Learning Curve

How one Archdiocese adapted its Catholic schools for the 21st Century

Timothy Dolan

Walter Kasper on the Synod on the Family
Joe Kennedy III on just Economic Policy
You may not know that in addition to our entanglements in the Middle East and elsewhere, the United States is currently prosecuting a land war in Britain. For more than five decades now, Britain’s native red squirrel has been locked in mortal combat with his cousin from across the pond, the American grey squirrel. Every autumn, the British press files reports from the various theaters of operation. When I was living in London a couple of years ago, I was amused to read one morning in The Telegraph newspaper that the greys or, “the American Expeditionary Force” as I choose to call them, were on the verge of a rout of the reds and were even “threatening the borders of Scotland.”

The British government was attempting to spin the ignominious defeat into a victory of sorts à la Dunkirk. The Prince of Wales was leading the propaganda effort, though his much-vaunted good nature did not prevent the deployment of the most amusing stereotypes, revealing that the United States and our closest ally are actually fighting a proxy war. According to The Telegraph, the red squirrel, “Britain’s most adorable mammal” (other than Her Majesty, presumably), was being “bullied by its bigger, pox-carrying cousin, the American Grey,” who was said to possess a ravenously advairous appetite. This compares unfavorably, of course, with the reds, who have a “gourmet approach to food,” according to the newspaper. (If that is the case, then the reds are the only British mammals with such culinary sensibility.) The reds, accordingly, were referred to as “endearing natives,” while the greys were mere “vermin.”

None of this pap, of course, should distract the astute and fair-minded observer from the essential fact of the matter: Defeat is at hand. The reds did attempt a “fightback” on Anglesey (an island theater of dubious import just off the coast of Wales), but this was only possible because the human Brits placed “infra-red cameras on the Britannia rail bridge between Anglesey and the mainland.” Surely this unfair advantage offends the virile honour of the reds, you say? Hardly, for the reds are notoriously effete. But don’t take my word for it. Here’s what the Red Squirrel Survival Trust has to say: “When the red squirrel is put under pressure, it will not breed as often.” Really? The British red squirrel, then, is unable to perform the procreative act because his bombastic American cousin is making too much noise? Where is the manly virtue that is said to have triumphed at Agincourt?

What does any of this have to do with the present issue of America? Very little, I should think. But that’s O.K.; there’s a reason this column is called Of Many Things. Still, even casual observers of the U.S. Congress will note that the fight between red and blue in Washington is nearly as ferocious as the fight between red and grey in Britain. It is a good sign, then, when two people like Paul Ryan and Joe Kennedy, two congressmen from different parties and with very different ideological perspectives, come together for informed, civil conversation, as they have done in these pages this month. Civilization, wrote Thomas Gilby, O.P., who was unable to perform the procreative act because his bombastic American cousin is making too much noise? Where is the manly virtue that is said to have triumphed at Agincourt?

As for our mates across the Atlantic, they need to face up to their true enemy in the battle being waged just outside their backdoors: self-deception. The fact is, as one behavioral scientist has written: “Although complex and controversial, the main factor in the eastern grey squirrel’s displacement of the red squirrel is thought to be its greater fitness and, hence, a competitive advantage over the red squirrel on all measures.” Finally, a truth speaker: Adriano Martinoli, the eminent Italian ecologist.
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**Current Comment**

**Father Arrupe’s Return**

“The ship of the Society has been tossed around by the waves, and there is nothing surprising in this,” said Pope Francis during a Vespers service in Rome on Sept. 27 that marked the 200th anniversary of the restoration of the Society of Jesus in 1814, after its suppression by Pope Clement XIV in 1773. The pope urged his brother Jesuits: “Row then! Row, be strong, even against a headwind! We row in the service of the church. We row together!”

Afterward, the pope visited a side chapel to bless a new painting of the “Deposition of Christ,” showing three men removing Christ's body from the cross. The faces of the men are those of three Jesuits now buried in the chapel, who guided the Society in times of persecution, struggle or misunderstanding. At the top is St. Joseph Pignatelli, S.J. (1737-1811), the Spanish Jesuit who served as a guiding light during the four decades of the suppression. Beneath him is Jan Roothaan, S.J. (1785-1853), superior general during a period when Jesuits were still banished from many countries. Perhaps most notable is the man at Jesus' feet: Servant of God Pedro Arrupe, S.J. (1907-91), the superior general who, after suffering a stroke in 1981, appointed a vicar general who was subsequently removed by St. John Paul II and replaced by a Vatican appointee. In response to that decision, Father Arrupe called for obedience from Jesuits worldwide—and received it.

Early in his pontificate, Pope Francis paid a public visit to this small chapel, touched the marble covering of Father Arrupe's tomb and blessed himself. For many years Pedro Arrupe's legacy was the object of suspicion within some Vatican circles. Today, however, it is gratifying to see one faithful Jesuit honored by another.

**An Unwelcome Sign**

They are a familiar sight to drivers everywhere: the posters that dot city streets and country roads providing information on church services. They have long been part of the landscape in many communities, as unremarkable as mailboxes on the sidewalk. But in Gilbert, Ariz., church signs like these are stirring up a hornet’s nest of political, religious and free speech issues that will head to the Supreme Court next year.

The case involves the Good News Community Church, a small Presbyterian congregation that does not have a permanent location and must rely on temporary signs to inform congregants about the sites and times of services. The Alliance Defending Freedom and the Becket Fund for Religious Liberty have filed briefs on behalf of Pastor Clyde Reed and his church, protesting what they consider the town’s arbitrary limits on the size and number of church signs.

According to the town code, temporary directional signs must be 70 percent smaller than “ideological” signs and 81 percent smaller than “political” signs. While nonreligious signs may remain up indefinitely, Good News’s 2-by-3 foot signs may stay up for only 14 hours. Town officials cite traffic safety concerns and aesthetics to justify the strictures on church signs. A 32-square-foot political sign left standing for months, however, would apparently be acceptable.

On Sept. 15, A.D.F. attorneys filed their opening briefs with the Supreme Court. “No law should treat the speech of churches worse than the speech of other similar speakers,” said the senior counsel David Cortman. If this case is a sign of the times, it’s a worrying one.

**Let Democracy Bloom**

Rhetoric on both sides of the confrontation in Hong Kong has ratcheted up dangerously since the Occupy Central students’ campaign for democracy began on Sept. 28. Now student leaders are demanding the resignation of Hong Kong’s chief executive, Leung Chun-ying, and on the mainland editorials in party-controlled media have begun to complain ominously that the student demonstration has become a threat to the city’s economy and good public order. The real fear in Beijing is, of course, the impact any democratic liberalization in Hong Kong might have on the mainland, where millions likewise yearn to match China’s vibrant economic development with new political and personal freedoms.

A makeshift Goddess of Democracy statue, a symbol of the long-ago occupation of Tiananmen Square, was raised again by these students, who are just as full of hope and determination as were the young people of 1989. May that be the last comparison to Tiananmen that this most recent campaign for democracy evokes.

If President Xi Jinping is looking for a face-saving way out of the current crisis, he need only review the terms of the Basic Law that led to the July 1997 handover of Hong Kong. Recognizing that the demonstrators in Hong Kong are calling for representation, not revolution, Mr. Xi should embrace their demands and the spirit of the “two systems, one nation” commitment his predecessors made. Article 45 of the Basic Law explicitly supports the universal suffrage that this current generation of young people is demanding on the streets of Wan Chai. He may want to let this one flower of democracy bloom in Hong Kong to learn what fruit it may one day bear for all of China.
Persons, Not Products

Earlier this year the Minnesota Catholic Conference entered into an unusual partnership. As the state legislature considered two bills that would have legalized commercial surrogacy, Catholic leaders worked together with Kathleen Sloan, an executive board member of the National Organization of Women, to lobby against the measures. The proposed laws, which would have granted judges the authority to adjudicate surrogacy contracts, were ultimately defeated.

The partnership is a sign that church leaders can work with a variety of individuals and groups when they share a common cause, even if they have sincere disagreements on other issues. Ms. Sloan is pro-choice, but she and other feminists have deep concerns about the practice of commercial surrogacy because of its potential to exploit women both in this country and abroad. Church leaders share these concerns and are working to stymie commercial surrogacy legislation in states across the nation.

They face a difficult challenge. An estimated 2,000 or more babies will be born through surrogacy in the United States this year, though experts say the procedure is underreported. Gestational surrogacy, in which a woman brings to term an embryo created by another family, is treated differently from state to state. Paid surrogacy has been legal in California for many years. Surrogacy agreements have been prohibited in New York since the Baby M debacle in the 1980s, but groups are actively lobbying for a change in the law. Louisiana recently considered a bill that would have allowed for paid surrogacy agreements, but that bill was also defeated, thanks in part to the efforts of the Louisiana Conference of Catholic Bishops. “Surrogacy arrangements commercialize and objectify women, relegating them to a utilitarian purpose,” the bishops wrote.

The European Parliament has also spoken out strongly against commercial surrogacy because of the obvious potential for abuse. In a 2011 resolution aimed at combatting violence against women, the parliament stated “that these new reproductive arrangements, such as surrogacy, augment the trafficking of women and children and illegal adoption across national borders.” In Germany, France and Italy commercial surrogacy is banned outright, though some countries, including Canada, allow for “altruistic surrogacy” between friends or family members.

Local laws, however, can have limited effect when families are able to hire surrogates in other countries. In India the country’s surrogacy industry is expected to reach $2.5 billion by 2020. The Akanksha Clinic in Gujarat has drawn praise from Oprah Winfrey for “making mothers’ dreams come true.” Left unsaid is that these dreams come at a cost: surrogate mothers from very poor communities are forced to live in rooms with 10 or 15 other mothers, away from their families, for most of their pregnancy. A recent case in Thailand points to the moral horrors that commercial surrogacy can introduce: an Australian couple refused to take responsibility for one of two twins born to a surrogate because the child had Down Syndrome.

Proponents of legalization argue that it is better to bring surrogacy out into the open so it can be regulated properly. They point to the sincere desire of many people to start a family, even if, at the cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars, this procedure is only available to the wealthy. These desires are surely heartfelt, and the children who are born of surrogacy deserve our welcome no less than other children. Yet serious questions must be raised about a practice that commodifies the body of one woman in the interest of fulfilling another family’s long-held dream. The long-term effects on children, who will naturally have questions about how they were conceived and brought to life, are also poorly understood. It is important to remember that, as the Louisiana bishops wrote, “a child is truly a gift to be given as opposed to a right to attain” and that individuals may be called to other forms of family life.

At a time when more women decide to have children later in life, and same-sex male couples are trying to start families of their own, the practice of surrogacy is sure to grow in popularity if other policy alternatives are not explored. European nations may restrict surrogacy, for example, but they offer many other family friendly policies. A robust government-funded child care program would surely help more women to balance a family and a career at an earlier stage in life. More research into the causes of infertility is also warranted. Finally, adoption friendly polices should be enacted on both the state and national level. The federal adoption tax credit should be expanded. Programs for foster children should be both adequately funded by local governments and heavily promoted by faith communities. When so many people are eager to start a family, it is critical to remember the thousands of children who are just as eager to find one.
REPLY ALL

Guilty Nation
Re “Prison Possibilities,” by Valerie Schultz (9/29): Ours is a crazy society. We believe that sending someone to prison for life will somehow restore justice in the world for a loved one whose life was cut short. At a rate of 716 people per 100,000, the United States incarcerates more people than any other nation on earth. Incarcerating that many people suggests we must be less discerning than other nations and a lot more vengeful. Is this who we are as a nation?

I have served as a prison minister for the last 13 years and am still amazed by the number of people who are not sure why they are in prison. There was no conclusive evidence. Often they were in a haze when the event occurred. Ministering to the innocent incarcerated is a lot harder than ministering to those who are guilty.

I would never presume to know what those in prison are thinking. In the silence of your heart, I ask, what are you thinking? I have often gotten the response: “Jesus was innocent. They crucified him. Why should I be any different?”

(Deacon) Chris Schwartz
Beltville, Md.
Deacon Schwartz is the coordinator for ministry to the incarcerated for the Archdiocese of Washington.

Divorce’s Victims
Re “Remarriage, Mercy and Law” by The Editors (9/22): The church’s biggest sin in the clerical sexual abuse scandal is its neglect of the victims. In the divorce and remarriage issue the same could be happening. There are victims to be considered. Unfortunately I am one of them.

After 29 years my wife left what she said was “a good marriage” to marry another divorced Catholic. There was no annulment. I love her and remain faithful to her, the church, my word and myself. I seek answers to two questions arising from what could someday happen: when receiving the Eucharist, I observe that she and/or he also receives the Eucharist.

First, what theological understanding can be provided to satisfy my intellect, especially in terms of eucharistic union in Christ, considering the situation of our sacramental matrimonial union in Christ? Second, what pastoral theology would satisfy my spirit if confronted with this situation? What would I share with Jesus about them at this moment of Communion? These are genuine concerns that give some reality to the deliberations of the Synod of Bishops.

Michael O’Connor
Online Comment

On the Lay Path
If I get Russell Shaw’s point in “Everyone’s Vocation” (9/29), evangelization toward the world that Pope Francis envisions requires a lay evangelization that extends far beyond the parish grounds. The “protagonist of a lay path,” as Pope Francis refers to the laity, evangelizes not so much in the parish hall or the liturgy planning meeting as in the office cafeteria, the staff meeting, the board room, the voting booth—all those ways in which lay people affect the world every day. That makes sense, in light of the Pew Research Foundation findings that only 37 percent of Americans attend religious services weekly or more often (and Pew suspects that number may be a bit overstated), and 29 percent attend “seldom or never.” Much of the work of changing the marketplace, government and society at large needs to be done by those of us who are out in those arenas.

