

# APPROACHES

December 1970 No 23

(This document is posted on the *Apropos* website, [www.apropos.org.uk](http://www.apropos.org.uk) )

## Contents

Editorial	2
[Note by Editor of Apropos]	3

## DOSSIER ON CATECHETICS

Section 1	<i>A Crisis of Truth</i>	8
Section 2	<i>The Catechetics Situation in the U.K</i>	16
Section 3	<i>A Positive Response</i>	29
Appendix 1	<i>The Development of Doctrine</i>	44
Appendix 2	<i>The Role of the Catechist</i>	51
Appendix 3	<i>Misgivings of priests and people</i>	57
Appendix 4	<i>The New Catechists</i>	71
Appendix 5	<i>Original Sin</i>	83
Appendix 6	<i>The Dutch Catechism</i>	88
Appendix 7	<i>Brother Gabriel Moran</i>	98
Appendix 8	<i>The 'Penny Catechism'.</i>	102
Appendix 9	<i>Bibliography</i>	109
Recommended Texts		110
Appendix 10	<i>By Their Fruits</i>	115

## EDITORIAL

In the name of 'renewal' - in the very name of Christ Himself: - false doctrine is today being taught in certain 'Catholic' schools, while in many others Catholic children are receiving little or no doctrinal formation.

Ten years ago, this would have been quite unthinkable.

There could, however, be no greater mistake than to imagine that there was nothing wrong with pre-Vatican 2 Catholic schools simply because heterodox catechetics was then the exception rather than the rule. For the role of the Catholic school as **conceived by the Catholic community**, then as now, was, alas: to enable Catholics to seek first the kingdom of this world rather than the kingdom of God. In other words, the *essential* role of the Catholic school was to effect the social emancipation of the Catholic community (and only incidentally to provide a sound grounding in faith and morals for those in process of being emancipated). Its role was in effect to seek first the kingdom of this world with impunity (by means of sound catechetical instruction tagged on for eternal life insurance purposes!). Its role was to provide education for Catholics rather than Catholic education. The pre-Vatican 2 Catholic school thus symbolised the spirit of worldliness that animated the generality of 'good' Catholics. It was crying out for the kind of *aggiornamento* Pope John had in mind: i.e. an *aggiornamento* that would reveal the full implications of the magnificent Tridentine catechism and thereby completely transform the spirit of the Catholic community, of clerics and layfolk, of parents and teachers, bringing it into harmony with the authentic mind of the Church.

*Alas!* it is the very opposite that has happened. The Catholic community has not been, transformed; instead the Christian catechism has been jettisoned in favour of a humanist catechism in harmony with the mind of the contemporary post-Christian world.

This is the real significance of the New (Dutch) Catechism - and of the 'new' catechetics it had inspired. The 'new' catechetics is the direct antithesis of the long overdue *aggiornamento* called for by Pope John. The 'new' catechetics represents the triumph of the mind of the world over the mind of the Church in the sphere of education. And unless there is a return to orthodoxy in catechetics there can be no future for Catholic schools.

There is clearly neither rhyme nor reason in having separate 'Catholic' schools if the latter are so permeated by materialism as to be virtually post-Christian in all but name. It is not accidental that, as a general rule, 'new' catechists are *open* to the idea of 'integration' (i.e. liquidation) of Catholic schools. In this respect at least they are commendably logical.

It goes without saying that the principle of Catholic schools for Catholic children makes no sense whatsoever unless catechetical instruction in these schools is Catholic – i.e. in line with the *Credo of the People of God* enunciated by Christ's Vicar on earth,

It is manifestly absurd to have 'Catholic' schools which contrive to undermine or pervert the faith of Christ's little ones. Yet this is precisely what is taking place wherever the 'new' catechetics meets with little or no resistance. In the words of Father George Telford (see pp. 19-21)...the *catechetical movement now seems to be indissolubly wedded to the "new" theology, and is begetting children who do not seem much at home in the household of the faith.'*

Would that this were not true. *Alas!* There is no one better qualified than Father Telford in terms of both knowledge and experience to assess the impact of the 'new' catechetics on the

minds of children.

It is precisely because we realise what is at stake that we have produced this *DOSSIER*.

Because of the length of our *Dossier on Catechetics*, all other features have had to be excluded from this issue of *Approaches*.

**Hamish Fraser, Editor.**

**[Note by Editor, *Apropos*:** The above text and that in the following pages has been taken from *Approaches* No. 23 where the *Dossier on Catechetics* first appeared. I suspect that both the Editor, Hamish Fraser, and the author, Michael Davies, were they alive, would not agree with all that it contains, particularly regarding Vatican II, because at that time, as Hamish Fraser indicated in a later *Approaches*<sup>1</sup>:

*‘...like so many other orthodox Catholics, we could not bring ourselves to believe that anything but good could come of the Council as such...What we did not then realise was that the real significance of Vatican 2 was to be found not in what was positively affirmed in the official documents, all of which were capable of being interpreted in a perfectly orthodox sense, but rather in what was omitted, or else stated so equivocally as to be of real value only to the forces of subversion.’*

The dossier thus gives the lie to those who maintain that traditionalists were predisposed to oppose the Council from the very beginning. Orthodox Catholics were disposed to embrace the Council in good faith. It was only when the forces of subversion began to show their hand, and use what Michael Davies described as “time bombs” in the conciliar documents, that orthodox Catholics began to question aspects not only of the “spirit of the Council” but of the Council documents themselves. Pope Paul VI who had hitherto gained their support because of his *Credo, Mysterium Fidei and Humanae Vitae* quickly lost same as soon as the *Novus Ordo* was imposed in an almost totalitarian manner, and as its defects and effects were made manifest.

The dossier must therefore be read with such in mind, making allowances for the era in which it appeared.

We have made no changes to the text other than removing prices of documents and some addresses, and adverts which are probably no longer valid due to the passage of time.

A S Fraser, October 2013.]

---

<sup>1</sup> *Approaches* No. 42-43, February 1975, in the article ‘Agonising Reappraisal’. The same issue contained a supplement, ‘The Changes in the Mass’ by Michael Davies, an article which had first appeared in *The Remnant* as ‘The Fort is Betrayed’ in June 1974.

# **DOSSIER ON CATECHETICS**

**by**

**Michael T Davies**

This is an *APPROACHES* Supplement

*APPROACHES* is edited, published and printed by Hamish Fraser.

*APPROACHES* seeks to promote lay initiative in the temporal order that is juridically independent of the Hierarchy yet in a spirit of uncompromising fidelity to the social doctrine of the Teaching Church.

## DOSSIER ON CATECHETICS

The object of this Dossier is to provide the basis for discussion groups wishing to analyse current catechetical tendencies and take positive action to halt those which are clearly against the best interests of the Church. It could also provide a basis for individual study.

Above all, however, it is hoped that it may enable concerned parents and teachers to brief themselves adequately before engaging in controversy with 'new,' catechists, most of whom are singularly astute. Past masters in equivocation, they are most difficult to pin down unless confronted by opponents who are sufficiently well informed.

### The Plan

The plan of the Dossier is as follows:

**SECTION ONE** analyses the current situation within the universal Church

**SECTION TWO** examines the situation in the U.K.

**SECTION THREE** discusses what practical positive action may be taken to remedy existing evils and make way for a genuine *aggiornamento*.

**SECTION FOUR**, which is composed of APPENDICES, is conceived as an arsenal of supplementary material, so that those who do engage in the fray may not be short of effective ammunition.

### Further reading

Where possible the suggestions for further reading should be followed up before meetings to enhance the level of discussion. It would be most useful if those organising meetings could arrange for a supply of recommended titles to be on sale. It is hoped that groups of concerned parents and teachers will come together in many parishes for regular meetings. In such cases all the recommended titles could be obtained for the group's literature pool, for a comparatively moderate outlay by individuals.

*'...the idea of change... for many has taken the place of "aggiornamento" presaged by Pope John of venerable memory.*

*'In the face of the evidence, and contrary to all justice, they attribute to that most faithful Shepherd of the Church ideas, which are not ideas of reform, but which are even destructive of the teaching and discipline of the Church.'*

Pope Paul VI, General Audience April 25, 1968.

*'...today the Church is undergoing great suffering... The Church is suffering... at the abandonment by so many Catholics of the fidelity that her centuries-old tradition would deserve and her pastoral effort, full of understanding and love, should obtain.*

*'She is suffering above all because of the restless, critical, unruly and destructive rebellion of so many of her sons, her dearest sons - priests, teachers, laymen against her intimate and indispensable communion, against her institutional existence, against her canon law, her tradition, her interior cohesion; against her authority, the irreplaceable principle of truth, unity, charity; against her very requirements of holiness and sacrifice; she is suffering at the defection and scandal of certain ecclesiastics and religious, who are crucifying the Church today.'*

Pope Paul VI, General Audience, April 2, 1970.

## **SECTION ONE**

### **A crisis of Truth**

## A CRISIS OF TRUTH

*'It is clear that the Church is facing a grave crisis. Under the name of "the new Church", "the post conciliar Church", a different Church from that of Jesus Christ is now trying to establish itself: an anthropomorphic society threatened with immanentist apostasy which is allowing itself to be swept along in a movement of general abdication under the pretext of renewal, ecumenism, or adaption.'*

Henri de Lubac, S.J. made the above statement in 1967.<sup>2</sup> One of the best known theologians of our era, he saw very clearly that the direction in which certain of his more radical colleagues were moving was towards apostasy.

His equally celebrated Jesuit confrère, Cardinal Danielou, is equally alarmed. In March 1970 he wrote: *'Today one cannot but wonder if this post-Conciliar period, which might have been a magnificent period in the encounter of Christian Faith with the modern world, does not risk, on the contrary, being a time of surrender in which the faith and the life of the Church will disintegrate.'*<sup>3</sup>

### **Pope Paul Speaks**

In May 1970, the Holy Father made one of his countless statements on the nature and gravity of the crisis of faith within the Church, statements which, alas: are given little prominence in the British Catholic press.

*'Today truth is in crisis', said Pope Paul. 'Objective truth, which gives us possession of reality through knowledge, is being replaced by subjective truth: experience, conscience, free personal opinion - not to mention criticism of our capacity to know and think validly.'*

### **Emptiness preferred**

*'Philosophic truth is giving way to agnosticism, to scepticism, to the snobbery of systematic doubt. People study and research in order to demolish, not to find. They prefer emptiness. The Gospel warned us about this when it said: "Men preferred darkness to the light" (Jn.3, 19). Together with the crisis in philosophic truth...religious truth has also collapsed in many minds, which have not been able to bear the great and crystal-clear statements of the science of God, of natural theology - much less those of the theology of revelation. Their eyes have been darkened, then blinded. They have dared to think that their own blindness was the death of God.'*

*'So Christian truth is undergoing fearful, shocks and crises. They will not accept the teaching of the magisterium which Christ set up as a safeguard and for the logical development of this doctrine... There are some who try to make the faith easy by emptying it - the whole, the true faith - of those truths which appear to be unacceptable to the modern mind. They follow their own tastes, to choose a truth which is considered to be acceptable...'*

### **Cult of man**

*'Others are looking for a new faith especially a new belief about the Church. They are trying to bring her into line with the ideas of modern sociology and secular history. In this they are repeating errors of other times, by seeking to model the Church's canonical structures on existing historical structures.'*

---

<sup>2</sup> *Témoignage Chrétien*, 1 September, 1967.

<sup>3</sup> *L'Osservatore Romano*, 12 March, 1970.

'Others again would like to put their trust in a purely naturalistic and philanthropic belief, a utilitarian belief, even though it might be based on the authentic values of the faith itself - those of charity. They would thus erect it into a cult of man and neglect the prime value, which is love and worship of God.

### Magisterium of believers

'Still others show a certain distrust for the faith's dogmatic demands, and take up the pretext of pluralism, which would enable them to study the inexhaustible wealth of divine truths and express them through a variety of languages and mentalities. **Under this pretext they would like to legitimize ambiguous and uncertain expressions of the faith, and content themselves with research into it in order to avoid affirming it.** They would like to turn to the opinion of the faithful in order to know what they wish to believe, and attribute to the faithful a questionable charism of competence and experience which puts the truth of the faith at the mercy of the strongest and most easily voiced choices.

'All this happens when one does not submit to the Church's magisterium, which the Lord willed to protect the truths of the faith (Heb.13, 7, 17).

### Courage of the Truth

'But, through divine mercy, we have this scutum fidei, this shield of the faith - that is, truth which is protected, secure and capable of withstanding the onslaught of the impetuous opinions of the modern world... For us, therefore, a second question arises: the question of courage. We ought to have - as We said - the courage of the truth. We will not now make any analysis of this moral and psychological virtue which we call courage... We will only note that, once more, Christian education shows itself to be a training ground for spiritual energy, human nobility, self-mastery and consciousness of duty.

### The world is looking to us for testimony

'We will add that such courage of the truth is chiefly required from him who is a teacher and champion of the truth, but that it also concerns all baptised and confirmed Christians. It is not a pleasant sporting activity but a profession of dutiful fidelity to Christ and his Church; and today it is great service to the modern world which, more than we perhaps think, is looking to us for this beneficial and fortifying testimony...' <sup>4</sup>

### BASIS OF TRUTH

The basis of Christian truth which the Pope asks us to accept and proclaim is contained in the 'deposit of faith' handed down by Christ through his apostles by means of the Church founded on them by Him. In its 'Declaration on Religious Freedom', Vatican II states:

'First this sacred Synod professes its belief that God Himself has made known to mankind the way in which men are to serve Him, and thus be saved in Christ and come to blessedness. We believe that this **one true religion** subsists in the Catholic and Apostolic Church, to which the Lord Jesus committed the duty of spreading it abroad among all men. Thus he spoke to the Apostles: "Go forth and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you" (Mt.28: 19, 20). On their part **all men are bound to seek the truth**, especially in what concerns God and his Church, and to

<sup>4</sup> 'L'Osservatore Romano', May 28, 1970. General Audience on May 20, 1970.

*embrace the truth they come to know, and to hold fast to it.' (Emphasis added)*

It is quite true that our understanding of the Good News of our salvation, the Gospel, and the doctrinal and disciplinary beliefs and practices arising from it, are subject to development. Confession as we know it today is a legitimate development of teaching implicit in the New Testament, arrived at over a period of centuries. The concept of doctrinal development as expounded in Newman's *'The Development of Christian Doctrine'* has as its basis that: *'Christianity being one, all its doctrines are necessarily developments of one, and if so, are of necessity consistent with each other or form a whole.'*<sup>5</sup>

*'Development of doctrine'* is, alas! used as a cloak for every post-Conciliar deviation from Catholic truth. As far as the ordinary Catholic is concerned the development of doctrine is not a matter with which he need greatly concern himself. He will find that the authentic faith proposed to him by the Magisterium today, as far as it concerns his life, is easily recognisable as what he learned from the *'penny catechism'*.<sup>6</sup>

Providing a Catholic teacher has a firm grasp of this faith and proclaims the same Gospel to his pupils he can be sure that he is fulfilling his vocation. *'The Gospel'*, wrote Cardinal Newman, *'is a definite deposit, a treasure, one and the same in every age, conceived in set words, and such as admits of being received, preserved, transmitted. It is "the Faith once delivered to the Saints"... Blessed be God! We have not to find the truth, it is put into our hands; we have but to commit it to our hearts, to preserve it inviolate, and deliver it over to posterity.'*<sup>7</sup>

These remarks are echoed by Vatican 2's *'Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation'*, Chapter 2 of which states:

*'In his gracious goodness, God has seen to it that what he has revealed for the salvation of all nations would abide perpetually in its full integrity and be handed on to all generations...Therefore the apostles, handing on what they themselves had received, warn the faithful to hold fast to the traditions which they have learned either by word of mouth or by letter and to fight in defence of the faith **handed on once and for all**. Now what was handed on by the apostles includes everything that contributes to the holiness of life, and the increase in faith of the People of God; and so the Church, in her teaching, life, and worship, perpetuates and hands on to all generations all that she herself is, all that she believes.'* (Emphasis added)

### **Role of the Magisterium**

As Pope Paul stresses in the discourse already quoted, to know these truths, and the sense in which we are to understand them, it is necessary to submit to the Church's magisterium. This is particularly true in regard to doctrinal development. **There has been no development of doctrine until it has been endorsed by the magisterium. Until then it remains mere theological speculation.**

In the same chapter of the *Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation*, Vatican 2 stresses: *'The task of authentically interpreting the word of God, whether written or handed on, has been entrusted to the*

---

<sup>5</sup> Op. cit. Chapter II., Sect. III. pt.4.

<sup>6</sup> See Appendix I.

<sup>7</sup> Parochial and Plain Sermons, vol.II, Sermon XXII. The complete text is available in the APPROACHES supplement *'The Laity and Catechetics'*.

*living teaching office of the Church, whose authority is exercised in the name of Jesus Christ.'*

While it is quite true that the Teaching Church (*Ecclesia docens*) is comprised of the bishops together with the Pope, the authority of the bishops is valid only when their teaching conforms to what the Pope teaches. THE REVERSE IS NOT TRUE. The Pope can rule independently on any matter that comes under the Church's jurisdiction without the concurrence of the other bishops or the rest of the Church. The bishops collectively (without the Pope) are not equal or superior to him in authority.<sup>8</sup>

### **Role of Pope Paul's Credo**

The Pope is quite clear as to where we shall find the essential truths of the Catholic Faith. In an earlier part of his May 20, 1970 discourse, which we have already quoted, he stated:

*'We felt obliged to make an explicit profession of faith at the end of the Year of Faith on St. Peter's Day, 1968, to recite a Creed which followed the line of the authoritative teachings of the Church and authentic Tradition, back to the evidence given by the apostles.'*

However, as soon after the Council as July 1966 the Holy Father had already made clear the reasons which later obliged him to make this 'explicit profession of faith':

*'There are those who could be said to be tired of being Catholic, and who profit from this period of revision and adjustment in the practical life of the Church by debating everything, by setting up systematic and contradictory criticism of ecclesiastical discipline, by seeking an easier path to Christianity - a Christianity enfeebled by removing the supports of experience and tradition, a Christianity conforming to popular opinion and the spirit of the world, a Christianity which is not binding, not dogmatic and not "clerical". How can such weariness of being Catholic logically derive from the Council?'<sup>9</sup>*

Those reading the Pope's 'CREDO' for the first time are heartened at the familiar teaching presented in familiar language. Their pleasure is heightened by the fact that this is the authentic teaching of the Church. Those familiar with the aim and teaching of Vatican II take this as a matter of course. For in his opening speech Pope John made Vatican II's purpose quite clear: *'The greatest concern of the Ecumenical Council is this: that the sacred deposit of Christian doctrine should be guarded and taught more efficaciously....to transmit pure and integral, without any attenuation or distortion, the doctrine which throughout twenty centuries, notwithstanding difficulties and contrasts, has become the common patrimony of men.'*

The contrast between the authentic teaching of the Second Vatican Council and the contentious nonsense peddled in its name by the proponents of neo-Modernism is obvious to all thinking Catholics. On no authority greater than their own opinions neo-Modernists seek to lead the ordinary faithful along the path to apostasy to which they themselves already seem to be irrevocably committed. In the words of Pope Paul: *'They attribute to themselves the guidance of the Holy Spirit, conferring on their own thoughts and actions a gratuitous and often fallacious power of certainty and infallibility.'*<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> See 'Dogmatic Constitution on the Church', Chapter 3. See also 'The Ordinary Magisterium of the Church' by Dom Paul Nau, 'A layman replies to Cardinal Suenens' by Marcel Clement; 'Authority' and 'Peter has spoken' both of which are C.T.S. pamphlets by David Knowles. Also, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, by Ludwig Ott, p.285.

<sup>9</sup> Speech at Castel Gondolfo, July 27, 1966.

<sup>10</sup> Speech at public audience on August 14, 1968. Cf. note 15.

## Role of the Catechist

Catholic education must be a corporate process involving the Holy Spirit, the parents, the parish clergy, who give the child access to the all-important sacraments of the Eucharist and Penance, and the trained catechist (in this country normally a teacher within the context of a Catholic school). It is quite clear that the prime function of the catechist is to present the authentic teaching of the Church expounded in the 'Credo', *in its entirety*, and in the sense intended by the magisterium, so that the child has had this indispensable instruction by the time he leaves school.<sup>11</sup> For if he does not learn these doctrines by then when will he do so? The family, the parish and the school must certainly also give every possible stimulus to ensure that the child will live his Catholic faith - emphasising that personal piety must be complemented by applying Catholic principles to the social order. **But the prime function of the catechist is to provide a sound basis in Christian doctrine.**

## Christianity in Caricature

The neo-Modernist answer to the teaching of the magisterium was well described in an article in 'L'Osservatore Romano'.

*'We are often presented with a "horizontal" Christianity stripped of its transcendence, reduced to a vague Boy Scout code of philanthropy, and entirely devoted to the earthly city and the figure of this world which passes away; it is a sweetened, aseptic, pasteurised form of Christianity, with no cross and no resurrection.'*<sup>12</sup>

Cardinal Daniélou has developed this theme more explicitly:

*'It is enough to ask a certain number of persons what Christianity consists of and many will answer: "Christianity consists of loving our neighbour." This answer is true, since it is true that love of one's neighbour is part of Christian doctrine. But it is completely false to maintain that love of one's neighbour is the whole of Christianity. This means reducing Christianity to what today is defined as "horizontalism" - a word I do not like very much - that is, in Christianity there is seen only the horizontal dimension, the relationship with others, completely eliminating the vertical dimension, that is the relationship with God.*

***'The danger for Christianity at present is that it should become secularised, worldly, reduced to a kind of socialist humanism. This is not what the world needs. And, if Christians were reduced to offering the world only this humanism, they would soon be set aside and rightly so, since there have always been Socialists, teachers of morality and organisers of society: they have rendered services, but they have never saved anyone.***

*'The world today does not need greater social organisation but a Saviour: man today needs someone who will answer the fundamental problems of his existence, which no social structure has been able to answer. And it would be sheer madness if, once again fifty years behind their times, Christians were to teach a Christianity that was nothing but social humanism, just when the men of today are beginning to discover its deficiencies and once more feel the need of God. It would be a distressing sight to see men seek God **in a church which is no longer able to offer Him.***

*'From the point of view of the young, I know what I am talking about: student contestation has*

---

<sup>11</sup> See Appendix 2.

<sup>12</sup> *L'Osservatore Romano*, March 12, 1970, article by Marcel Clement.

revealed the inability of technocratic society to solve human problems and has shown us a revolt of the imagination and the hearts of the young, who ask for an answer to the fundamental problems, which are those of the happiness, the meaning of life, truth. **It is distressing to see Christians and priests who are not interested in this dimension, for which the men of our time ask us.** <sup>13</sup> Emphasis added.

The significance of these two alternative interpretations has been summarised by one of the few Catholic laymen living today who truly merit the title of philosopher, Dietrich von Hildebrand: 'On the one side, we find the true spirit of Christ, the authentic voice of the Church i.e. that in both form and content breathe a glorious supernatural atmosphere. On the other side, we find a depressing secularization, complete loss of the census supranaturalis, a morass of confusion.' <sup>14</sup>

The most prestigious of all living Catholic Philosophers, Jacques Maritain, is equally critical of neo-Modernism which he terms 'kneeling before the World'. In 'The Peasant of the Garonne' he makes the following observations:

*'The present crisis has many diverse aspects. One of the most curious spectacles it offers us is a kind of kneeling before the world, which is revealed in a thousand ways...*

*...In large sectors of both clergy and laity (but it is the clergy who set the example), hardly is the word "world" pronounced when a gleam of ecstasy lights up the face of one and all. And immediately what is talked about are the necessary épanouissements (blossomings of dear human nature) and the necessary engagements (commitments), as well as the communitarian fervors and the présences, the ouvertures (openings to the dear world), and their joys. Anything that would risk calling to mind the idea of asceticism, mortification, or penance is automatically shelved as a matter of course...*

*In other words, there is henceforth only the earth. A complete temporalization of Christianity: ...*

*...We can understand henceforth why there are three things an intelligent preacher should never speak about, and which an up-to-date Christian should think about as seldom as possible, although one has to recite the Creed each Sunday (but there are so many myths therein; and besides, one can always repeat a formula - even in the vernacular - without stopping to think about it).*

*'The first thing to leave in oblivion is obviously the other world (since there isn't any).*

*'The second thing to leave in oblivion is the cross (it is only a symbol of the momentary sacrifices demanded by progress).*

*'The third thing to leave in oblivion is sanctity - if it is true that sanctity has its principle, at the center of the soul (even if the saint remains plunged in the activities of the world) in a radical break with the world (in the Gospel sense of the word) and with the false God of the world, its mythical god, "the Emperor of this world."' <sup>15</sup>*

---

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* See Appendix 3 for evidence of what Cardinal Danielou says.

