In September of 1971, a “joint assembly” of priests and Bishops met in Madrid to adopt guidelines on pastoral action. When they were finished, a week later, they had approved a gigantic document, divided into seven parts (ponencias — an untranslatable word which means both “theses” and “chapters”). Each part consisted of a long body of texts followed by 50 or so “propositions” or conclusions, each of which had been voted on separately. The finished document was held to be a milestone in Spanish Church history, and its approval by the full hierarchy of the national conference was thought to be a rubber stamp affair.

Then, however, Rome intervened. Somehow most of the document had found its way to Cardinal Wright’s Sacred Congregation for the Clergy, where its content produced dismay, and the dismay turned into the stinging text published here for the first time in English. This is the famous “Wright Intervention.”

The American reader will peruse this document with a growing sense of shock and recognition. Every error pointed out in the Spanish joint assembly proves to be commonplace, a cliche — something said so often and repeated so many places that no one is sure it is heresy any more — in the Church in America. It is almost as though the same mimeograph machine in the same basement were supplying copy both to the NPFC and to the Spanish assembly, so close is the ideological and even phraseological resemblance. In fact, the only difference is that in Spain this subtle perversion of the Faith is new.

But there is something else which the American reader will recognize. Cardinal Wright takes the Spanish document to task, inter alia, for (1) confusing natural and grace, and (2) revising the errors of the Synod of Pistoia, a nest of Jansenists. Now what American Catholic weekly does this sound like? We are too modest to say. But what American Catholic journalist and essayist (who is always talking about Jansenism) does this remind you of? No doubt, Mr. Clinton is too modest to say.

It is little short of providential that this Roman document — so outspoken, and so carefully researched by theologians for whose credentials Cardinal Wright’s congregation will vouch — should come into our hands in the Fall of 1972. For this is the season when our attention has turned to the proposed Bishops’ pastoral letter on education (entitled “To Teach, to Learn, a Jesuit Did”), to the “Church, World, Kingdom” series coming out of Detroit, and to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Priestly Life and Ministry, chaired by Archbishop Philip Hannan of New Orleans. (Not that there are not other curious documents and dubious goings-on which the Wright intervention will shed a new light upon — far from it. But these three are especially timely and urgent.)

The proposed pastoral letter on education, despite some good sections on teaching doctrine, really amounts to a benediction of everything the educationist-catechetical establishment has been doing for the past ten years. The fight to scrap this pastoral and replace it with a genuinely critical (or at least neutral) one is now about eight months old, but the Wright Intervention puts valuable new ammunition into the lands of the orthodox.

Speaking of a ferment in the Church, for example, the pastoral says, on page 15: “It would be a serious mistake to identify institutional forms with essential faith.” For a direct condemnation of this type of ambiguous, dangerous formula, cf. the Wright Intervention, part II, analysis of chapter three, number two. On page 37 the pastoral puts doctrinal orthodoxy and contemporary educational methodology on the same level of importance for successful Catholic education. Things of this sort are a gross symptom of Modernism and a falsehood of the supernatural according to the Wright Intervention (cf. part I, section A, and many other passages). On pages 35, 49, and elsewhere, the pastoral calls precisely for the suffocating sort of “total planning” which Cardinal Wright rejects in strong terms (cf. part I, section D, and elsewhere). A dozen more examples could easily be adduced.

Totalitarian “planification” (a continental European word which has more precisely bureaucratic overtones than our plain English “planning”) is also the key feature of the Hannan Ad Hoc Committee Report, with its threat to subject every priest in America to an endless round of self-evaluation studies, tests, and meetings. The report even goes so far as to suggest “evaluation” procedures for Bishops, whose authority it compromises in many other ways as well (see report elsewhere in this issue).

And as far as the “Church, World, Kingdom” series is concerned, well: let us say only that there is not a single error denounced by the Wright Intervention which is not somewhere to be found in the CWK documents. Not one.

These observations, the translator trusts, will whet the reader’s appetite to study the Wright document from beginning to end. This is something we shall be talking about for years to come.

W.H. MARSHNER

Document Of The Sacred Congregation For The Clergy
In Reply To The Conclusions
And Chapters (Theses) Approved By The General Assembly
Of Bishops And Priests Held In Spain, September 13th-18th, 1971

Complete text translated from the Spanish by W.H. Marshner

OVERALL ANALYSIS

1. The totality of the conclusions and chapters (theses) shows that a large-scale effort was made in trying to confront the principal questions that bear upon the nature and ministry of the hierarchical priesthood, with particular reference to present-day pastoral needs in Spain.