Joseph J. Dunn
Online Comment

Paying Repentance
In “The Message of Mercy” (9/15), Cardinal Walter Kasper writes that if a person “repents of his failure to fulfill what he promised before God,” he should be forgiven.

I believe that one way of showing repentance that should be obligatory is living up to one’s responsibility to the first marriage, even after remarrying. It is wrong that children or spouses in a

Michael Schultz (9/22): The church’s big-

Re “Remarriage, Mercy and Law,” by

Archdiocese of Washington.

Mary A. McKenna
new marriage should have a dramatically better lifestyle than the spouse or children in the first, valid marriage.

My parents divorced many years ago and my father remarried. He has always paid my mom more than what the court demanded because she gave up her career to raise his and her children. He knew it was wrong to make her live a dramatically lesser lifestyle. I have always respected my father for this and believe God forgives him for the divorce, which he wanted more than my mother.

Unfortunately, my father still does not go to a Catholic church. He said it would make him feel like an outcast not to be allowed Eucharist. If the spouses who want to be accepted into the church agree they will not abandon their responsibilities to the old, still valid marriages, then I think this can be considered a sign of ongoing repentance for their failure to reconcile their first marriage.

NORA BOLCON
Online Comment

American Commonwealth

In “American Exodus” (9/15), Gabriela Romeri writes in depth about living conditions in Central American countries, the challenges that migrants face coming through Mexico and the legal challenges for the lucky few who make it to the United States.

Puerto Rico provides an example for a possible solution to the migration crisis. Because Puerto Rico is a territory of the United States, citizens who can't find jobs on their island come to the United States for employment without any legal obstacles. Pharmaceutical companies located several factories in Puerto Rico to take advantage of lower operating costs, coupled with the added bonus that they can export their products to the U.S. mainland without having to pay import duties.

I believe that the first step to ending this “American Exodus” is to expand this model. What if our hemisphere created something similar to the European Economic Area, in which small Central American countries form legal and economic relationships with the United States similar to that of Puerto Rico?

MERT MOLINA
Spokane, Wash.

Spiritual Heights

In “Faithful Aspirations” (9/1), Frank DeSiano, C.S.P., makes a strong argument for inclusion in the church community—for not creating barriers by setting our sights too high for believers at various stages on their spiritual journeys. With this I agree; but so, as I read her, does Sherry Weddell.

In Forming Intentional Disciples, Ms. Weddell uses Pikes Peak near her home in Colorado Springs as a metaphor for the Eucharist as source and summit of our Christian lives. I would like similarly to propose my home state of Colorado as an image of the church. Here the majestic Rocky Mountains, towering unavoidably in the center of the state, are impossible to ignore. Even upon disembarking at Denver International, visitors are aware that this place is different. It may take a while before you venture into the foothills or up onto a ski slope, or, heaven forbid, tackle a 14,000-foot peak. But those mountains are always in your consciousness, if only just to help you get your bearings.

The church should be like that, with Jesus Christ and his presence in word and sacrament, as well as in the community of believers, always visible, unavoidably present to our awareness—not as a hurdle, but as an inviting, alluring wonder in our midst. Members of the church need to be like guides, welcoming the newcomer to ever deeper forays into those spiritual mountains, according to their confidence and willingness. Not all may venture to the top, but it’s good they know that those heights are there and that there’s always the possibility of going deeper and higher.

FRANCES ROSSI
Littleton, Colo.

STATUS UPDATE

Readers respond to Pope Francis’ appointment of a record five women to the 30-person International Theological Commission:

And women compose what percentage of practicing Catholics and of theology teachers in our schools and colleges? This is great news and I’m genuinely pleased by it. It is still a small step toward an institution that recognizes the work of women “doing theology” daily and catechizing our youth as mothers and teachers.

HEATHER BEASLEY

Pope John XXIII allegedly once said, “I have to be pope both for those with their foot on the gas, and those with their foot on the brake.” Though the saying may be apocryphal, the wisdom is spot on, and Francis’ recent personnel moves seem to reflect some of the same thinking.

CRAIG PILANT

“Today stocks dropped on news that the only thing to fear is everything.”
Tensions between student demonstrators and authorities in Beijing rose as protests continued for broader democratic rights in Hong Kong in October. On Oct. 3 protesters accused police of allowing pro-government “thugs” to assault them in the city’s Mong Kok district.

“Nothing like this has happened in Hong Kong before. I’m just praying that it won’t become like Tiananmen. The situation is similar in many ways,” said Cardinal Joseph Zen Ze-kiun, speaking by phone from the former British colony on Oct. 1.

The retired 82-year-old cardinal, who led the Diocese of Hong Kong between 2002 and 2009, has been with the Occupy Central protesters since the beginning of the demonstrations on Sept. 27. “I’m very worried,” he said. “The authorities…don’t seem to realize the seriousness of the situation or how angry the people of Hong Kong are. They seem to have no sense of what has happened in these days.

“The protesters are peaceful, but they are waiting for an answer from the government, but no wise answer is coming from the authorities. We have to remain united, nonviolent and peaceful till the end,” he added.

Cardinal Zen suggests that the only way out of this impasse is for the chief executive of this semi-autonomous region of China, Leung Chun-ying, to resign. “If he resigns, then maybe it will be possible for the authorities to open a dialogue and hold a consultation. Maybe Beijing will send somebody who will be able to listen to the people and talk with the leaders of the pro-democracy protest,” he said.

The Shanghai-born cardinal spoke at gatherings as protests accelerated and students in schools and universities across the city boycotted classes in a spontaneous pro-democracy demonstration. Zen explained Catholic social teaching and the right to peaceful resistance and scolded police after they were too rough on the students, reminding them that “students are their brothers and sisters.”

According to the cardinal, protesters want Beijing and Hong Kong authorities to keep the promise given at the time of the colony’s handover in 1997 and allow universal suffrage to the city’s 7.1 million residents. The colony’s Basic Law had promised broad consultation before reaching a decision for the 2017 elections, but when the pro-democracy movement came up with proposals through a public referendum months ago, Hong Kong and mainland governments ignored its input.

Instead, the Hong Kong executive, together with Beijing, decided on a plan that controls the selection of candidates in the election to choose the next chief executive. The Occupy Central movement arose in response and soon converged with the spontaneous student protest efforts.

The Hong Kong diocese with its 374,000 faithful is behind the call for greater democracy, according to the cardinal. Cardinal John Tong Hon, who succeeded Zen as bishop of Hong Kong, has issued a statement calling on the government to exercise restraint and to listen to the people. The diocesan Justice and Peace Commission works in close contact with the student movement and with the Occupy Central leaders, and the cardinal said one of the new auxiliary bishops of Hong Kong, Bishop Joseph Ha, a Franciscan, celebrated Mass in a crowded cathedral on Sept. 30 “to invoke the help of God in the present situation.”

Cardinal Zen said he is going to ask the faithful to pray the rosary throughout the month of October to ask God to enlighten the leaders in Hong Kong and Beijing so that they will listen to the people and work out a plan for real democracy that the people can accept. “I ask people everywhere to pray for us as the situation in Hong Kong is dangerous right now. Anything can happen.”

GERARD O’CONNELL
Christian Groups ‘De-Recognized’

InterVarsity Christian Fellowship organizations in the massive, 23-campus, 450,000-student California State University system have to abide by new nondiscrimination rules or else become “de-recognized” as official student groups. The change comes as a result of a decision in 2011 by system officials to enforce an “all comers” policy for student club membership. The idea is that if you are a member of the journalism club you cannot require your membership or leadership to be exclusively student journalists. Same with the Republican Clubs, etc.” If a group wants official school recognition, any student must be free to attend and to lead it. But InterVarsity groups require that student leaders assent to a Christian creed. And that, says Uhlenkamp, is “discriminatory against those who are not of that faith.”

Greg Jao, spokesperson for InterVarsity, expressed his disappointment with C.S.U.’s decision. They have been negotiating the policy shift for three years. “In general we affirm the nondiscrimination policy; we believe every student should have a safe, welcoming diverse experience on campus,” he says. “But we believe a religious group should be led by members who are representative of that religion.”

Uhlenkamp reports that C.S.U. officials have suggested ways in which InterVarsity could be true to itself and maintain recognized status. “They could have a vote, require leaders to attend a minimum number of meetings, pay dues, be in good standing with the club for a specific amount of time or take a skills-based test.”

“I’m really grateful that they’re trying to think of ways around it,” says Jao. “But what Cal State is saying is ‘Remove the overt religious beliefs from your requirements.’ …It’s a form of dishonesty—a terrible model for students in terms of integrity.”

When asked whether Newman clubs that have Mass on C.S.U. campuses could be de-recog-
Synod Looks At Remarried Catholics
Cardinal Walter Kasper of Germany, the author of a controversial proposal to make it easier for divorced and civilly remarried Catholics to receive Communion, said on Oct. 1 that he believes Pope Francis backs the measure but would not apply it without support from the bishops at the upcoming synods on the family. “I had the impression the pope is open for a responsible, limited opening of the situation, but he wants a great majority of the bishops behind himself. He does not like division within the church and the collegiality of bishops,” the cardinal said. The special bishops’ synod on the family is scheduled to begin Oct. 5 and conclude on Oct. 19. The issue is sure to be one of the most discussed at the synod, which will prepare the agenda for a larger world synod in October 2015. The later gathering will make recommendations to the pope, who will make the final decision on any change.

Iraqi Refugees May Never Return
Iraqi refugees who fled Islamic State violence after Mosul was overrun say it will be difficult ever to return home, despite concerns by the church that more Christians are fleeing their ancient homeland in the Middle East. “I thought I was living in a kind of dystopian end-of-times film,” said Jassam, 33. “I had lived in Mosul my whole life, and never anywhere else had I experienced the love and kindness I knew there. But what a violent upheaval of fortune befell us after June 10, when the extremists took over,” he told Jordanian Catholic and Muslim officials during a day of solidarity with the Iraqi refugees held outside of the capital, Amman, on Oct. 1. Jassam and his family abandoned their homes and businesses to the militant. “In the end,” he said, “we had to flee for our lives.” The United Nations reported on Oct. 2 that the Islamic State has committed a “staggering array” of human rights abuses and “acts of violence of an increasingly sectarian nature” in Iraq.

C.R.S. Continues Response to Ebola
Catholic Relief Services has committed more than $1.5 million in private funds to continue its emergency response to the Ebola outbreak in West Africa, which has so far killed 2,800 people. While the World Health Organization has declared the outbreak contained in Senegal and Nigeria, the number of deaths and people infected with the virus continues to increase rapidly in Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea. C.R.S. has worked with the local Catholic Church, religious leaders and the ministries of health in all three countries on public awareness campaigns aimed at teaching the population about Ebola. “There is still a huge need to educate the public in all of the affected countries about Ebola, how it spreads and what actions people need to take to protect themselves and their families,” says Meredith Stakem, C.R.S.’s Regional Technical Advisor for Health. With health care systems overwhelmed, many people aren’t receiving care for non-life-threatening conditions, and now health officials are seeing an increase in preventable deaths from illnesses like malaria.

From CNS, RNS and other sources.

NEWS BRIEFS

The Obama administration announced plans in early October to allow minors to apply for refugee status from within El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras, in an effort to discourage them from making the dangerous trek to enter the United States illegally. • On Sept. 29, during a ceremony at Chicago’s Archbishop Quigley Center, Cardinal Francis George formally closed the investigation into the life of the Rev. Augustus Tolton, the first African-American diocesan priest, forwarding documents supporting his sainthood to the Vatican. • Rommel Banlaoi, executive director of the Philippine Institute for Peace, Violence and Terrorism Research, said on Oct. 2 in Manila that authorities should take “very seriously” the threat of Islamic State fighters on Pope Francis’ life as planning for his visit in January continues. • The Raskob Foundation awarded the Catholic Near East Welfare Association an emergency grant on Sept. 24 to support two additional medical clinics serving displaced Christians in northern Iraq. • The California Catholic Conference filed a federal civil rights complaint on Sept. 30, describing a state ruling mandating the inclusion of voluntary direct abortion in California health insurance policies as “coercive and discriminatory.”
‘I Am Because We Are’

Ubuntu is important to the founding myth of the new South African nation.

... As I see it, though, this is a profoundly unfair statistic since a relatively small proportion of these offenses are reported. Robbery with violence or threat of violence, most notably street muggings, increased.

We may argue about the reasons for such violence, citing the terrible income gap between the richest and poorest in our land, endemic poverty and the lack of jobs particularly for most school-leavers (the guesstimate for unemployment among young people is 50 percent and higher). We may cite the legacy of inequality under apartheid and the wide perception from the past of the gangster as a kind of social outlaw who bucked the system, found in African literature as far back as the 1950s.

But... Once again, these arguments presuppose more than they explain. Poor people are not automatically criminals. This is a profoundly unfair Victorian notion of the poor as “the criminal classes” that, in its patronizing form, reduces moral agents to objects of pity and control. Closer reading of the crime statistics also shows us that most victims of violent crime are the poor themselves, precisely because they are the most vulnerable. Though crime is not a preserve of the poor—almost every South African I know, across the race and class spectrum, knows someone who has been murdered or the victim of violence—most crimes occur in poor areas.