<sup>14</sup> *Trojan Horse in the City of God*, Chapter I.

<sup>15</sup> *The Peasant of the Garonne*, p.55.

## CONCLUSION

This section shows clearly that:

1. There is a crisis of Truth within the Church today.
2. This is the opinion not only of the Holy Father himself but also of some of the most brilliant minds among both clergy and laity: men who by no stretch of the imagination could be described as rigid, *integriste*, or conformist: men such as Fr. De Lubac, Cardinal Danielou, Jacques Maritain, and Dietrich Von Hildebrand, to mention but a few of those who have denounced neo-Modernism.
3. The division of opinion can be simplified as follows. On one hand those who wish to remain faithful to the Magisterium of the Church, loving and serving God first and loving and serving our neighbour for His sake (as taught by Our Lord) and accepting the whole deposit of faith as proposed and interpreted by the magisterium; on the other hand, those who see Christianity exclusively in terms of service to our neighbour - i.e. those who conceive of a secularised Christianity.<sup>16</sup>
4. There is no confusion and no doubt as to what constitutes the true basis of Christian teaching: it is the faith set out in Pope Paul's '*Credo*'.
5. Catholic children have a right to instruction in the totality of this doctrine before leaving school.
6. Only catechists providing such teaching are fulfilling their mandate and have a right to be called catechists - or Catholic for that matter.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> *Many, like Charles Davis and Louis Evelyn, pursue their theories to their ultimate conclusion and formally apostasise. Thus a hundred French priests resigned and left the Church en bloc in July 1970 (only 44 made their names public and this was the total given in British Catholic papers). The number included a good proportion from the ultra-radical 'Échanges et Dialogues' group. Others who share their attitude are remaining to 'reform' the Church from within. Charles Davis has testified to this although he feels their task is hopeless, since, as he sees it, the Church is not capable of reform to a degree that would satisfy him. In Charles Davis's own words: **'The reason why not a few Roman Catholics, though with the same problems about the church as myself, do not feel any need to leave the church is that they have not for many a day fully believed in it or taken its teaching authority seriously or paid much heed to its dogmas...'***

<sup>17</sup> *'No one is entitled to accept a label ("Catholic") without its contents. This would not be honest. To be a Catholic means to be attached to the Church, a SINCERE and TOTAL profession of the FAITH of which she has the deposit, and, therefore, a joyful acceptance of the living magisterium which Christ has conferred upon her.'* Pope Paul, Nov. 14, 1968.

Canon 1325 of the Code of Canon Law states:

*'The faithful are bound to profess their faith publicly whenever silence, subterfuge or their manner of acting would otherwise entail an implicit denial of their faith, a contempt of religion, an insult to God or scandal to their neighbour.'*

*'Any baptized person who while retaining the name of Christian obstinately denies or doubts any of the truths proclaimed for belief by the divine and Catholic faith is a heretic.'*

See also Chapter II of 'The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church'.

## **SECTION TWO**

### **The Catechetics Situation in the United Kingdom**

*'....the catechetical movement now seems to be indissolubly wedded to the "new" theology, and is begetting children who do not seem much at home in the household of the faith'.*

The Rev. George Telford in *'The Universe'*, July 31, 1970.

## Is Britain Different?

Unless we are prepared to concede that the Holy Father and a number of the most distinguished Catholics of our time are suffering from a pathological obsession with heresy, it must be admitted that Section One has shown that a serious crisis exists within the Church concerning the teaching of the deposit of faith in the sense required by the magisterium.

Many British Catholics, including (or rather especially) some in positions of authority, seem to have been trying to convince themselves that the problem does not exist in Britain. Like latter-day John of Gaunts they see themselves living in a catechetical Eden, a doctrinal demi-paradise, a fortress built by nature for herself against the infection of unorthodoxy ... the envy of less happier lands! Relatively speaking there is some truth in this. Compared with the U.S.A., France, or Holland, we are indeed, catechetically speaking, a happy breed of men.

## Father Telford Speaks

This situation is however changing rapidly and the fact that it has already reached serious proportions was made clear by a letter in *The Universe* from Fr. George Telford on July 31, 1970. Fr. Telford is Vice Chairman of the National Council for Catechetics, Chairman of the Board of Religious Inspectors, and Director of the Southwark Diocesan Catechetical Centre. His letter was a reply to an article in the same newspaper by Fr. David Konstant, the Westminster Catechetical Director, who had fully endorsed current catechetical trends.

## Father Telford's Letter

'Sir,

*As a religious inspector in pre-conciliar days, I was well aware of the fact that religion was sometimes taught in our schools in a dull, unimaginative abstract manner. The need for renewal was very evident, and the catechetical movement was welcomed by many such as myself.*

*'In those early days we used to be told that the teacher must regard himself as the mouthpiece of Christ, commissioned, as He was, to bear witness to the truth.*

*'The teacher's task was to present the fulness of Christian revelation in all its realism and challenge, inviting the pupils to respond with faith and love, and to dedicate themselves to the Father's will, with Christ as their model.*

*'We were urged to study Our Lord's own method: He taught simply and directly, in a manner suited to the ability, temperament and environment of His hearers, using examples and allegories from everyday experience in order to lead them to an understanding of eternal truths.*

## Valid

*'This, if I understood it rightly, was the original manifesto in its simplest terms, and surely no one would question the validity of its basic principles. But considerable progress seems to have taken place in recent years...*

*'At various gatherings of teachers over the last few months, I have reiterated the principle that catechetics must be concerned essentially with the effective communication of revelation.*

*'On several occasions this has been rejected as a naive over-simplification which fails to take account of "contemporary theological development." This is disquieting.*

*'We all agree that religion should not be taught as a set of theological abstractions and legal sanctions, but surely we must never lose sight of the fact that our catechesis is built upon a divinely-revealed faith?*

*'If we drift from this anchorage we shall be giving our pupils merely human insights instead of the whole glorious vision of man as God's creature, made and re-made in His image.*

### **Confused**

*'However much leading catechists insist that they have never denied this principle, either explicitly or implicitly, the total effect of their approach seems to lead to a neglect of it in practice.*

*'My own experience in various parts of the country indicates that some of our teachers and students are unable to see the theological wood for the catechetical trees.*

*'At a training college recently, students were saying that they were unwilling to teach religion because "we don't know what we are supposed to teach." At another, the students had no such scruple, and willingly explained their catechesis: through various themes and activities, they would "help the children to become aware of themselves," both as individuals and as members of a community, and to form loving relationships with each other.*

*'After a little prompting from me they added that this was, of course, a way of leading the children to God - with the exception of one student, who saw "no point in talking to little children about a God they can't possibly understand."*

### **Difficulties**

*'In a group discussion with grammar school teachers, I was trying to point out that real-life themes and doctrine were not mutually exclusive alternatives in the approach to the religious lesson, but rather different ends of one, integrated process.*

*'This was totally rejected by one member of the group who asserted vehemently that "young people are not the slightest bit interested in doctrine - with them it's only living that matters."*

*'At a similar meeting, a teacher complained bitterly at the "theological irrelevancies" imposed upon teachers, citing the Incarnation as an example: "While the theologians argue about the divinity and humanity of Christ, people are killing each other and starving to death - why can't we get down to what really matters?"*

*'Even for those teachers who still subscribe to the theory that religious belief is the mainspring of human endeavour, there is a further difficulty to be surmounted: which theology is to be taught? To be specific: is the resurrection a physical fact or a "spiritual breakthrough?"*

*'Similarly, was the Virgin Birth a miraculous event or merely a "sign of the uniqueness of Christ's divine sonship?" Is original sin generated at the deepest level of man's being, or do we contract it from the "sin situation" into which we are born?*

*'Is the Eucharist transignified bread, or the very reality of Christ's Body and Blood? Is the Magisterium really infallible in preserving fundamental truths, or is it merely indefectible in the sense that it will survive in spite of its many errors? The list could be extended indefinitely.*

## Problems

*'We all know that the deeper penetration of revealed truth is a continuous activity in the Church, under the Holy Spirit's guidance, and that our faith is more than the words in which it is expressed.'*

*'But surely the differences outlined above are more than merely linguistic? Is the "new" theology really an organic development of the "old" - or a contradiction of it? This creates big problems for teachers.'*

*'Notwithstanding, the catechetical movement now seems to be indissolubly wedded to the "new" theology, and is begetting children who do not seem much at home in the household of the faith. This causes anguish to those teachers who recognised the need for modernising the decor, but had never thought in terms of a demolition squad.'*

## Optimistic

*'In spite of all, I am optimistic regarding the future, because the experience of talking to many teachers in my own diocese of Southwark over the last few months has convinced me that faith and common sense are surviving remarkably well, and that the majority are steering clear of lopsided, catechetical bandwagons. Thank. God there are so many teachers who do not merely theorise about the responsible use of freedom, but actually exercise it in evaluating modern theory.'*

*'They would certainly agree with Fr. David Konstant's conclusion that "Religious education in schools today is undoubtedly difficult," but would not seek a remedy in the deletion or dilution of vital truths, or in the introduction of a vast programme of desacralisation.'*

*'The present difficulties rather spur them to even greater generosity in imitating the perfect Teacher, who never compromised or accommodated His message, but spoke with authority, and sought a free response of faith and love.'*

(Fr.) GEORGE TELFORD,  
Institute for Christian Education,  
London

## Things will never again be the same

In making this statement Fr. Telford merely gave public expression to longstanding and widespread misgivings among parents, teachers, and parish clergy. (Examples of these are given in Appendix 3.)

But whereas these criticisms have hitherto been discounted as *'uninformed'*, *'unnecessarily alarmist'*, and indicative merely of the inevitable reaction of Conservative minds in a period of rapid change, it is quite impossible for even the boldest of *'new'* catechists to dismiss Father Telford's critique in so cavalier a fashion. For being himself a Diocesan Catechetical Director, and also a leading figure in the national catechetical movement, Father Telford speaks with an authority based on years of catechetical experience.

His indictment cannot therefore be either dismissed as frivolous or ignored. And what an indictment: *'...the catechetical movement now seems to be indissolubly wedded to the "new" theology, and is begetting children who do not seem much at home in the household of the faith,'*

This indictment represents a complete debunking of *'new'* catechetical pretensions. Moreover, as the *'new'* catechists know only too well, it is an unanswerable indictment. After Father Telford's broadside, things will never again be quite the same. July 31 (the feast of St. Ignatius of Loyola),

1970, was thus a red letter day in the struggle for orthodoxy. And not only for the U.K. and the English-speaking world, but for the Universal Church. To the best of our knowledge, nowhere has a Diocesan Catechetical Director spoken so forthrightly concerning the perversion of Catholic education in the name of renewal.

### **'New' Catechists in Key Positions**

The deviation from Catholic Truth in this country is being organised by a small but influential group of 'new' catechists who are firmly entrenched in the vital sectors: in the training of teachers, and in the publishing field.

Their influence in teacher-training can be seen in the Colleges of Education (teachers' training colleges), Diocesan Catechetical Centres, and above all in the National Catechetical Centre, *Corpus Christi College*. (This influence is illustrated in Appendix 4.)

### **In the Colleges of Education**

The theological training given in our teachers' colleges has never been of a high standard but at least it was normally orthodox until recent years. Lecturers indoctrinated with the new catechetics are now passing on their mistaken attitudes to the students. Such essential articles of Catholic Faith as original sin, the existence of purgatory, hell, Satan, or angels, are treated as myths. Distorted explanations of Papal authority or the nature of the Eucharist are given to young people without the biblical or doctrinal background to detect erroneous teaching. The very divinity of Christ is under attack. Even where what the students learn is not formally heretical it is often little more than meaningless verbiage concerned with encounter, commitment, community, or freedom.

It is not generally known that there is no fixed syllabus for our colleges; nor is there any form of external examination in religion. Each religious department devises its own syllabus and sets and marks its own examinations. A Catholic Teacher's Religion Certificate in no way certifies that its possessor is competent to teach Catholic doctrine, merely that he has attended a Catholic Training College. The bricks and mortar '*explosion*' in these colleges has resulted in a huge increase among students and lecturers, and a resultant decrease in quality in both cases.

### **In the Publishing World**

Co-operating with '*Catholic*' publishers who vied with each other in signing *anti-'Humanae Vitae'* manifestoes, the 'New' Catechists have accomplished what is virtually a complete '*takeover*' in every sphere involving religious literature for schools. Most of the series now being printed for primary or secondary use show obvious signs of their influence. As stocks of orthodox books go out of print there will be no alternative to these publications. The 'New' Catechists have an equally firm stranglehold over publications on methodology. Those who attend courses as a supplement or an alternative to this literature will find that they are often given by the authors! They also co-operate by writing forewords to each other's books and writing fulsome reviews when this can be arranged. <sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> This is illustrated in Appendix 4, para 6.

### **Consequences of 'New' Catechetics**

The seriousness of the situation is evident. Having failed to absorb sound doctrine during their training, young teachers will be unable to pass it on to their pupils. The essential criterion for successful teaching is a firm grasp of the content of the subject rather than a theoretical knowledge of methodology. The method whereby a teacher can communicate a subject of which he is largely ignorant has yet to be devised! These teachers will be forced by their inadequate training to rely heavily upon series of text books, or syllabi, of amorphous content and dubious orthodoxy. This is already the case in the U.S.A. where children are being withdrawn from Catholic schools in large numbers as more and more parents come to realise that this is essential if their faith is to be preserved. We are a long way from this situation in most British schools but there are already some, particularly in the secondary sphere, where what is taught bears little or no relation to Catholic teaching.<sup>19</sup>

### **'New' Catechists v The Pope**

The 'New' Catechist denies that he is changing any essential aspect of the Catholic Faith. He considers that those who criticise him are unable to distinguish what is true, permanent, and essential from a host of unnecessary accretions and practices, which may have served a useful purpose in their time but must now be discarded if Christianity is to have anything relevant to say to modern man. He, of course, is the one who decides what is relevant and what is not. Why the Holy Spirit should make him rather than the magisterium of the Church, the Pope in particular, the recipient of this special revelation he never gets around to explaining. The total content of his new revelation seems to be that '*All you need is love*'. We must all treat each other as we would like to be treated and the world will be a happier place.

### **Scarcely Original**

To say the least, this is hardly original. Cardinal Newman wrote: '*It is a fashion of the day to suppose that insisting upon precise Articles of Faith is injurious to the cause of spiritual religion, and inconsistent with an enlightened view of it, and interferes with the "liberty wherewith Christ has made us free." Accordingly, instead of accepting reverently the doctrinal truths, an attempt is made by the reasoners of this age to refashion them... you will meet with writers who consider that all the Attributes and Providences of God are virtually expressed in the one proposition, "God is love".*'<sup>20</sup>

### **Sins displeasing only to our neighbour**

Love of our neighbour and service to the community motivated by love of God for his own sake, charity, are essential attributes of the true Christian. This is as traditional as it is obvious. The radical departure from Catholic belief comes in presenting love of our neighbour *for his sake* and service to the community as *ends in themselves* rather than as expressions of the love and obedience which we owe our Creator. The end product of the 'New' Catechetics would be to reduce the Christian revelation to a vague form of Liberal-Protestantism, if not humanism with religious overtones. Aspects of the Faith which cannot be given a '*community*' slant will be, and are being, gradually discarded. Angels, veneration of saints and their relics, sacramentals, Eucharistic devotion outside the Mass, penitential acts, the pursuit of individual sanctity - all are expendable. Some value can be seen in the Sacrament of Penance providing there is no suggestion of an individual sinner breaking a law imposed by a personal God. The National Catechetical Centre recommends that as far as sin and penance affect children: '*We should train them to see their own*

---

<sup>19</sup> See Appendix 4, para 10.

<sup>20</sup> See Section One, Note 6.

*faults and failings in the context of the community or communities to which they belong. We should try to avoid laying stress on an individual's failing to observe a fixed code of morality.*<sup>21</sup> The fact that we can commit sins which involve no one but ourselves and our Creator, or that offences against the community are only sinful because they offend God, is ignored completely.

### **Why Religion?**

Young people will soon begin to wonder why religious overtones are needed for this new version of Christianity. Time spent in praying could be devoted to a 'significant demo', a sponsored walk, or even, though less frequently, some personal and constructive act of kindness towards an individual, decorating an old person's home, for example. This is precisely the result which this policy has brought about in the major branches of Protestant Christianity. The more they have accommodated their teaching and attitudes to the spirit of the age the more their numbers have declined. A similar decline in the formal practice of their religion by large numbers of Catholics has proved to be the first fruits of the pseudo-renewal which the Church is undergoing in this country, a far cry from the true renewal advocated by the Council for which an increase in *personal* sanctity was to provide the basis.

### **Authoritative Teaching wanted**

The ordinary Catholic wants clear and definite teaching on what he must believe and how he must behave if he is to save his soul. He may not always conform his behaviour to the norms laid down by the Church, but he will not question the objective value of those norms if they are maintained firmly and consistently. He is only too happy to accept the authority of the Church. The idea that morality (let alone basic doctrinal truths) is in a state of constant flux, and arrived at by a perpetual dialogue between the Pope and the faithful, is quite alien to him. He does not want the Pope to be a spokesman for the Church, reflecting the consensus of opinion any given moment. He expects the Pope to fulfil the role which Christ gave him, to teach and rule with authority, and he expects his bishops who have also received this mandate to fulfil it, too, always ensuring that what they teach conforms with what Peter is teaching - the one sure test of authentic Catholicism.

---

<sup>21</sup> 'The Sower', January 1970, p.4. See also Fr. A. Bullen, 'Growing in Christ', p.36. 'Every sin. inflicts damage on the family of God (no sin is purely private), and so, although nowadays the confession is private, the ceremony is in a way a public one, with the representative of the family admitting the sinner once again to the family circle. ' Contrast with the Council of Trent: 'That which is signified and produced by this sacrament is, so far as its force and efficiency are concerned, reconciliation with God. '

St. Thomas Aquinas explains that the virtue of penance is that moral virtue which inclines the will to turn away inwardly from sin, and to render atonement to God for it, (*in as much as sin is an insult to god*) (*in quantum est offensia Dei*), together with a purpose of amendment. S.T. III, 85, 3.

In so far as we are united to God through Christ within his Mystical Body the Church, and in separating ourselves from God by sin we separate ourselves from the Mystical Body (although not completely in the case of most sins, but Schism, heresy, or apostasy are such of their very nature that they sever a man from the Body of the Church, see *Mystical Body of Christ*, para 22, C.T.S. Do 266), reconciliation with God is reconciliation with the Church, and it is through the power of absolution granted to the Church that we are reconciled. When we sin it is certainly true that we betray the whole Church and it would be wrong to overlook this valid aspect of the Sacrament of Penance when refuting its exaggeration out of all proportion by the proponents of the 'new' theology.

### **Brother Gabriel Moran - and Derek Lance.**

Brother Gabriel Moran, the most celebrated of the 'New' Catechists, has no time even for the concept of a fixed deposit of faith to be handed on. He defines revelation as '*an historical and continuing intersubjective communion in which man's answer is part of the revelation*'<sup>22</sup> His British disciples echo this view. '*There can be no question of "handing on the message" in the sense of "putting it across" as though the message were something given once and for all like a body of information*', writes Derek Lance, a lecturer of the National Catechetical Centre.<sup>23</sup>

### **'No Indoctrination'**

The manner in which generations of dedicated Catholic teachers have striven to pass on this treasure to their pupils is described by Brother Moran as: '*...a blunt frontal attack upon a person's freedom with a mass of religious concepts and practices*'. He wishes teachers to abandon this for a policy of opening the minds and hearts of the children to recognise and accept the action of the Holy Spirit in communicating the reality and truth of the Risen Christ. Any attempt at '*indoctrination*' is seen as the supreme heresy of the new faith.

The 'New' Catechists do not question such statements; they merely pass them on to any teacher they are able to influence. It seems to have escaped their notice that teaching the great truths of the Christian religion might be an effective means of co-operating with the Holy Spirit in his work of transforming young Catholics into other Christs, a work to which their hearts and minds were opened by baptism. The exemplary lives of generations of Catholics, taught by the traditional methods, is a fact which they chose to ignore. Whatever methods of teaching are used many Catholics will fall away; the reason is usually found in themselves or their family background. A system of teaching religion which will have a significant effect on any but the smallest proportion of children from lapsed homes has yet to be devised.<sup>24</sup>

### **Who Indoctrinates Whom?**

The constant harping on our duty to avoid '*indoctrinating*' children stems from constant secularist propaganda on this theme. Those who reiterate it reveal themselves to be the victims of secularist indoctrination! The shallowness of the argument can be seen if it is taken to its ultimate conclusion. Saying prayers with or in the presence of children, reading to them from the Bible or the lives of the saints, taking them to Mass, celebrating Christmas or Easter all these activities could be classed as means of indoctrinating a child and influencing his ultimate freedom of choice.

### **Brother Moran on the 'Credo'**

When the 'New' Catechist finds that his ideas conflict with the official teaching of the Church he is not troubled in the least. Confronted with the 'Credo' of Pope Paul, Brother Moran made his now notorious statement: '*To me it was irrelevant. I don't know if what I am teaching is at variance or not. He just doesn't use any of the language I use. I can't figure out if what I teach is absolutely contradictory because his statements don't say anything to me. It's not that they're false. They just don't say anything.*'

It is quite clear that a man who can make a statement such as this, concerning Papal teaching of a nature which demands unhesitating acceptance from anyone claiming the title of Catholic, is

---

<sup>22</sup> *God Still Speaks*, Burns and Oates

<sup>23</sup> Derek Lance, 'Duckett's Register'.

<sup>24</sup> See Appendix 2.

separated by more than a differing concept of the *same* faith from those who consider that what the Pope teaches on faith and morals demands loyal adherence: <sup>25</sup>

### **Father Bullen on free choice**

Fr. Bullen states: '*...true religious activity, at any age must of necessity be the consequence of free choice.*'<sup>26</sup> This is typical of what teachers now expect from the 'experts'. How many of the decisions a child makes in religious or ethical matters are a result of a 'free choice'? He certainly cannot possibly have weighed up the pros and cons of any belief or course of action and made a balanced and rational choice. When he accepts that Jesus comes to him in Holy Communion he is doing so purely on the authority of adults whom he respects and loves, aided of course by the action of the Holy Spirit. The very fact that he believes in the existence of Jesus is based upon his trust in adults. Needless to say, since believing the truths taught by Christ gives freedom in its truest sense he is being made free by this childlike reliance on adults. Moreover, we have it on good authority that to be childlike is an essential prerequisite for entering the kingdom of heaven. It is true that the *application* of these truths accepted on authority must, to a certain extent, be a matter of free and personal decision. No form of moral pressure should, for example, be used to compel an unwilling child to go to confession during school time. This and similar instances are obvious and would rarely be disputed today, but this is a far cry from accepting the validity of Father Bullen's unqualified observation.

### **Absence of Common-sense**

A careful examination of recent syllabi shows that behind an impressive facade of contemporary psychological jargon there lies a frightening lack of knowledge of the very realities of classroom life. Even if the doctrinal content of what they say were beyond question, this is a factor which would throw considerable doubt on the suitability of certain of our 'experts' for their present positions.

Fr. Bullen's syllabus, for example, seems to be based on the assumption either that classes are composed exclusively of perfectly behaved children who will divide into groups and discuss topics of the day in a mature and orderly fashion before presenting their profound conclusions to the class, or that their teachers are perfect disciplinarians who can organise and control such discussions without the slightest difficulty.

The barest outlines of what should be taught are given. Enormous booklists are added, heavily biased in favour of the theology and certainly calculated to indoctrinate any teacher who reads all the recommended titles. (The lack of touch with the real world here is fortunate. Few teachers, very few lay teachers, will ever read more than a small fraction of the books recommended.)