2. In general, the propositions approved by the Assembly cannot be considered in isolation from their respective chapters, since in these latter the true sense of the diverse propositions is made clear — propositions which have been formulated at times in an imprecise and ambiguous way.

3. Perhaps it was because of the breadth of the themes dealt with and the short time devoted to studying them — although the remote preparation was much more careful — that the whole of these documents turned out to be quite ill-digested, both in content and expression.

4. In going through the various documents, one can find propositions and considerations that are very positive, motivated by a noble pastoral concern, and well founded. Among these prevailing interests are those which refer to the unity of the clergy and the faithful with Christ through the Eucharist, the necessity of prayer, the need for self-denial and full dedication in order to exercise the priestly ministry properly, etc.

5. Nevertheless, there are orientations and basic positions scattered in all the chapters which elicit grave doctrinal and disciplinary reservations. Only if these controlling ideas are well interpreted in the light of the perennial Magisterium of the Church can the totality of the documents of the Assembly be considered a suitable matter for study and application.

These incorrect, or in various cases clearly erroneous, fundamental ideas and basic positions, which affect in good measure all the documents, can be summarized in the following points:

A. The content of the supernatural Revelation which is transmitted through the Sacred Scriptures and the tradition of the Church and is infallibly taught by the Magisterium, is continually put on the same level with the “signs of the times,” for purposes of discovering the truth of the faith and the manifestation of the salvific will of God.

B. The demands of the modern world upon the Church and the ideology of the modern world, “the Church, World, Kingdom” series coming out of Detroit, and to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Priestly Life and Ministry, chaired by Archbishop Philip Hannan of New Orleans. (Not that there are not other curious documents and dubious goings-on which the Wright intervention will shed a new light upon — far from it. But these three are especially timely and urgent.)

The proposed pastoral letter on education, despite some good sections on teaching doctrine, really amounts to a benediction of everything the educationist-catechetical establishment has been doing for the past ten years. The fight to scrap this pastoral and replace it with a genuinely critical (or at least neutral) one is now about eight months old, but the Wright Intervention puts valuable new ammunition into the lands of the orthodox.

Speaking of a ferment in the Church, for example, the pastoral says, on page 15: “It would be a serious mistake to identify institutional forms with essential faith.” For a direct condemnation of this type of ambiguous, dangerous formula, cf. the Wright Intervention, part II, analysis of chapter three, number two. On page 37 the pastoral puts doctrinal orthodoxy and contemporary educational methodology on the same level of importance for successful Catholic education. Things of this sort are a gross symptom of Modernism and a falsehood of the supernatural according to the Wright Intervention (cf. part I, section A, and many other passages). On pages 35, 49, and elsewhere, the pastoral calls precisely for the suffocating sort of “total planning” which Cardinal Wright rejects in strong terms (cf. part I, section D, and elsewhere). A dozen more examples could easily be adduced.

Totalitarian “planification” (a continental European word which has more precisely bureaucratic overtones than our plain English “planning”) is also the key feature of the Hannan Ad Hoc Committee Report, with its threat to subject every priest in America to an endless round of self-evaluation studies, tests, and meetings. The report even goes so far as to suggest “evaluation” procedures for Bishops, whose authority it compromises in many other ways as well (see report elsewhere in this issue).

And as far as the “Church, World, Kingdom” series is concerned, well: let us say only that there is not a single error denounced by the Wright Intervention which is not somewhere to be found in the CWK documents. Not one.

These observations, the translator trusts, will whet the reader’s appetite to study the Wright document from beginning to end. This is something we shall be talking about for years to come.

W.H. MARSHNER
Magisterium of the Church are frequently supplanted and always conditioned by the hypotheses, theories and data; in short, by a whole philosophy of religion, psychology, disciplines which, for that matter, are understood and applied here with an obvious dilletantism. In fact, it seems that the term "modern world" one continually wants to understand a determined Wattersonian tendency or characteristic of the philosophical currents of the last century and which by penetrating into the sphere of Catholic theology would give the Church into a socio-political action which conditions the realisation of the political-economic liberation is postulated as a universal, irreversible, necessary, and justified end. This vision of the world is surprisingly accorded a universal, irreversible, necessary, and justified end.