A more useful way to analyze the contradiction between Ubuntu and violence is to examine South Africa as a culture of resentment. Resentment takes on many forms. There is a widespread attitude of entitlement. The rich feel entitled to their wealth and to show it off by conspicuous consumption in ways ranging from the absurd to the obscene. The poor feel entitled to an immediate share in the material benefits of liberation. There is a commonly held view that now that apartheid is gone, government will meet all material needs.

In contrast to the myth of harmony presented by Ubuntu, there is the widespread belief in witchcraft, particularly in black urban communities and rural areas. When a sibling or relative does well and I do not, it is not the result of better education, hard work or dumb luck. It is clear that he or she has powerful muti, magic power, and this is at my expense. Resentment grows and with it hostility to others, passive and sometimes active aggression.

This is the other founding myth of modern South Africa. Which myth, Ubuntu or Resentment/Entitlement, is dominant in South Africa will ultimately determine our heritage and the legacy to humanity of South Africa’s struggle for democracy.

ANTHONY EGAN
As many as 300,000 people marched in New York on Sept. 21 to call for the United Nations to take action on climate change—four times the number that organizers predicted. In the interfaith bloc, behind a wooden ark on wheels and a giant inflatable mosque, I marched and sang with nuns and seminarians, friends and strangers, sharing our love for the planet we all have in common.

The Book of Acts talks twice about the early church holding "all things in common," in the second chapter and in the fourth. Both times, the phrase "signs and wonders" comes right before. Sharing things followed a shared experience. There is some kind of connection, it seems, between holy spectacle and how we treat the world around us. Like how falling in love makes us see miracles all around us, or how a wedding binds families together, signs and wonders help us share what we once kept to ourselves. September’s climate march was certainly a wonder. I hope world leaders will also take it as a sign.

But what does the phrase “in common” mean? Cold War shudders might arise in us: Are we talking communism or capitalism? Was the climate march some kind of plea for an Earth-worshiping politburo? I hope not. Heeding the scientific consensus and the cries of people enduring climate-induced floods and famines, popes from John Paul II to Francis have spoken of inaction on climate change as a pressing moral crisis for Christians. An environmental eminent challenge is in the making. In New York, Cardinal Timothy Dolan wrote on his blog, “It would be wonderful if there were a strong Catholic presence at the march, to indicate our prayerful support of God’s creation.”

What the apostles were doing, and what we should be doing to protect the planet, falls on neither side of the Cold War binary. Acts is not talking about a state bureaucracy any more than about a stock market; it is talking about the ancient practice sometimes called “commoning”—that is, treating the means of livelihood as the common birthright of everyone. The whole world, after all, is ultimately God’s. Thus Gratian understood that by natural law omnia sunt communia—all things are common—and thus St. Thomas Aquinas held that poor people’s right to necessities trumps the property rights of the rich. Thus, alongside England’s Magna Carta came the Charter of the Forest, which ensured that the landless masses would have the right to sustain themselves with the fruits of common land. Thus Leviticus required that farmers leave the edges of their fields unharvested so that the poor could live off the remains—and so, to protect the health of the land, every seven years it was to be left fallow.

Commoning was the original bulwark against poverty, an economic system built around meeting the needs of the poor and sustaining the environment. It was a natural fit for early Christians, many of whom were on the fringes of society. The medieval church went on to maintain churches and land for common use; it was no accident that with the Reformation came a surge in the enclosure of land into private estates.

Throughout history, commoners have had to fend off the urges of the wealthy to enclose common resources. “The pre-eminent challenge is to assure the greatest integrity of the commons, so that the fruits of commoning are not siphoned away by clever, covetous businesses and governments,” writes David Bollier in his essential new introduction to the commons, Think Like a Commoner. While commoning might coexist with a market or state, it is neither. Commons are governed by the customs of the poor, not the bureaucracies of the rich.

Today, movements framed around the commons are resisting attempts to privatize such essentials as water, seeds and medicines. Climate change itself results from a kind of enclosure—an economic system that allows polluters to treat the atmosphere as theirs to disrupt and profit from. That is why, the day after the big march, I helped to organize another event: Flood Wall Street. Following a call to action from poor and indigenous communities, several thousand people wearing blue filled the Financial District. One hundred were arrested in a peaceful sit-in near the stock exchange.

First, we must see a God-given commons like the climate for what it is. Next, we must organize to protect it. Third, may we find the grace to become good stewards of it again.
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Justice begins with economic security.

Dignity for All

BY JOE KENNEDY

Editor’s Note: This article is the second in a two-part series. We asked two prominent members of Congress, both Catholics with famous names, to respond to Pope Francis’ repeated calls to empower the poor. The first response, by Congressman Paul Ryan, Republican of Wisconsin, appeared on Oct. 13.

There was not much on the stretch of highway between Llanos de Perez and Imbert in the Dominican Republic: a few wooden shacks with tin roofs, a couple of fruit stands, a small crowd gathered by the local lottery kiosk or watering hole. It was a poor but tight-knit community. Stalks of sugar cane swayed in the breeze and rolled on for what seemed like forever. Behind, a series of foothills rose up, and Rio Damajagua weaved between them.

By the time I arrived there as a young Peace Corps volunteer, tour companies from the North Coast had discovered Rio Damajagua and its stunning waterfalls, running to-
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gether like Mother Nature’s perfect water park. They had set up shop, busing in tens of thousands of tourists a year and charging them up to $100 to climb the falls. The locals served as guides, escorting the tourists up and down the river, sometimes carrying them on their backs. For that grueling work, the companies guaranteed them only a few dollars per trip.

Economic instability was constant, electricity intermittent, schools haphazard, illness frequent. Try as they might, families struggled daily to put food on the table. But their poverty was not by choice or even chance; it was the result of a system that had left them powerless. Corporate interests operated with impunity, government turned a blind eye, and workers were denied the simple dignity of providing for their families.

Over the next two years, I worked with the community to regain a stake in its future. We convinced the government to put the park under local control, allowing the community to set wages and craft safety precautions. We raised money and built a small business to run the park operations with more local autonomy. We set up a community reinvestment fund so that a portion of every entrance fee went into the local neighborhood—to build a bridge, buy a school bus, bring clean water to the community.

Change did not happen overnight. The effort is very much ongoing to this day. But as the weeks and months passed, there was a shift in those men I will never forget. It was not just the energy they felt at the prospect of being able to provide for their families. It was the way they actually held their heads higher. That pride rippled through the community, empowering people who had never had much reason to believe that their hard work might pay off.

It is the lesson of fundamental human dignity that lies at the very heart of our Catholic faith. Throughout the Gospel, we are called on to acknowledge the humanity of those who are suffering, impoverished or oppressed. Matthew summons us to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, welcome the stranger and comfort the afflicted. Luke tells us of the good Samaritan’s gentle mercy, kneeling beside his bleeding neighbor on the road to Jericho while others simply passed by.

In the Catholic tradition, these stories elevate calls for charity and compassion into calls for justice. They echo the same self-evident truth on which our founding fathers staked life and liberty: all men are created equal. Whether in church or state, this country has been anchored by the belief that the same spark of human dignity resides in all of us, that there is inherent value and untold potential in each person.

Today our commitment to human dignity is being tested, threatened by the growing number of people in this country unable to afford or access the most basic of human necessities: a roof, a meal and a paycheck. These numbers have left us searching for something to blame or explain them away, and the loudest voices have arrived at a resounding conclusion: Poverty is bred of individual inadequacy and government dependency. If he worked harder, he would not need food stamps. If she had made better choices, she would not need affordable housing. And if government had not stepped in to offer these things, he or she would have figured out how to eliminate need.

While this antigovernment rhetoric might make for colorful talk radio, it ignores a fact proven by history, economics and human experience time and again. Poverty is rarely a consequence of individual choice; the families who turn to food stamps to keep dinner on the table after a lost job are not trying to get a free pass. Rather, poverty is the product of an economic infrastructure that builds heavy ceilings above the weak and vulnerable instead of sturdy floors beneath their feet.

It is a great legacy of the Catholic Church and Jesuit tradition that communities of the faithful gather every day, around the world, to bless and to serve the poor, the meek, the mourning, the hungry and the persecuted. But “charity is no substitute for justice withheld,” St. Augustine reminds us. The “economy of exclusion,” aptly named by Pope Francis, will require more than individual acts of service to include those left out. It will require a collective effort to reverse decades of policy choices that have stacked the deck against the poorest among us.
How Did We Get Here?
As technology and globalization revolutionize our world and expand opportunity across the globe, U.S. workers face competition from countries that did not see much playing time a generation ago. Technological advances expedited the production of consumer goods but simultaneously hollowed out a once-robust pipeline of middle-class jobs. As the American middle class lost some of its strength in numbers, it has become increasingly bookended by concentrated wealth on one end and the swelling ranks of the working poor on the other.

Our recent political choices have succeeded only in compounding and entrenching these growing inequities. Led by a steady deregulatory drumbeat, the United States has made a gradual but profound shift in values and priorities. Tax loopholes, corporate inversions and a broken campaign finance system protect the interests of a few at a cost to many. Divestment in public education closes doors whose openness once defined our nation. Looking into federal courts, we hear the bedrock Constitutional rights of individuals morphing into expansive rights and privileges for corporations.

In 2013, after-tax corporate profits as a share of the economy were at the highest level ever recorded. Labor compensation, on the other hand, comprised its smallest share of the economy since 1948. A quarter of the jobs in this country are paying salaries that keep a family of four below the federal poverty line. And let us be clear: both the amount of corporate profit that escapes taxation and the minimum level at which companies must pay their employees are bound by the laws we write. To blame market changes is to ignore policy choices.

Walmart, the nation’s largest employer, has 1.4 million U.S. workers on its payroll and takes home upwards of $25 billion in pre-tax profit. At the same time, many of its employees are paid at levels so low they are forced to rely on food stamps, Medicaid and housing assistance to make ends meet. And that $6.2 billion tab to cover the basic needs of Walmart employees falls at the feet of American taxpayers.

The federal benefits received by Walmart employees and other low-wage workers are not welfare; they are corporate welfare. Hard-working taxpayers are forced to subsidize a corporation’s ability to pay its workers less than they need to live. And we cannot just blame Walmart when it is Congress that sets the minimum wage and Congress that has failed to raise it. Policy choices like these keep poverty entrenched in the United States and trample on the dignity of hundreds of thousands of workers.

What Can We Do?
Tackling the profound economic inequity in this country means realigning public policy with the fundamental American idea that what you start with does not determine where you end up. That means reversing the deep and draconian cuts our safety nets have seen in recent years so immediate needs of food, shelter and medical care can be met. It is hard to think about going back to school or updating your résumé if you are trying to figure out how to keep your children from going hungry tonight.

It means outlawing the manipulative practices of credit card companies, payday lenders and debt collectors, which prey on cash-strapped families and trap them into a paycheck-to-paycheck cycle of just hanging on. Subprime credit cards charge sky-high interest rates to consumers who are already having trouble paying the minimum balance every month. Payday loans that demand lump sum payments lock borrowers into taking a second loan to pay off the first, drowning consumers in debt while the $9 billion industry thrives.

Breaking the cycle of poverty also means investing in early childhood education. Our children are set up to fail if they arrive for a first day of school after the achievement gap between high and low-income households has already opened. It means increasing high school graduation rates and investing in the career/technical education that opens up pathways to middle class jobs in growing fields.

It means eliminating the false choice between providing for a family and caring for one. Laws that guarantee paid sick leave and paid family medical leave are critical for low-wage workers, who too often must choose between a sick child or a lost job. It means raising the minimum wage so no full-time worker lives below the poverty line and exploring ideas like a regionally indexed minimum wage to protect low-wage workers from falling further behind. It means extending the Earned Income Tax Credit to childless workers, an idea that has broad support on both sides of the aisle. It means passing the Paycheck Fairness Act so that women are not paid less than men for doing the same job and passing the Employment Non-Discrimination Act so that lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender workers are not relegated to the economic margins.

And it means reversing the deeply structural injustices and inefficiencies that keep our policies stacked against those with very little, from reforming our badly broken campaign finance system to improving access to legal resources to resurrecting strong voting rights protections. A society founded on human dignity and equality cannot give the wealthy greater ability to have their claims heard in court or their voices heard at the ballot box.

None of these policies is a silver bullet. But together they work to reform a system that routinely denies working-class families mobility, opportunity and justice. Most important,
they build the one force poverty cannot overcome: individu
alists with the means to invest in themselves, define their own
future and make their families better off.

Building a system that protects the dignity of each of us
is beyond the reach of any individual. It is not beyond the
reach of our nation. Today, that very idea is being challenged.
Across the political spectrum we are increasingly faced with
people who insist that taking care of each other is a sign of
weakness, rather than strength.

It is a familiar playbook. The specter of government pow-
er has long been used to incite fear by special interests and
those desperate to protect the status quo. When the Fair
Labor Standards Act made permanent our minimum wage
and child labor hours in 1938, there was panic that our busi-
nesses would crumble and jobs would dry up. Instead, our
economy soared to global leadership in the second half of the
20th century. Wall Street warned us feverishly that Dodd-
Frank financial regulations would crush the vitality of finan-
cial markets, but our stock markets have rebounded from
recession and surged to all-time highs in the four years since
the bill’s passage. San Francisco and Seattle currently tout the
nation’s fastest rate of small business job growth. They are
also home to the nation’s highest minimum wage laws.

“Government,” wrote the U.S. Conference of Catholic
Bishops in the pastoral letter “Economic Justice for All,”
“is a means by which we can act together to protect what
is important to us.” Or as President Theodore Roosevelt, a
Republican, put it: “The government is us; we are the govern-
ment, you and I.”