Fr. Bullen presumes, like Fr. Konstant in the Westminster Syllabus and the authors of the 'Over to you' series, that teachers have the time necessary to prepare individual lesson notes for a syllabus which they may well not understand, and for which they will often (and rightly) have little sympathy. Does he realise that married women are the backbone of the lay staff in our primary schools? Any teacher who puts in an honest day's effort with a class of forty children cannot help feeling exhausted at the end of the day. Yet most married women teachers have children of their own and they have often to collect them from different schools. It may be five o'clock or later before they get them home. Then begins the work of getting tea ready, and after that there is housework to catch up with, supper at different times for different age groups, washing and bathing, tooth-cleaning, trouble with teenagers over homework or romantic involvements...The

---

<sup>25</sup> See Appendix 7.

<sup>26</sup> *Syllabus, Living and Believing*, (G. Chapman).

wonder is that they contrive to succeed as well as they do. Yet all the help they get from the 'expert' is an outline sketch of lessons backed by a mass of verbiage which will rightly be assessed at its true worth.

It must also be admitted that even many teachers who might be expected to be able to find time to do the background reading and lengthy preparation required for the successful implementation of such a syllabus (whether orthodox or not) simply will not do so. Whether they ought to or not is another matter. But an 'expert' should cater for the situation as it is (the 'existential' situation in his own language), not the situation as he thinks it ought to be. The lack of success of certain much vaunted 'modern approaches' to secular subjects is mainly due to the fact that they demand more from the teacher than it is reasonable to expect<sup>27</sup>.

### **Just. What Are Children Like?**

Father Bullen would seem to have in mind a child rather different to the general run of children in ordinary schools. Can it be that, given their obsession concerning the need to play down 'original sin', the 'new' catechists prefer to shut their eyes to all manifestations of the Old Adam - and to the fact that even the most lovable of children can at times prove naughty, selfish, even cruel, and quite capable of getting immense pleasure out of disrupting lessons?

Since they conceive of sin as an offence against society rather than the Almighty, it is certainly logical enough that educationists who themselves grovel before the mind of the world should also wish to see children of even tender years genuflect, however precociously, before the community in which they find themselves. One cannot help wondering if this is why such emphasis is placed on pressurising children to accept everyone into their groups at play at the very stage in their development when they tend to form exclusive cliques in which (although the membership may vary) they tend to remain.

This is an expected and natural stage of development, and it cannot simply be ignored because Fr. Bullen requires every child to see himself as a member of the school community. This school community concept is very much an adult idea which psychologists like to imagine children share, but which has meaning for most children only on such competitive occasions as inter-school sports. And even then they are not so much for their own school as against another! The class is normally the largest community to have real meaning for a child, and this only in a limited sense. How many parents can honestly claim that together with their children their own family forms a genuine community in which each member subordinates his own interests to the harmonious workings of the whole? Multiply the complex pattern of tensions within the family by many hundreds and the practicability of the type of community which Fr. Bullen advocates can be imagined without difficulty.

### **The Bullen-Approved School.**

Father Bullen is however careful to express himself in such a way that no one is any the wiser concerning what he really means after reading, or even carefully pondering his observations.

Here for example is the message he would have above the entrance to every Catholic school:

---

<sup>27</sup> Educational experts have decided that any primary child can learn a second foreign language and that any teacher without previous knowledge, can be trained to teach one, assisted by audio-visual aids. A survey carried out by the Scottish Education Department into primary French taught by these 'modern' methods devised by 'experts' revealed success in only 17 out of 325 classes: (Scottish Education Department, 'French in the Primary School' H.M.S.O.)

'We try to establish a community , based on love and care for the individual' [not for God!] , in which the Faith of the Church, accepted at least tacitly by the home, gives implicit direction and ultimate meaning to all the community's activity, This activity flows from an integrated child-centred curriculum, in which no hard line is drawn between the sacred and the secular because the Christian Revelation is seen as a dimension of, and not something alongside of, the learning and living situation in which the child finds himself. In this kind of security-giving community context, emphasis will be less on verbal, doctrinal exposition than on developing in the child a more acute awareness of, sensitivity to and interest in, everything in his existential situation, and helping him to find the meaning in it... We try to build a miniature community... where the Faith, linking school with home, is shared by all.'

This is typical 'new' catechetics hogwash. The advantage of this kind of 'newspeak' is that it means whatever the reader cares to read into it. Interpreted in one sense, it could no doubt be wholly acceptable to the most orthodox. Yet interpreted in another way it could be no less acceptable to the kind of 'Christian' who would feel perfectly at home as an active member of the *British Humanist Association*. A cynic would say that it simply says nothing beautifully. In point of fact, however, this studied ambiguity exemplifies 'new' catechetical technique, which is to employ language not to reveal but rather to conceal intention.

### **A Magisterium of self-proclaimed 'experts'**

Although this dossier is concerned primarily with the doctrinal orthodoxy of religious education, this somewhat lengthy digression on the frequent lack of rapport between catechetical 'experts' and the classroom situation is by no means irrelevant. For members of the clergy nowadays tend to defer to the 'experts' in view of their '*specialised knowledge*', despite unease about the content of their teaching. When the 'expert' says that a certain doctrine would be meaningless to children, or that this is the only way in which another doctrine can be taught, or that yet another doctrine must be left until a later stage, a priest will often feel that it is not for him to question the judgement of the expert appointed by the bishop. Bishops, too, often tend to defer to the judgement of catechetical directors despite complaints from teachers and parents.

### **Positive Value of Fr. Bullen's ideas**

This is not to say that there is no value in any of the experts' ideas. In the particular syllabus (Fr. Bullen's) which has been under discussion there is much material which any conscientious teacher would be glad to use, particularly the use of secular themes to clarify religious concepts. If it is felt that a study of bread might clarify the true nature of Holy Communion, good and well. But will the true nature of Holy Communion always be clarified by such illustrations?

While the orthodoxy of a syllabus is easily judged by reference to Pope Paul's '**Credo**' the value of new methods can only be assessed in practice. And a conscientious teacher will be only too pleased to give them the benefit of a fair trial unless they are blatantly contrary to the interests of his pupils. (see Appendix 4 para. 10)

### **SUMMARY**

As Father Telford has made clear, the good sense of most Catholic teachers is proving a considerable obstacle to anything like general - let alone enthusiastic - acceptance of the 'new' theology, as presented by the 'new' catechists.

Nevertheless, as can be seen from the evidence we have adduced - particular in the *Appendices* - we must reckon seriously with the following four considerations:

**First**, despite the efforts of many orthodox teachers, the 'new' catechetics is making increasing headway.

**Secondly**, the dilution or complete suppression of '*unpopular*' doctrines is common and, on a lesser scale, there is also definite evidence of specifically unorthodox teaching.

**Thirdly**, the 'new' catechists are gradually establishing a stranglehold over teacher training and the publishing world.

**Finally**, as well as being unorthodox, 'new' catechetical programmes are frequently quite unrealistic.

## **SECTION THREE**

### **A Positive Response**

*'He who would interpret the Council as a loosening of the former engagements of the Church toward Her Faith, Her tradition, Her asceticism, Her charity, Her spirit of sacrifice, and Her adhesion to the Word and to the Cross of Christ, or even an indulgent concession to the fragile and versatile relativistic mentality of a world without principles and without transcendent end, a kind of more facile and less exacting Christianity, would be completely mistaken.'*

His Holiness Pope Paul VI

(As quoted by Michel de Saint Pierre in *Sainte Colère Editions de laTable Ronde*, 1965, Paris).

## **A positive response**

The current catechetical crisis is a crisis in the true sense of the word: a period of decision which will decide the future course of events.

A concerted effort by a substantial proportion of orthodox Catholics can indeed ensure that the Gospel of Christ, whole and entire, will continue to be proclaimed in our schools. But only providing that action is taken *now*.

We have not yet a state of affairs comparable to the situation in Holland,<sup>28</sup> or in France, where the national hierarchy is not only permitting defective and heterodox catechetical teaching (as in the U.S.A. and to a lesser extent here), but is actually enforcing it in the schools under its control. This point was made by Geoffrey Lawman in his article, '*The Layman's role in Catechetics*', published in the APPROACHES supplement, '*The Laity and Catechetics*'. (Details concerning the actual falsification of scripture in the '*fonds obligatoire*' or *Compulsory Catechetical Groundwork* - imposed by the French hierarchy were published in the April, 1969 issue of *Itinéraires*.)

In his article in '*The Laity and Catechetics*', Geoffrey Lawman discusses what kinds of action can be taken by loyal layfolk, and he insists on the need for small groups of parents determined to act prudently in order to ensure that their rights as Christian parents are respected.

It is our purpose here to provoke fruitful discussion concerning ways and means of developing still further the basic strategy suggested by Geoffrey Lawman.

Clearly, it is much more realistic to seek to ensure that orthodoxy prevails in this or that school, or to enable even a single group of families to teach the true faith to their children, than to think in terms of issuing proclamations, however impressive, which may not result in a single child's learning what the magisterium wishes him to know.

## **The parents' problem**

What is wanted then is action by groups of parents in defence of *their* children's faith, action that takes into consideration the concrete circumstances that exist in the school or schools to which *their* children go.

It is certainly not difficult for parents to know when such action is quite indispensable. There are few areas in the country where positive parental initiative is not long overdue. If parents wish to convince themselves of this, all they need do is to ask their children, and to keep on asking them, what they are being taught in the name of religion. If possible, they should of course seek to obtain a copy of whatever syllabus is in use locally, and to discover which textbooks (if any) are being used by their children. 'New' Catechists are rather reticent about answering such questions. But even discovering this for themselves may help parents to realise what they are up against. And irrespective of the replies given by the 'new' catechists they encounter, the real nature of the syllabus being followed can be inferred from what their children can or cannot tell them.

Needless to say, parents must know their own faith. And to consolidate their knowledge of the essentials of what Catholics must believe (and therefore must be taught) they can do no better than study Pope Paul's '*Credo of the people of God*'<sup>29</sup>. It should then be comparatively easy for them to assess the orthodoxy of what their children are being taught.

---

<sup>28</sup> The situation in Holland is described in an article by Father Van de Ploeg in Appendix 6.

<sup>29</sup> C.T.S.

**Generally speaking, they can be sure that a syllabus is defective if it neglects, omits, or deals ambiguously with, any of the doctrines which they themselves learned in school. If any of the doctrines they learned are contradicted, either implicitly or explicitly, by the catechists who are teaching their children, they may be sure that what their children are being taught is definitely not orthodox.**

Let them not be put off by talk about 'new insights', new methods, or the development of doctrine. The faith is still today what it was yesterday and will be tomorrow. The faith they were taught is the faith which is proclaimed by Pope Paul in his *'Credo of the people of God'*, and it is this faith which the magisterium of Mother Church insists should be taught. It is this faith which their children have a right to learn.<sup>30</sup>

### **The 'new' catechists and the bishops**

Since 'new' catechists usually operate under episcopal patronage, apparently with the bishop's explicit blessing, concerned parents sometimes tend to despair. Knowing that the bishop is the representative of the Church's magisterium in his diocese, parents ask themselves what useful purpose can possibly be served by initiative on their part when the bishop seems to approve the very state of affairs that is the cause of their alarm.

It is therefore necessary to insist that parents continue to be responsible for the education (and the salvation) of their children whether or not the bishop realises the true significance of what is happening in the schools of his diocese.

Even bishops as orthodox as the Scots Hierarchy can unwittingly be used as a cloak for the teaching of a false religion if parents and teachers do not face up to their responsibilities. Bishops tend to be extraordinarily lonely men to whom few people care to speak frankly. Generally speaking, going to see the bishop is the very last thing a cradle Catholic will think of doing. (And when he does, he is usually so diffident about it that he either fails to say what he had intended saying, or else, to compensate for his lack of confidence, he becomes quite unnecessarily aggressive and thus creates the very worst of impressions).

Bishops probably do not realise the full significance of what is happening in the schools. (This is certainly the only charitable - and realistic - assumption to act upon in Scotland, where there are no neo-Modernist bishops.) But we also knew that in moments of crisis for the Church nothing is more dangerous than the silence of orthodox bishops. Father Ninian Winzet, Scots champion of orthodoxy at the time of the Reformation, points out that one of the main factors responsible for the success of subversion in 16th century Scotland was the silence of the bishops at the very moment when they should have spoken out.<sup>31</sup>

Hence the necessity of understanding how imperative it is for bishops to be apprised concerning what is really happening in the schools. For disastrous as may be the bishop's silence, his silence may well be a function of our indifference, of our failure to see that he has been appropriately informed.

---

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Statement by Pope Paul on p.255 of *Trojan Horse in the City of God*. See also 'Nothing but the Truth' (Appendix 3).

<sup>31</sup> *The Reformation in Scotland*, by the Rev. W.E. Brown (C.T.S.) [see also *Apropos* No. 27 where this work is reproduced].

### **Need for respectful representations**

It cannot be too strongly emphasised that whatever representations are made to the bishop (or the parish priest) must be made respectfully.

Nor should such representations be made in the expectation that appropriate action will be taken without delay. For since, generally speaking, bishops are not aware of how really pernicious is the effect of the 'new' catechetics, it would be quite unrealistic to suppose that they will immediately grasp the true situation the moment they are confronted with parental dissatisfaction.

This, after all, is the age of '*contestation*' and protest. This being so, bishops are as likely as not to assume that protests concerning the 'new' catechetics are simply what may be expected in a period of change, and that what is really wrong is that protesting parents have yet to come to terms with Vatican 2.

Hence the importance of realising that representations must be respectful, restrained, and characterised by under rather than overstatement. Hence also why those who go to see the bishop should not be types easily recognised as men or women with a chip on their shoulder.

Realism also demands that representations be made with confidence in the justice of our cause (What cause could be more just than the Christian education of our children?), despite our having no expectation of immediate episcopal action. Realism demands that while we should indeed hope that our representations may be effective (at least in the long run), we must nevertheless act on the assumption that they will be in vain (at least in the short run).

It is only if we have this balanced, realistic approach to the problem that we shall be able to measure up to our responsibilities as Christian parents and teachers. For then, while hoping for the best, we shall be prepared even for the very worst. We shall take the necessary steps to protect our children's faith even if the bishop does nothing and by doing so we shall at the same time have prepared ourselves to be able to give effective positive support to episcopal initiative in the event of our representations proving successful.

### **What action should we take?**

There could come a point when certain parents may have no option but to consider removing their children from a '*Catholic*' school and sending him to a non-Catholic school - in order to ensure that he is no longer taught heresy by teachers purporting to act in the name, and with the approval, of the magisterium of Mother Church. This has been a frequent necessity in the U.S.A., where parents have been refused permission simply to withdraw their children from religious lessons. In the U.K., however, where Catholic schools are either largely or wholly State supported, as a general rule it should be unnecessary to go beyond withdrawing, or threatening to withdraw, one's child from religious lessons. But even this threat should be used only as a last resort, when all other representations have proved to be of no avail.

### **Action appropriate to the circumstances**

Where one has to reckon only with inadequate teachers, time-wasting, drawing endless series of maps or plans, making endless lists of inane subjects, etc., the ultimate sanction of withdrawing or threatening to withdraw one's child from such meaningless '*religious lessons*' would be tantamount to using a sledgehammer to crack a peanut. But this by no means implies that this kind of nonsense can by any stretch of the imagination be described as '*religious education*'.

On the other hand, we may well have to reckon with convinced neo-Modernists who are

deliberately teaching what in effect is false doctrine. Where children are being taught that Mass is *simply* a special kind of meal, that the Pope is essentially a spokesman for majority opinion in the Church; where Christ is represented as being capable of sin, ignorant of His divinity, or simply as an outstanding 'leader' type (such as John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Ghandi, etc.); when the priesthood is portrayed as being simply a species of social service; when angels, hell and original sin are dismissed as myths (and the Immaculate Conception and the Redemption logically enough not mentioned!) - under such circumstances we should indeed think seriously in terms of employing ultimate sanctions.

But when this state of affairs exists, it goes without saying that both before and after taking whatever action is deemed to be necessary, the parish priest and the bishop should be fully informed either in person or in writing, and supplied with detailed information concerning the teaching of false doctrine.

We know of a priest who has recently had to advise troubled parents to employ the ultimate sanction of withdrawing their children. And we know of other parents who have done likewise on their own initiative.

Needless to say, when parents consider that their children have to be withdrawn, ether from the religious periods in a 'Catholic' school or from a 'Catholic' school altogether, responsibility for instructing the children concerned in the faith then rests exclusively on the parents. Indeed, a parent would be very foolish in these days to assume automatically that his child is being adequately instructed concerning the faith by attending a Catholic school. (It is not being cynical but simply realistic to say that the best one can hope for in many cases today is that one's child will be taught nothing about his faith in his 'Catholic' school. For then at least he will have nothing to unlearn.)

### **Role of parish priest**

The step of withdrawing one's child should certainly not be even contemplated without first informing the parish priest. For the parish school is the responsibility of the parish priest.

Canon 469 of Canon Law states explicitly that *'the pastor must watch with care that nothing contrary to faith and morals be taught in his parish, especially in the public and private schools.'*

As was remarked in a recent article in the *Scottish Catholic Observer*:

*'All problems in catechetics derive from the non-implementation of this Canon - or more precisely from the usurping of the rights and duties of parish priests by the alumni of catechetical institutes which, generally speaking, seem to be hotbeds of neo-Modernist subversion.'*<sup>32</sup>

### **Taking rebuffs in. our stride**

Unless all of the foregoing considerations are taken into account, and anticipated, unless we go into action without illusions we shall almost certainly end up disillusioned - if not actually in despair.

Generally speaking, the great difficulty in getting anything done through official channels is that complaints are normally referred back to those responsible for the defective or false teaching to

---

<sup>32</sup> August 21, 1970.

which exception is taken. This should be anticipated. One can indeed expect to see the buck passed around endlessly.

Representations made to the school will probably be referred to the catechetical centre; the catechetical centre's spokesmen in turn will insist that the centre is simply carrying out episcopal instructions; and complaints to the bishop are normally referred back to the catechetical director, or else they result in a reassuring note from his Lordship assuring complainants that the same faith is being taught, but only by methods which are not properly understood, and that there is no reason for parents to lack confidence in the school, etc.

It is only if we begin by expecting this kind of immediate reaction that we shall be able to take rebuffs in our stride without becoming disheartened.

### **Need for a central team**

This kind of experience is nevertheless very frustrating even when it has been anticipated. It is therefore necessary to anticipate this frustration also, and also to devise means of overcoming it. This means that parents and teachers must feel that there is someone to whom they can turn for help and guidance,

In his article in *'The Laity and Catechetics'*, Geoffrey Lawman suggested the possibility of establishing a central team who would be able to serve this purpose. Geoffrey Lawman had in mind a central team able to supply documentation, information concerning good and bad catechisms, and also to exercise vigilance over what goes on in catechetical centres, diocesan education committees and sub-committees, etc., a team able not only to keep neighbourhood groups informed, but also to concern itself with making representations to bishops where abuses merit such action.

Although this was mooted only a year ago, we are happy to be able to say that the kind of informal team envisaged by Geoffrey Lawman is now already in existence.<sup>33</sup> Parents no longer need feel entirely on their own.

### **What is now possible**

It is true that as yet the team exists only in skeletal form. It is nevertheless already in existence. Assessments of all syllabi and textbooks now being used will eventually be prepared and made available. In the meanwhile, the team is able and willing to give guidance concerning any textbook or syllabus that is forwarded for inspection. This assessment will be made not by amateurs but by a team of priests and teachers with specialised catechetical knowledge.

The team should also be able to advise parents perplexed at having had the buck passed around continually. It would certainly be quite impermissible to create the impression that victory is just around the corner, or that our team will be able to work miracles. At the very least, however, we can say with certainty that henceforth no parent or group of parents need feel utterly isolated, with nowhere to turn for help and guidance. And even awareness of this cannot but enormously strengthen the resolve of all concerned parents and teachers.

Hitherto, the struggle for orthodoxy at grass roots levels has been undertaken almost exclusively by isolated individuals. And while it says much for those who have persisted notwithstanding lack of success, the fact remains that had there been some provision for co-ordination of effort this

---

<sup>33</sup> The Catechetical Enquiry Centre, Surrey.

would have both stimulated the elan of the few and spurred into action others who felt resistance to be quite futile precisely because of the absence of anything in the nature of co-ordinated effort.

Perhaps the most demoralising of all the temptations to which concerned parents and teachers have been subject is the temptation to ask oneself how can one possibly be right when confronted with an immense corpus of 'new' catechetical opinion whose representatives are in control of the majority of key positions in the catechetical world, and apparently with the blessing of the hierarchy.

One Catholic headmaster has spoken of *'the feeling that the most we can do is to keep plugging holes in the dyke.'* At times it has been like trying to empty the sea with a sieve. Under these circumstances, clearly, only one thing made it possible for a minority to keep on struggling however futile their efforts seemed to be: the conviction that no 'expert' opinion that contradicts the teaching of Christ's Vicar on earth can possibly merit consideration, let alone acceptance. Hence the Golden Rule: *'Know the Credo and insist on the Credo.'*

This must continue to be our Golden Rule the Golden Rule also of the groups of concerned parents and teachers which we hope to see proliferating now that no group of parents and teachers need feel in utter isolation.

### **Withdrawal a last resource**

As concerned parents become increasingly aware of their capacity to resist unsatisfactory religious teaching, the action undertaken will become increasingly prudent and thus more effective. For where there is no feeling of isolation - and thus no temptation to act rashly, in desperation as it were - there is much less likelihood of invoking the use of the ultimate sanction of threatening to withdraw one's child either from religious classes or even from a 'Catholic' school altogether.

Now that a basis for effective communication exists between concerned parents, this kind of action will be contemplated in exceptional instances.

And this is as it should be. For withdrawing one's child from a Catholic school and putting him in a non-Catholic school, is tantamount to an admission of defeat, and an admission of total victory for neo-Modernism in the school concerned.

Moreover, as the demand for places in Catholic schools south of the Border is often in excess of those available, withdrawing or threatening to withdraw children from Catholic schools can scarcely be reckoned a very effective weapon.

In private schools, the position would of course be very different. There, two or three families prepared if need be to withdraw their children could have a dramatic effect on school policy.

### **The child's role in catechetics**

Withdrawing one's child from the religious class (or even from a 'Catholic' school altogether) may well be an effective means of letting the parish priest or the bishop know what one thinks of the 'new' catechetics. But such action is scarcely likely to worry the 'new' catechist over much. He is rather likely to experience relief, for thenceforth he will have fewer children from concerned Catholic homes to reckon with.

Much more upsetting for the 'new' catechist - more upsetting even than a visit from an irate parent - is the presence in his class of an appropriately briefed child who is both willing and able

to ask the most embarrassing questions at the most awkward moments. For nothing can be more humiliating for the catechist than to have his heterodoxy revealed out of the mouth of a mere child.

Providing concerned parents are willing to take on responsibility for their children's religious education, there is no reason why every 'new' catechist in the country could not be so embarrassed day after day.

Nor let it be imagined that it is unrealistic to think in such terms. If there is one thing of which we can be reasonably sure it is that, 'new' catechetics notwithstanding, no child of any family prepared for total involvement in the struggle to uphold Christ and His Vicar against the spirit of the world is likely to be adversely affected by neo-Modernist subversion in the classroom.

To doubt this is indeed to doubt the reality of the graces received in the sacrament of matrimony to enable us to fulfil our parental responsibilities. It is also to doubt the reality of the graces received by the baptised children of really apostolic parents. **The truly apostolic family can be an impregnable fortress.**

The casualties of neo-Modernist subversion are not likely to be found in such families, They are much more likely to be found among the children of 'good Catholic parents' who are so unconcerned about what their children are being taught that they never even bother to enquire, let alone think seriously in terms of equipping their children for the fray.

That even young children can be equipped appropriately for apostolic activity is one of the facts of life with which we must begin to come to terms without delay. Indeed, one of the most essential aspects of a real *aggiornamento* in catechetics is a realisation that, in the present epoch particularly, a school child is quite literally never too young for involvement in the apostolate. It can even be said that the faith of no one is safe today unless as a little child he learns to differentiate between sound doctrine and false, and to appreciate that by no means all teachers, clerical or lay, are bearers of the faith of Peter.

