erie, PA 16541.

Friend of the Fellowship

Bishop Lawrence P. Graves

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

Item of Interest

Harvard Plans for Millennium of Ukrainian Christianity (988-1988 A.D.)

One thousand years of Christianity in Ukraine will be commemorated in collaboration with the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute. Scholarly plans included republication of ancient Ukrainian writings, an encyclopedia of church history, and an international conference on the Christianization of Kiev-Rus. Moreover, funds for the chair in the-history of religious thought in Ukraine at the Harvard Divinity School are being raised. The Millennium Project is carried out under active advice of the Director of the Institute.

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

Special Item

For several weeks following the November Bishops' meeting, NC News devoted major space to the opposition within U.S. circles to Cardinal Baum's schema on Catholic higher education. The November 21 release cited opposition to Baum by episcopal leaders of the NCCB — without mentioning the intervention of Bishop Adam Maida (Green Bay) who said it is "a red herring to claim that Catholic colleges will lose \$500 million in federal funds because of this implementation" (of Baum's Schema). (Webster defines a R.H. as "something used to divert attention from the basic issue.") The basic issue, of course, is whether Catholic colleges are or want to be "really Catholic." Two weeks later NC News gave Fr. William Byron,

S.J., Fr. Theodore Hesburgh, CSC, and Fr. Charles Curran space not only to contest Rome but to mislead readers on the problem Rome is trying to correct. As those stories filtered through the diocesan press, multiplying their misinformation about the Baum schema, no effort was made to solicit statements from educators who believe Rome is absolutely right, if somewhat late.

Although the December 1985 issue of the Fellowship's *Newsletter*, which supported Cardinal Baum, goes to several offices of the USCC, which publishes NC News, no mention was made of the Fellowship's supportive position.