II

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE CHAPTERS

Chapter I

(Catholic Church in the Spanish World) - p. 1, par. 4: "The voice of God reaches us not only from the pages of the Gospel but also through the signs of the times." This ambiguous balancing, which can justify anything, is a constant element. See, for instance, the whole of the Chapter III, especially the last paragraph, which is fundamentally affirmed of taking from traditional Catholicism and from "modern thought the good which both have and of abandoning the other aims beside material well-being: one gets the impression of the Church into a socio-political action which conditions the realisation of the political-economic liberation is postulated as a universal, irreversible, necessary, and justified end. This vision of the world is surprisingly accorded a universal, irreversible, necessary, and justified end.

3. From a very formal point of view, there is an attempt to "invade" the Catechism (as a proof of posteriority, with arguments ex magistri). This is done by putting together a sort of mosaic of texts from the Constitution Gaudium et Spes (on the Church in the Modern World), from the encyclicals Pacem in Terris and Populorum Progressio (on political-economic liberation), etc., and texts, put one after another, outside of their proper context - from which they receive their sense and meaning - on the program, in favor of which are adduced the well-known Gospel texts which have been abused for this purpose for some years. The primary which is constantly attributed to this "liberation" brings with it a collectivist conception of the rights and duties of the Church in the modern world, a whole philosophy of a kind of "liberation" which is seen as a historical necessity for a greater recognition and a practical realiza-

4. A strong basic argument is taken from sociology, by means of statistics, investigations, etc. (almost always taken from "modern" or "progressive" Harvard, etc.), which are heaped up for purposes of "prophetic denunciation of injustices," faults, defects, etc., of the strictly economic order. It is such an argument - though it is a marginal argument - that on the one hand, there is nothing but talk of economic questions, of material means, of political power, and not precisely basic necessities: automobiles, televisions, washing machines, refrigerators, etc.) and, on the other hand, that the Church's mission is to advocate the needs of the Spanish people, that she must be the "critical conscience of the world," the "supreme good" and of the Church as such - in her doctrine and in her life - to this new situation, to this new situation, to this new situation, to this new situation.

5. Another presupposition by which a pretense is made of justifying such a deformation of the nature and ends of the Church, of the Christian faith, of the ministerial priesthood, etc., is the very characteristic of modernism and neo-modernism: the "radical change" of the modern world, a change which is considered as an absolute, univocal and irreversible value. From this idea an alternative view is developed, in which the Church, as such, is, not in her doctrine and in her life - to this new situation, to this new situation, to this new situation, to this new situation.

6. Continually demanded - with all kinds of motives, including those which are apparently supernatural and natural, among them the idea of the Church in the modern world, the established order, from the temporal power, etc., while equally continually there is proposed - as a prin-

7. Also patent in this Chapter I, in a special way, is the tenden-

8. The development of the human sciences has been breaking up the infrastructures of the sociological, economic, and psychological orders on which many bases their beliefs. Thus religion has come to be exposed, without human props, and to see itself as obliged to specify with exactitude wherein its decisive orientations that we have been mentioning crop up, the motivations, of moral decisions, and through elucidation of justifying such a deformation of the nature and ends of the Church, of the Christian faith, of the ministerial priesthood, etc., is the very characteristic of modernism and neo-modernism: the "radical change" of the modern world, a change which is considered as an absolute, univocal and irreversible value. From this idea an alternative view is developed, in which the Church, as such, is, not in her doctrine and in her life - to this new situation, to this new situation, to this new situation, to this new situation.
Marist social forces, and by "historic movements of liberation of the Communist states, Marist-inspired subversive movements, etc. — Examples could be multiplied from the text of the chapter and its attendant documentation.

In the approved propositions:

Proposition 1. We find unacceptable the affirmation according to which "the spirit of God" diffuses through the transformation (secularizing and socializing) of the world. One cannot overlook the fact that a good part of the phenomena mentioned tend essentially to be contrary to Christian faith and morals.

Proposition 7. The factors which are enumerated as proper to "Catholicism in Spain" lead to a genuine perpetuation of the Spanish people's possession of a pure religiosity, as a positive factor, and say immediately thereafter that it is an "official and socio-cultural" religiosity. Similarly, at one and the same time the text intends to give to this proposition a clear and unacceptable: as "integralism" and as an inversion of ends.

Proposition 29. There is no way of calculating the force which this proposition could have, since it would amount in practice to turning the priest into a political leader (cf. also Proposition 58).

Proposition 53. This interpretation could be taken as confirmation to the teaching of the Gospel (c.f. Matt. 20.28) and the Church, as a denominational condemnation of a centuries-old practice which rests on sociological foundations. (See also Page 50 par. 1, ch. 1.)