Our most systemic shortcomings have always required
collective action. If man or market were enough to capture
justice on their own, then we would have never written a
Constitution. We never would have needed amendments to
abolish slavery, establish equal protection and due process or
give women the right to vote. We would have never passed the
Civil Rights Act, created Social Security, constructed a G.I.
Bill or passed the Affordable Care Act.

We did these things because nearly 250 years ago we prom-
ised to build a country where every person was valued, recog-
nized and counted. Our history is the story of a people fight-
ing—together—to live up to that ideal.

That promise strikes me each time we kneel for the ho-
liest moment of Sunday Mass. At the consecration, when
bread and wine become body and blood, the priest repeats
Jesus’ words “Do this in memory of me.” He is calling us to
remember him in celebrating the Eucharist as Catholics
have done for centuries. But I believe that he softly calls us
to do much more. This means gathering in community to
share and support one another. This means going out into
the world to serve and to love as Jesus did. This means using
whatever gifts and talents we have to leave our world a little
more just and fair than we found it.
Do something this spring that will change your life forever!

“Life is Short. Go on a Pilgrimage.”

Our pilgrimages are filled with beautiful sights, time for reflection and prayer, and lots of fun!

Pilgrimage in the Footsteps of Jesus, Mary, and the Apostles
11 Days: April 22-May 2, 2015
Complete package: $3795 from New York
- Nazareth, Cana, Capernaum, Sea of Galilee
- Mount Carmel and Mount of Transfiguration
- Bethlehem, place of birth, and Shepherds’ Field
- Stations of the Cross, Calvary, Holy Sepulcher
- Upper Room, Mount of Olives, Gethsemane
- Place of Jesus’ Ascension and Mary’s Assumption
- First class hotels, great food, and much more!

Pilgrimage in the Footsteps of the Saints in Italy
12 Days: May 18-29, 2015
Complete package: $4375 from New York
- Sites of Sts. Peter, Paul, and early martyrs
- Monasticism of Sts. Benedict and Scholastica
- Medieval Renewal of Sts. Francis and Clare
- Fiery Courage of St. Catherine of Siena
- Transforming vision of St. Ignatius of Loyola
- Newly-canonicalized Sts. John XXIII and John Paul II
- First class hotels, audience with Pope Francis

Itineraries and complete details at www.Bridge-B.com or write to sjbinz@aol.com. Each pilgrimage is limited to 46 people, so sign up soon.
Listen to the Spirit
Cardinal Walter Kasper on the Synod on the Family
BY GERARD O'CONNELL

Not since the Second Vatican Council has a gathering of representatives of the world’s Catholic bishops sparked such interest and controversy as the Extraordinary General Assembly of the Synod of Bishops on the Family, which opened in the Vatican on Oct. 5. While the agenda is very wide, public interest has mainly focused on how this synod and the follow-up synod in October 2015 will address the situation of Catholics who are divorced and remarried, and whether they can be readmitted to Communion.

As is well known, Pope Francis asked the German cardinal-theologian Walter Kasper, emeritus president of the Pontifical Council for the Promotion of Christian Unity, a former university professor and diocesan bishop and the author of a book on mercy, to give the keynote address on the family to the College of Cardinals when they met last February to discuss this subject. In one part of that long presentation, Cardinal Kasper envisaged a possible way forward on the question of those who are divorced and remarried. The subsequent debate revealed two very different theological approaches to the question.

Several cardinals—including the prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Gerhard Müller, and the prefect of the Supreme Tribunal of the Apostolic Signatura, Raymond Burke—have opposed Cardinal Kasper’s opening of the question of those who are divorced and remarried, but Pope Francis publicly praised his contribution.

The temperature rose significantly, however, on the eve of the synod, when five cardinals—including Cardinal Müller and Cardinal Burke—published a book rejecting Cardinal Kasper’s line (Remaining in the Truth of Christ), while another Vatican cardinal, George Pell, wrote a preface to a different book in the same vein. Many in Rome perceived these initiatives as a clear attempt to close the discussion on this delicate topic even before the synod opened; some interpreted it as resistance to the pope.

In this context, America and La Nación—Argentina’s leading daily newspaper—interviewed Cardinal Walter Kasper in his apartment in Rome on Sept. 26 and asked how he read the contrasting theological visions at work here and what he expected to happen at the synod.

There is much interest in this synod, especially regarding how it will deal with the question of whether there will be some opening toward Catholics who are divorced and remarried.

Yes, this interest in church questions is a positive thing, and we should be grateful for it. But the problem is that some media reduce everything at the synod to the question of Communion for divorced and remarried people. The agenda of the synod is much, much broader and concerns the pastoral challenges of family life today. The problem of the divorced and remarried is one problem, but not the only one. Some media give the impression that there will be a breakthrough and started a campaign for it. I too hope there will be a responsible opening, but it’s an open question, to be decided by the synod. We should be prudent with such fixations. Otherwise, if this doesn’t happen, the reaction will be great disillusion.

Some cardinals and bishops seem to be afraid of this possibility and reject it even before the synod meets. Why do you think there is so much fear of a development in the church’s discipline?

I think they fear a domino effect; if you change one point all would collapse. That’s their fear. This is all linked to ideology, an ideological understanding of the Gospel, that the Gospel is like a penal code.

But as the pope said in “The Joy of the Gospel,” quoting St. Thomas Aquinas, the Gospel is the gift of the Holy Spirit, which is in the soul of the faithful and becomes operative in love. That’s a different understanding. It is not a museum. It is a living reality in the church, and we have to walk with the whole people of God and see what the needs of the people are. Then we have to make a discernment in the light of the Gospel, which is not a code of doctrines and commandments.

Then, of course, there is also a lack of theological hermeneutics, because we cannot simply take one phrase of the Gospel of Jesus and from that deduce everything. You need a hermeneutic to see the whole of the Gospel and of Jesus’ message and then differentiate between what is doctrine and what is discipline. Discipline can change. So I think we have here a theological fundamentalism which is not Catholic.

So you mean you cannot change the doctrine but you can change the discipline?

Doctrine, insofar as it is official binding doctrine, cannot change. So nobody denies the indissolubility of marriage. I do not, nor do I know any bishop who denies it. But discipline can be changed. Discipline wants to apply a doctrine to con-
crete situations, which are contingent and can change. So also discipline can change and has already changed often, as we see in church history.

How did you feel when you learned that this book by five cardinals was being published that attacks what you said?

Well, first of all, everybody is free to express his opinion. That is not a problem for me. The pope wanted an open debate, and I think that is something new, because up to now often there was not such an open debate. Now Pope Francis is open for it, and I think that’s healthy and it helps the church very much.

There seems to be fear among some of the cardinals and bishops because, as the pope said, we have this moral construction that can collapse like a pack of cards.

Yes, it’s an ideology; it’s not the Gospel.

There is also fear of open discussion at the synod.

Yes, because they fear all will collapse. But, first of all, we live in an open pluralistic society; and it’s good for the church to have an open discussion as we had at the Second Vatican Council. It’s good for the image of the church too, because a closed church is not a healthy church and not inviting for people today. On the other hand, when we discuss marriage and family, we have to listen to people who are living this reality. There’s a sensus fidelium. It cannot be decided only from above, from the church hierarchy, and especially you cannot just quote old texts of the last century. You have to look at the situation today, and then you make a discernment of the spirits and come to concrete results. I think this is the approach of Pope Francis, whereas many others start from doctrine and then use a merely deductive method.

In a sense, the synod is like a replay of the Second Vatican Council.

Yes, I think it is a very similar situation. Immediately before the Second Vatican Council there were Roman theologians who had prepared all the texts and expected the bishops would come and applaud and in two or three weeks it would all be over. But it didn’t happen in this way, and I think it will also not happen this time.

In an Italian daily, Il Mattino, you are reported as saying that you think the real target of these attacks is the pope, not yourself.

Maybe it was a bit imprudent of me to say that. But many people are saying this; you can hear it on the street every day. I myself do not want to judge the motives of other people. It is obvious that there are people who are not in full agreement with the present pope, but this kind of thing is not totally new. It happened also at the Second Vatican Council. Then there were people against the aggiornamento of John XXIII and Paul VI, though perhaps not in this organized way. Even Cardinal Ottaviani, the prefect of the Holy Office at that time, was against the intentions of the majority of the council.
Many analysts think it is no coincidence that this book is coming out now, precisely on Oct. 1. There has been resistance to Francis from the beginning, but this seems a more organized kind of resistance. Yes, it is a problem. I do not remember such a situation, where in such an organized way five cardinals write such a book. It's the way it's done in politics, but it should not be done in the church. It's how politicians act, but I think we should not behave this way in the church.

In recent weeks the pope said we must read the signs of the times. He wants the synod to do this.

Yes, to read the signs of the times was fundamental for the Second Vatican Council. I cannot imagine that the majority of the synod will be opposed to the pope on this point.

In recent weeks, too, Pope Francis, in his homilies, has spoken again and again about mercy and insisted that pastors must be close to their people and avoid having a closed mind.... It seemed as if he was referring to people like the five cardinals and supporting you on the question of mercy.

I think there is often a misunderstanding on what mercy is all about. Some are thinking that mercy is cheap grace, and "light" Christianity. But it is not that. I think mercy is a very demanding virtue; it is not a cheap thing. It does not take away the commandments of the Lord; that would be absurd. But as it is the fundamental virtue, according to St. Thomas Aquinas, mercy is a hermeneutical key for interpreting the commandments.

Some were surprised that the pope appointed a number of very "conservative" participants to the synod.

I think he did this because he didn't want to be criticized by selecting only those who are in favor of one position. He wants an open discussion; he wants the other group too to have their voice. He wants to be fair. He does not want to exclude anybody, but to include everybody and have all participate in the discussion. He wants to hear everyone, and everyone should have a voice. And I think this is very positive.

His understanding is that God speaks through the people and their real situations.

Of course. That's the theological conception in the last book of the New Testament: Listen to what the Spirit is saying to the churches! In the synod there should be a listening and prayerful atmosphere.

Coming back to the question of Communion for the divorced and remarried: Is Communion the prize for the perfect one or is it something to help the sinner?

We are all sinners. Nobody is really worthy to receive holy Communion. Communion has a healing effect. Especially people living in difficult situations need the help of grace and need the sacraments.

So in terms of the sacraments, do you think that at the end of the day the decision should be up to the individual or the couple?

No. The sacraments are not just private events; they are public celebrations of the whole church. Admission to the Eucharist goes through baptism and, after sin, through the sacrament of penance—that is, confession and absolution. Absolution is an official act of the church, a juridical act. Therefore divorced and remarried people should find a good priest confessor who accompanies them for some time; and if this second, civil marriage, is solid, then the path of new orientation can end with confession and absolution. Absolution means admission to holy Communion. I do not start immediately with the question of admission to Communion but with a penitential path. This does not mean to impose special acts of penance, because normally these persons are suffering a lot. A divorce is not such an easy thing; it is suffering. In this situation they need the help of grace through the sacraments; and if they have an earnest desire and do what they can do in their difficult situation, the church should find ways to help them in a sacramental way.

This, then, is a development of pastoral practice.

Yes, it is pastoral practice ending in a sacramental practice.
The church by its nature is a sacramental reality. It’s not just pastoral counseling. It’s a sacrament, and the sacrament has its own value. To say, “I absolve you” is different from giving good human advice. It is saying: God says yes to you and accepts you anew; you have a new chance.

Some have proposed that there should be an easier and quicker process for the annulment of a marriage. The pope has now set up a commission to look at the annulment process.

Well, there are situations in which such annulments are helpful and can be made. But take the case of a couple who are 10 years married and have children. In the first years they had a happy marriage, but for different reasons the marriage fell apart. This marriage was a reality, and to say it was canonically null and void does not make sense to me. This is an abstract canonical construction. It’s divorce in a Catholic way, in a dishonest way.

You said there is fear that if you open a door, then the whole moral structure collapses. In the 1980 synod, for example, they didn’t want real free discussion and those who spoke openly got sidelined. Now there’s fear that if you talk openly, you may come up with other conclusions not only here, but in other areas too.

Yes, there is not only the question of the divorced and remarried but also of same-sex unions, rainbow families, stepfamilies, the whole gender problematic and many other problems. But I think all these are very different situations and problems. You cannot argue from one situation to the other. In each of these questions a different kind of argumentation is needed. But if fear is at work, fear is always a bad counselor. The church should not act out of fear. The church should be the people of hope.

Often pastors want to control human life. It’s clericalism. They don’t trust people and therefore don’t respect the conscience of people. Of course, we have to give guidelines from the Gospel and remind people of the commandments of the Lord, but then we should trust that the Holy Spirit is working in the hearts and in the conscience of our people.

This synod process began with last year’s worldwide consultation. It was followed by the Consistory of Cardinals last February and preparation of the working document. What do you expect to come out of this synod?

We have two phases of the synod. It’s not just one synod; it’s a synodal process. I think the general idea of the pope is to have this first synodal step in order to clarify the status quae-tionis (the real situation of the family today). I think that’s very important because there are questions in Asia and in Africa that are different from ours in the Western world. After a clarification of the status quae-tionis, we will have a whole year to discuss the problems on the local church level, in the dioceses, in the parishes and the bishops conferences. Then, after a year,
the bishops come back to the synod in October 2015 to make, in communion with the pope, the necessary and adequate pastoral decisions.