### **Withdrawal - its limitations**

Where really concerned Catholic parents are concerned, the problem is essentially one of equipping them and their children for the fray. But human beings being human, apart from really concerned, dynamic, fight-to-a-finish parents, there are others who, though seriously concerned about their children's faith, feel themselves quite inadequate to counter the influence of the school, especially where priests or nuns are among, or obviously backing, the 'new' catechists.

Such parents generally find themselves petrified in the presence of a Roman collar or nun's habit - a psychological trait which neo-Modernist clerics exploit quite unscrupulously (while they simultaneously denounce the legitimate exercise of authority by the Sovereign Pontiff as clericalism!).

This, incidentally, shows that one essential feature of a real *aggiornamento* is a realisation by the faithful of the true nature of clericalism. Clericalism is essentially the *abuse* of clerical authority - and thus not to be confused with the *legitimate exercise* of authority by the Holy Father, the bishops and the clergy generally. But just as the devil delights in quoting scripture, so do the very worst clericalists denounce as 'clericalist' anyone who dares to show them up for what they really are. Utterly contemptuous of the authority of Christ's Vicar on earth (and of any bishop, priest or layman who would dare defend it) neo-Modernist clerics generally speaking are quite intolerant of anyone who refuses to take *their* pretensions seriously. Thus they command obedience while

being a law unto themselves. It is therefore necessary to take advantage of every opportunity to drive this lesson home - to show that clericalism so called is the abuse, not the legitimate exercise, of clerical authority.

In the meanwhile, however, we must reckon with things as they are: with the fact that many parents have yet to be able to distinguish between the institution of the priesthood (which indeed commands respect) and the heterodox notions of this or that priest (which may deserve only contempt). It is extraordinarily difficult for parents who have not this distinction clearly in their minds to resist neo-Modernist clericalist pressure and simultaneously to retain their own equilibrium,

American experience has already shown that whereas such parents can, with an immense effort, summon up enough courage to withdraw their children from the wrong kind of 'Catholic' school, they are seldom capable of sustained resistance to neo-Modernist influence within the context of the parish or the Catholic school. And parents such as these are by no means confined to the U.S.A. Given such parents - who though genuinely concerned about their children's faith are, for the time being, incapable of total involvement in an all-out struggle against neo-Modernist subversion - the fact must be faced that, generally speaking, their children would indeed be much safer in a non-Catholic school than in a 'Catholic' school in which heresy is taught in the name of Christ and His Church. The only child who is comparatively safe even in this kind of environment is the child of parents who are both willing and able to cope effectively with so insidious a menace.

There are therefore circumstances in this country no less than in the U.S.A. where the withdrawal of children from a 'Catholic' school is justifiable. It must however be emphasised that it is far from being the ideal way of resisting neo-Modernist subversion. The ideal is total involvement, which includes equipping one's children to become effective apostles within the school. But where withdrawal is indicated, both before and after it takes place, it should be exploited to the maximum (but prudently, resolutely, and without any kind of hysteria or fanaticism) in order to let the parish clergy and the bishop realise what is taking place in the classrooms of 'Catholic' schools.

Generally speaking, withdrawal of children from a 'Catholic' school is to be discouraged. At the most it is but a second best. Moreover, as a general rule it is likely to be effective in containing subversion within a given parish or diocese only where there is a considerable body of parents who are prepared to act in this way as a means of showing their parish priest and the bishop how determined they are that a false religion will no longer be taught in the name of Christ and His Church. But, paradoxically, given such a body of concerned parents, it is extremely unlikely that such action would ever be necessary. For the 'new' catechetics flourishes only where the majority of parents and teachers are unconcerned, passive and inert.

What must always be encouraged is the emergence of a *corps d'élite* of really concerned, dynamically apostolic parents and teachers, and a *corps d'élite* of equally concerned apostolic children of all ages. Such parents and such children - especially the children - are such more likely to frighten 'new' catechists than even the weightiest of late 20th century croziers.

### **Other types of positive action**

In ordinary Catholic schools in the U.K. there is however another very simple means whereby concerned parents and teachers can make their voices heard effectively: by obtaining key positions in Parent-Teacher Associations and by seeking discreetly, prudently, yet persistently to canvass opinion in favour of orthodoxy. This can be done not only by speaking out themselves, but also by

arranging where possible for orthodox speakers to address the Associations.<sup>34</sup>

Too often in the past, as a result of inertia and lack of initiative on the part of orthodox parents, Parent-Teacher Associations have become mere platforms to be exploited at will by 'new' catechists. The need for appropriate initiative on the part of both parents and teachers was brought home in a most striking manner by popular reaction to B.B.C. sex programmes. For it was found that, almost invariably, a talk by the head teacher or by a visiting speaker, for or against the sex programmes, sufficed to induce a majority of the audience to share the speaker's attitude towards the B.B.C.'s concept of sex education in school. Alas! with Catholic as with non-Catholic schools, few parents being capable of independent judgement in such matters (for without sound doctrine one can have no reliable criteria by which to judge), they are usually quite happy to accept whatever the school or an eloquent 'expert' thinks best.

Indeed, the ease with which so many Catholic parents can be brainwashed - even into accepting doctrinal teaching that flatly contradicts the teaching of the magisterium shows that Catholic education in pre-Conciliar days was far from perfect. Notwithstanding what certain nostalgic traditionalists would have us believe, a real catechetical *aggiornamento* was long overdue. It is therefore all the more regrettable that instead of genuine renewal we have had the perversion of doctrine masquerading as renewal.

### **Basis for action**

Clearly no effective action is conceivable - whether on the catechetics front or on any other - unless those who realise its necessity are prepared to equip themselves appropriately. In short, before we can equip our children we must first equip ourselves - particularly by seeing to it that we have a sound doctrinal formation. And since sound doctrine is nowadays taught scarcely anywhere - least of all in the generality of catechetical centres and training colleges - equipping ourselves doctrinally must essentially be a 'do-it-yourself' job. (Not of course that we concoct our own doctrine, as do the 'progressives': The 'do-it-yourself' aspect of our work applies only to the question of obtaining access to, and sound guidance<sup>35</sup> in understanding, the doctrine of the magisterium. This can however be done under lay initiative as has been proved by the experience of the *International Office*.)

Moreover, given the prevailing dearth of sound doctrine, it is futile to hope that we may be able to make an effective stand against subversion - particularly subversion in the school and in the world of education generally - unless in the process of attending to our own doctrinal formation we also seek to gather around us others who are disposed to know, understand and implement the authentic teaching of Mother Church.

One of the saddest aspects of the catechetical problem is the dearth of dedicated Catholic teachers of unquestionable orthodoxy. Until this dearth can be remedied, discussion about Catholic education must necessarily be largely academic. For in the absence of an adequate number of Catholic teachers who unequivocally and wholeheartedly identify themselves with the Magisterium of the Church, Catholic education properly so called is out of the question.

It goes without saying that we cannot hope to solve *this* problem. This state of affairs will be remedied ultimately only by hierarchical initiative - i.e. by the rooting out of neo-Modernist

---

<sup>34</sup> A list of suitable speakers will be made available by the Catechetical Enquiry Centre early in 1971

<sup>35</sup> There is never any difficulty in obtaining competent theological advice where this is necessary.

influences from all seminaries and higher educational institutes where the hierarchy is in a position to make its weight felt.

It would however be quite unrealistic to act on the assumption that the present malaise could be remedied overnight, even were the Hierarchy to take the most resolute action immediately. In the meanwhile, therefore, our problem as layfolk is to hold fast to the Rock in the midst of the neo-Modernist tempest, to defend sound doctrine, and also to implement it as far as this is possible in our own milieux. Hence the vital importance of developing study-action groups of loyal layfolk wherever possible (and above all groups of layfolk determined that the deposit of faith, whole and entire, shall be passed on to their children).

## Literature

For the type of study-action group we have in mind, it is imperative that appropriate literature be available. Without such literature it is quite impossible to think in terms of producing cadres with a sound doctrinal-cultural-political formation.

Here, of course, we are specifically concerned with the problem of action in the catechetical field. But here too we cannot operate effectively without the right kind of specialised literature.

One of the most urgent problems confronting us is indeed the preparation of information concerning what orthodox syllabi and textbooks are available. It is virtually certain that, in most cases, these will have to be either imported or specially compiled. It is true that there are a number of excellent courses still available, but these will not be reprinted when existing stocks are exhausted (unless of course, as in the U.S.A., demand induces the publishers to change their minds!). The one exception we know of is the post-Conciliar Dublin Catechism for junior children, which was produced under the direction of Archbishop McQuaid.

The '*Penny Catechism*' is of course still available from the C.T.S., but it requires to be used in conjunction with supplementary literature. Its precise doctrinal formulations which summarise what has been taught in a concise form that can be easily memorised make it invaluable. But it would not be satisfactory for parents simply to make their children learn the answers to questions in isolation.<sup>36</sup>

An interim list of suggestions is contained in Appendix 9 together with a list of books and periodicals which would be of help to groups of parents and teachers preparing themselves to instruct their children and make a stand for orthodoxy in catechetics.

The cost of some of this literature may be prohibitive for some individuals, but all of the literature listed should be within the combined resources of any group of three or more families.

Moreover, once the cost of the initial textbooks has been met, the expense of subscribing to the periodicals and of obtaining new material as it appears should not be excessive.

It is hoped that a more comprehensive list of children's material may be available early in 1971.<sup>37</sup>

## In international perspective

Finally, it is helpful to see the catechetical problem in international perspective. If in many respects the situation here is not nearly so serious as in the U.S.A., France and Holland, it is also

---

<sup>36</sup> See Appendix 8.

<sup>37</sup> From the Catechetical Enquiry Centre, Surrey.

true that in the development of positive parental initiatives in the catechetical sphere we lag seriously behind both France and the U.S.A,

### **France**

In France, where neo-Modernism is solidly entrenched at all levels within the Church, parents grouped together in S.I.D.E.F. (*Secretariat D'Information et D'Etudes Familiales*, Versailles.) have established a quite remarkable service of documentation, information, mutual aid and advice from which we in the English-speaking world have much to learn.

In the U.S.A., where the reaction has been more spontaneous, varied, and tumultuous - as indeed might be expected in a land so vast, where the population is composed of so many different ethnic groups - quite outstanding progress has been made by orthodox parents. Groups of concerned parents have sprung up virtually everywhere, and there is already a considerable body of literature available concerning this eruption of righteous parental indignation.

This in turn has tended to stiffen resistance among the clergy, and there is now a considerable body of priests in sympathy with these Christian parents. They also have substantial support from a number of bishops, who have as yet, alas! been unable to induce the hierarchy to act '*collegially*' in defence of orthodoxy in catechetics.

### **Baltimore Catechism**

The best measure of the orthodox reaction in the U.S.A. is the escalation in sales of the '*Baltimore Catechism*' (which had been generally in use prior to Vatican 2) - from 10,000 copies in 1963 to 250,000 in 1969. Needless to say, this has not proved comforting to U.S. catechetical '*experts*' who consider the '*Baltimore Catechism*' as a symbol of the Church's '*former faith*'.

There is no reason why there should not be a similar escalation of parental initiatives in the U.K. now that a basis for co-ordination at long last exists.

### **The nature of our initiative**

We have indeed much to learn from both France and the U.S.A. But we have no intentions of blindly copying the initiatives of others no matter where.

Hence why we beg to indicate what precisely is the basis and the justification of our own initiative in the catechetical field.

*First*, our initiative as layfolk in this sphere derives from the exercise of natural rights concerning the education of our children which (as Pius XI reminds us in *Divini Illius Magistri*) we receive '**directly from the creator**'.

*Secondly*, the action we take must have, and be seen to have, but one objective: the restoration of right order, by taking positive steps to ensure that our children are taught the faith as outlined in the Catechism of the Council of Trent and in Pope Paul's '*Credo of the People of God*'.

*Thirdly*, while we welcome the advice and co-operation of all priests and religious who sympathise with our objectives, *our initiative is and must remain a lay initiative that is juridically independent of the hierarchy*. For it is only an initiative of this order that can have the freedom necessary to attain the ends we seek.

*Fourthly*, being juridically independent of the hierarchy, it goes without saying that our initiative must be similarly independent of any private association of priests. For, clearly, a group of layfolk, independent of the hierarchy but subordinate to a private association of priests, could not but suggest a polarising of the latter against the former. And this is of course quite unthinkable, For far from seeking to challenge the authority of the Hierarchy, our primary concern is the restoration of right order by restoring respect for the authentic magisterium of the hierarchy,

### **True Catholic Education**

We can do no better than conclude our study with a restatement of the aims of true Catholic education taken from '*Catholic Philosophy of Education*' by Drs. Redden and Ryan of Fordham University, who summarise these aims in the following words:

### **The aims of Catholic Education**

*'(1) To present dogmatically and by appropriate methods, the teaching of the Church concerning the existence of God; the immortality of the soul; the freedom of the will; man's origin and destiny; the fact of man's fallen nature and its consequences, together with the fact of man's redemption by Jesus Christ; man's duties to his neighbours and himself; the nature and binding obligation of the moral law; the supernatural life of grace which man ought to live; in brief, all the eternal truths of the Catholic religion. These truths are the only norms that can guide human conduct honestly, intelligently, and safely. **It is clear that direct instruction in these truths is an essential part of Catholic education.***

*'(2) To centre religious education in, and have it revolve around, the personality of Jesus Christ. Thus religious education becomes a way of life wherein the individual, of his own free will, and in his interior "life, adopts Christ as "the way, the truth, and the life".'*

Commenting on the above in '*The Wanderer*' of July 23, 1970, Edith Myers made the following observations:

*'There are teachers who attempt to develop Christian attitudes without the essential basis of a sound knowledge of Christian doctrine. Some of our educators say illogically that Christianity is not a set of propositions to be learned but a way of life. The fact is that it is **both**; and the student who does not have a "set of principles" as a foundation will not have the proper pattern for a Christian life, nor will he have the assurance that will enable him to cope with doubt and disbelief when he encounters them.'*

It goes without saying that a clear understanding of these principles is quite indispensable as the basis for the kind of action suggested by Geoffrey Lawman in '*The Laity and Catechetics*'. It also goes without saying that those undertaking this action will have the necessary fortitude and prudence only if they have continual recourse to prayer and confront the world in a spirit of penance, but also with that joy which is the indelible mark of the Christian.

And in the year of the canonisation of the Forty Martyrs, can we do better than beg their intercession on our behalf?

## **Divine Wrath**

'When the Pharisees gave Him no reply to His question, "Is it lawful to do good upon the Sabbath?" He looked at, them full of anger. It was holy wrath. The man who does not in his heart protest against obvious baseness and does not passionately try to suppress it whenever he can, is not a moral man. The more purely and intensely someone is sensitive to good and evil, the more sharply and decisively his feeling will, be expressed. So Jesus' infinitely pure and high-minded spirit more than any other would react to every baseness and wickedness with a bitterness without like or peer...

Fr. Karl Adam; *The Christ of Faith*; Mentor Omega paperback p.284.

## **APPENDIX I**

### **The Development of Doctrine**

The article '*The Truth about the Truth*' by Father John McKee is reproduced with acknowledgment to the C.T.S. organ '*Catholic Truth*' (Spring 1970).

Every concerned Catholic should be a member of the C.T.S. Members receive '*Catholic Truth*' and most new C.T.S. pamphlets free of charge. With a few unfortunate exceptions C.T.S. material is admirably sound and orthodox.

## The Truth about the Truth

by Fr. John McKee

G.K. Chesterton, that joyous 'Doctor' in, if not officially of, the Church wrote once:

*'An imbecile habit has arisen in modern controversy of saying that such and such a creed can be held in one age but cannot be held in another. Some dogma, we are told, was credible in the twelfth century, but it not credible in the twentieth. You might as well say that a certain philosophy can be believed on Mondays, but cannot be believed on Tuesdays. You might as well say of a view of the cosmos that it was suitable to half-past three, but not suitable to half-past four' [Orthodoxy].*

When he wrote this, he was not a Catholic, but let me add something that he wrote after his conversion:

*'Catholics when they stand up together and sing "Faith of our Fathers" may realize almost with amusement that they might as well be singing "Faith of our Children".'* He followed this with: *'Catholicism really is in the twentieth century what it was in the second century; it is the New Religion' [The Catholic Church and Conversion].*

### How Does Dogma Evolve

I hope that these passages will lead some Catholics to read again the pages of this extraordinary man who has so much to teach our restless era, but at least they will have served to underline the truth about God's truth: it does not change, and this means, first, that dogmas of the Church are not discarded, and, second, that they are not subjected to that more subtle form of disqualification involved in *changing their sense*. For many a long year after the Modernist attack on traditional doctrine in the day of St. Pius X, every priest had to affirm on oath:

*'I sincerely receive the doctrine of faith which the orthodox Fathers have transmitted to us from the Apostles, always in the same sense and meaning. And I therefore reject the false and heretical view of the evolution of dogmas, according to which dogmas may change meaning, so as to receive a different sense from that which the Church at first attached to them.'*

In making this solemn affirmation, without which he was not allowed to perform his priestly functions, he was expressing his acceptance of the teaching of the first Vatican Council:

*'That sense of the sacred dogmas is to be retained forever which Holy Mother Church has once clearly taught, nor is it ever to be departed from under the guise, or the name, of deeper insight' (Denzinger, Enchiridion, n.1800).*

In recent years, authority has judged that there is no need now to impose the oath (one wonders: will the Church be driven to reconsider this?), but the Church has not suffered a change of teaching. The recent Vatican Council is uncompromising about *'the unchanging truth'* and the way in which the Church *'clings without fail to the faith once delivered to the saints, penetrates it more deeply by accurate insights, and applies it more thoroughly to life'* (*Lumen Gentium*). I draw attention now to the phrasing of the oath: the priest rejected the heretical, not the orthodox, view of the evolution of dogma, the orthodox position being that the unchanging meaning of dogma can be more deeply penetrated, as the passage from *Lumen Gentium* makes clear. This is not truth-by-the-clock, or truth-by-the-century, which Chesterton rightly scouted, but timeless truth rewarding study and meditation, an opening flower, and no one has written better of it than Cardinal Newman unless

we find it most perfectly expressed in two lines of Milton's *Paradise Regained*:

*'The childhood shows the man  
As morning shows the day.'*

Thus, when St Columbanus wrote in the early seventh century, *'I believe that the pillar of the Church is always solid at Rome,'* he was not as articulate as the first Vatican Council when it expounded papal authority, but he was teaching the same, recognizable, truth as had St Irenaeus before him. Thus it is that the Catholic Faith is always the New Religion, because it is never dated. Here I quote with gratitude an utterance of the 17th Session of the Scottish Youth Assembly in 1965: *'If we are always prepared to be married to the thought of the contemporary generation, then we cannot but find ourselves widowed in the next.'*

### **Truth Outside Time**

Theological truth, like philosophical truth, is outside time - *'Age shall not weary it nor the years condemn'* - and a Catholic feels uneasy when he reads of Teilhard de Chardin, driven by current scientific theories, setting down three different *'possible'* (he thought) interpretations of the doctrine of original sin. His unease in face of attempts to *'reinterpret'* doctrine are shared by the Holy Father who has sounded warning after warning on this matter, and taken pains to enunciate a very explicit *Credo*, reaffirming in clear terms some articles of the Creed which were being *'reinterpreted'* out of existence. *'...There must be only one faith shared by the whole Church...which cannot come about unless any question of faith which arises is settled by him who rules the whole Church, with the result that his sentence is firmly accepted by the whole Church. And in this way a new formulation of the creed is the prerogative of the Supreme Pontiff, as are all other matters which concern the whole Church...'* (St Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, II-II, q. 1, a. 10.)

### **No New Revelation**

The truth is that, though there has been so much talk about the development of doctrine - doctrine does *not* develop so very much. This is the sort of remark that would bring forth cries of horror in certain circles, but it happens to be true, and one has only to read Irenaeus or Augustine or Aquinas, followed by Newman or Sheed, to see that this is so. *'The childhood shows the man as morning shows the day.'* In other words, if you had been a Christian taught by St Peter or St Paul, you would not really be a *'deprived child'* as compared with someone who had sat under an eminent Dutch theologian or read England's foremost Catholic thinker today. This may be humbling to modern pride, but that is because it is the humble truth. There has been no revelation since apostolic times. There have been Jeromes, Augustines, Newmans, and Chestertons, for whom God be thanked; but, alas, there have also been the heretics, and, though the wind may have blown them all away, the heresies have remained; and there has been a vast array in recent days of people who have mistaken the bright eyes of danger for brilliance and obscurity for depth. These last bring back the delightful saying of Max Beerbohm: *'It distressed me, my failure to keep pace with the leaders of thought as they passed into oblivion.'*

### **The Peril of 'Re-statement'**

We have a duty to make the teaching of the Church clear to our generation, but this has led in practice to an over-emphasis on *'re-statement'*. I even read recently that the doctrine of the Assumption was already due for the plastic surgery of re-statement, but the person who wrote in this vein wisely refrained from suggesting how it should be re-stated. A year or two ago a distinguished Jesuit spoke about the Holy Trinity and said, *'Clearly the truth is not stated in one form of words in such a way that it cannot be stated in another form'*, but, once

again, he did not try to bell-the-cat. If he had, he would, I am sure, have been floundering in heresy in five seconds flat. As Pope Paul declared in *Mysterium Fidei*:

*'It would be intolerable if the dogmatic formulas, which Ecumenical Councils have employed in dealing with the mysteries of the most Holy Trinity, were to be accused of being badly attuned to the men of our day, and formulas were rashly introduced to replace them...'* <sup>38</sup>

As we know, an attempt to restate transubstantiation has ended in disaster, and an English theologian who essayed it left the Church; his reinterpretation turned out to be Calvinist doctrine. I make no apology for quoting Chesterton once more:

*'The Catholic Church has for one of her chief duties that of preventing people from making those old mistakes; from making them over and over again for ever, as people always do if they are left to themselves...She does dogmatically defend humanity from its worst foes, those hoary and horrible and devouring monsters of the old mistakes' (The Catholic Church and Conversion).*

In no cynical spirit, he asserted:

*'Nine out of ten of what we call new ideas are simply old mistakes.'*

### **'One Iota'**

When something is of minimal importance, we say, *'I don't give a jot for that'*, or *'It isn't worth a jot'*, a jot being the tiny Greek letter *iota*. But those who have worked in a science lab with finely adjusted scales know that, if you balance two identical pieces of paper on the scales and then pencil an *iota* on one piece, you tip the scales, the *iota* or jot carrying decisive weight. It may sound ludicrous at first hearing, but the balance of truth is so fine that a jot can tip the scales of dogma too. Battle has been done over a jot, the *iota* which turns Greek *'homoousion'* into *'homoiousion'*, changing the statement that the Son is one of substance with the Father into the doctrine that he is only similar in substance. If anyone feels inclined to cry *'hairsplitting!'* let him first ponder:

*'...it is exactly this which explains what is so inexplicable to all the modern critics of the history of Christianity. I mean the monstrous wars about small points of theology, the earthquakes of emotion about a gesture or a word. It was only a matter of an inch; but an inch is everything when you are balancing. The Church could not afford to swerve a hair's breadth on some things if she was to continue her great and daring experiment of the irregular equilibrium...It was no flock of sheep the Christian shepherd was leading, but a herd of bulls and tigers, of terrible ideals and devouring doctrines, each of them strong enough to turn a false religion and lay waste the world' [Orthodoxy].*

And reading the final words of that passage, one remembers Bockelsohn and Knipperdollinck and the streets of Münster running red.