Although the text proceeded with greater caution in the formulation of the propositions, here also examples of dangerous ambiguities could be multiplied.

8. Therefore chapter I, and its respective propositions, are unacceptable and cannot constitute valid material for further work. Moreover, the theme which it treats is superfluous for the study of questions relating to priestly ministry, which was the immediate object of the Assembly; it is precisely the presence of this theme, treated with the criteria specified above and placed at the beginning of the book, that seems to have been the cause of the various deformed aspects which are encountered in the subsequent chapters.

Chapter II
(Priestly Ministry and the Forms by which it is Lived in the Church)

1. The approved propositions as well as the text of the chapter itself offer an imprecise document much less elaborated and purposeful, which must be revised. The recent Synod of Bishops. This is understandable and does not preclude recognition of the noteworthy diligence exercised by the commission which worked on this chapter.

2. The presupposition which determines the entire orientation and content of Chapter I are encountered again in the second chapter and in its propositions. There are formulations, at best ambiguous, which seem to maintain that the mission of the Church begins with the presentation of the Mystical Body of Christ, of which the Church is the immediate object of the Assembly; it is precisely the presence of this theme, treated with the criteria specified above and placed at the beginning of the book, that seems to have been the cause of the various deformed aspects which are encountered in the subsequent chapters.

Chapter III
(Criteria and Channels of the Church's Pastoral Action)

1. One notes in this thesis-chapter a noble concern to promote pastoral action and to make all the faithful sense of responsibility to fulfill their own respective parts in the mission of the Church. Prerequisites also is the concern that organizations should not suffice that Christian life but rather foster it and the care taken to manifest in the text and propositions of this thesis-chapter.

2. However, there is a basic fault which is especially manifest in the text of the chapter, but which also concerns the tenor and content of the propositions. This fault arises from the principle that "An instrumental, contingent, provisional character is commensurate with the pastoral structures of the Church" (III, c.2.3.), without clarifying more correctly what is meant by the term "instrumental". For purposes, and therefore of these categories and conclusions native to present-day developments, one can point out here some very equivocal points which have been the cause of the various deformed aspects which are encountered in the subsequent chapters.

3. The priory ministry is continually presented as a secondary role with respect to the need to adapt to the supernumerary dimensions — "The end therefore which priests pursue in their ministry and in the exercise of their pastoral action is "the Father in Christ." (Decree on Priestly Life and Ministry, n. 2) — in its diverse aspects: liturgical, pastoral, etc.; there is little concern asserted, on the contrary, for a tendency to assume categories and conclusions native to present-day secularizing currents of thought.

4. Certain reservations are also called for by the demonstration which implies the need to present the exercise of the priestly ministry with the bishop in a particular community (cf. Proposition 22). The necessary distinctions are not made, and this demand could easily be understood as an arbitrary limitation of the authority of the bishop: "This power which the bishops personally exercise in the name of Christ and of the Church in the "immediacy" (Constitution on the Church, n. 27). The power of the bishop in his own diocese is proper and ordinary, inherent in the munus /office/ and consequently in the person who exercises it; and it is also immediate: it can reach out to all the faithful committed to his pastoral care without the necessity of intermediaries. The bishops exercise such a power personally in the name of Christ and not as members of a governing collegial group presided over by them.

5. In this, as in the other chapters one notices a very imprecise theological and juridical terminology which avoids terms already consecrated in the usage of the Magisterium, such as "ablogous". At times, this ambiguity gives rise to obvious doctrinal difficulties; so, for example, when it is said that "That which is proper to the ministerial body is specific for purposes of celebrating the Sacraments. Priests in fact, that as sign of unity in the community, he convokes and presides over the eucharistic assembly, and makes present "the Body of Christ in the Church" (Proposition 8). One may recall, with respect to these points, the doctrinal precisions made by the Magisterium; c.f. Paul VI, Pastoris Dedit, 160, 502, Constitution on the Church, n. 10; Decree on Priestly Life and Ministry, n. 2, 5, etc.

6. Concerning the reference made to the opportuneness of reforms made in the face of new world, man, and events. (Proposition 41), it suffices to bear in mind that this has been rejected at the recent Synod of Bishops.