So that year between the two synods is crucial.

I think it is very crucial. In this period the bishops will have time to speak to their people. Bishops will not be sitting in their palaces or residences. They will meet their people, listen to them and to the sensus fidelium, and then they may decide.

In this sense the questionnaire was also important.

To have such a questionnaire was a new way to listen. And the working document (instrumentum laboris) that was prepared for the synod is very different from the previous ones, which were a doctrinal exposition of the whole question. But this one is a résumé, a summary of the answers to the questionnaire. It’s a new kind of synod. It’s a synodal process which involves the whole of the church.

This decision by Pope Francis to invite open debate throughout the church on the subjects that are touching the lives of the faithful is really a very courageous act.

It is courageous. It’s new, and I think it’s very helpful because it’s a question of the health of the church. A church that cannot discuss what is going on or cannot speak out in an open discussion face to face will be a sick church. In this context the mass media also can and should play their part.

It seems that this whole debate on the divorced and remarried has become an issue that is in fact changing a lot in the church.

Yes, it is changing the whole atmosphere, the style in the church, and gives the image of the church as a dialogical church. This goes back to what John XXIII wanted and also what Paul VI wanted in his first encyclical on the dialogue within the church.

In these last weeks I read again what Benedict XVI said in his famous talk to the Roman Curia about the hermeneutics of continuity regarding the Second Vatican Council. He was very clear: there is continuity in the principles, but there is a discontinuity in the application of the doctrine to concrete situations. He said there is continuity with newness and a discontinuity, because the principles have to be applied to a changing reality, as was done at that council in the question of religious freedom.

What do you expect will happen in the synod?

I think it depends a lot on how the pope himself will open the synod, what he says. He cannot give us a solution at the beginning, indeed he should not do it, but he can give us a perspective, a direction. I hope there will be a serene, friendly discussion about all these problems, and I think we will achieve a broad consensus, as we did at Vatican II.
Like almost every other diocese in the United States, the Archdiocese of New York is undergoing a serious and daring refashioning of our beloved Catholic elementary schools. Since 1727, when the Ursuline Sisters of New Orleans opened the first Catholic grade school in what would become the United States of America, our schools have never had an easy time. Even during the 1950s, an era now considered their heyday, only 50 percent of our Catholic children were enrolled in our schools, and the cost, energy and sacrifice demanded to keep them going has always been staggering.

The past 45 years have presented particularly pointed challenges, as the numbers of religious women and men who formerly taught and administered in our schools have drastically diminished, costs of education have skyrocketed, competition has become more vigorous, the support for our schools among the wider culture has been severely diluted, and our own passion for supporting them has sometimes flagged.

We as a church are charged with keeping our schools excellent in education, effective in evangelization and catechesis, and affordable to all. Five years ago, the Archdiocese of New York embarked upon a fresh plan to meet these goals. The initiative is called Pathways to Excellence and, although still in development, it is already giving hope and confidence to our parents, educators, clergy, students and the wider community. The strategy is based on three non-negotiable principles, each giving rise to practical implementation.

Catholic schools are, indeed, “a pearl of great price.” This belief is bolstered by sound data and held firm by our parents, alumni and students. Our schools are singularly effective in educating our children and passing on our cherished values, and are worth all the trouble, sacrifice and energy they require. The question raised in the late 1960s—Why Catholic schools?—which, sadly, was taken up by some circles of prominence in the church, has been decisively answered: because they work! Our alumni and supporters know this in their gut, and the scholarly data backs them up.

It often seems as if people outside the Catholic community recognize the priceless value of our schools more than we do, as journals, pundits, scholars and newspapers rarely known for their sympathy to Catholic causes trumpet the indisputable effectiveness of our schools and beg us not to give up. Just ask the hundreds of parents of our inner-city children eagerly awaiting a scholarship from the renowned Inner City Scholarship Fund so championed by my predecessor, Cardinal Edward Egan, if Catholic schools work! As a prominent Jewish benefactor of our schools often chides me, “Nobody does it better than your schools! For God’s sake, quit closing them!”

Yet realism demands that we admit that our schools cause headaches, heartburn and sweat and absorb every dollar we can scrape up. Honesty also insists that we quit foolishly asking if they are worth it and confidently thunder: You bet they are!
We cannot do business as usual. In the Archdiocese of New York, we had to admit that we had too many schools—all of them very good, mind you, but just too many. The archdiocese was spending a bundle of money to keep open half-filled schools in buildings costly to maintain, thus consuming resources better used to strengthen other schools and offer more scholarships. Rather than have two struggling schools blocks apart, the reasoning went, we could have one solid, full, stable school.

As our superintendent of schools, Dr. Timothy McNiff, observed, “If we don’t close some, we’ll end up eventually closing all of them.” Besides, he reasoned, we can make the tough decisions on which ones should close—trusting in a great deal of study and consultation—and get it over with, so we could assure our parents that, at least for the foreseeable future, there would be no more closings.

Sure, it was painful, as, over two years, 60 of our schools closed. Our main consideration was that all of our children would have a nearby school ready to welcome them. Our school office offered energetic assistance so that nearly two-thirds of the students in the closed schools were able to attend another one nearby.

The result? We now have fewer schools—still a good number at 170—but they are in better facilities with larger enrollments and the choicest principals and teachers. And we do not anticipate a need for any large-scale closings in the near future.

In addition, parishes that used to have their own parochial school on their property but that were closed in the recent process, now find themselves with fresh revenue, especially if they can rent, lease or sell the former school building. In justice, our plan concludes, a part of that new revenue—we settled on half—must be given to the archdiocese to help our parents that, at least for the foreseeable future, there would be no more closings.

Realism demands that we admit that our schools cause headaches, heartburn and sweat and absorb every dollar we can scrape up.

In the Archdiocese of New York, all parishes support Catholic education. Pastors and the lay faithful in a region comprise school governing boards. This governing model was first introduced by my predecessor, Cardinal Egan, for the effective management of our Catholic high schools. After the success we realized for our high schools, it also made sense to move in this direction with our elementary schools. These boards oversee shared resources among the schools of the region in maintenance, facilities, budgets, payroll and, very importantly, enhanced fundraising, recruitment and marketing. The priests and principals report a welcome freedom in no longer having to mess with the boilers and snow removal. This leaves more time for priests to focus on pastoral duties, with their presence in the schools now concentrating on the sacraments and catechesis, and gives principals more time to focus on instructional leadership.

I do not want to give the impression that it all is rosy now here in New York. We still have challenges and snarls to work out. But as we enter our second year of this fresh strategy, enrollment is up, religion scores are up and test scores are on the rise. Last June, for the first time in memory, not a single grade school closed in the archdiocese. The pastors and their parishioners are cooperating and paying their freight, with parishioners proud that their parish now has a school to claim as its own. The pastors and their people have dug deep to pay their share of “their” school, even if it is not on their parish grounds. And, they reason, if the parish is helping support a nearby regional school they should encourage parents to send their children there.

Best of all, there is a renewed sense of confidence. As one parent commented, “It used to seem we were in a ‘hospice mode’ regarding our schools, thinking that they’re dying, and our job was to postpone their passing as long as we could and make their death as painless as possible.” No more: We trumpet that our schools are well worth fighting for, but admit that we can no longer do business as usual and that it is time to make them catholic, not only in character but in ownership by every parish.
Our Bleeding Hearts
Seeking more mercy from the media
BY ELIZABETH STOKER BRUENIG

During my year in the United Kingdom I kept up obsessively with news of home. It is not a habit that is encouraged among students abroad, but I expected with the sort of headlines I followed I would not be missing much. How is it possible, I then reasoned, to read about controversial or troubling events and feel anything but gratitude for distance? But I estimated wrongly. I encountered the Byron Smith case while I was overseas and followed the coverage of the trial as it unfolded. And it did generate, contrary to my expectation, a kind of homesick feeling: a longing to console someone or something very far away.

Home Invasion
On Nov. 22, 2012, Thanksgiving Day, 65-year-old Byron Smith was home alone in Little Falls, Minn. He was in the basement of his house, waiting, with bottled water and energy bars for provisions and an audio recorder that was tapping the silence. He was also armed with multiple firearms. Eventually Smith heard signs of a break-in: first the shattering of glass and then footsteps on old wood flooring. He waited.

When 17-year-old Nick Brady began to descend Smith’s basement stairs, Smith fired multiple times without warning, killing him. He then sat down in the chair he had been waiting in and remained there, still, for another 10 minutes. Haile Kifer, 18, approached next.

Smith shot her but did not immediately kill her. Seeing that she had not died, he leaned over her prone body, placed the barrel of his gun under her chin and shot her. Smith waited a day to call the police. He was sentenced to life in prison on April 29, 2014, after the jury deliberated for just three hours, pursuant to a lengthy and public trial that I followed with a sense of distant mourning.

Media Frenzy
Coverage of the Smith case was immediately polarized, unsurprising in light of comparable cases in recent memory, most notably the killing of Trayvon Martin by George Zimmerman in 2012. More grim yet was the fact that the verdict against Smith was handed down—to mixed media response—just as news broke of an eerily similar case in Montana. In that case, a homeowner named Markus Kaarma allegedly baited 17-year-old Diren Dede, whom he suspected of burglary, into his garage and then killed him.

As in the wake of Martin’s killing, heavily politicized media outlets quickly competed to interpret Smith’s murders so as to deflect all the usual critiques: of gun violence, for instance, and of laws that permit lethal force in admittedly hazy cases of trespassing and self-defense. On April 30, Sean Hannity covered the case on his Fox News show.

Hannity was suitably outraged that Smith was sentenced to life in prison for his murders. “They broke into the guy’s house,” he argued, while a guest claimed Smith should “get a medal of freedom for what he did.” Both proclamations

ELIZABETH STOKER BRUENIG is a doctoral candidate in religion, politics and philosophy at Brown University. She earned a master’s degree in Christian theology from the University of Cambridge as a Marshall Scholar and has published in The Atlantic, The Boston Review and First Things.

SEE THE VICTIM. Women pray at the New Life Word Center Church in Sanford, Fla., after the George Zimmerman murder trial.
were evidently premised on the fact that Smith had been, in his words and those expressed on Hannity, “repeatedly victimized.”

“What are you gonna do?” Hannity mused, “It’s easy to say after the fact ‘I wouldn’t....’” When he finally convinced his guest Geraldo Rivera that he would kill an intruder, Hannity joked, “you’re becoming a right-winger.”

Right-wing political ideologies cannot be used to justify a sense of victimization so strong that it results in the murder of unarmed teenagers. Yet the culture of celebrity surrounding individuals who, acting within the contested parameters of legal statutes allowing for the killing of intruders upon person or property, do commit such murders is unfailingly generated among the pundits of the political right.

There is a reason Joe Scarborough felt motivated to warn the Republican Party against hailing George Zimmerman as a hero in the wake of so many gun factory photo-ops. Nonetheless, the acquitted killer still signs autographs and snaps pictures with fans at gun shows from time to time. And there is some association—ambiguous and vague, but consistent—between individuals who commit killings that seem just beyond the necessities of self-defense, the guns they use and the laws giving wide berth to protection of self and property that they arguably abuse. They are celebrities, it seems, of a terrible defensiveness, emblems of a society that views itself as perpetually victimized and, finally, unwilling to tolerate any more. Smith said as much in his statements to police regarding the murders.

Culture of Death

Minnesota’s judicial department makes all media related to court cases available to the public. Two audio recordings of Byron Smith’s statements to police following the murders are currently available on its website, totaling nearly two hours of painstaking dissection of the events. What comes most strikingly to the fore in Smith’s explanation of his behavior is not that his version of the story is not consonant with the facts (he neglects to admit he attempted to lure the burglars inside and that he waited for them hidden in a homemade blind) but that he himself seems caught up in a murky sort of paranoia. In explaining the 2012 murders of teenagers Brady and Kifer, Smith refers to a series of burglaries ranging back 15 years, which he attributes to a neighborhood girl named Ashley, with whom he has had extremely limited contact.

Smith lived alone, he explains. He was not enjoying a Thanksgiving meal because he is, in his words, “somewhat uncomfortable with other people’s family holidays.” He says, “It’s not the kind of social thing I do.” Smith had very little interaction with his neighbors. “I’ve known since grade school,” he informs the officer taking his statement, “that being ganged up on is a sore spot with me.... I wasn’t thinking, I was just—they’re ganging up on me. So I killed her, too.”

In recounting the process of that murder, Smith claims Kifer laughed at him when his gun jammed. The audio recording taken that day in his basement reveals no such laughter, only empty, sonorous silence, shattered by a series of gunshots. After the shot that ultimately ended Kifer’s life, Smith mutters to himself: “I’m safe now...."

There is much to love about American culture, even the media venues that endlessly hound their viewers with relentless visions of fear and dreadful vulnerability.

I’m totally safe.... I refuse to live in fear.... I am not a bleeding-heart liberal.”

Whatever conflation of abject fear and the justification of extreme measures (only loosely construed as defense) permeates the darker corners of right-wing punditry had clearly taken root in Smith’s consciousness. His defense on “The Sean Hannity Show” was, therefore, yet another contribution to the strange celebrity that regenerates itself with every death it encourages. A keen media observer might identify this morbid tendency as yet another iteration of a culture of death; an Augustinian would at the same time suspect the bleeding heart—or the hardened one, in the case of Smith—was at the center of it all along.

Hearts Must Bleed

St. Augustine’s conversion, as documented in his Confessions, still strikes me as one of the more dramatic events in all of literature, though the core conflict occurs within the heart of one man. And the fierceness of the battle concerns mostly the strength of the perimeter: Will Augustine allow God to come into his heart, or will he harden his heart against God to seal him out?