### **St John Fisher**

We are warned in Scripture about false shepherds and a Catholic has therefore to be cautious about the credentials of one who puts forward new interpretations and to ask, *'Does this conform to the teaching of the Church?'* If not, it must be rejected, and this is no want of charity or intellectual liberty; it is a basic law of self-preservation. Listen to St John Fisher handling the

---

<sup>38</sup> The Holy Eucharist, Encyclical Letter *Mysterium Fidei* of Pope Paul VI, C.T.S. translation, Do 355.

heretic Oecolampadius who promised unity of faith to those who followed him:

*'Oecolampadius thinks that the Doorkeeper, the Holy Spirit, has been so long idle in the Church, that he has not opened to the prayers and searchings of the saints for so many centuries.'*  
 Oecolampadius urged study and prayer. *'Do you think,'* St John answered, *'none of our forefathers has done these things? Did not Basil and Chrysostom, Athanasius, Cyril, Cyprian, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, and the rest exercise themselves frequently? ...And are we to think that he has hidden from all these the true meaning of his principal sacrament, in order that you may have the glory of discovering it?'*

It is a beautiful exercise in deflation, performed by one of the kindest men this country has ever known.

### **Timeless Truth**

The truth about the truth? Well, the truth about the truth - here comes the earth-shaking revelation - is that it is *true*. And being true, it shares in God's timelessness; *veritas Domini manet in aeternum*. A consoling thing, while some Catholics fight the metal of truth's bridle in their mouth, is that non-Catholics still pay tribute to the unchanging Gospel of the Catholic Church. When Leo XIII's great Encyclical *Satis Cognitum* dashed the hopes of Halifax and other Anglicans over reunion, the *St James's Gazette* commented: *'Of course there is nothing new in it... When Leo XIII speaks to Anglicans he can only say what Leo the Great or Leo the Saint said, or would have said, to the Greeks.'* Professor T.F. Torrance, of the Church of Scotland, recounting the difficulties of reunion, refers to Rome's *'dogmatic decisions upon which it is unable to go back.'* And from the century of St Patrick, and from the Isles of Lerins where Patrick studied, there comes the voice of St Vincent: *'It never was, is, or will be lawful for Catholic Christians to teach any doctrine, except that which they once received; and it ever was, is, and will be their duty to condemn those who do so...They must carefully observe the rule laid down at the beginning of this treatise...They are to interpret the divine text, according to the tradition of the Catholic Church.'*

## **POSTSCRIPT**

### **An example of the abuse of 'development of doctrine'**

An example of the manner in which 'development of doctrine' can be abused is found in an article by Fr. D. Konstant, Westminster Catechetical Director, in *'The Universe'*, July 10th 1970. In an article aptly entitled *'Revolution in the R.E. Class'* he stated:

*'Once the religion teacher can accept the notion of a developing theology his biggest hurdle (which is one of attitude rather than knowledge) is crossed.'*

He was taken severely to task on this point by Fr. Romuald Horn, O.P. (*'The Universe'* July 24, 1970.)

*'If a lecturer in a teachers' training college were to say: "Christ achieved divinity" would Fr. Konstant call that a development?'*

*'Perhaps the words of another teacher may be quoted: "The greatest care must be taken that the important duty of research does not involve the undermining of the truths of Christian doctrine. If this happens, and we have unfortunately seen it happen in these days, the result is perplexity and*

*confusion in the minds of many of the faithful." (Pope Paul VI)...What teaching has Fr. Konstant in mind: divine revelation to be believed or human science which can be understood? Who are his "pupils", theological students or schoolchildren?*

*'That he is interested in theological development is obvious in his article; there is less evidence of his interest in catechetics, or of his understanding of it.'*

ooooooOoooooo

## **Vatican I and Vatican 2**

*'We wish to remind you...of the relevance of the First Council of the Vatican... We should remember here that the Church's dogmas can be topical in two ways: in respect of their content of revealed truth, inasmuch as they are authoritative definitions of a divine teaching contained in Holy Scripture, or coming down to us from the Apostolic preaching, by way of tradition.*

*'They are the faith - thought, lived and celebrated by the Church, the People of God animated by the Holy Spirit and instructed by a body of authorised and qualified witnesses: the Pope and the Bishops with him. Under this aspect the Church's dogmas are always living, that is, they are always true, with that divine and supernatural truth to which they refer. Divine truth does not change; the dogmas of the faith are therefore always living and always true.*

*'But they can be relevant to the present in another way also: in a contingent way, relative to the time and historical conditions, which called forth the definition, provided the definition itself with its language and made it opportune to define it at that time and in those circumstances...'*

*'Now it seems to Us that the First Vatican Council's teachings not only possess the perennial relevance of their objective truth; they still have also the contingent relevance which comes from their being pertinent and opportune for our time. Some might be inclined to think that the Second Vatican Council relegated the First Vatican Council to past history, to the archives of ecclesiastical erudition; that Pius IX's Council has nothing more to say in terms of subjective relevancy to our time, offers no contingent reference to our spiritual sensibility and state of cultural maturity, But this is not so.*

*'It is not so because, as has been explained, the First and the Second Councils of the Vatican complement each other....'*

*'...the First Vatican Council has not ceased to be relevant today for another and even stronger reason. The truths affirmed by that First Vatican Council are most relevant for our modern state of mind; they are attacked, debated, experimented with, or professed in all conscience at the present day.'*

Pope Paul VI, on December 10, 1969.

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **The Role of the Catechist**

*'...to look to God for help in those matters in which a man can help himself by his own action, is the attitude of a fool and a tempter of God, Indeed, this is an aspect of divine goodness, to provide things not by doing them directly, but by moving others to perform their own actions... So one should not look to God in the hope that, without performing any action by which one might help oneself, God will come to one's aid, for this is opposed to the divine order and to divine goodness.*

*'But since, in spite of our having the power to act, we do not have the power to guarantee the success of our actions in attaining their proper end, because of impediments which may occur, this success that may come to each man from his action lies within the disposition of divine providence, Therefore the Lord commands us not to be solicitous concerning what pertains to God, namely, the outcome of our actions, But He has not forbidden us to be concerned about what pertains to us, namely, our own work. So he who is solicitous concerning the things that he can do does not act against the Lord's precept.'*

St, Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, Book Three, Part 2, Ch. 135, 24-5.

## The Role of the Catechist

*'Catechetics must be concerned essentially with the effective communication of revelation.'*<sup>39</sup>

Much of the confusion in contemporary catechetics has arisen because the catechist has been confused as to the precise nature of his role. No teacher can fulfil his mandate effectively without a clear idea of what he is meant to be doing and why. There is no lack of advice to help him build up a 'contemporary' philosophy of catechetics. Cynical references to a 'catechetical industry' have a sound basis in fact. New titles are constantly added to the list of 'essential background reading' which reflects the increasing swing from content to theory in British teacher training. Those who read educational journals will know that anxiety over the standard of instruction given in our teachers' training colleges (colleges of education) has never been greater. A speaker at the National Association of Headteachers' conference in May 1970 remarked that even recruiting experienced teachers to the staffs of these institutions serves little purpose.

*'Within a short time most of these previously sound practitioners are dishing out jargon with the best of them.'*

When it comes to jargon the professional Catholic catechist could teach lecturers from secular institutions a good deal on how to make even the most simple concept incomprehensible by means of copious verbiage.

Much more serious than this, however, is the new catechist's exaggerated notion of his own importance - his failure to realise that the catechist's role is by its very nature subsidiary to that of home and Church, and subordinate to the teaching authority of the Magisterium.

Religious education most properly describes the complete religious formation of a Christian, a process which continues throughout life and in which the elements of formal religious instruction will not normally be the major factor. We are incorporated into Christ by baptism and our Christian education must be an extension of this **Christening** until we can say with St. Paul, 'I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; and the faith I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me.' (Gal. 2:29)

The continual process of 'Christening' that we call religious education is the work of the Holy Spirit through the Christian community, the Church. We are incorporated ever more perfectly into His Mystical Body through the efforts of the members of that Body.

*'Dying on the Cross, He bestowed upon His Church the boundless treasure of Redemption without any co-operation on her part; but in the distribution of that treasure He not only shares this work of sanctification with His spotless Bride, but wills it to arise in a certain manner out of her labour.'*<sup>40</sup>

The primary agent in our Christian education is evidently the Holy Spirit,

*'...dwelling in us as a Person and making us think like Christ, judge like Christ, love like Christ, live like Christ. St. Paul says that it is the Holy Spirit in us who makes it possible for us to be sons of*

<sup>39</sup> Fr. G. Telford, Vice Chairman of the National Council for Catechetics in 'The Universe', July 31, 1970.

<sup>40</sup> Pius XII, 'The Mystical Body of Christ'.

*God, like Christ, and to use the same name for God as Christ uses, Father. "The proof that you are sons is that God has sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts: the Spirit that cries, 'Abba, Father,' and it is this that makes you a son, you are not a slave any more." (Gal.4:6,7) It is equally the Spirit of Christ living in us and moulding our personalities into His which gives us the lived filial relationship with God, in other words the Christ likeness, in which Christian living consists.'*<sup>41</sup>

The fact that the indwelling of the Holy Spirit from the moment of baptism endows a child with the spiritual potential to become another Christ by no means ensures that this will follow. A child's natural potential is often underdeveloped or simply not developed at all. The same can be true of supernatural potential. A boy with the latent ability to become a brilliant footballer may never do so if he spends his life in a city slum without the facilities and stimulation necessary for the fruitful development of his talent. A suitable environment is equally necessary for the fruitful development of the gifts of the Holy Spirit and this is obviously the Christian home. In its 'Declaration on Religious Education', Vatican II makes it quite clear that if Christian parents, who are the first educators of their children, do not provide the essential atmosphere of Christian life and love then nothing is likely to compensate for their failure. As Cardinal Heenan has remarked:

*'It is therefore important to recognise that Catholic children will probably not be saved merely through enlightened methods of religious instruction. In the battle with bad home influence teachers will almost certainly be defeated. Success will depend, under God, less on the method of the teacher than on the spiritual life of those to whom the care of the child is entrusted.'*<sup>42</sup>

Surveys in Australia and the U.S.A. have shown how very minimal is the effect of a Catholic schooling on a child from a non-practising home, the striking exception that occurs from time to time serves merely to exemplify the rule.

The primary complement to the Christian home is the parish Church where parents can lead their children to that frequent recourse to the sacraments of Penance and Holy Communion so earnestly exhorted by the Council. It is impossible to exaggerate the role of parents in the religious formation of a Catholic child.

Consideration of these points makes it possible for the teacher to consider his role in its proper perspective. His function is to play a subsidiary, but nonetheless important, role within the complete pattern of religious education. His role is to complement the efforts of home and church by providing specialised instruction on the content of the Christian faith in a manner for which parents may not have the expertise and parish clergy do not have the time. In thus recognising the effective limitation of his role the Catholic teacher need not fear a diminution of his status. The writer of 'Hebrews', St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and St. Ambrose would all have been proud to style themselves 'Religious Instructors', initiating the faithful ever more deeply into the mysteries of the faith. 'Therefore let us leave the elementary doctrines of Christ and go on to maturity.' (Heb.6.1)

'Catechetics is concerned with teaching the Faith to those who are willing to believe but do not know fully what the faith is.'<sup>43</sup> Once the catechist understands what is his role in religious education he must then discover what it is he must teach and how best to explain it to his pupils. Vatican II was explicit on both points. We are to follow the example of the apostles in holding fast to the traditions we have received 'by word of mouth or by letter, and to fight in defence of the faith handed

<sup>41</sup> Quoted from an address by the Bishop of Ardagh and Clonmacnois to University College, Cork. (Recommend whole supplement)

<sup>42</sup> Foreword to Westminster Primary Syllabus.

<sup>43</sup> Rev. R. Horn, O.P. 'The Universe', July 24, 1970. See Appendix I.

on **once and for all.**<sup>44</sup> In his opening speech Pope John made it quite clear that the primary aim of the Council was to guard and teach the sacred deposit of Christian truth more efficaciously and transmit it pure and integral without any attenuation or distortion. The most accurate synopsis of this deposit of faith developed in the light of the Council's teaching can be found in Pope Paul's '*Credo of the People of God*' (C.T.S.)

The Council made clear in its '*Declaration on Christian Education*' that every advance in educational psychology and every improvement in teaching techniques is to be incorporated into this catechesis. The matter is also dealt with in the decree on bishops where it states: '*Catechetical training is intended to make men's faith become living, conscious, and active, through the light of instruction....In this instruction a proper sequence should be observed as well as a method appropriate to the matter that is being treated and to the natural disposition, ability, age, and circumstances of the listener. Finally, they shall see to it that this instruction is based on Sacred Scripture, tradition, the liturgy, the teaching authority, and life of the Church.*'

At a time when the Pope himself never ceases stressing the deplorable consequences of the widespread failure to conform doctrinal teaching to the authority of the magisterium, the need to respect this supreme teaching authority cannot be sufficiently stressed. The mandate of the Catholic Catechist is to teach what the magisterium sets forth in the precise sense intended by the magisterium. It is an abuse of a sacred trust to dilute, distort, or ignore this teaching on his own authority or that of any theologian or school of theology which might appear to him as more '*relevant*' or '*contemporary*'. If he does not feel able to transmit the authentic teaching of the Church then he has no right to consider himself or pretend that he is a catechist.

Recent discussions on the role of the catechist devote a great deal of space to emphasising such points as the need for him not only to teach the faith but to live it and help his pupils to translate the teaching he gives into the manner they live. The importance of the '*witness*' of the Christian teacher in this way is so obvious that it hardly needs developing. Quoting Leo XIII, Pius XI stated in '*The Christian Education of Youth*':

*'It is not enough for the young to be taught religion at specified hours; all the rest of their training must be instinct with the spirit of piety. If this is lacking and the minds of the teachers and pupils are not pervaded and warmed by this sacred atmosphere, little benefit will be derived from any kind of learning, and much harm will frequently result.'*

What does need stressing is that a firm grasp of the content of our Faith must always take precedence over theoretical instruction on how to present it in the training of our teachers. Theoretical expertise will not help a teacher to transmit effectively information of which he is largely ignorant himself. A Catholic child should be familiar with the entire content of the Pope's '*Credo*' before leaving school. Catechists may legitimately differ on the most appropriate time for teaching certain sections (*'a proper sequence should be observed'*) but not on whether they should be taught eventually. In giving this religious instruction as effectively as possible the catechist can rightly claim that he is making a valuable contribution to Christian education. But his contribution will be all the more effective the more the catechist realises what are the limitations of his role.

Formerly the catechist considered his role that of a '*religious instructor*' acting on behalf of both Church and home. The new catechist by contrast considers himself an '*educator*', his expertise and what he teaches being beyond question by parents, bishops or Pope.

---

<sup>44</sup> 'Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation'.

*'...he who is solicitous about things that he can do does not act against the Lord's precept, Rather, he does who is solicitous concerning the things which can result, even if he carries out his own actions, so that he omits the actions that are required to avoid these eventualities, against which we must rather place our hope in God's providence, by which even the birds and the flowers are supported. To have solicitude of this kind seems to pertain to the error of the Gentiles who deny divine providence. This is why the Lord concludes that we must not be "solicitous for tomorrow". He did not forbid us, by this injunction, from taking care in time of the things necessary for the future, but, rather, from being concerned about future events in despair of divine help. Or perhaps, He forbade preoccupation today with the solicitude which one should have tomorrow, for each day has its own concerns; hence, He adds: "Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof" (Matt. 6. 34).'*

St. Thomas Aquinas, in *Summa Contra Gentiles*, Book Three, Part 2, Ch. 135, 25.

## **APPENDIX 3**

### **Misgivings of priests and people**

*'It is clear that the Church is facing a grave crisis. Under the name of "the new Church," "the post-conciliar Church," a different Church from that of Jesus Christ is now trying to establish itself: an anthropocentric society threatened with immanentist apostasy which is allowing itself to be swept along in a movement of general abdication under the pretext of renewal, ecumenicism, or adaptation.*

Henri de Lubac, *Témoignage Chrétien*, September 1, 1967.

## Nothing but the Truth

by Father Francis J. Ripley

(Father Francis J. Ripley is one of the most distinguished priests in the U.K. Father Ripley has done more to present Catholic teaching in an intelligible manner for ordinary layfolk and priests than anyone else in recent years.)

In the book published recently by the Vatican Press under the title *The Teachings of Pope Paul VI*, I came across the following in a speech made by the Holy Father on April 3rd, 1968:-

*'Many wish to submit religious truth to a **radical** revision, to **eliminate** those dogmas or teachings that seem antiquated and outmoded by scientific progress, and which are incomprehensible to the modern mind. In the attempt to give the Catholic religion an expression more in conformity with contemporary idiom and mentality, and to bring it "up to date", it often happens, unfortunately, that the reality is undermined, and people try to make it understandable by first changing the formulas in which the Teaching Church has expressed it and, as it were, sealed it, to enable it to traverse the centuries while jealously preserving its identity. Then they alter the **very content** of traditional doctrine, subjecting it to the dominant law of historical change. **The Word of Christ is no longer the truth that never changes.** It becomes a **partial** truth deprived of all objective validity and transcendent authority. It will be said that the Council authorised such treatment of tradition. **Nothing is more false.**'*

Note well the words I have put in bold.

The fact that the Pope deliberately used these words shows that he believed that he was not dealing with a negligible or unimportant matter. He was in fact saying that there are many people in the Church today who wish to change Catholic doctrine in its essentials so as to make it more acceptable to those outside the Church, particularly to those intellectuals who are steeped in contemporary science and modern ways of thinking. The implication is that there is something wrong with tradition. One can excuse modernistic members of the Church of England, like Bishop Montefiore, wanting to do away with the dogmatic definitions of Councils like Chalcedon, but one finds it hard to understand why members of the Catholic Church should wish to jettison defined traditional teaching in this way. But it is being done,

In the past couple of years I have read in many books and articles statements which cannot be reconciled with Catholic doctrine. I could give you chapter and verse for assertions that Christ's actions are not all attributable to His Divine Person, that the Virgin Birth is not a dogma of the Faith, that the Pope and the Bishops may only ratify what is already believed by the consensus of opinion in the Church, that Christ is present in the Blessed Eucharist only as the giver is present in the gift, that original sin is contracted merely by bad example, that Christian marriage cannot really be absolutely indissoluble, that we go to confession frequently just to encounter Christ and appeal to His powerful prayer; and so on.,

### Explanation, not Reformation

Many of those who teach these and other doctrines apparently have nothing but scorn and pity for those who refuse to accept them. For centuries the Church, guided by the Holy Spirit, has built up a great framework of doctrinal truth. She has always believed that the Decrees of the General

Councils defining dogmas or imposing anathemas are beyond reform. They must be true. That does not mean to say that they cannot be further explained. All this defined teaching is supported by valid proofs from Scripture and tradition. Now, in this age of scriptural revival, as the Pope has said, the reality of these truths is being undermined and it is being done in the very name of the Second Vatican Council. Yet, when he opened the Council, Pope John proclaimed that its greatest concern was to guard the sacred deposit of Christian doctrine and to ensure that that deposit is taught more efficaciously.

We do not guard the deposit of doctrine nor teach it more efficaciously when we change its substance. That is not development. It is denial. Pope Paul spoke of the efforts of the Teaching Church over the centuries to jealously preserve the identity of Catholic truth. It is this identity which is being jettisoned today.

Those who are guilty of this offer, in support of their new ideas, nothing like the volume of proof from Scripture and tradition to which the Church has always appealed. The Holy Father accuses the innovators of surrendering eternal truth to the demands of the contemporary idiom and mentality. They appear to think that because a modern scientist calls a Catholic doctrine - like original sin or transubstantiation - outdated, that doctrine must be changed simply to accommodate the critics. Is this attitude conformable with the love of truth which has always been a mark of the saints of the Catholic Church? Did not our martyrs die to preserve the truth?

### **The Dangerous Catechism**

I have recently travelled to many places lecturing on the Faith. Almost everywhere I have come across teachers and students for whom the *Dutch Catechism* has been required reading in their training colleges. Some time ago a highly respected teacher called me on the telephone asking, 'What is transignification?'. 'Why do you ask?' I said. 'Because a young student is telling my class of ten-year-olds that Christ is present in the Holy Eucharist through transignification', she said. I explained what was at stake and immediately posted to that teacher a copy of the encyclical *Mysterium Fidei*.

A mother came to me not very long ago saying that her daughter, who is at a training college, was extremely worried about her faith. I questioned the young lady and found that she had been rebuked after a lesson on doctrine during her teaching practice. 'What were you rebuked for?' I asked her. 'Well, Father,' she said 'I told the children that it was the wish of the Church that priests should celebrate Mass every day. But afterwards my tutor upbraided me soundly and said that I was filling the heads of the children with a lot of nonsense. This was no longer the wish of the Church.'

Within the last month I was lecturing to a group of young mothers. Among them was a day student at one of our colleges of education. After my lecture she questioned me, saying that to teach about original sin as Pope Paul did in his *Creed* just met with scorn. Indulgences were laughed out of court. Frequent confession was regarded as psychologically inadvisable. Limbo, of course, did not exist. The Virgin Birth, to put it mildly, was doubtful and, of course, Pope Paul was quite wrong in what he wrote in *Humanae Vitae*.

It is being said by the defenders of the colleges concerned that the lecturers are not teaching these things at all but that they are being misunderstood by the students. I find it passing strange that students from at least six different colleges have raised the same difficulties with me. All these young people are being prepared to teach children by imbibing the *Dutch Catechism*, which was strongly recommended to them and, in some cases, was imposed as necessary reading. So far I have not met one single student who has been told to study the *Supplement to the Dutch*

*Catechism*, drawn up as a result of the Declaration of the Commission of Cardinals appointed by the Holy Father. I believe that the *Supplement* is itself a magnificent guide to orthodox thinking on the points I have mentioned already and on others. Surely this *Supplement* ought to be emphasised for the students more than the original *Catechism* which, in the words of the Declaration of the Commission of Cardinals, required comments which were 'not negligible, either in number or in seriousness'.

### **Should the Pope's critics teach our children?**

Those responsible for teaching doctrine today in any capacity whatsoever surely have an obligation to base their teaching on the *Creed* which Pope Paul solemnly proclaimed at the end of the Year of Faith. Yet leading catechists have gone so far as to say that this *Creed* is irrelevant for them, doesn't use any language that they can use, doesn't say anything to them. Are people who can publicly criticise a solemn *Creed* of the Vicar of Christ in this way fit to be entrusted with the formation of the future teachers in our Catholic schools? I ask the question in all seriousness. It demands an answer.

Fortunately, there is another side to the picture. While I was in Boston in December I bought a magnificent commentary on the *Creed* of Pope Paul drawn up by a team of Daughters of St Paul. It is called *The Faith We Live By*, is splendidly written, brilliantly illustrated and excellently indexed. In nearly 400 pages these good sisters have provided a first-class textbook of catechetics for all of us. It is a book which priests can use most effectively in all their instruction work. Every student in our training colleges should study it. Senior children in our schools should have it explained to them. Probably because it is orthodox this outstanding book has been greeted with nothing like the ballyhoo which heralded the publication of the *Dutch Catechism* in such questionable circumstances.

Lest anybody should think that my mind is closed to the many excellent qualities of the *Dutch Catechism* permit me to say that I believe that its very excellence in some matters has its own peculiar danger. Am I not right in thinking with the Cardinals that 'It is precisely the high qualities with which the work is enhanced which make it desirable that the teaching of the Church should always be given without any shadows which might obscure it'?

Many years ago that celebrated Archbishop of Liverpool, Dr Thomas Whiteside, argued that successful mixed marriages had their own special danger in that young people might presume that the mixed marriage they intended to contract might be as successful as some about which they had heard. So an attractively-produced book which contains valuable information, well written and freshly and cogently presented, may be particularly dangerous for this very reason. Error is more dangerous when it is cocooned by truth.

Divine truth is infinitely precious, so precious that God became man to teach it to us. He called Himself the Truth. He commissioned His Church to teach that Truth. He said that He Himself and the Spirit of Truth would always be with His Church to safeguard her in the truth, It will be a sad day for the Church when those who, to quote Pope Paul, wish to submit religious truth to a radical revision or to eliminate those dogmas or teachings that seem antiquated and outmoded by scientific progress are regarded as more worthy of praise than those who are dedicated to the purpose of the Second Vatican Council as stated by Pope John, namely that the sacred deposit of Christian doctrine should be guarded and taught more efficaciously,

(With acknowledgment to *The Keys*, April 1970.)

## False Alternatives

### by Dietrich von Hildebrand

(The following is Chapter One of *Trojan Horse in the City of God* by Dietrich von Hildebrand (Sands & Co.), a book which should be in every concerned Catholic's library.)