7. In conclusion, it would seem advisable that study for "in order to promote the laity" and "avoid dispersion of efforts" (6.0); and "first of all, appropriate calculation of resources necessary to reach the desired end" (6.3.1); a "sifting of existing organizations" is called for "in order to promote the laity" and "avoid dispersal of efforts" (6.0.1); there is a demand for "organization of the People of God."

Chapter IV
(Interpersonal Relations in the Ecclesial Community)

1. Love is put as the basis of interpersonal relations in the ecclesial community — the theme of the chapter — and questions are handled concerning such relations between bishops and priests among priests, and between clergy and other believers. The chapter contains very opportune statements about charity, the fraternal spirit which ought to reign in all these relations, and about some ways of fostering this mutual charity.

2. Besides the ambiguities common to all the chapters, one can point out here some very equivocal points which must be put to question. Those who wish to reign in all these relations, and about some ways of fostering this mutual charity.

Chapter V
(Pastoral Action in the Church)

1. Love is put as the basis of interpersonal relations in the ecclesial community — the theme of the chapter — and questions are handled concerning such relations between bishops and priests among priests, and between clergy and other believers. The chapter contains very opportune statements about charity, the fraternal spirit which ought to reign in all these relations, and about some ways of fostering this mutual charity.

2. Besides the ambiguities common to all the chapters, one can point out here some very equivocal points which must be put to question. Those who wish to reign in all these relations, and about some ways of fostering this mutual charity.

3. The entire chapter as well as the propositions belonging to it should be attentively revised to avoid...
Chapter V

The text of this chapter and the respective propositions have not reached the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy. Thus, its content is unknown, as is the value of its conclusions.

Chapter VI

(Devotional Demands on the Mission of the Priest in the Church of Today)

1. In this chapter, the subject is the "devotional exigencies of the priest's mission in the Church and in the world of today." There is insistence on the need to follow Christ, the life of faith, hope, and charity, and the need for sanctification. Of all the chapters, this one is probably the safest, the most correct from both a doctrinal and a practical point of view. Even so, some observations are necessary.

2. First of all, in the study of the propositions, it is necessary to keep in mind what the Synodal document on ministerial priesthood had to say about this theme (cf. De sacerdotio ministeriali, par. II., n. 3). Furthermore, in propositions 34-37, one would have to integrate more completely what was established by the Decree on Priestly Life and Ministry, n. 18).

3. There are also some equivocations of the kind pointed out in A and E of the "Overall Analysis." Take, for example, these two statements:

   "Our faith demands of us a committed and sincere answer, as was Christ's response to the Father, one that is ordered to the total liberation of man. Otherwise, we should not be faithful to the Paschal Mystery, and the faithful would inevitably convert into alienation from ourselves and from others." (1.2.2).

   "The capacity for taking risks signifies at times this leap into the void beyond the obscurity of faith, beyond opinion and crisis, contrary to prophetic warning and that are maintained by the established society." (3.2.1).

4. Throughout, a totally positive — purely comforting — evaluation is made of the quite negative aspects of the crisis which is a consequence of the clergy, involving their faith, the nature of the priesthood, the exercise of the ministry, etc.

Chapter VII

(Preparation for the Ministerial Priesthood and Permanent Formation of the Clergy)

1. The chapter concerns the "preparation for the ministerial priesthood and the permanent formation of the clergy." In reality, it is fundamentally limited to "permanent formation." It proposes the full adoption of the so-called "active methodology" and of various educational methods which do not seem to have been sufficiently tested and scientifically proven, so that a greater prudence would be desirable in this whole area. The chapter limits itself almost exclusively to the formal aspects of pedagogy, although there is also a tendency to take up unconditionally — without sufficient evaluation in the light of the faith — forms and categories belonging to philosophical and ideological currents which seem hard to reconcile with Catholic dogma; there are also some ambiguous allusions to the political-sociological area.

2. The greatest defect of the whole chapter is that it ignores totally the norms given not long ago by the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy concerning the permanent formation of priests (S.C. Pro Clericis, Literae Circulares de permanenti clerici institutione et formatione, November 4, 1969: A.S.S. 62 (1970), pp. 123-124). Its content should have been clearly included in the propositions devoted to this question.