God prevails. Augustine writes:

You had pierced our hearts with the arrow of Your love, and our minds were pierced with the arrows of Your words. To burn away and utterly consume our slothfulness so that we might no more be sunk in its depths, we had the depths of our thought filled with the examples of Your servants whom You had changed from darkness to light and from death to life; and these inflamed us so powerfully that any false tongue of contradiction did not extinguish our flame but set us blazing more fiercely.  

Confessions 9:2
It is not by mistake that Augustine’s conversion brings with it a heightened awareness of others; as a member of the church he puts himself not only in the service of the Lord but also in the service of his fellow Christians. It is a decided turn from an otherwise deeply internal narrative, and the piercing of the heart seems key. Once a passage is made into one’s heart, community is truly possible.

And so it is also with Christ’s teaching on divorce in Mt 19:8; separation was permitted because the hearts of the Israelites under Moses were hard, repelling genuine bonds with spouses and the wishes of the Lord. But the original bond of marriage was predicated, we gather, on hearts of a decidedly softer kind, and it is that sort of heart that Christ requires of us and ultimately bears himself on the cross.

For community to prevail, hearts must bleed. The hardened heart is a defensive one; self-interested and resistant to the pain that can be caused to it by the doings of others, it resists risk but also rejects authentic bonds. It is paranoid and soaked in fear, and fear has to do with punishment (1 Jn 4:18). But perfect love drives out fear.

Promoting Mercy
The objects of political obsession are very often the objects of defense; American right-wing media have refined a morbid fixation on the protection of self and property in delirious extremes to a fine art. But the promotion of the likes of Zimmerman and Smith to folk heroes is a dangerous dealing in a culture of death, confirming for viewers the very fears that gave rise to murders like these and simultaneously proposing killing as the best solution. It is a vicious cycle in the most literal sense, a cycle of vice that isolates and estranges.

And yet there is much to love about American culture, even the media venues that endlessly hound their viewers with relentless visions of fear and dreadful vulnerability. Familiarity may be little more than coincidental, but it does signal a kind of bond, and if there is an authentic bond, there is a community. All of us have it within our power to participate in a reversal of narrative. Dare we expect from our media the promotion of mercy? It seems a fair request. Mercy by nature confounds expectations, and so too would the most virtuous response to a deathly culture in media. Instead of participating in the same old deriding and decrying that leads to a good deal of self-satisfaction and a deliberate taking of sides, we could as easily reach out to the media infected by this tendency and plead for a reversal. It is a small step, but an available one, full of hope and longing; it is the sort of longing I associated with this country while living in the United Kingdom. It is a longing I still associate with the United States, because I love it and because it is mine.
Shock Waves in Rome

The house arrest of the former nuncio, Archbishop Jozef Wesolowski, on Sept. 23, sent tremors through the ecclesiastical establishment in the Vatican and worldwide.

Never before in the history of the Vatican City State had a senior archbishop been arrested for the sexual abuse of minors and possession of a considerable quantity of pornographic material involving minors. The Vatican could arrest him because he was a Holy See diplomat and a citizen of the Vatican when he allegedly committed the crimes.

The fact that his arrest was carried out with the pope’s approval sent a powerful message to the universal church and the wider world that a policy of zero tolerance is being pursued under this pontificate for those who sexually abuse minors and for those who give perpetrators of such abuse cover or protection.

That policy regarding those who give cover or protection was highlighted on Sept. 25 by the removal of the bishop of Ciudad del Este in Paraguay, Rogelio Livieres Plano, a member of Opus Dei. He not only formally accepted into his diocese an Argentine priest accused of sexual misconduct with minors in the United States, but did so against the advice of the bishop of Scranton and later promoted him to vicar general. These actions, and the fact that Bishop Livieres Plano has long been a divisive figure in the bishops’ conference, led the pope to remove him.

On the flight back from Tel Aviv on May 26, when Pope Francis was asked what he would do with bishops who do not abide by the new Vatican regulations in this field, he recalled that in Argentina, those “who get special treatment” are called “Daddy’s boys”; but in the church “as far as this problem is concerned...there is no special treatment,” and “on this issue we need to keep moving forward: zero tolerance!”

He made clear then and again on July 7, when he met six abuse survivors, that the age of immunity and impunity in the Catholic Church is over. Those responsible for the abuse of minors or for protecting perpetrators or covering up their crimes will be punished. This cleanup operation is well under way. Started under Benedict XVI, it is picking up strong momentum under Francis, who is above all a man of action. Sources say Francis intervened directly to speed up the judicial process in the case of the nuncio.

“The arrest of Archbishop Wesolowski is a strong and unequivocal political choice of Francis,” the Italian Cardinal Velasio de Paolis stated. A member of the Vatican’s Court of Cassation who oversaw the renewal of the Legionaries of Christ, he described the arrest as “an act without precedent,” which is both “punitive and exemplary for the common good.”

Cardinal Walter Kasper described it as “a change of paradigm.” He recalled that there was a time when priests “were protected”; but now, he said, “we are looking at the whole problem from the viewpoint of the victims and not from that of the church as institution” and “its image.” This is “something new,” he told the Italian daily Corriere della Sera, adding that “the pope’s line is clear; he cannot stop now, and certainly not in the case of a bishop. The church has need of purification and renewal.”

The Wesolowski case is still under investigation and could bring further developments. The Italian media say investigations are being conducted in all countries where he served as a diplomat, and there are suggestions (unconfirmed) that he might have had links to an international pedophile network, with protection in high places. A Polish priest who was with him for a time in the Dominican Republic has been arrested in Poland for the abuse of minors.

On the plane from Tel Aviv, Pope Francis said three bishops were under investigation for such crimes. It is presumed that Wesolowski was one of them. Vatican and other sources say a number of bishops in some countries have covered up cases of abuse, and they cannot expect to be ignored. On July 7 Francis told survivors, “All bishops must carry out their pastoral ministry with the utmost care in order to help foster the protection of minors, and they will be held accountable.” Right now Francis’ clean-up is a work in progress. Stand by for further developments.

**GERARD O’CONNELL**

**GERARD O’CONNELL** is America’s Rome correspondent. America’s Vatican coverage is sponsored in part by the Jesuit communities of the United States. Twitter: @gerryorome.
I was a seminarian in Rome when Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli was elected Pope John XXIII. More than five decades later, I found myself in Rome once more, on April 27, at the canonization ceremony that celebrated Pope John's holy life, as well as that of Pope John Paul II. I was one of 800 priests distributing Communion that day, and the experience offered me the chance to reflect on what these great men have meant to the church.

I participated in the visit by Pope John XXIII to our seminary, the North American College, on Oct. 11, 1959. Although we listened closely to the pope’s homily in English—he had been coached by his Irish priest secretary—we understood nothing of what he was trying to say.

A few days later, my bishop was given an audience with Pope John and invited me to accompany him. The audience was conducted in French, one of the two languages Pope John spoke fluently, and his characteristic informality shone through. At the end of our audience, instead of bowing politely, the pope himself walked us out.

As we walked to the door, I was anxious to say something to the pope and so, at that last moment, wanting to express appreciation for the gesture he made to us at the seminary by preaching in English, I said, “Sainteté, votre parole à nous en anglais était...” (“Your holiness, your words to us in English were...”) and searching for a word that would say how deeply impressed we were by his attempt, I chose magnifique. Pope John then took my hands into his and said in French, “Let me tell you something St. Philip Neri used to say. When people say something negative about you they may be speaking the truth, but if they say something positive, they could be making fun of you.” He knew he had failed in his attempt at speaking in English and then went on to comment how difficult a language it is to master.

Years later I became rector of the North American College, and I was present for the election of Karol Jozef Wojtyla, who began his pontificate as Pope John Paul II on Oct. 22, 1978. He later accepted my invitation to come to the North American College, a visit that took place on Feb. 22, 1980. The visit lasted four hours. It began by my asking him to plant a California sequoia on our grounds, as it seemed a more fitting tribute than a marble plaque for this young and athletic pope. When he departed at 10 p.m. he turned and said to me, “Planting that tree was a good idea!”

After the pope celebrated Mass and individually greeted every single priest, seminarian and employee of the college, we sat down to dinner. It was Lent, and the Vatican had instructed us to serve soup and bread. My conversation with the pope consisted mostly of him asking me questions. I realized how reserved he was in such situations, yet he also made me feel comfortable enough to finally ask him a question in return. To a much lesser degree than the pope, I was trying to balance my scholarly interests with administrative duties, and so I asked him how he was managing to accomplish this himself. He replied, “I take no appointments until 11 o’clock in the morning. This allows me to devote the early morning hours to reading and writing, although at this point it’s mostly writing.”

**This Is The Day**

I did not sleep well the night before the canonization Mass. There were reports that more than a million people would be converging, with busloads arriving daily from Poland and Bergamo in northern Italy. No tickets were be-
ing issued; people were sleeping in the streets to get a good spot. The weather forecast included an 80 percent chance of rain during the outdoor ceremony, and I worried about getting from the North American College to St. Peter’s.

I decided to leave the seminary through a rarely used back gate and walk down a blocked street toward the basilica. Friendly police created space to penetrate the crowds, and I arrived safely in the Blessed Sacrament chapel of St. Peter’s—the location designated as the meeting place for the extraordinary ministers of the Eucharist. Ominous black clouds supplied a few rain drops, but as the morning unfolded the sun appeared.

Those quiet moments in the closed, darkened basilica were the most precious for me that day. A few cardinals were praying at the nearby tombs of the two popes, and I was able to savor this special moment.

Finally, our group moved to the main church. Pope Francis chose to make his entrance behind the altar from the front doors of St. Peter’s. The crowds were instructed to make no applause, not even to wave their banners; they were to join in the chanting of the Litany of the Saints and so enter into a prayerful atmosphere for the Mass.

In his homily Pope Francis spoke with eloquent simplicity about the heroic virtues of the two new saints. John XXIII transformed the papacy into a position of world leadership and summoned the Second Vatican Council. John Paul II participated in the fall of Communism and his papacy was the second longest in history. Pope Francis described them respectively as one who was open and docile to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and “the pope who was devoted to the life of the family.” He said: “They lived through the tragic events of the 20th century but were not overwhelmed by them. For them, God was more powerful, their faith was stronger—their faith—and Jesus Christ, the redeemer of man.”

Pope Francis clearly saw the appropriateness of canonizing the two popes together, for John Paul II’s papacy would have been impossible without the accomplishments of John XXIII. For over a century the popes were self-proclaimed “prisoners of the Vatican,” protesting Italy’s confiscation of the papal states. Pope John was the first to venture outside the Vatican, making pilgrimages to Assisi and Loretto. This led the way for John Paul to travel the world. John convened Vatican II, which taught that all Christians, lay, religious and clergy, are called to one and the same perfection of holiness. John Paul underlined the point by canonizing more saints than all previous popes combined. John’s social teaching in his landmark encyclicals, “Mater et Magistra” and “Pacem in Terris” were built upon by John Paul as he sought to make a greater connection between the church and the world.

Vatican II called for more collegiality and consultation in church governance. Now Pope Francis has taken this to heart. With his rapport with those on the fringes of society, Francis has adopted the pastoral style of Pope John. Long before Pope Francis did so, Pope John visited people in prison and shocked his entourage by saying, “I feel comfortable with you. Some of my relatives have been in prison!”

On the day these men were canonized, I pushed myself to the limits, bringing Holy Communion to people in the square before being directed to proceed down the Via della Conciliazione toward the Tiber to still more of the crowd. I was accompanied by a young priest professor from the University of Lublin, where Pope John Paul had taught. He came to Rome from Poland over the Alps on his motorcycle. Another of the priests near me was from the diocese of Sacramento. His trouser pockets were so filled with religious medals he intended to distribute at home that he found it difficult to climb the stairs to bring Communion to the people on the bleachers on top of the Bernini colonnade.

I traveled to Rome filled with memories of joyous encounters, and hope for what the raising up of Pope John XXIII and Pope John Paul II means for the church. At the audience with Pope Francis the following Wednesday, I recognized the beginning of a new phase with a new pope and returned home renewed in my joy, assured of my hope.
Enter into the Gospels in a New Way

“Clear, accessible...deeply personal.”
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The Blue Wall

Last month a blue wall sprang up in Berlin.

Seventy-nine feet long, the soaring wall of glass is a monument to the 300,000 victims of the Third Reich’s euthanasia program. From January 1940 to August 1941, German medical personnel killed 70,000 people in gas chambers. Those with serious mental and physical disabilities were soon joined by people simply judged to be social misfits. Protests by the Catholic Church, led by Clemens von Galen, bishop of Münster, forced the German government to announce the end of the program in 1941. But it continued in secret. More than 200,000 new victims were executed through lethal injection or starvation.

Popularly known as T-4, the National Socialists’ euthanasia campaign was housed at Tiergartenstrasse 4 in Berlin. In the mansion located at this address, scores of doctors and bureaucrats planned the program’s victim rolls, construction of “hospitality centers” and methods of execution. The euthanasia memorial stands on land immediately in front of the old Tiergartenstrasse headquarters. The building itself has an odd history. The German government confiscated the mansion from its Jewish owners and then “Aryanized” it by putting it to eugenic use. A sleek palace housing the Berlin Philharmonic now stands on the site. The strains of Mozart have covered over the T-4 staff’s deliberative whispers, which had replaced the Hanukkah songs of the earlier Jewish family.