When one reads the luminous encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam* of Pope Paul VI or the magnificent "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church" of the Fathers of the Council, one cannot but realize the greatness of the Second Vatican Council, But when one turns to so many contemporary writings - some of them by very famous theologians, some by minor ones, some by laymen who offer us their dilettante theological concoctions - one can only be deeply saddened, and even filled with grave apprehension. Indeed, it would be difficult to conceive a greater contrast than that existing between the official documents of Vatican II and the superficial, insipid pronouncements of various theologians and laymen that have been breaking out everywhere like some infectious disease. On the one side, we find the true spirit of Christ, the authentic voice of the Church; we find texts that in both form and content breathe a glorious supernatural atmosphere. On the other side, we find a depressing secularization, a complete loss of the *sensus supranaturalis*, a morass of confusion.

The distortion of the authentic nature of the Council that this epidemic of theological dilettantism produces expresses itself chiefly in false alternatives between which we are all commanded to choose: either to accept the secularization of Christianity or to deny the authority of the Council.

These drastic alternatives are quite frequently labelled the "progressive" and "conservative" responses. These terms, which are facily applied to many natural realms, can be extremely misleading when applied to the Church. It is of the very nature of Catholic Christian faith to adhere to an unchanging divine revelation, to acknowledge that there is something in the Church that is above the ups and downs of cultures and the rhythm of history. Divine revelation and the Mystical Body of Christ differ completely from all natural entities. To be conservative, to be a traditionalist, is in this case an essential element of the response due the unique phenomenon of the Church. Even a man who may be in no way conservative in temperament and in many other respects "progressive" must be conservative in his relation to the infallible magisterium of the Church, if he is to remain an orthodox Catholic. One can be progressive and simultaneously a Catholic, but one cannot be a progressive in one's Catholic faith. The idea of a "progressive Catholic" in this sense is a *contradictio in adjecto*<sup>45</sup>. Unfortunately there are many today who no longer understand this contradiction and proudly proclaim themselves to be "progressive Catholics".

And with the labels "conservative" and "progressive" they are in reality putting the faithful in the position of having to choose between opposition to any renewal, opposition even to the elimination of certain things that have crept into the Church because of human frailty - such as legalism, abstractionism, external pressure in questions of conscience, grave abuses of authority in monasteries - and a change, a "progress," in the Catholic faith which can only mean its abandonment.

But these are false alternatives; for there is a third choice, which welcomes the official decisions of the Vatican Council, but at the same time emphatically rejects the secularizing interpretations given them by many so-called progressive theologians and laymen.

---

<sup>45</sup> [contradiction in itself]

This third choice is based on unshakable faith in Christ and in the infallible magisterium of His Holy Church. It takes it for granted that there is no room for change in the divinely revealed doctrine of the Church. It admits no possibility of change except that "development" of which Cardinal Newman speaks in the explicit formulation of what was present in the faith of the Apostles or of what necessarily follows from it. This attitude holds that the Christian morality of holiness, the morality revealed in the Sacred Humanity of Christ and His commandments and exemplified in all the saints, remains forever the same. It holds that being transformed in Christ, becoming a new creature in Him, is the goal of our existence: in the words of St. Paul, "This is the will of God, your sanctification." This position asserts the radical difference between the kingdom of Christ and the *saeculum*; it takes into account the struggle between the spirit of Christ and the spirit of Satan through all the centuries past and to come, until the end of the world. It believes that Christ's words - "Had you been of the world, the world would love its own; but as you are not of the world, as I have chosen you out of the world, the world hates you" - are as valid today as in any former time.

This is simply the Catholic position, without further qualification. It rejoices in any renewal that enlarges the "*instaurare omnia in Christo*" and brings the light of Christ to added domains of life. This is in fact a specific encouragement to Catholics to confront all things with the Spirit and Truth of Christ - in season and out of season - regardless of the spirit of the present age or any past age. Such a renewal follows the admonition of St. Paul: "Test all things, hold to what is good." It appreciates reverently those great gifts of previous Christian centuries which reflect the sacred atmosphere of the Church - for example, Gregorian Chant and the admirable hymns of the Latin Liturgy.

It maintains that these should never cease to play a great role in our Liturgy and that they have today as in the past a great apostolic mission. It believes that the *Confessions* of St Augustine, the writings of St. Francis of Assisi, and the mystical works of St. Teresa of Avila contain a vital message for all periods in history. It represents an attitude of deep filial devotion to the Holy Father and reverent love for the Church in all its aspects, the true "*sentire cum ecclesia*".

It should be clear that this third response to the contemporary crisis in the Church is not timidly compromising, but consistent and forthright. It is not retrospective, nor does it anticipate a mere earthly future, but it is focused on eternity. It is thus able to live fully in the present, because real presence is fully experienced only when we succeed in freeing ourselves from the tension of past and future, only when we are no longer imprisoned in a frantic propulsion toward the next moment. In the light of eternity every moment in life - whether of an individual or a community - receives its full significance. We can do justice to the present age, therefore, only by regarding it in the light of man's eternal destiny - in the light of Christ.

The response that we have been describing involves grave concern and apprehension over the present invasion of the life of the Church by secularism. It considers the present crisis the most serious one in the entire history of the Church. Yet it is full of hope that the Church will triumph, because our Lord Himself has said: "And the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it."

## **A Headmaster complains**

(The following is a 'letter to the editor' which appeared in *Catholic Education Today*, July/August, 1970)

Dear Sir,

I should like to make a few comments with reference to your editorial in the May-June number, particularly with respect to the last three paragraphs.

When I was at a Catholic teacher training college twenty-odd years ago it was generally taken for granted that you were there because this was where good Catholic teachers were formed and that you intended teaching in a Catholic school when you left. The idea of opting out of the course preparing for religious education was unthinkable - at least it was in my college.

Why is it now that we have teachers leaving Catholic colleges of education with no intention of teaching in a Catholic school? (I am even told that students opt out of the courses in religious catechetics.) I have had personal experience of students not wanting to teach in a Catholic school when interviewing staff for vacancies. At present I have 2.5 non-Catholic teachers out of a staff of 6.5 and a current vacancy in the infants' department carrying a graded scale I allowance which I am unable to fill despite repeated advertisements in the Catholic Press. I have also written to five Catholic colleges of education - two only of whom acknowledged my letter!

If Catholic colleges of education are failing to turn out committed Catholic teachers there will be no 'next generation of teachers' available. This problem to me is deeply disturbing and at the very roots of Catholic education.

I would welcome your observations on this problem.

Yours etc.,

A.W.Johnson (Headmaster)

St Ethelbert's R.C. Primary School,  
Ramsgate, Kent.

## **The Need for Orthodox Catholic Teaching**

**by His Eminence John Joseph Cardinal Carberry, Archbishop of St Louis, U.S.A.**

*(John Joseph Cardinal Carberry, Archbishop of St. Louis, has performed a signal service - not only to his Archdiocese, but to the entire Catholic Church in America - by his stirring call for an examination - in the light of orthodoxy - of the content of religious education in the Archdiocese of St. Louis. Following is the complete text of Cardinal Carberry's call for orthodoxy which was presented before four thousand Archdiocesan school teachers at their annual institute.)*

It is with deep gratitude to God, and a sincere expression of my appreciation of the noble work to which you, as Christian educators, have dedicated your lives, that I greet you and open this Teachers' Institute of the Archdiocese of St. Louis in this year of Our Lord 1969. I pray that all your deliberations and discussions during these two days will be fruitful, and that the priests, Religious and lay people of this Archdiocese who are, in any capacity, engaged in the work of education will be inspired to even higher ideals of Christian service and apostolic effectiveness by your meeting together here.

In no sense will it be news to you, who in your daily lives are confronted with the problems of education, if I say that there are three areas of concern for all of us in this field today.

One is the problem of resources - bluntly, the escalating requirements of money and personnel to meet the ever growing needs of our inescapable commitment to Christian education.

Second is the problem of techniques and methods involving such varied problems as how to reach as many of our inner-city children as possible, how to make use of the rapidly developing scientific aids to education, how to provide best for both the education of all, adults as well as children.

The third is the problem of the content of Christian education - which may be put in the form of a question:

*Are we giving our children in grade and high school a sound, solid, effective formation in the Christian truths and the Christian values for the sake of which we accept the heavy burden of maintaining a Catholic school system?*

To the first two problems that I have mentioned - that of resources and that of techniques - I know that much of your time will be devoted during this Institute, and in solving them you can count on my continued leadership, encouragement and cooperation. But it is to the third problem - the problem of the content of Christian education - that I wish to devote myself today.

### **An Urgent Problem**

The timeliness and urgency of this problem has been made evident to me by the fact that many parents, many pastors, many Religious and lay teachers, even some of the adolescents of the Archdiocese have made known to me, by letter and by word of mouth, their worries, their doubts, their distress, sometimes even their frustration, over what is taught in some of our classrooms these days. In responding now to this concern, I take neither a judging nor a condemnatory attitude. Rather, I am asking you, my indispensable associates in the responsibility of providing a truly Christian education for our children, to unite with me both in asking the question are we providing a sound and solid Christian education for our youth? - and in seeking answers to that question.

*Our very first efforts must be exploratory: a seeking for facts, an analysis of popular philosophies and theologies that clash with the deposit of faith handed down from the Apostles and that can find their way into Catholic classrooms, an ascertaining of where or to what extent deviations from, or misrepresentations of orthodox doctrine may have appeared. I cannot take this matter lightly. As your Archbishop and Chief Pastor, I am bound in conscience to make questions of doctrine my first responsibility and my first concern.*

That there are problems to be faced and questions to be raised in this area is not a local or limited experience today. In meetings with my fellow-bishops, with educators of many dioceses, with pastors and dedicated lay people from all over the land, I find the same questions, the same doubts, the same worries about the quality of Christian formation in our Catholic schools being raised. And the best of our Catholic scholars are agreed that the questions must be raised because of the dominant impact of three trends in the secular academic world, which have had their influence even on Catholic thinking today.

### **Dangerous Secular Trends:**

#### ***Denial of Christ's Divinity***

The first trend is that which proposes a Christianity, or a form of religion, whose central feature is a denial of the Divinity of Jesus Christ. Historians of human thought know that in every age, since Christ died on the cross and rose from the grave and ascended into Heaven, there have been some who rebelled against accepting Jesus Christ as God. One easily recalls, for example, how central this denial of the Divinity of Christ was to the Enlightenment in England of the seventeenth and eighteenth century; to the Encyclopaedists of France in the mid-eighteenth century, to the *Gewissenslehre* of Germany in the last part of the eighteenth century and the first part of the nineteenth century.

In our own more recent times, this denial reached a kind of a peak in the person of Adolph von Harnack, whose influence, from his prestigious position as the head of the School of Theology in the University of Berlin and from his many writings, seemed to permeate much of the Christian world. Indeed, though he himself died in 1930, four of his students have become world-famous in our time, all of them accepting, under one guise or another, the denial of the Divinity of Christ as a starting point of their religious systems.

They are:

1. Paul Tillich, whose three-volume work *Systematic Theology* was to call the worship of Christ as God a form of idolatry;
2. Rudolph Bultmann, whose famous principle of de-mytholization denies anything miraculous or supernatural to the life and teachings of Christ;
3. Albert Schweitzer, who, despite the inspiring humanitarianism of his later life among the poor in Africa, had, in his book entitled *The Quest for The Historical Jesus*, presented to the world what he thought were the final convincing arguments against the Divinity of Christ;
4. The unfortunate Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who in the prisons of Adolph Hitler's Gestapo, in one of which he was to be hanged in April of 1945, found himself struggling with his faith in Christ and jotting down notes about "a world without God," "a religionless Christianity" and "Christ as merely the man for others".

The writings of these four men, together with those of Harnack and others of his followers have profoundly influenced much of the religious thinking of our time. It would be strange if the effect were not to be detected even among Catholic educators and theologians,

## Philosophy of Existentialism

The second trend is that of the philosophy of existentialism, which at times becomes a theology, because it attempts to answer the ultimate questions that can be raised by the mind of man. We know that existentialism is a reaction against its opposite extreme: a rigid essentialism, which had been inclined to neglect or even deny the individual differences among human beings.

In its extreme form, however, as we find it in the writings of Martin Heidegger, of Karl Jaspers, of Jean Paul Sartre, and many others, existentialism makes the individual supreme, accountable to no law of truth or of God or of origin or of destiny. It is this that has led to the exaggerated notions of freedom and personalism and even lawlessness today. Again its pervasive influence is bound to engulf some of the Catholic thinkers and writers and educators of our time.

## Agnostic Secular Humanism

The third trend that may be detected in almost all fields of education today is that which endeavours to make a religion out of agnostic secular humanism. We find this presented, for example, in the books of the Anglican Bishop John A.T. Robinson - *Honest to God* and *But I Can't Believe That*, and the books of Harvey Cox - *The Secular City* and *On Not Leaving It To The Snake*, and of Joseph Fletcher - *Situation Ethics* and *The New Morality*. It is the belief that man's sole and entire purpose in life is to make a better world out of this visible world in which he briefly lives. No one can doubt that the goals which this secular humanism sets for itself are good: they are, as outlined by Harvey Cox, the elimination of war, and poverty, and discrimination, and hatred, and suffering that can be relieved by the scientific and humanitarian ingenuity of man. Indeed, no one can be a true Christian unless he devoted himself to the attainment of these goals, because they are essential to the fulfillment of Christ's command: "*Thou Shalt Love Thy Neighbour as Thyself.*"

*But agnostic secular humanism, which may be called the loving of our neighbour without the love of God, or the program for changing the world without the benefit of guidance from God or of any motive that transcends the present, will never succeed because it does not recognize man for what he is: a creature made immortal in the image and likeness of God; a creature needing redemption from sin through the Precious Blood of Jesus Christ; a creature to whom God has revealed Himself in Christ, Who, in turn, reveals His will to the end of time through the Church He founded; a creature destined to attain by his cooperation with the redeeming grace of Christ and obedience to His will an everlasting communion with God.*

Many of the contemporary so-called theologies of hope are nothing other than veiled forms of secular humanism. They are based on the unrealistic foundation that if only we have good will, if only we love one another, if only we work together for what is good for us all, we can make a paradise out of this world. And the words of the Psalmist have never been more true:

*"Unless God builds the house, they labour in vain who build it; unless God guard the gates, they watch in vain who stand guard" (Psalm 126).*

## Supremely Important Questions

The questions that I raise, then, are very simple, but supremely important:

- Are any of our Catholic schools, founded and maintained as they have been through the immeasurable sacrifices of staunchly Catholic people, infected with any of the heresies that have achieved so wide a popular acceptance in our day?
- Are children in our schools, at any age, being given reason to doubt the Divinity of

Jesus Christ, the authority of the Church He founded to continue His work and preserve His teaching through the ages?

- Have any forms of existentialism found their way into our classrooms, making it possible, if not easy, for children to think that they can ever be a complete law unto themselves, or that there is no such thing as sin, whereby they might lose the friendship of God?
- Is it possible that at times so exaggerated a stress is placed on the social obligations of a Christian, or on the need of changing society and reforming this world that the First Commandment is rarely adverted to or heard: "*Thou shalt love The Lord Thy God with thy whole heart and soul and mind and will*"?

Let there be no mistake: I am as deeply and irrevocably committed to our obligation to love one another, to love our enemies, to work for the righting of all the wrongs that flourish in our society today as any one in your midst. I am merely proclaiming the truth that we shall instill neither an adequate motive nor the Divinely revealed methods of changing the world unless we are steeped in the love of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, and determined to achieve that holiness of life to which He has called us all. No better statement of this truth can be found than in Paragraph 19 of the *Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World* of Vatican Council II. I quote:

*"The root reason for human dignity lies in man's call to communion with God. From the circumstances of his origin man is already invited to converse with God. For man would not exist were he not created by God's love and constantly preserved by it; and he cannot live fully according to truth unless he freely acknowledges that love and devotes himself to his Creator."*

The questions that I have raised could be raised, I feel sure, in any part of our Country or even of the world today. It is our task to meet our responsibility here in the Archdiocese of St. Louis.

### **Study Commission Established**

To this end, therefore, I now announce that a Commission is being established, made up of carefully chosen members representative of every segment of the People of God in this Archdiocese, whose task it will be to make a thorough study of how the apostolate of religious teaching is being carried out in our schools. This will involve a comprehensive study of all textbooks that treat of religious matters; a careful analysis of alleged deviations from true and orthodox Catholic teaching; even representative tests of what our youth have been given in the way of religious and spiritual formation.

After the Commission has made its study, it will apply itself to a task in which I myself shall be personally involved: that of drawing up a compendium of the basic and essential truths of our holy Catholic religion as they must be presented to the pupils in our schools. This compendium will be presented in such a way to offset and nullify whatever dangerous tendencies or heterodox teachings may threaten the faith and the commitment of young people whose parents entrust them to our schools. It will be based on the documents of Vatican Council II; on the authentic teachings of previous councils; on the *Credo* of Pope Paul VI, and on the universally accepted magisterial teaching of the Church that has come down to us through the centuries.

In no sense is it our purpose to interfere with technically advanced methods of teaching religion. We are aware that the behavioral sciences are constantly contributing new insights into how children can be assisted in the learning process; and we happily note that educators in our Catholic schools are quick to learn and make use of such new discoveries and techniques. We are concerned, as is our pastoral duty, with what is taught or learned in the name of religion, and it is with the obligations that this involves that our newly formed Commission will be specifically

charged.

### **Doctrine: Fundamental, and Developments of**

Nor, let me add, is it our purpose to discourage the academic interest of our teachers in the many speculative and controversial theological matters that are discussed by the learned these days. It should not be forgotten that the turning point in the conversion of John Henry Cardinal Newman, in the year 1845, came with his writing of the book, *The Development of Christian Doctrine*. There will always be development of doctrine as long as man is man, given a mind that is the image of the all-knowing mind of God. But there are also fundamentals of doctrine, as Newman well knew, and these must be transmitted undiluted to our children so that they may be prepared to judge in their later years, what is a development and what is a contradiction of Christian doctrine.

### **A Word on Sex Education**

Further, I beg your sufferance while I say a few words about the hotly disputed matter of sex education in our schools. Certainly, I can reassure parents and teachers that we shall never permit, nor approve, the naturalistic and amoralistic type of sex education that is promoted so widely today.

We are fully aware of the fact that ignorance in matters of sex has badly damaged the lives of many individuals. But we also know that knowledge alone is not the answer to the problems that are an integral part of the human condition in this regard. Therefore, we recognize the right of parents as first in the order of nature for teaching children, at the proper time, the moral, spiritual, physical and social aspects of the sexuality that is part of their nature.

We recognize that many parents, uncertain or ill-equipped for this task, ask that our schools assist them in fulfilling it. Wherever this need is to be met, we shall attempt to have qualified teachers thoroughly prepared to deal with the subject with the respect and moral integrity and spiritual understanding that it deserves.

*I beg you all, then, administrators, teachers, students, counselors of the schools of the Archdiocese to share with me the responsibility that I have felt compelled to put into words in this address. We all know that even with the best of efforts, our schools will not always succeed in transmitting the Christian heritage to individual pupils. The competition of other factors for their souls is powerful today. But we would be derelict and blameworthy if we did not work together for the highest possible standards in the quality of the Christian education we try to impart.*

I close with the solemn words of the *Declaration on Christian Education* of Vatican Council II, addressed to all teachers of Catholic schools: *'But let teachers recognize that the Catholic school depends upon them almost entirely for the accomplishment of its goals and programs. They should, therefore, be very carefully prepared so that both in secular and religious knowledge they are equipped with suitable qualifications and also with a pedagogical skill that is in keeping with the findings of the contemporary world. Intimately linked in charity to one another and to their students and endowed with an Apostolic Spirit, may teachers by their life as much as by their instruction bear witness to Christ, the unique teacher.'*

I pray to Almighty God, through the intercession of His Immaculate Mother and of St. Louis, the patron of our Archdiocese, that we shall unite in bearing witness, by our lives and by our work, to Christ, the unique Teacher, to Christ, the only Savior and Redeemer of mankind, To that end I bless you all. (Reproduced - American spelling included—from *The Wanderer*.)

## Who are the faithful?

*'Often public opinion in the Church today is manipulated by unstable people who consider themselves the more highly educated theologically in proportion to the number of moral and religious problems they have. They think, as one of them wrote to me, that the Church consists of two groups: an immature and contented majority of sleeping nominal Christians, who have no living faith, and a mature, rebellious minority of wide-awake discontents, who feel that their vocation is to reform the Church.'*

*'But they forget the important middle group of millions of silent, prayerful, struggling and non-rebellious faithful with no other problem than their human frailty, which they endeavour to overcome. From among these God is still recruiting His saints.'*

*'It is a melancholy fact that this immense multitude of pious, generous Christians, forming together with the misjudged Christ the true nucleus of the Church on earth, is being more and more despised, ridiculed, insulted, injured, neglected and down-trodden by a militant and loveless minority.'*

*'The shepherds who abandon these ninety-nine sheep, not in order to seek a lost sheep, but because they have not the courage to call the hireling a hireling and the false prophet a false prophet, are a cause of great offence. And the priests who ignore the sufferings of these forsaken people because they are on the side of the others are more worthy of condemnation than the heartless priest on the way from Jerusalem to Jericho.'*

Father Werenfried van Straaten, in the October 1970 issue of the *Iron Curtain Church Relief Mirror*.

## **APPENDIX 4**

### **The New Catechists**

## The arrogance of scholarship

*'Theological scholarship which sets itself above the Magisterium is apt to do less than justice also to the gifts of wisdom and understanding which contribute more than erudition to knowledge of the things of God. The greatest exponents of revelation have attributed their best insights to divine grace and many a priest has found his hardly gained learning put to shame by the easy grasp of religion that piety has brought to the unlettered. Sometimes the arrogance of scholarship carries its own nemesis in a failure to respect the disciplines that scholarship requires, the duty to reason rather than assert, to examine every side of a case objectively, to respect the achievement of the past and not to seem to equate novelty with progress. A widespread tendency to neglect the Scriptures and ignore our dependence on them is a disturbing feature of much that is being written. "It is my desire," Erasmus wrote, "to lead back that cold disputer of words, styled theology, to its real fountain."*

The Most Rev. W.J. Philbin, Bishop of Down and Connor in 'Does Conscience Decide?', Irish C.T.S.,

## The 'new' Catechists

The following are prominent in the 'new' catechetical movement. It is not implied that all of them have heterodox views or that any are inspired by any motive other than to propagate what they believe to be Christian truth. They are, however, clearly working very closely together. Those in bold have publicly opposed '*Humanae Vitae*' and this fact alone make it scandalous that they should fill any official position connected with catechetics or be invited to address any Catholic audience as an official spokesman of the Church.

Rev. A. Bullen, Liverpool Catechetical Centre.

**Rev. P. De Rosa, Corpus Christi College.**

Br. Drostan, Corpus Christi College.

Rev. H. Richards, Corpus Christi College.

Sister Margaret of Jesus (Ruth Duckworth), Corpus Christi College.

Rev. F. Somerville, S.J., Editor of the Sower, journal of Corpus Christi College.

Sr. Romain, Corpus Christi College.

**Rev. P. Harris, Corpus Christi College.**

**Rev. N. Lash, Corpus Christi College.**

**Dom Sebastian Moore, O.S.B.**

Rev. L. Pyle, Director Newcastle Catechetical Centre.

**Mrs Rosemary Haughton.**

**Rev. L. Bright, O.P.**

Other outspoken opponents of *Humanae Vitae* such as N. St. John Stevas, Dr. J. Marshall, lecture for Corpus Christi College as does Dr. J. Dominion whose views on Christian marriage are very far from Catholic.