III

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Both the overall analysis and the detailed analysis of each chapter, as set forth above, relate to the content of the document, we have been able to examine, a content which is indifferent, in itself, to the question of where the texts came from and, in general, how they were prepared, presented and voted on. Nevertheless, it seems useful to take into account the repercussions which all this has had among the faithful in Spain, the burning polemics which it has aroused, which are still going on, and which the press has given a prominent part in, and the obvious consequences. It has been denied that these documents effectively represent the thoughts of the country, and a series of concrete and verified data has been adduced: ecclesiastical regions where previous diocesan Assemblies had been held; election of representatives from regions where no Assemblies were held; the protests of many groups of priests over the methods followed in naming representatives and relating to the diocesan assemblies: the generally scarce participation of the clergy — attributable, perhaps, in part to the lack of interest caused by the bias and shape of the inquiry, with its particular doctrinal and disciplinary orientations —; the shortage of time allowed to participants in the Assembly for studying the texts presented — the documentation needing to be gone through amounted to 452 pages, and the number of propositions voted on was 257; in all one week; — some noted irregularities in the procedure of the Assembly — such as the repeated attempts to get proposition 33 of Chapter I approved, which after being rejected on two votes, reappeared two more times in Chapter VI; etc.

2. Naturally, all this imposes a great sense of caution, in order to avoid the action of pressure groups, which could bring about harmful divisions among the faithful, and even among priests.

3. In accordance with this fact and with all that has been said above, the following steps would seem vitally advisable:

   A. that in the next plenary meeting of the Spanish Episcopal Conference, everyone present from Chapter I and its propositions, which seem to be unacceptable both doctrinally and pastorally and which clearly transgress the limits with the propositions of the Clergy Commission which prepared the Joint Assembly and which is now supposed to present its report to the Episcopal Conference.

   B. that the text of chapter II should be replaced by the document on ministerial priesthood approved by the last Synod of bishops, a document whose theological bases and practical applications are much more secure and valid. One should not forget that today any ecclesiastical document issued in any country has immediate repercussions on other countries; this is a responsibility that one cannot ignore under pretext of considering local problems.

   C. that the remaining Chapters be studied, keeping in mind the observations which have been made in this study and the basic doctrinal and disciplinary orientations which have been mentioned, so that the present imperfections may be remedied.

Rome, February 9, 1972
John Card. Wright, Prefect
P. Pallazini, Secretary

THE PROPOSED BISHOPS' PASTORAL ON EDUCATION: SOME CRITIQUES

Nailing "Jello" To A Wall

After a specially prolonged and painful gestation, "To Teach As Jesus Did: A Pastoral Message on Education" will be presented in November for the Bishops of America for a vote. It is a long document, 34 pages, big in conception, big in ambition. It is not a simple proposal to rescue our schools in their ever-present harassment but a monumental master-plan of Catholic education, a manifesto, a pastoral covering the whole of Catholic education from infancy to eternity.

The educators put it together by describing the educational ministry of the Church in its three interlocking dimensions — the message revealed by God (didache), fellowship or community (koinonia), and service to the Christian and human community (diakonia). Harvey Cox in his The Secular City did the same. The didache treatment is good. The second part on community is where we won't take time to detail here. Suffice it to say that the writers seem to use that mixed blessing of every school administrator, the P.T.A., as model rather than that communalistic People of God so subtly detailed in Gaudium et Spes (chp. two). To be specific, whatever will become of that forlorn figure, the pastor? For a century in America, often it was he almost alone who kept his little Catholic school open; cold, simple, maybe even primitive, but open. We suggest the Bishops might have not a small problem on their hands when the pastor takes his collegial place at the table, when he sits on nasc with the other parish representatives.

CONFUSING TWO WORLDS

However, we find that the third part, diakonia, service, is the most troublesome element in the document. The concept centers around the question of the relation of the Church to the world, the sacred with the profane, the divine with the human, the City of God with the City of Man. Since Vatican II there has been a marked tendency to identify the two, to assimilate and confuse them. This pastoral doesn't help. While it begins with a notion of service in keeping with the Gospel spirit, it ends with service in the kind of disinterested and private Christian education is for service. Isn't every social organization? Isn't the Army? Isn't a bakery? We fault this shot-gun definition of service, plain service. We are told Christian education is to identify the two, to assimilate and confuse them. This concept centers around the question of the relation of the Church to the world, the sacred with the profane, the divine with the human, the City of God with the City of Man. Since Vatican II there has been a marked tendency to identify the two, to assimilate and confuse them. This pastoral doesn't help. While it begins with a notion of service in keeping with the Gospel spirit, it ends with service in the kind of disinterested and private Christian education is for service. Isn't every social organization? Isn't the Army? Isn't a bakery? We fault this shot-gun definition of service, plain service. We are told Christian education is to identify the two, to assimilate and confuse them.