Unsurprisingly, the abstract monument has attracted criticism from victims’ relatives and the general public. Why are there no human figures or even names on the wall itself? In fact, the designers Ursula Wilms, Heinz Hollmam and Nicholaus Koliusis have created a window eloquent by its very anonymity.

The blue tint is not arbitrary. It reproduces the color of the questionnaire used by euthanasia supervisors to determine who would die. As a nearby information panel informs us, the most important question on the form asked whether the candidate was “productive.” By the end of the war, the most damning description of a potential victim was “work-adverse.”

The transparent wall evokes the anonymity of the T-4 victims themselves. The memorial to the euthanasia victims did not open until years after Berlin had inaugurated monuments to other Third Reich victims: Jews, Roma, homosexuals. In the postwar Nuremberg trials, several architects of the T-4 campaign were executed or imprisoned, but most participants eluded prosecution. Their crimes were quickly forgotten. Virtually no one received compensation from either the West or East German governments for the suffering of a disabled relative. As historians work on the archives of the T-4 program, German grandchildren have suddenly discovered that a previously unknown aunt or uncle had perished in the euthanasia campaign. This long forgetting of these particular victims of Nazism reflects the irrational shame that has long shrouded the treatment of the disabled. Earlier in the 20th century, people with mental illness and serious physical handicaps were to be hidden away, preferably in rural institutions with few visitors. This social sequestration facilitated the occult killing of the disabled. Few questions were raised about the mendacious death notices concerning those whom polite society had already banished as an embarrassment.

As visitors gaze through the blue glass, they perceive people on the other side through one tinted lens. Just as the disabled can be perceived and dismissed on the basis of one flaw, the observed visitor is reduced to one dull color in the monochrome blur. The tinted glass distorts the image of those on the other side. A bandaged limb or a hearing aid or a limp is suddenly magnified. The blue wall also serves as a mirror for the spectators. A large number of those visiting the monument in its first weeks were seated in wheelchairs, a visual reminder of the progress made in recent decades to integrate the disabled into mainstream society. But the wall’s mirror also functions as an indictment. The eugenic dream was not eliminated by the Nuremberg tribunals. It still seduces.

The eugenic dream was not eliminated by the Nuremberg tribunals.

John J. Conley, S.J., holds the Knott Chair in Philosophy and Theology at Loyola University Maryland in Baltimore, Md.
A cynic might suggest that one way to keep immigrants from wanting to come to the United States would be to show them a dystopian exposé like *To the Bone*, Lisa Ramirez’s affecting if wildly uneven new Off Broadway play about undocumented female poultry workers slaving away thanklessly in Sullivan County, N.Y. That is not entirely fair, though, since the tense, gnarly tale that unfolds among a quintet of Central American women and a few men in their lives is not unrelentingly bleak. Indeed, one of the play’s most sneakily shocking moments comes when after a particularly tragic incident near the show’s end, the women calmly set out a card table and a cooler in their backyard for another of their impromptu social gatherings.

This abrupt transition does more than mark the passage of time; it also drives home a point the show has been quietly making all along, alongside its more bold-faced statements about structural injustice and economic oppression: that the working poor everywhere, regardless of their immigration status or other obstacles, make a life and a home for themselves even amid the worst conditions.

This adaptive persistence, albeit in a more middle-class milieu, is also among the revelations of Aldo Bello’s documentary/advocacy film *Dream: An American Story*, which is being shown around the country this fall, presumably timed for the midterm elections. Bello’s central case study is the story of the Gómez family, Colombians who decided to stay in Miami after their request for asylum was denied and their work permits expired, all the while raising the two Colombian-born sons, Alex and Juan, they had brought to America as toddlers. These boys would hence become prototypical “dreamers,” young Americans in all but their legal status, whose liminal status the DREAM Act legislation was crafted to resolve.

Juan in particular distinguished himself, attending Georgetown on a full scholarship and graduating summa cum laude, then working for a time as an analyst at JPMorgan in New York. Both of these achievements, however, followed his parents’ forced return to Colombia, a fate he and his brother avoided only when no less a personage than Senator Chris Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut, passed a private bill to delay their deportation.

Though Juan, who emerges in the film as a stoical pragmatist and who now works in São Paulo, Brazil, lives a life far removed from the killing floors of Sullivan County, he is no less prey to the existential uncertainty that haunts the undocumented—those nearly 12 million people described as living “in the shadows” while the nation’s polarized immigration politics churn un-
helpfully around them.

Neither “To the Bone” nor “Dream,” though, directly engages these contentious politics or gives an explanation as to why immigration reform has become such a third rail that even the relatively supportive President Obama has bowed to pressure, opting to defer action on the current border crisis until after the midterm elections. This deficit of perspective is less of a problem for Ramirez’s play, a work of dramatic fiction, than for Bello’s film, which aims to be persuasive. The voices of opposition we hear in “Dream” are bilious snippets of talk radio, brief samples of House Republican talking points during the vote for the DREAM Act (it is described as “affirmative action amnesty,” a clumsy bit of alliterative dog-whistling) and a sign or two at a Washington march. The president’s stunning decision in 2012 to take executive action to defer deportation for some young undocumented immigrants is portrayed as the culmination of a drama in which activists worked to raise the profile of the DREAM Act, only to see it dashed in Congress by Republican obstruction.

While the film does not spare Obama from the just criticism that he has become a sort of deporter-in-chief—there is a recurring title card about the mounting millions who have been flushed from the United States during his presidency—it also leaves viewers yearning for a clearer sense of the election-year political calculus underpinning his executive action and the somewhat bumbling maneuvers among cautious, Republican reformers like Marco Rubio of Florida or John McCain of Arizona. The film’s argument for a saner immigration policy chiefly emerges through the personal lens—the sad, lonely saga of over-achieving Juan Gómez, whose best efforts end up thwarted by our broken system. The political backdrop for his story would be filled in immeasurably by even just one voice who could answer for Republican recalcitrance.

By contrast, the debate that rages in “To the Bone,” and which gives it inarguable momentum even as its plot strands get tangled in melodrama, is between dueling matriarchs, Olga (played by the playwright Ramirez) and Reina (Annie Henk). Olga is a dyspeptic, perpetually aggrieved fighter whose ever-simmering anger, even when she is in the right, is compellingly unpleasant; Reina, meanwhile, is a go-along-to-get-along peacemaker, better able to compartmentalize the indignities of the workplace and the comforts of hard-won domesticity. Between these two poles are the more tender Juana (Liza Fernández), in mourning for a lost daughter, and Carmen (Xochitl Romero), a new arrival whose disastrous fate gets caught in the crossfire between Olga and Reina.

The true child of this warring household, a quintessential teenaged “dreamer” named Lupe (Paola Lazaro-Múñoz), provides the most hopeful note in “To the Bone.” She has Olga’s strength, minus the bitterness, and Reina’s determination, minus the denial. If “To the Bone” belongs resolutely to the muckraking tradition of American storytelling, in which the experiences of the “least of these” are offered as a stark diagnosis of the state of the national character, the endearingly tough, transparent Lupe points a way forward for this nation of immigrants—if we are willing to take it.

to recognize that we cannot go back to either a secular enlightenment or a Christian consensus, and that culture-war stances are not helpful alternatives. Rather, all sides need to recognize that they should be searching for ways to build a more fully inclusive pluralism.” Marsden’s own account hardly leads to the conclusion that “all sides” might be ready to see the light. Still, he urges that “journalistic media should provide leadership in cultivating a public domain as fully inclusive of religiously shaped viewpoints as is feasible.” Also, secularist commentators, rather than denouncing religion in the name of “universal reason,” should wrestle with more generous approaches.

A reader may well ask—this one does—why Marsden finds so little positive endeavor or achievement from leaders and movements of the last time around, in those fabled 1950s. Public philosopher Walter Lippmann and public theologian Reinhold Niebuhr do come off with qualified good marks for their efforts, but they fail to do justice to—here’s that phrase again—the “fully inclusive pluralism” which the nation needs. Marsden does sound two cheers for what he calls the “mainline Protestant establishment” which became somewhat tolerant in the mid-20th century. But it promoted only a “tri-faith (Protestant-Catholic-Jew) inclusive pluralism.” Because it was based in liberal religion, it failed to include—count these samples!—“fundamentalists, Pentecostals, and other conservative evangelicals as well as Mormons, Orthodox Jews, conservative Catholics, Muslims, Hindus, and many others who did not fit the mainline religious profile.” Now, did any of these other mentioned groups make any contribution to Marsden’s hoped-for “fully inclusive pluralism?” Could they have?

Marsden is a wise, accomplished and fair-minded scholar who knows that if he finds little resource in what is left of the American Enlightenment and even less in Protestantism, he has to come up with some sort of alternative on the horizon of his hoped-for dawn. He has the guts or, his critics will say, the foolishness to suggest that fully inclusive pluralism, so needed in our world of culture wars, is available in modified versions of what we may call Kuyperism, which he describes and advertises in a dozen pages at the end of the book. This “alternative view does not resolve all the remarkably complex problems regarding religion and culture. But it does offer a starting point or framework for thinking about them that differs from the dominant American models.”

Influential chiefly in the smallish high culture of Christian Reformed Protestantism in America, it was developed in the Netherlands by Abraham Kuyper, a Dutch theologian, churchman, political leader and publicist in the late 19th century. Let’s be clear: pointing to a figure unknown to vastly vast majorities is not by definition pointless or futile. Picture, in a different category, how an obscure Danish thinker, Søren Kierkegaard, vivified some latter-day Christian circles and also influenced French existentialism decades ago. So, we will pay attention to Marsden’s Kuyper.

Let me spend a moment on Marsden’s context. First, his fine biography of Jonathan Edwards, probably the most profound theologian in our hemisphere’s history, shows that he is not frivolous in his choices and proposals. Second, Kuyper does merit attention. (James D. Bratt has recently published a worthy biography, Abraham Kuyper: Modern Calvinist, Christian Democrat (Eerdmans, 2013). Also, to show my readiness to take this alternative seriously, I confess that I could also be described, with Kuyper and Marsden, as an “Augustinian Christian.” Marsden defines such as one whose “commitments involve a recognition that people differ in their fundamental loves and first principles, and that these loves and first principles act as lenses through which they see everything else.” I am a bit wary about Marsden’s added “Augustinian” view that “at the same time, all humans, as fellow creatures of God, share many beliefs in common and can communicate through common strands of rational discourse.”

Marsden generously adds that his own “pluralism” has been fed also by many other sources, but in this book he criticizes, for example, both the ecumenical Protestants like Niebuhr and secular rationalists like Lippmann for “Building without Foundations” (the title of Chapter 3). Lippmann’s citation of “natural law” does, though, attract Marsden.

The author is realistic enough to know that he is asking us to stretch imaginations if we are to include the eight or nine mentioned “others” we counted above, who were not invited to the pluralist table by secular and Protestant establishmentarians at mid-century last. Marsden even hopes to interest some in “mainstream academia” to be friendlier to religions. That old “mainstream,” which Marsden dismisses, was too Protestant-Catholic-
Jewish. However, with a Kuyperian “fully inclusive pluralist base,” his alternative framework promotes “equity for communities that represent virtually every religion in the world.”

Some would consider this reach to be utopian. Still, it may be good to have this sweeping vision come from a conservative, some would say “evangelical,” Protestant voice. But if a titanic figure like Reinhold Niebuhr, for all the secular media attention and the large following which was still possible for one to gain in a more coherent, less pluralist time, failed because he lacked some of the Kuyperian-style foundations, what chance is there in the post-modern chaos of today? Marsden writes, as the foundational point, that Kuyper “believed that God had created a reality that all people could know, in harmony in holding a society together.” He believed “that since all people share experience in God’s ordered reality, these areas of agreement among peoples of various religious or secular faiths could be considerable.”

I end with questions: doesn’t assent to these propositions demand a great a priori “leap of faith”? And doesn’t it expect a more generous attitude to the near-miss secular and Christian thinkers who lack some of what Marsden called “foundations”? Still, while raising these questions, many of us will participate around the dialogical and political table Marsden would set, instead of getting armed for tiresome “culture wars.”

MARTIN E. MARTY is an emeritus professor at The University of Chicago.

WILLIAM BOLE

SPIRITUAL EXERCISERS

INSIDE THE JESUITS
How Pope Francis is Changing the Church and the World

By Robert Blair Kaiser
Rowman & Littlefield. 238p $32

In July of last year, aboard a plane returning to Rome from the World Youth Day celebration in Rio de Janeiro, Pope Francis made clear to the world that he was pontificating in a new key. He walked back to the press compartment and stood in the aisle for 81 minutes, answering every question in a spontaneous exchange with reporters and uttering his now-emblematic “Who am I to judge?” remark about gays. Scarcely noted was another comment by this product of the Society of Jesus: “I think like a Jesuit.”

Robert Blair Kaiser contends that the latter quote is most revealing about the Jesuit pope and where he is taking the Catholic Church. Kaiser’s book—

idiosyncratic though interesting at almost every turn—is largely a journalist’s probe into what it means to think like a Jesuit in the Age of Francis. He argues at the outset that Francis “has been driven by his Jesuit DNA to make changes in the Church that have been up to now unthinkable.”

Kaiser is a former award-winning religion reporter for The New York Times, CBS News, Newsweek, and Time (which sent him to Rome in 1962 to cover the Second Vatican Council), and so his journalistic credentials are palpable. He is not, however, a detached observer. Kaiser spent 10 years as a Jesuit in the California Province, leaving the order before ordination for a career in journalism. He says he remains “a Jesuit at heart.”