All these individuals tend to admire such celebrated radicals as Cardinal Suenens, Bishop Butler, or Gabriel Moran. It must be made clear to those who have heard certain new catechists lecturing in past years, or have read books or articles written by them several years ago, and found nothing to complain of, that, in many cases, their views have changed considerably in recent years. Those with the most orthodox views who become absorbed in this catechetical '*freemasonry*' tend to adopt its attitudes. Fr. David Konstant, Westminster Diocesan Director, provides an example here. He now gives unqualified support to the new catechists and their methods and, as so often happens with converts, has taken an even more extreme attitude than many of his mentors by producing a text book, '*Beginnings*' which is most unsatisfactory. This dilution of the faith provides a perfect example of the trend condemned by the Pope (see Section I) but it is described as '*a new step in the catechetical and ecumenical field*' as it is '*suitable for use in both Church and county schools*'. This deplorable example is made even more reprehensible by the fact that Fr. Konstant wrote this book as joint author with John Cumming, a member of the Marxist '*Slant*' group and a most

virulent opponent of *Humanae Vitae*, hardly the type of person for a Diocesan Catechetical Director to link his name with in public, or to be entrusted with the religious education of Catholic children.

Fr. Anthony Bullen, the Liverpool Catechetical Director, has produced a similar work. His new series, *'Growing Christian'*, (Holmes McDougall) is also diluted beyond the point where it is recognisably Catholic.

The January 1970 edition of *'The Sower'*, journal of Corpus Christi College, provides a complete secondary syllabus without a single specifically Catholic doctrine from beginning to end. This syllabus provides a synthesis of the type of teaching emanating from this centre for a number of years. Writing in *'The Universe'* on 3 July 1970 a Catholic teacher stated that anyone urging teachers to use the type of approach found in this syllabus was, *ipso facto*, *'trying to persuade them to ignore the authentic teaching of the Pope and the Council'*. Replying to the teacher Fr. F. Somerville, S.J., editor of *'The Sower'*, boasted that *'so great was the demand for this particular issue that we had to order a reprint. Schools and Colleges of Education, especially, bought it in quantities...'*

Given the inadequacy of this syllabus, Fr. Somerville has provided an unwitting testimony to the wide diffusion of heterodox teaching. The syllabus itself is invaluable as an example of what is being taught in place of the Catholic religion, particularly as its authors cannot plead that they are being misquoted. Fr. Somerville defended the syllabus as follows (*'Universe'*, July 17, 1970):

*'With the fuller theology of revelation approved by Vatican II and a deeper understanding of the learning process, Catholic educators are striving to adapt themselves to the requirements of the present day.'*

*'If God is speaking today, as He has always done, in the events of daily life, then we must help pupils and adults to look deeply at their environment and human experiences to discover what God is doing and saying now.'*

*'Whereas we used to start from the Word of God in Scripture and apply it to the present situation, we now "read the signs of the times" in the light of God's past actions in Israel, in Jesus and in the community of the Church.'*

### **The Training College Monopoly**

The extent to which the 'new' catechetics has permeated teacher training was illustrated in *'The Universe'* (29 May 1970) where a primary head is quoted as stating that *'he wonders how long he can continue to endanger the faith of his pupils by exposing them to teaching from these students. He will allow them to give religious instruction only on condition that they adhere rigidly to the school syllabus under close supervision.'* Reports from a number of priests and teachers indicate beyond any doubt that many students are confused about what to teach, are unwilling to teach religion or, worst of all, are teaching heterodox doctrine. The testimonies of Fr. Telford (Section II) and Fr. Ripley (Appendix 3) illustrate this point.

The *'Dutch Catechism'* is increasingly adopted as the standard text book in Catholic Colleges of Education. Even where the Supplement correcting some of its most glaring deficiencies is incorporated there is no guarantee that this will be referred to. Large sections of the Catechism provide nothing less than what might be described as the subliminal propagation of heresy which undermines such truths as the bodily resurrection of Christ or the existence of a separate soul in a manner which only the most doctrinally literate reader will detect. Any teaching based on the *'Dutch Catechism'* must certainly be suspect (see Appendix 6). This also applies to any priest or

teacher recommending it. In 'People Priest and Parish' (G. Chapman), Fr. Bullen urges priests to use it as the basis for their homilies:

*'The Dutch Catechism leads the way in presenting doctrine in non-technical living language, and I can think of no contemporary book more likely to offer consistent help to the preacher.'*

Fr. F. Somerville expressed the same view in 'The Sower' (January 1970) where he stated:

*'Speaking as an outsider this reviewer considers that no one-volumed work presents so fine a synthesis of the faith for the people of today with their particular preoccupations as this catechism. **But in a Church whose official thinking is usually about a century behind the times the compilers inevitably startled the Roman traditionalists.**' (Our emphasis)*

### **Father Bullen**

In his current syllabus for primary schools, 'Living and Believing' (G. Chapman), Fr. Bullen presents only five of the twenty two specific points of doctrine in the Pope's CREDO in a satisfactory manner. He purports to teach the doctrine of Original Sin but ignores the teaching of the Church and puts forward a theory of his own:

*'The sacred writers teach that evil in the world is not due to the malevolence of God or of gods, as their pagan contemporaries alleged. All that God created was good. The sinfulness of mankind is responsible for much human misery and unhappiness. This sinfulness can be traced back to the very beginnings of the human race; it has been accumulating ever since and affecting every descendant of the men God first created.'*

Compare this with the observations in Pope Paul's CREDO concerning the teaching of Trent quoted in Appendix 5. Fr. Bullen recommends teachers wishing to deepen their knowledge of Original Sin to read the 'Dutch Catechism' and 'Christ and Original Sin' by Fr. de Rosa! Most of the books recommended in this syllabus favour the 'new' theology and it is hardly surprising that the Pope's CREDO is not included in the list!

Fr. de Rosa's book on Original Sin has already been reviewed in 'Approaches'. (Excerpts from this review are reproduced in Appendix 5) It was reviewed as follows in CATHOLIC TRUTH (Official journal of the C.T.S.) in the following terms:

**'Christ and Original Sin.** By Peter de Rosa. (Geoffrey Chapman; 138 pp., 25s.) "There is no subject more liable to cause teachers to tear their hair out and children to profess a belligerent unbelief than original sin." So says the author. But that is not the experience of one of the 24 Catholic members of my very experienced staff. I passed the book around. The general comment was: "I wonder if he believes in original sin at all." My own principal regret is that Fr de Rosa, who is undoubtedly a talented writer, did not think it worthwhile to comment at length on the statement of Pope Paul on 11th July, 1966 and the subsequent discussion about it. Possibly some of the more highly personal speculations might have been modified, especially concerning the reconciliation of polygenism with original sin. Speculative theology must be taken for what it is and judged accordingly. In this case vastly more attention should have been paid to the traditional teaching of the magisterium.'

Reviews from the same journal also cast light on the views of other new catechists mentioned at the beginning of this appendix: in particular Sebastian Moore, Nicholas Lash, Peter Harris, Theo Westow, Robert Murray, S.J., Fr. Van Beck, S.J., John Fitzsimmons and John Dalrymple (see review of 'Authority in a Changing Church' and 'His Presence in the World' in the Autumn 1968 issue of 'Catholic Truth!')

## The publishing monopoly

The stranglehold exercised by the 'new' catechists on publishing is easily illustrated. There are two recent books on the theory and practice of catechetics: *'Religious Education'*, published by Darton, Longman & Todd, & *'Introduction to Catechetics'*, published by Chapman. It should be noted that both of these publishers attacked *'Humanae Vitae'* in public,

In the Darton, Longman & Todd book we have such stalwarts as Derek Lance, Dom Sebastian Moore, Rosemary Haughton and A.E.C.W. Spencer (not mentioned in the list but a prominent anti—*'Humanae Vitae'* campaigner). In the Chapman book we have Peter De Rosa, Sister Margaret of Jesus, Fr. H. Richards, Rosemary Haughton and Sister Romain. *'Introduction to Catechetics'* was reviewed in *'CATHOLIC TRUTH'* by a headmaster in the following terms:

**'Introduction to Catechetics.** Edited by Peter de Rosa. (Geoffrey Chapman; 203 pp., paper.) *In this book "Nine experts team up to present a fundamental and comprehensive introduction to the subject" - we read on the back cover. They have all written well and clearly, using "layman's language", about what, whom, and how we teach. But this book worries me. For however well we understand our children, however good our methods, in religious education it's still **the content** that matters most. And this **introduction** to catechetics could well mislead the beginner, the inexperienced teacher- for whom it is presumably intended. Fr. de Rosa in his introduction disclaims the term "new theology" and points to the **renewal** as a return to the past. He goes on to "set out in a simple, direct, and brief way the unchanging content of the Christian message." He does this - up to a point. For while he does full justice to the Covenant, he skates over the defined doctrine of Original Sin, writing: "Sin cannot simply be an inheritance due to the misdemeanour of an individual (or a couple). There is the sin of mankind, a network of iniquity, an accumulation of wrongs always threatening to bring disaster. Into this situation each child is born", Now, whatever else he does, surely the catechist **must teach what the Church teaches.** Mother Theodore's chapter on "Christ and the Fall of Man" looked promising. But she begins by recommending us to "revise our terminology and be very careful in our choice of traditional words and phrases." Then she writes this: "THE FALL. I am not here concerned with the who or the how at the dawn of history but with the here and now of contemporary history." This is an interesting chapter. But it is not on the subject - Christ and the Fall of Man. Yet if anything was to be mentioned at all it should have been Original Sin. Rosemary Haughton wrote thoughtfully and well on "Sexual Education of Christians" and Desmond Brennan's chapter on "Teaching Aids" is good. But any Catholic reading Sister Romain on "First Confession and First Communion" will be shocked to read "It is surely somewhat dangerous to present sin as totally shameful, as something that ought never to happen." She explains this shock away later, but one feels that the catechist should do better than the following: "The most important sign Jesus has given us is that of the bread blessed by the priest. This blessed bread is Jesus." On the "Principles of Religious Education" Sister Margaret makes the gratuitous statement: "The fact that today we are in reaction against a too exclusive and unreflecting use of this sign (the doctrinal formulations of the Church) does not mean that we reject it altogether in our teaching." (Who is in reaction?) Then we read. "Every doctrinal formulation is in a sense the child of its time...no formula is exhaustive and none is the final word." Frankly, I'm disturbed, not by catechetics but by some of our catechists.'*

In a single issue of *'Catholic Education Today'* we find articles by A.E.C.W. Spencer, Rosemary Haughton, Fr. L. Bright, O.P., and Fr. Anthony Bullen. In his syllabus, *'Growing in Christ'*, Fr. Bullen highly praises and recommends Derek Lance. Derek Lance, of course, reciprocates in his writings. Rather than cite a long list of syllabi, books and articles it would be easier to ask the reader to try and discover anything on the topic not written by one of them and to find any syllabus published in this country since Vatican II in which the Pope's CREDO is adequately presented. It should be pointed out that the excellent *'On Our Way'* series has now been revised in a *'Vatican II edition'*, highly praised by Frs. de Rosa and Richards. Teachers who admired the original edition, which did not become widespread here until after the Council, must be warned that the new version bears

no resemblance to the old. It has been effectively 'deCatholicised'. A 'progressive' reviewer in 'The Tablet' expressed delight at the manner in which there is 'little attempt to teach doctrinal phraseology. . . talks on original sin and niggling questions like "What is personal sin?" completely vanish.' Any series coming from the U.S.A. must be looked upon with great suspicion, particularly anything published by Sadlier.

### **Taking in each other's washing**

With the not invariable exception of 'Catholic Truth', the 'freemasonry' usually manage to review and praise what their fellow members write.

Rosemary Haughton is put forward by Chapman's as Britain's most discussed Catholic theologian! Mrs Haughton is, of course, without any qualification whatsoever either in theology or religious teaching. Her work is highly praised by Charles Davis and Fr. de Rosa but one of her books was described in 'Catholic Truth' as follows:

**The Transformation of Man**, By Rosemary Haughton. (Geoffrey Chapman; 280 pp., 30s.) *Perhaps the exaggerations in the blurb and in the publicity matter accompanying this book have something to do with at least one reader's quite unfavourable reaction. Much of the book seemed to be sheer verbiage, many of the statements incapable of verification and the whole thesis rather unconvincing. One finds here yet another example of the "sin mysticism" with its implication that some of those whom the Church classifies as sinners are in reality closer to God than the "good" man who, while fulfilling his obligations and being outwardly blameless, is pharisaic and self-righteous within and is ignorant of what true charity implies. The implication seems to be that sin brings a man closer to God and that, despite theological statements to the contrary, the sinner is a man of true humility and true charity. At the root of Mrs Haughton's philosophy seems to be some kind of a vague desire to shake off the yoke of moral obligation.'*

Mrs Haughton helps in her turn by praising such books as 'Coresponsibility in the Church' by Cardinal Suenens.... 'At a time like this it must be a huge encouragement to Catholics, and to all Christians who want to work with Catholics, that such a man is in such a position and is telling the world about it.' (Bishop Butler is equally enthusiastic. The views of Cardinal Suenens are dealt with in depth by Marcel Clement in 'A layman replies to Cardinal Suenens'- see Approaches.) Sister Margaret of Corpus Christi College (Ruth Duckworth) writes a book which is reviewed by her principal Fr. Richards: 'It would be difficult to find within the compass of a single book as comprehensive an exposition of Catechetics as this.' The views of Gabriel Moran are now notorious and dealt with fully in Appendix 7. Yet Frs. Richard and de Rosa consider that Br. Moran 'indicates the path that we must be prepared to tread if religious education is really to be renewed.' (Preface to 'God still speaks'.) Their colleague Br. Drostan recommended it in 'Duckett's Register' as '...prescribed reading for all interested in the aims of religious education. It offers no practical schemes, but what it has to say on the principles of religious education is so interesting and contradicts so much of what others take for granted that from now on no one constructing or adopting a syllabus of studies can afford to ignore it.' Derek Lance gives it equally fulsome praise in 'New Blackfriars'.

### **The doctrine of Father Bullen**

It might be useful to conclude this appendix with some specific examples of the manner in which authentic doctrine is distorted by the 'new' catechists. Fr. Bullen is included once again not because his Liverpool catechetical centre is very much worse than a number of others, but because he obtains more publicity and a wider circulation for his views than any other individual in the movement.

## Liquidation of the Soul

The January 1969 edition of *'Concilium'* had a good deal to say on the *'myth of the separate soul'*. Fr. Schillebeeckx stated: *'Since we are abandoning the heavily dualistic understanding of man of earlier days, the Christian belief in a hereafter now has to ask questions about whether there is any sense in speaking of a "soul separated from the body". This traditional presupposition will have to be demythologised.'* In the same issue, p.48, Fr. G. Ruiz asks: *'If we are agreed on the importance of serious work on the demythologization of the Bible, why should we resist the inevitable demythologization of dogma'* Why indeed! No informed Catholic will need any explanation on the effect the *'abolition'* of the separate soul would have on the traditional teaching on purgatory. A religion which had misled its members so seriously for so long could hardly claim to be infallible or expect to be regarded as a credible source of truth by any rational person.

Without explicitly denying the existence of the separate soul Fr. Bullen goes a long way to adopting the *'Concilium'* thesis (which. is that of the *'Dutch Catechism'*) In his book *'Growing in Christ'* he adopts the typical *'new'* catechist technique of setting up an Aunt Sally which he proceeds to demolish and then uses it as an excuse for a dilution or change of teaching. The word *'soul'* is not to be used in our teaching. It is a *'metaphysical notion which can only be understood by someone who is acquainted with philosophical ideas'*. In *'their inevitably concrete, literal way'* children *'think of the soul as a white ("whiter than white") hollow organ situated behind the ribs which from time to time they are urged to "top up" with this invisible fluid (grace).'*

Instead of *'soul'* therefore we must use *'me'*. The soul is thus liquidated in practice if not in theory.

## Baptism

In the same book Fr. Bullen claims that baptism has been presented as consisting mainly of *'the washing way of the "stain of original sin".'* There may be some truth in this and there are other important aspects of baptism which need to be emphasised, but no presentation of baptism can be orthodox unless this aspect is included. (See appendix 5 on original sin.) FR. BULLEN FAILS TO INCLUDE THIS ASPECT EITHER IN *'GROWING IN CHRIST'* OR HIS MOST RECENT SYLLABUS *'LIVING AND BELIEVING'*.

## The Divinity of Christ

At a time when the divinity of Christ is under an attack unprecedented since the Arian heresy, Fr. Bullen like the generality of new catechists finds it necessary to put an exaggerated stress on His humanity. In the March 1968 edition of *'Catholic Education Today'* he quotes such authorities in support of his view as Fr. de Rosa, Sister Margaret of Jesus and Bishop *'Honest to God'* Robinson. This exaggerated emphasis on the humanity of Christ has been the consistent policy of Corpus Christi College.

## The Eucharist

The following *'comments by a theologian on two broadsheets on the real presence circulated to secondary schools by a diocesan catechetical centre [Father Bullen's]* were published in the July 1969 issue of *'KEPHAS'*:

*'I regard the broadsheet on the Eucharist as seriously wrong, not merely misleading, but directly dangerous. Nowhere does the author make the point of Trent that the Blessed Eucharist is to be adored with the cult of LATRIA, the cult owed to God in Person and to God alone. He picks and chooses his quotations from Trent and succeeds in giving the wrong gloss on Trent....'*

*'Again, his identification of all modes of presence of God to men with the ONE Real Presence which*

we encounter in many different ways etc. is erroneous. This puts the Eucharist in one common category of modes of divine presence in Creation and in the Church, modes in which "the body and blood, the person and his very life, are made real under the sign par excellence of his presence". Now that is a direct quote from the broadsheet.

'It will not do: "are made real under the sign of his presence"! This is no more than the mode of presence which Trent explicitly condemns, namely the opinion of those who say that Christ is present VIRTUALLY i.e. by exercise of his divine power and by action and interaction upon men and with men. We do not underestimate this power at all, but in the Eucharist God is present ONTOLOGICALLY as *Mysterium Fidei* says, - "WHOLE AND ENTIRE, BODILY PRESENT TOO, IN HIS PHYSICAL REALITY"- i.e. this Host is Jesus Christ, God to be adored, the same thing, i.e. God and the same Person, Jesus Christ, as was present, God and Man, at the supper table and is present at the right hand of the Father, and this THING, this consecrated Host is NOTHING ELSE AT ALL, nor is anything else existent together with it, IT IS CHRIST AND NOTHING ELSE.

'Nowhere does the author of this broadsheet talk in such a way. The presence of Christ in the Eucharist is different from any other presence, NOT one supreme manifestation of a common category of "presence of Christ". The presence of Christ is different because in the Eucharist Christ is really, substantially, ontologically or PHYSICALLY present. To say "present" is wrong. In fact, THIS IS CHRIST by identity. Even to speak of "being present" can mislead if we do not realise that what we see and hold and receive is PHYSICALLY GOD TO BE ADORED, - AND NOTHING ELSE.

'The broadsheets make a cunning play upon the subtle meanings of the word "PHYSICAL". They say often Christ is not PHYSICALLY present, using the word of the natural form and figure of his manhood, but the word "physical" more properly means "according to nature", and Christ is present naturally in that sense of "according to nature" for we receive his true Body, his human nature, Body and Blood, soul and divinity. We receive the NATURAL CHRIST i.e. HIMSELF. When Christ at the Supper pronounced the word of consecration for the first time, the Man at table and the Bread He broke and gave were ONE AND THE SAME THING, the ONE PERSON - and NOTHING ELSE. We receive the PERSON of Christ in the natures of God and Man. CHRIST THEN IS PHYSICALLY PRESENT and PHYSICALLY received. This mode of presence is the source and origin of every other mode of operation and presence in the Church, for it is the operation of the same God and Saviour who is present equally at the right hand of the Father and in the Eucharist as Sacrifice and Sacrament.

It is the same person effecting the same one work. IN NO OTHER OPERATION OF GOD is Christ present BY REAL AND PHYSICAL IDENTITY. The perspective of this broadsheet is pantheistic - we should adore God present in all things in the same one manner but in different degrees of exercised virtue or power.

'The CANNIBAL difficulty is easily dealt with. We do not consume indeed the 'Body and Blood of Christ'; we receive and eat God made Man. As He said, "It is the spirit that quickens; the flesh profits nothing". He meant that because He was God, the Divinity is the good and life of men, and since He is the fulness of the Godhead corporeally, His human nature shares in the work of the divinity, as it must, for Christ is ONE PERSON and GOD IN ESSENCE. It is CHRIST we receive, and Christ is not less God for us because made Man, but more so and more fully for a more perfect union and communion. As the breast of the mother is for the child - and this is no cannibalism - so also is the Body of Christ for us, and WE ARE INCREASED BY HIM AND HE IS NOT LESSENERED BY US.

*'The comments at the beginning about misunderstanding of the presence of God in Creation etc. as also the horrific picture of the childish misunderstandings are just the usual Aunt Sallys, the setting up what we never did believe or say, or the imputation of a neglect of which the Church in fact was never guilty, to bring in false doctrine under the guise of zeal for the whole truth. It is a classical example of the wolf donning the sheep's clothing. Children, of course, have to be taught gradually a true image, but DID NOT THE AUTHOR OF THESE NOTES SAY THAT THE EUCHARIST WAS A MYSTERY? In any case, from the woolly and muddling teaching that he gives, a child would be much more likely to take the view that Jesus is there in some big way, but NOT REALLY of course, and not in a different way from the way He is present in people and especially good people, and poor sick people, and so on.*

*'In any event, to say that Christ is present but screened so to speak, IS TRUE. That is said in the ADORATE DEVOTE. If the Thomist view of substance and accident is true, then quite rightly we can say that the appearances of bread SCREEN the reality of Christ physically and substantially present. If we do not, then there is no screening at all, only the physically real and ontological presence of Christ in the sacramental form of Himself, as Trent says.'*

The above exposé of Fr. Bullen's views on the Eucharist (which are based on those of Fr. Schillebeeckx) will explain why, among the many inexcusable omissions from *'Living and Believing'*, that of Eucharistic devotion is prominent. Not one word is written advocating devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, despite the clear teaching of the Council on this point.

### **Father Bullen and Hans Kung**

It is also of interest that in his infamous 'pope-baiting' tour of Britain in 1970 Fr. Hans Kung, who was unhesitatingly described as 'no longer a Catholic Christian' and a 'dangerously heretical theologian' in the May 1970 issue of *'KEPHAS'*, normally lectured under the auspices of extremist groups such as the ultra neo-Modernist Renewal Movement. This was not the case in Liverpool where the visit was organised by Fr. Bullen. Tickets for Kung's meeting were sent from his catechetical centre, and the facilities of a Catholic teachers' college were given to Father Kung for his attack on the Holy Father.

Incidentally, Fr. Bullen's reflex reaction to any complaint, like that of other 'new' catechists, is that he is acting with the approval of his bishop. One can only pray that some of our bishops are guilty of no more than giving blanket approval to material which lack of time precludes their reading. It is hard to believe, for example, that Archbishop Beck really agrees that teachers should not seek to cultivate a love of the Blessed Sacrament among their pupils or that the clear teaching of the Pope on original sin should be distorted.

### **Derek Lance's series**

The extent to which Catholic teaching has been abandoned and the arrogance of certain 'new' catechists who make no pretence of reconciling their views with those of the Church is shown perfectly in the following examples.

A series of books is being issued to supplement *'11 to 16'* by Derek Lance. This secondary syllabus is amorphous, unrealistic, and a totally inadequate basis for a sound education in Catholic doctrine. (It is, however, a model of orthodoxy when compared with the syllabus in the January 'Sower', which indicates the extent to which matters have deteriorated in only a few years.) One of the 11-16 series books is by J. Singleton, a colleague of Derek Lance, and is entitled *'Violence'*. Why our adolescents should need to make a special study of violence is a mystery in itself! It is not a problem which affects the mass of Catholic children who live in law-abiding families and districts. It

appears to be a course of indoctrination in pseudo-Marxist dogma rather than Christianity. A study of the first page alone makes it quite clear that the book should be banned by Local Education Authorities in view of its nature as political propaganda and statements which are clearly false. The first page is aimed at the American presence in Vietnam where '*P.O.W.'s are not even imprisoned they are shot on the spot after torture*'. (Ironically this is often true often the case of those captured by the Communists, including thousands of innocent civilians. Mass graves of those eliminated after the capture of Hué have been discovered.) The fact that ample evidence could be provided of P.O.W. camps and rehabilitation centres in South Vietnam, from which tens of thousands of simple peasants conscripted by the communists have been enabled to readapt themselves to a life of freedom, would be considered irrelevant. It is the myth and not the truth that matters. Recent events have proved how sternly the American authorities react once definite evidence is available of atrocities committed by their troops. These are invariably unauthorised and not part of a deliberate policy of achieving power through the large scale murder of leading non-communists, or wanton atrocities, as is the case with the Communist forces.