Earthly progress must be carefully distinguished from the growth of Christ's kingdom. (Gaudium et Spes, 38) For faith throws a new light on everything, manifests God's design for man's total vocation, and thus directs the mind to solutions which are fully human. (GS11) Thus the mission of the Church will show its religious, and by that very fact, its supremacy, human character. (GS11) The truth is that only in the mystery of the Incarnate Word does the mystery of man take on light. . . . Christ, the final Adam, by the revelation of the mystery of the Father and His love, fully reveals man to himself and makes his supreme calling clear (GS22).

(The Church) desires thereby to add the light of revealed truth to mankind's store of experience, so that the path which humanity has taken in recent times will not be a dark one. (GS33)

Common, secular service to mankind or the world is not the purpose of the Church, nor of its Christian education. Rather the very refined, proper, specific contribution which Christianity makes to the world can be seen through these short excerpts. When this specific service is lost sight of, all the operations of the Church, the Church as an educational entity, can become meaningless. The Church can become a mere fellowship or community, a religious association, a social club, a political party. (GS11) Thus the mission of the Church will show its religious, and by that very fact, its supremacy, human character. (GS11) The truth is that only in the mystery of the Incarnate Word does the mystery of man take on light. . . . Christ, the final Adam, by the revelation of the mystery of the Father and His love, fully reveals man to himself and makes his supreme calling clear (GS22).

(The Church) desires thereby to add the light of revealed truth to mankind's store of experience, so that the path which humanity has taken in recent times will not be a dark one. (GS33)

REALITIES WHICH CAN'T BE IGNORED

The pastoral decrees the weakening of the total Catholic school system. It gives as reasons lack of interest, past priorities favoring education, present concern for other services, lacks of finance. It doesn't even suggest that the reason could possibly be in the Catholic school itself, that it has lost its raison d'etre, that there has been a con-
trovery over Catholic doctrine and its catechetical expression. The newly erected "orthodoxy" schools around America are a "sign of the times;" the thousands of Catholic parents who are so exercised over the type of religious education their children are receiving that they spend great amounts of energy and finances on establishing new schools, the bishops who are also exercising their optioners and are indifferent about their attendance — these are realities which no Bishop should ignore today. That is the sensus fidelium at work. This very difficulty which parents have is mentioned in the pastoral but as a reason for a new, stepped-up program of adult catechesis. The parents must be retrained, reprogrammed, retooled, we told. There seems to be no possibility that the parents might have some legitimate complaints. This is not a way of establishing and maintaining that koinonia community which the document opts for.

Catechetical analysis of the document, to applaud the new catechetics, to give a general vote of confidence to what has gone on in that area in the past decade, the new牧oric of the last spring. One may not go far wrong in saying the parents are the Bishops up behind the new catechetics. The document is not addressed at all to catechetics and its methods but to Catholic education in general. These two remarks on catechetics are simple "asides" introduced in passing. Catholic education in general. These two remarks on catechetics are simple "asides" introduced in passing. Catholic education in general. These two remarks on catechetics are simple "asides" introduced in passing. Catholic education in general. These two remarks on catechetics are simple "asides" introduced in passing. Catholic education in general. These two remarks on catechetics are simple "asides" introduced in passing. Catholic education in general. These two remarks on catechetics are simple "asides" introduced in passing.

A SIMPLISTIC ANALYSIS

If this document opts for an educational picture more congruent to modernity, its treatment of technology is simplistic. It could come out of Paul R. Ehrlich's office, or the Sierra Club. It may be the newest of the new catechisms. "Our readiness for sharing has not kept pace with our skill at acquiring." Is this factual, really? Without American technology, the world would have no capital, most of this hungry world would starve, its translation would be oxen, its medicine primitive, its labor inhuman. Technology is said to cause alienation; yet America is described as alienated because of this technology. An analysis, 19th century Marxist in spirit, doesn't reflect the most responsible and realistic description of conflict in the modern world which the Fathers of Vatican II enumerated in Gaudium et Spes (par. 6, 7, 8). They blame modern unrest on changes in traditional local communities and urbanization, on the spread of communications media, on migration, on economic growth, on psychological, moral, and religious changes, besides industrial, and technocratic. Technology certainly is one of the true "signs of the times;" it doesn't come off well in this document.