One of the book’s early chapters is a very brief history of the nearly 500-year-old Society of Jesus, beginning with St. Ignatius Loyola and the early Jesuits, who “had a conviction that most problems have solutions and that they should try to solve them with imagination, perseverance, and an openness to new ideas.” Managing to figure into the 10-page overview is the West Coast Compañeros Inc., Kaiser’s group of former Jesuits (“Like Marines, we have a special identity,” he writes). Less oddly, Jorge Mario Bergoglio plays a standout role in this remade history. Kaiser surmises that Bergoglio was a “lousy leader” serving as Argentina’s Jesuit provincial during the 1970s, a dark period of bloody repression there. The author concludes that the man now called Francis is “a poster boy for Cardinal Newman’s observation that to live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often.”

The most thematic chapter is “The Jesuit DNA.” Kaiser traces no small part of this genetic structure to Ignatius’s Spiritual Exercises, which turn Jesuits into “men who are self-aware, with a confidence and a sense of freedom that compels them” to take risks for God and the greater good. At that point, Kaiser runs with another Pope Francis quote, that “the Society of Jesus can be described only in narrative form.” This methodology brings us to the least edifying part of the book, as Kaiser devotes 28 pages to his own Jesuit story. Along the way he settles old scores with fellow Jesuits and religious superiors who underappreciated his ministerial talents (he sup-
plies real names). Part of the literary problem here is that Kaiser is cribbing from his engaging 2003 memoir, Clerical Error, a genre better suited to these recollections than a book subtitled How Pope Francis is Changing the Church and the World.

Kaiser is perhaps most eloquent when writing about Vatican II and the Jesuits (John Courtney Murray, for one) who helped shape the Council, which in turn “helped us all be more real, more human, and more loving.” He is simply brilliant when profiling contemporary Jesuits including the likes of Paolo Dall’Oglio, “a tall, animated man on the move with flashing eyes,” who has devoted his ministry to dialogue with Arab Muslims. The Italian calls himself “a Jesuit Muslim ...because Jesus loves Muslims, the same Jesus who is alive in me.” Kaiser also throws much light on the world of former Jesuits, with profiles of several including California governor Jerry Brown.

Throughout the book, Kaiser’s contentions and observations are rarely dull and often intriguing.

In a chapter on liberation theology, he digresses into the question of priests who fall in love, naming among them Karl Rahner, the preeminent 20th-century Jesuit theologian. He also infers (partly from the 2013 biography Francis by Argentine journalist Elisabetta Piqué) that Bergoglio was one such priest. The pope has spoken of a passing infatuation with a woman he met while a seminarian, but Kaiser speculates about a 50-year-old Bergoglio, in Germany, pursuing a doctorate. The author resumes this conjecture later in the book, writing, “No wonder Francis can laugh at himself; he, a sinner, who is also now a pope.”

Kaiser’s conclusions are lively and often bracing. In the final chapter, he argues that Francis is perfectly positioned to “bury the Church’s thousand-year-old blunder, the non-biblical understanding of papal primacy.” Francis is already reorienting Catholicism with his message that “we should care more about Jesus than the Church,” he writes, alluding to a back-to-basics Christianity that preaches “in the key of mercy.” (On the other hand, Kaiser acknowledges Francis’s limitations and urges reform-minded Catholics to cut him some slack—“If birth control is a sin, Daddy cannot give them permission to practice it. And if it isn’t, he doesn’t need to.”) He links these and other expectations to Francis’s Jesuit genes, which program him to reach for the “magis,” or more without fear of failure.

One suspects Kaiser is saying unrevered what many Jesuits are whispering among themselves. If this is so, and if Francis does think like a Jesuit, then there are undoubtedly more papal surprises in store.

William Bole is an editorial consultant at Boston College and an independent journalist.

Maureen O’Connell

Surviving Anti-Modernism

All Good Books Are Catholic Books

Print Culture, Censorship, and Modernity in Twentieth-Century America

By Una M. Cadegan
Cornell University Press. 240p $39.95

A word of warning to book reviewers, especially for Catholic periodicals like this one: what you say about what Catholic authors are saying about our current cultural reality may someday become fodder for a critical construction of what is not being said, or more precisely, what is forbidden to be said, about the same in more theological and ecclesial circles. In other words, whether you know it or not, you’re more than simply commenting about what’s going on in Catholic books. You’re building the distinctively American Catholic culture of the first half of the 21st century.

I learned this lesson from Una Cadegan’s masterful historical examination of American Catholic literary culture in the first half of the last century, with particular focus on the years between 1917, when canon law prescribing censorship of Catholic literature was promulgated, and 1966, when books on “the Index” were no longer forbidden. While this period has recently received quite a bit of retrospective attention in popular culture with the pending centennial of the Great War, it has long been overlooked by theologians like myself because of the wet blanket Pope Pius X threw on theological innovation in his 1907 encyclical “Pascendi Dominici Gregis,” which unequivocally rejected modernism and any engagement with it. Even the groundbreaking social encyclicals of the time were susceptible to its stifling effect.

Theological discourse may have been truncated, but Cadegan mines a variety of sources to reveal public and private conversations among those in the Catholic literary world awash in insightful engagement with modernism. She sifts through book reviews
and letters to the editor in Catholic periodicals like America and Catholic World; letters between Catholic editors and authors; essays in literary journals, symposia, annotated anthologies and library guides; lecture notes of Catholic professors; biographies of Catholic writers; and case studies of censorship. In all of these unexpected places, Cadagen exposes a pointed engagement with theological questions that shaped the age and primed the pump for the Second Vatican Council—magisterial authority vs. the authority of personal conscience, engagement with secular society and the orientation of the moral life.

Throughout the book, Cadagan successfully defends her central thesis that Catholic literary culture stood squarely in the no man’s land between modernism and Catholicism and offered a space for Catholics to encounter self-reflectively and embrace distinctively the tensions between the two. She begins by naming the sources and contours of the Catholic aesthetic that guided critical engagement with literature and gave rise to the tools Catholics used to engage the distinctively American literature of the time: the obligation to seek and maintain unity within the American Catholic community through an emphasis on the communal dimension of human experience, the imperative of literature to awaken moral responsibility given the scriptural roots of story telling and the timelessness of the Catholic tradition when oriented by the Thomistic transcendentals of goodness, truth and beauty. She then maps the contours of the theological challenges of modernism and identifies four pairings which Catholic literary thinkers used in the classic Catholic “both/and” fashion in order to navigate rather than reject or ignore modernism: individualism/community; iconoclasm/orthodoxy, innovation/repetition and openness/closure.

Cadagen’s implicit recognition that the Catholic Church’s history of censorship, particularly in Hollywood during this period, provides a significant counter-argument to her thesis in one of the most fascinating sections of the book. Here she joins others in the field of American Catholic history in offering a detailed account of the way censorship actually functioned in the lives of all sorts of American Catholics—bishops, publishers, pastors, writers, readers, movie-goers—during this period.

Pulling on her previously explicat ed Catholic aesthetic, as well as a variety of case studies and interviews, she demonstrates how even in an assumed anti-intellectual climate of censorship, American Catholics engaged in literary culture created a “flourishing rhetoric of individual responsibility and communal solidarity that helped to bridge the gap between Counter-Reformation church discipline and modern American understandings of the mature ethical self.”

Since it is the first of its kind to consider this historical period from a Catholic literary perspective, All Good Books Are Catholic Books is a must read for cultural historians; for theologians of liturgical, aesthetic or feminist persuasions; for literary scholars;
of American modernism or American Catholicism; or for those with even the faintest of memories of the aftermath of this period in the American Catholic Church. Ever wonder how the Legion of Decency exercised so much authority during the “Golden Age of Hollywood” as to command the recitation of a pledge after sermons in parishes around the country and to dictate the fate of Roberto Rossellini’s 1950 film “The Miracle” because of his affair with Sister Mary Benedict (the characters played by Ingrid Bergman) before fading quietly into the lore of American Catholicism? Or how conscience came to trump canon law in creative self-expression as well as religious liberty in the 1960s? Catholic literature and popular culture, and more importantly the people who commented on them, hold the answers.

Cadagen reminds us that it was not simply theologians who primed the church’s intellectual pump for Vatican II’s aggiornamento. Those who were writing about writing that engaged modernism also cracked those hermetically sealed windows. Moreover, she broadens our understanding of American Catholic history beyond the familiar arch of the immigrant experience to an equally compelling Catholic coming of age story set in America’s predominantly Protestant literary culture. While the plotlines are similar, new players—cultural commentator Daniel Lord, S.J., Motion Picture Herald owner Martin Quigley and National Organization of Decent Literature head Bishop John F. Noll come to the fore and familiar figures—like the iconic Jesuits John Courtney Murray and William Lynch or Flannery O’Connor and Graham Greene—play new roles.

If all of the good books are indeed Catholic, then Cadagen’s is quite Catholic.

MAUREEN O’CONNELL is a theology professor at LaSalle University.
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God’s Interest

THIRTIETH SUNDAY IN ORDINARY TIME (A), OCT. 26, 2014

Readings: Ex 22:20-26; Ps 18:2-51; 1 Thess 1:5-10; Mt 22:34-40

“If your neighbor cries out to me, I will listen” (Ex 22:26)

In the covenant code in Exodus, in which Moses reveals God’s prohibitions and commandments to the Israelites, we quickly learn that God is a God who hears the voices of the powerless, who sees the needs of the poor. The terms of the covenant directed the Israelites not to “wrong or oppress a resident alien” or “abuse any widow or orphan.” And “if you take your neighbor’s cloak in pawn, you shall restore it before the sun goes down; for it may be your neighbor’s only clothing to use as cover; in what else shall that person sleep?” God offers the poor divine protection, a protection that is accompanied by promises of judgment on those who exploit the needy. God says, “If you do abuse them, when they cry out to me, I will surely heed their cry,” and “if your neighbor cries out to me, I will listen, for I am compassionate.”

Amy-Jill Levine and Douglas Knight write of God’s care for those in need, saying: “Certainly not all widows were poor, and neither were all foreigners and orphans. But they were the most vulnerable members of the community. Rather than leave their care to the moral compass of those who were better off or to the compassionate individual, the law insists that all members of society bear responsibility for the care of its neediest members” (The Meaning of the Bible).

That we adopt God’s generous care for the neediest among us and not turn away from those most vulnerable is incumbent upon Christians. This concern also requires constant calibration, for individuals and societies have blind spots that block our vision and hide from us the poor among us. These impede our moral vision precisely in those areas where change is needed and affect our ability to see clearly what God has demanded of us.

I passed over just such a command from this section of the covenant code, whose intent is also to guard the poor and weak: “If you lend money to my people, to the poor among you, you shall not deal with them as a creditor; you shall not exact interest from them.” It is not my intention to offer a discourse on what level of interest constitutes usury, whether church teaching regarding usury has changed or whether this teaching applied only to loans among Israelites.

Instead I will simply ask some questions. Does exacting interest from the poor lead to the same sort of moral outrage today that oppressing the orphan and the widow do? What sort of interest do payday loan companies and credit card companies charge? How much debt is required to attend “for profit” colleges or even, it must be said, nonprofit universities, which require massive loans for most students? How well is our financial system giving attention to the poor?

Supporting all of these particular demands of the compassionate God to see and hear the poor among us are two commandments that Judaism taught and Jesus later proclaimed: “You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind”; and “You shall love your neighbor as yourself.” The first commandment, known as the Shema (Dt 6:4), asks us to love God foremost; but if the love of God is our foremost guide, we will shape ourselves in the image of the one we love, God, whose commandments allow us to see our neighbor as God sees: as a beloved friend of God. When we see our neighbors as God sees them, we will treat them with the clarity of God’s compassion.

These questions regarding our neighbors go beyond asking what is the letter of the law regarding charging interest, or what is the least I can do for the immigrant who lives among us. But how can I hear what God hears? How can I see my neighbors as God sees them? When we are inspired by the word of God to imitate God’s care for the weak and vulnerable, to hear the cries God hears and to see people as God sees them, then our blindness falls away. We are transformed by God, who desires us to care for all among us who are in need, not just because particular laws govern us but because the love of God and neighbor burns in us.

JOHN W. MARTENS

Examine yourself. Has reading the Bible helped you to discover blind spots in your moral vision?

PRAYING WITH SCRIPTURE

John W. Martens is an associate professor of theology at the University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn. Twitter: @BibleJunkies.
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CONTRIBUTORS INCLUDE:

Rob Bell, James Martin, SJ, Jan Richardson, Richard Rohr, OFM, as well as:

Fr. Bill Bausch  Msgr. Michael Doyle  Carol Howard Merritt
Dr. Margaret Blackie  Fr. Jim Greenfield, OSFS  Penny Nash
Joel Blunk  Fr. Paul Holmes  Msgr. Wally Nolan
Fr. Greg Boyle, SJ  Fr. Dan Horan, OFM  Dr. Christine Vaters Painter
Sr. Simone Campbell  Deacon Greg Kandra  Mary Sperry
Dave Davis  Deacon Jim Knipper  Martha Sterne
Deacon Bill Ditevig  Michael Leach  Fran Rossi Szydlczyn
Michelle Franci-Donnay  Fr. Rick Malloy, SJ  Pat Wenrick

Artwork by: Br. Michael O’Neill McGrath, OFSF

To order your book, go to: http://clearfaithpublishing.com/homilies/
To follow us, go to: www.facebook.com/Homilists