SEND IT BACK

We suggest that the Bishops give this pastoral back to the educators who wrote it as they did last Spring when it first appeared. It's too big. Nothing, but nothing has been put out. There is material for at least ten different pastoral. Solid and proven plans and techniques are interlarded with myths and proposals already rejected everywhere. There are two reasons why the Bishops are Ill served by this document. What do they know of "access centers" or new "civic and academic accountability?" We Bishops are only as good as the educators themselves know professionally, scientifically about what they are suggesting? What studies have been made? What financial resources are available? Is it longer be the best framework for formal schooling," is this a threat, a prediction, or a goal? This one observation would be sufficient for months of episcopal consideration and collaboration. We look to our Bishops for wisdom and maturity in decision; we shouldn't ask them to nail Jello to a wall. Let the educators take their proposals back to committee, break them into workable units, try them, test them, prove them, then write a modest proposal for the Education Department of the USCC or the NCEA.

The Educators Miss Again

By K.D. WHITEHEAD

The new draft pastoral letter on education, "To Teach As Jesus Did," which will reportedly be presented to the Catholic Bishops of America for adoption at their November meeting, is not as bad as the previous draft presented to them for approval last spring. But then nothing could be as bad as the previous draft which was submitted last spring.

This new draft may stand a better chance of acceptance, however, since the defective principles which inform it is the same defective principles which currently plague Catholic education in general. This draft is not obvious as they were in the earlier draft, which was sent back by the Bishops with so many changes and modifications that the result was that the document was much more superficial reading to be less objectionable than the earlier draft.

The document, this draft actually mentions, along with "commitment," and "service," "doctrinal" as one of the three necessary components of Catholic education. After so many years of exile from what passed for Catholic educational theory, the restoration of doctrine to an apparently prominent place in this document can only seem reassuring. Typically, as the serious study of Greek and Latin deponents, which today afflict Catholic education. Here there is space for the term "Catholic Church"! It is only supposed to be an official document issued by the Catholic Church! It only

a "WORLDLY" BIAS

Distortions of Catholic truth which stem from this document's "this worldly" bias can be discerned throughout the document. They are roughly the same distortions which have always marked a document which did not include some mention of doctrine. Perusal of the entire document reveals that the mention is no more than a token nod to doctrine by way of the Bishops probably consider important. Nothing of any significance is said about doctrine, how it truly relates to community or service, for example, or why it is necessary to them. No organic connection is shown whereby true Christian community or true Christian service are seen to follow from orthodox Catholic doctrine, as is actually the case, and could not but be the case, if the Catholic Church is truly commissioned by the divine Source of all truth. In fact, the document's treatment of community and service differs scarcely at all from what one might expect to find in a Protestant or secular discussion of these concepts, and many educators really did have nothing to contribute to the ecumenical dialogue which is presumably going on about these things. At most — since, after all, this draft is supposed to be a document which the Catholic Bishops will deliver to the world — a vague patina of religiosity is thrown over a discussion which in essence sees the purpose of Catholic education as nothing but "education," the process of mechanically fitting the familiar secular priority of "building a better world." This is exactly the sort of thing liberal Protestantism has to say about the "social gospel" at a time when they were in the process of losing their grasp of the fundamental importance of doctrine. Neither the passage of time nor the shift to a Catholic milieu has rendered this essentially sentimental social gospel any more compelling or relevant to the true human condition, which God established the Church in the world to provide a remedy for, than it was when the liberal Protestants first preached it. Consider how much better the world would be if, when she was first preached! Only an understanding of doctrine — doctrine in the vertical sense as it relates man's present condition to the unchanging nature of God, and in the horizontal sense as He Redemptor — can provide any sound appreciation of man's true earthly vocation. His earthly vocation, it cannot be too often repeated, is not to "build a better world" as such. Paradoxically — it is the paradox of the Gospel — a better world in the political and social sense as favored by this draft will stand in direct opposition to Christian principles to the affairs of this world; but to make the building of this better world the aim of the Christian life, as this draft pastoral apparently makes it, the aim of Catholic education, will not make this world any better, and, meanwhile, will jeopardize one's chances in the next!

A PASSING REFERENCE

Unfortunately, this does not seem to be the case. Doctrine seems to be mentioned among the requirements for Catholic education out of the calculation that the Catholic Bishops couldn't possibly put their name on a document which did not include some mention of doctrine. Perusal of the entire document reveals that the mention is no more than a token nod to doctrine by way of the Bishops probably consider important. Nothing of any significance is said about doctrine, how it truly relates to community or service, for example, or why it is necessary to them. No organic connection is shown whereby true Christian community or true Christian service are seen to