**This misleading text is backed up by a picture of a little girl with a bandaged arm using a crutch, presumably a victim of the wicked Americans. In actual fact the girl, Giang Thi Yen, was wounded at Dong Zoai in June 1965 by an incendiary grenade thrown by a Viet Cong terrorist which killed her eight year old brother and five year old sister, burning them to death. She, her mother, and a month old baby girl were wounded.**

**It is hard to believe that responsible head teachers would expose their pupils to such teaching, but some must be doing so or Darton, Longman and Todd would not have published the book.**

### **Education for Apostasy**

The final, and perhaps most alarming example, comes from an article in '*Catholic Education Today*' (March/April 1970) concerning the '*Catholic Schools Humanities Project*'. This involves using material from the '*Humanities Curriculum Project*' prepared for non-Catholic schools. The basic idea of the scheme is to provide pupils with '*packs*' giving differing points of view of social, ethical, economic and religious matters and allowing them to sift the evidence and form their own conclusions. '*...promoting autonomous responsibility*' is the aim. This is, of course, precisely the type of approach advocated by humanists.

The teacher is meant to act as an impartial chairman and allow the children to reach their own conclusions without interference from him whatever these might be. The fact that this is a betrayal of his vocation as a Catholic teacher is easily overcome because '*a neutral Catholic teacher bears witness to the freedom of his pupils during the humanities lesson, and outside that lesson bears witness in many other ways.*'

Short shrift is given to any '*reactionary*' teachers '*who would question the wisdom of introducing adolescent pupils to views which are contrary to the teaching of the Church, and who would therefore be inclined not to use such pieces of evidence from HCP packs.*' For this, we are told, would lead pupils to conclude that, '*the evidence was being rigged*'. And the idea is to use the HCP as a whole, '*not to make a selection of these materials or to censor them.*' No secret is made of the fact that exposure to this '*evidence*' might result in some children rejecting the teaching of the Church but this would be quite acceptable as it would be a '*genuinely free and conscientious rejection!*'

**'The possibility must be faced, nevertheless, that, through a process of thoughtful examination aimed at a deeper understanding, some pupils may reject some aspects of Catholic moral teaching. Rejection in these circumstances, however, could be described as**

***free and conscientious, unlike the comparatively unthinking and even casual rejection which sometimes occurs.'***

Lest it should be thought that such a scheme could not be put forward seriously and would, in any case, be rejected by every Catholic school, it must be made quite clear that it is already being used in certain Catholic Secondary schools. It might also be imagined that so outrageous a proposition which offends against every view of Catholic education put forward by the Church, as well as against plain common sense, would be met with a storm of protest. Yet only a solitary letter of complaint was published - from an official of Oxfam who felt that teachers should not remain neutral on such topics as aid to developing countries:

**Towards Anarchy - in the name of Christ!**

The growing acceptance of this concept of the teacher's role was revealed in an article by Fr. Konstant (referred to in Appendix 7) in the July 10, 1970 *Universe*, in which he stated:

*'Although this is an oversimplification, one might say that the pupil's part is to seek out the evidence and then to evaluate it critically. The teacher then becomes more of a guide than an instructor.'*

The final result of this '*guiding rather than instructing*' approach can be a degeneration to the level revealed in a letter to the author of this '*Dossier*' from a senior teacher in a well-known Catholic boys' school. He explains that R.E. is now in the hands of two young '*specialist*' teachers '*whose classes are a bear garden, and who will go to any lengths to avoid having to give an honest-to-goodness lesson. They will play pop records, tell the boys to get on with their homework, watch television, invent "projects"....*

## **APPENDIX 5**

### **Original Sin**

## Original Sin according to Pope Paul's Credo

*'We believe that in Adam all have sinned. From this it follows that on account of the original offence committed by him human nature, which is common to all men, is reduced to that condition in which it must suffer the consequences of that fall. This condition is not the same as that of our first parents, for they were constituted in holiness and justice, and man had no experience of either evil or death. Consequently, fallen human nature is deprived of the economy of grace which it formerly enjoyed. It is wounded in its natural powers and subjected to the dominion of death which is transmitted to all men. It is in this sense that every man is born in sin.'*

*'We hold, therefore, in accordance with the Council of Trent, that original sin is transmitted along with human nature, **not by imitation but by propagation**, and is, therefore, incurred by each individually.'*

*'We believe that our Lord Jesus Christ redeemed us by the sacrifice of the Cross from original sin and from all those personal sins to which we confess, so that the truth of the Apostle's words is vindicated that **where sin abounded, grace did more abound**.*

*'We believe in one baptism instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. Baptism is also to be given to infants, who cannot as yet be guilty of any personal sin, in order that, though born deprived of supernatural grace, they may be reborn of **water and the Holy Spirit** to divine life in Christ Jesus.'*

(Emphasis is Pope Paul's.)

(The above is from page 9 - the passage headed 'Original Sin' - in the C.T.S. edition of 'The Credo of the People of God'.)

## Pope Paul on Polygenism

*'As for Original Sin, Pope Paul spoke to theologians and scientists about it on 11 July, 1966. The key words are: "It is therefore evident that the explanations of Original Sin given by some modern authors will seem to you irreconcilable with true Catholic doctrine. Starting from the undemonstrated premise of polygenism, they deny, more or less clearly, that that sin from which so many cesspools of evil have come to mankind was first of all the disobedience of Adam, 'first man' figure of him who was to come, namely Christ the Lord, committed at the beginning of history. Consequently these explanations do not even agree with the teaching of scripture, of sacred tradition and the Church's magisterium, according to which the sin of the first man is transmitted to all his descendants not through imitation but through propagation, 'in each one as his own' and is 'the death of the soul' that is, privation and not simply lack of holiness and of justice even in new-born babies." The reference is to n.22 of the Council's Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the World of Today.*

*Earlier in the same address the Holy Father appealed to the consistent teaching of the three famous Councils of Carthage, Orange and Trent to prove the fact and universality of Original Sin. This doctrine, the Pope said, "was reaffirmed in the second Vatican Council, particularly in connection with its principal, subject, which was the mystery of the Church." In support he quoted from the Pastoral Constitution, as we have said, and also from n.2 of the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, which he says is "in full consonance with divine revelation and the teaching of the preceding Councils. "He warned his hearers that they must not depart from doctrine that was sure and unchangeable. There must be adequate freedom of research but there are limits which cannot and must not be overstepped by the scripture scholar, theologian and the scientist who really intends to enlighten his own faith and that of other Catholics. These limits are marked by the living teaching voice of the Church, which is the proximate norm of truth for all the faithful. He went on to reprove excessive liberty in interpreting dogma "as if everyone were permitted to consign to oblivion doctrine already defined by the Church, or to interpret it so that the genuine meaning of the words or the recognized force of the concept is extenuated",'*  
(With acknowledgment to *Catholic Truth*, Autumn 1968).

## Father de Rosa on Original Sin

(Excerpts from a review of Fr. de Rosa's '*Christ and Original Sin*' by Marie Endean published in the December 1969 issue of *Approaches*)

...Father de Rosa has fallen victim and in this book<sup>46</sup> he asks ill-timed, ill-considered and irrelevant questions, Mostly he refurbishes old questions that the Church has long ago dealt with. He probes, he pokes, he prods. His questions and his answers lead to intellectual confusion and to distaste for the doctrines of the Church and for the patently fuddy-duddy and obscurantist '*classical*' theologians. His book is bright and facile enough to attract Catholics and others who are interested in theological inquiry and it will have a certain impact on the unsuspecting and uncritical mind.

His technique is interesting. He is fond of setting up Aunt Sallys and shying at them with might and main. In his first essay, *Christ*, he revives the hoary heresy of the Docetists who claimed that Christ's body was not real but phantasmal and he proceeds to demolish the heresy with little recognition of the fact that throughout the ages the Church has strongly condemned the belief as variously expressed by Gnostics, Manicheans, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites and the rest. He raps orthodox theologians throughout for stressing the divinity of Christ at the expense of His humanity maintaining that '*the profession "Jesus is God" has immobilised our theology.*' In fact, he is so preoccupied with the human aspects of Christ's nature that we expect him at any moment

---

<sup>46</sup> *Christ and Original Sin* by Peter de Rosa

seriously to assess Our Lord's I.Q. Nowhere does he make it clear that the Church has always been obliged to defend the Divinity of Christ because others, and particularly the Jewish people and the Hebraists, have insisted on denying it. Furthermore, he quite forgets to mention the tradition of the great schools of Catholic devotional painting which strove in every detail to express the suffering humanity of Our Lord: *Ecce Homo*, Behold the Man.

He is sometimes infelicitous, sometimes flippantly humorous: children look upon the Holy Trinity 'as a puzzle', not as a mystery; apart from, and independent of faith, Christ's empty tomb is 'an enormous red herring'; if Christ was not truly tempted, then He was giving us an example of 'pretending to be tempted when one really isn't.' Father de Rosa has an unhappy knack of subordinating accuracy of expression to suit the understanding of a popular audience.

Elsewhere in his public life his colourful language helps us to catch a glimpse of his fundamental attitudes in the great debate on authority in the Church. At the 'teach in' on birth control sponsored by the London Newman Circle in September, 1968, he thought the suspension of dissenting priests by their bishops ('Vatican sheep-dogs') was 'a Kremlin-like scandal'. (*Universe*, 20.9.68) At a press conference the following month he said: 'The whole point of the Christian religion is to make men free. Yet often our Church gives the impression that men are not free. We are making a venture in freedom.' (*Daily Express*, 3.10.68) Such loose and superficial use of the words 'free' and 'freedom' ill becomes a priest and teacher, lecturer and author.

In the second essay, *Original Sin*, Father de Rosa accepts uncritically that organic evolution is a fact instead of an hypothesis, as it is still so regarded by many distinguished scientists. Nowhere in his essay does Father de Rosa show that he is even aware of the distinction between organic and inorganic evolution. His inability to define his terms and to distinguish between fact and fancy is a serious flaw in his thinking.

Truth is indivisible: theology and science will be seen to walk hand in hand. Theology will not be 'put out of business', as Father de Rosa anticipates, if theologians do not bring their ideas up to date. When all is known, it will set the seal on the findings of the scientists and vice versa. He is being frightened with false fire, as Father Crehan, S.J., observed in a letter to the *Catholic Herald* (17.5.68). He is the victim of his own hypotheses.

The trouble is that the 'new scientific world picture' drawn by Teilhard de Chardin fascinates Father de Rosa. But de Chardin's ideas on Original Sin and the Fall have been condemned by the *Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith*. This Jesuit's ideas on consciousness and evolution, on Superman, Cephalized Man, and the Omega Point are so full of theological and philosophical and, we may add, 'scientific' ambiguities that not only did his own superiors condemn his views from the beginning, but as late as 1962, the Church uttered a *monitum* that his works are so 'full of grave errors as to offend against Catholic doctrine.' This *monitum*, as far as the present writer knows, is still in force.<sup>47</sup>

Father de Rosa seems not to have heard of all this, For instance, for him Adam and Eve are 'theologically superfluous'. He asks: "Is It not easier to admit that they never did exist?" How much easier? Polygenism only compounds the difficulty. If not one Adam, then why not a hundred? A thousand? Hundreds of thousands of Adams? Hundreds of thousands of Eves? (God forbid!) Committing the first sin all together? Separately? In groups? Any way, according to Father de Rosa, the first sin (or sins) was not significant. That mankind as a whole is sinful is what really matters for him. No one was really to blame. Such a proposition leads to some exquisite

---

<sup>47</sup> As recently as October 20<sup>th</sup>, 1967, a statement issued by the Apostolic Delegation in the USA affirmed 'that the Monitum issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Faith concerning the writings of Fr Teilhard de Chardin is still in effect'.

theological conclusions.

There is a grave warning by Pius XII in *Humani Generis* about the misuse by the Communists of the theory of evolution. (Did not Marx himself write to Engels about the value of Darwin's theory to Marxist political propaganda?) It comes as no surprise, therefore, that the affinity between Teilhardism and Marxism was publicly recognised at the first annual Conference of the Pierre Teilhard de Chardin Association of Great Britain and Ireland in October, 1966, at which one of the chief speakers was Professor Roger Garaudy, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Poitiers, chief theoretician of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party, and a Politburo member. He stressed that Marxists felt close to Teilhard in his confidence in Man and suggested that Marxism could put Teilhard's vision into effect.

The tragedy of de Chardin was that he wanted to be faithful to the Church<sup>48</sup> but nevertheless precipitated a serious crisis within the Church through vagueness and vacillation of thought and – most unforgivable in a Frenchman – through serious ambiguity of expression. Where he follows de Chardin, Fr de Rosa's ideas place him in direct opposition not only to Catholic theology at a number of sensitive points but in direct opposition to the long philosophical tradition of the West. The fruitful study of philosophical problems depends upon logic for which good intentions, feelings, desires and poetic vision are no substitute. The logic of biological evolutionism, raised to the level of philosophy, destroys the very meaning of the individual, subsuming him as a mere cell of the species – or of the state. De Chardin's Omega Point can easily be interpreted as Collectivism, His Hominisation as Maoism. Hence the particular fascination Teilhardism has for Marxists who are trained to spot and exploit the weakness of opponents...

Marie Endean.

---

<sup>48</sup> [Re de Chardin's faithfulness to the Church - we refer readers to *The Strange Faith of Teilhard de Chardin* by Henri Rambaud, an *Approaches* supplement which will be posted in the near future on the *Apropos* website. Editor, *Apropos*.]

## **APPENDIX 6**

### **The Dutch Catechism**

## Democracy and Truth

*'The movement for democratisation of the Roman Catholic Church continues apace. Now, this is not a subject that a non-Catholic feels comfortable intruding on, yet the process suggests certain anomalies even to the secular mind.*

*'Democracy cannot be defended on the grounds that it will provide us with the Truth. The only reliable defence of political democracy comes from those who concede that the Truth is unknowable at any given moment, so we're better off opening the whole matter up to the public will. Then, even if people don't get what's good for them, they may in any case get what they think, on election day, is good for them.*

*'That's all very well for a government, but quite inappropriate for a religious body. The raison d'être of the Catholic Church, as of all churches, is that the Truth, or a crucial part of it, already known, and it is the responsibility of those who possess it to carry it to the benighted. As soon as one admits democracy into the process, one admits uncertainty along with it. Once a religious doctrine is put to a vote then win or lose, it can scarcely carry the force of ordained truth.'*

The above observations, by Walter Goodman, appeared in the October 19, 1970 issue of the secular humanist, *NEW LEADER* (New York).

(see also p.98)

## The Dutch Catechism and its progeny

(The following appraisal of the New [Dutch]Catechism is reproduced from the *Approaches Supplement*, 'The Laity and Catechetics'.)

Until comparatively recently, it is roughly true to say that all children's catechisms were based on the Catechism of the Council of Trent, or that of St. Pius X, or simplifications or revisions of these two. In short there was virtual uniformity throughout the world. It is true that even within this context there was considerable variety. Alongside such books as were catechetical in form - i.e. compilations of questions and answers - there arose a whole host of religious textbooks for children which did not use the question and answer method. But this variety concerned only presentation; it did not concern doctrine.

For the general public, the break appeared to coincide with the emergence of the notorious Dutch Catechism, the prototype of what may be called '*non-Catholic*' catechisms.

Now that it is at last being published with official permission provided that it is accompanied by a '*Supplement*' consisting of '*replacement*' versions of several passages in the original text, it would not be perhaps correct to describe it as actually heretical. On the other hand, those responsible for issuing this '*New Catechism*' have consistently shown themselves to be most stubbornly intransigent and contemptuous of Authority.

In April 1967, they refused point blank to introduce modifications requested by a commission of theologians appointed by the Holy See. According to the Declaration of the Commission of Cardinals subsequently appointed to examine the '*New Catechism*' by Pope Paul, the Dutch theologians concerned refused even to heed the personal wishes of the Holy Father. In the words of the Cardinals' Declaration: '*...no change was made with regard to those points which, by way of example, the Holy Father himself had indicated: "for example, what pertains to the virginal conception of Jesus Christ, a dogma of the Catholic faith, to the teaching supported by the Gospel and the Tradition of the Church by which we believe that angels exist; and to the satisfactorial and sacrificial character of the redemptive, act which Christ offered to His Eternal Father for the remission of our sins and to reconcile men with the Father."*'

(And this, be it noted, was indicated by Pope Paul only '*by way of example*'.)

The Commission of Cardinals appointed by the Holy Father found the '*New Catechism*' defective on the following questions: the existence of angels; original sin; the Immaculate Conception, the '*satisfaction*' made by Christ; the Sacrifice of the Cross; the Sacrifice of the Mass; the Eucharistic Presence; Transubstantiation; the infallibility of the Church; the role of the priesthood; the Teaching Authority of the Church; the Blessed Trinity; the efficacy of the Sacraments; miracles; souls in purgatory; and certain points of moral theology including the presentation of conjugal morality.

This list of defects indicated by the Commission of Cardinals is produced above in order to indicate just how defective the Dutch Catechism IS. For the '*New Catechism*' now in circulation is the same '*New Catechism*' that was found to be so defective by the Commission of Cardinals. No alterations have been made in the original text. The original defective text is simply accompanied by a '*Supplement*' which will presumably be ignored by enthusiastic '*New Catechists*' who have for years been itching to have it officially introduced into schools and colleges.

The attitude of mind characteristic of those who have published, circulated and promoted the use of the 'New Catechism' can be seen from the fact that notwithstanding the disapproval of the commission of Theologians and the Commission of Cardinals appointed by the Holy See, despite the personal disapproval of the Holy Father, contrary to the declared wishes of the Dutch Hierarchy, and without the prescribed corrections, English, French and German translations were hurried into circulation. And, simultaneously, certain publications were issued which (according to the Declaration of the Commission of Cardinals strove *'in various ways to frustrate the plan of the Holy See to resolve in mutual understanding with the Dutch hierarchy a matter of no small moment for the good of the people of God.'*

Even now, the authors of this 'New Catechism' stubbornly refuse to change the original text. And now that Authority has permitted this 'New Catechism' to be published so long as it is accompanied by the aforementioned 'Supplement' as an appendix, it can be taken for granted that neo-Modernist catechists will interpret the permission thus granted as implying that this Dutch Catechism is now mandatory.

Indeed many of them have already been acting as though this was true even when the publication of the 'New Catechism' was actually forbidden. For a whole host of 'new catechisms' which have for some time been in use in schools in many Anglophone countries have clearly been based on the 'New Catechism', as though it had been the officially prescribed 'Compulsory Catechetical Groundwork' to be used as a basis for *aggiornamento* in catechetics. In France, the 'Fonds obligatoire' (or 'Compulsory Catechetical Groundwork') imposed by the Hierarchy is clearly animated by the spirit of the Dutch Catechism. And in the U.S.A. the old universally used Baltimore Catechism (1885, revised 1941-3) has made way for new textbooks, which are mostly of Dutch Catechism vintage and as highly questionable as they are expensively produced.

As so many of our American correspondents tell us, these catechisms do not involve merely a changed presentation or changed or improved teaching methods. *They are just not presenting the same faith.* Some doctrines are omitted, others are heavily slanted (sometimes even given a Leftist political tint), morals are taught permissively, sometimes in a manner verging on the obscene, and the philosophical basis, if any, is a sort of woolly existentialist humanism instead of the clear categories of yesteryear.

### **A Dutch priest looks at the Dutch Catechism**

A particularly strong condemnation of the 'Dutch Catechism' has recently been written by one of Holland's most distinguished theologians, Rev. P.M. Van der Ploeg, O.P., M.S.T., D.S.S., M.R.A.S.N., Professor of Old Testament Studies in the University of Nijmegen and internationally celebrated as a result of his Biblical studies, particularly those on the Dead Sea Scrolls.

He explains that where dogma is concerned the principal author of the New Catechism is certainly Fr. Schoonenberg, S.J. In a somewhat technical analysis of the particular brand of modernism expounded by Fr. Schoonenberg, who has been forbidden to teach by his order, he explains how it destroys the whole supernatural basis of our religion. A comprehensive and fully documented analysis of the Dutch Catechism is now in preparation and should be available early in 1971. It will include the whole of Fr. Van der Ploeg's comments. An excerpt from the final two paragraphs reproduced below indicates not only the pernicious nature of the Dutch Catechism but the extent to which the Catholic faith can virtually disappear from a country in only a few years.

*'The Dutch Catechism' says Fr. Van der Ploeg, 'is, from one end to the other, a manual of Modernism for which it aims to win acceptance everywhere. In order not to alarm its readers, the*

*true import of its teaching is frequently concealed by deceptive and ambiguous phrasing, although at times the authors have the insolence to flaunt it openly. The Dutch Catechism has already caused incalculable harm throughout the world, as a Roman cardinal confided to me recently. Cardinal Alfrink has persuaded the Pope to agree that translations may be published with an appendix containing the observations of the Cardinals' commission. This is about as helpful as giving our Catholic children Luther's catechism with an appendix of paragraphs from the "Catechism of the Council of Trent".*

*'Like many others who wish to remain faithful to the Catholic faith of our country, I am of the opinion that the faith is virtually dead here, particularly in view of the fact that the Religious Instruction which our children receive in Primary and secondary schools (which most children attend) is wholly impregnated with modernism. The institute which produced the Dutch Catechism has been entrusted with the overall control of Religious Instruction and is doing all in its power to impose its ideas. The faith has been betrayed, for the hierarchy will take no effective action to combat this catastrophic situation. It even gives its support to those who have produced the Dutch Catechism. Catholicism in Holland, so flourishing only a few years ago, has virtually disappeared....'*

It is precisely to help to prevent such a situation coming about in Britain that this Dossier has been prepared. As far as the Dutch Catechism is concerned, the only sensible advice is, 'Don't read it.' Ordinary Catholics, even trained teachers, could not normally be expected to discern the use of orthodox terms in an unorthodox manner by highly qualified and sometimes brilliant theologians whose prime aim is not to dismay the orthodox reader but absorb him into the ethos of their naturalism so that he comes to accept their views without realising it. For those unskilled in theology, and most Catholic teachers would claim to have no more than a grasp of basic doctrine, there is no shame in realising their limitations. True humility is the basic virtue: To be sure that we will 'see through' the errors without an appropriate theological training is, surely, somewhat presumptuous. In Matthew 24, Our Lord warns us that false prophets will arise who will lead even the elect astray and St. Paul's admonition to Timothy could almost have been written with the proponents of the Dutch Catechism in mind:

*'For the time is coming when people will not endure sound teaching, but having itching ears they will accumulate for themselves teachers to suit their own likings, and will turn away from listening to the truth and wander into myth. (II Tim, 4:3,4).'*

## **Rome's condemnation of the Dutch Catechism**

(The following is a reproduction from *L'Osservatore Romano* of Dec. 12, 1968 of the Doctrinal section of the Declaration of the Commission of Cardinals on the New [Dutch] Catechism - emphasis as in *L'Osservatore Romano*.)

### **I. Points concerning God the Creator.**

It is necessary that the Catechism teach that God, besides this sensible world in which we live, has created also a realm of pure spirits whom we call Angels. (Cf. v.g. Conc. Vat. I. Const. *Dei Filius*, cap, I; Const. Vat. II. Const. *Lumen Gentium* n. 49, 50). Furthermore, it should state explicitly that individual human souls since they are spiritual (Cf. Conc. Vat. Const. *Gaudium et Spes*, n.14) are created immediately by God (Cf. v.g. Encycl. *Humani Generis*, AAS, 42 [1950], p.575).

## 2. **The fall of man in Adam.** (Cf. Conc. Vat. II, Const. *Lumen Gentium* n.2).

Although questions regarding the origin of the human race and its slow development present today new difficulties, to be faced in connection with the dogma of original sin, nevertheless in the New Catechism the doctrine of the Church is to be faithfully proposed, that man in the beginning of history rebelled against God (Cf. Conc. Vat. II, Const. *Gaudium et Spes*, n. 13, 22) and so lost for himself and his offspring that sanctity and justice in which he had been constituted, and handed on a true state of sin to all through propagation of human nature. Certainly those expressions must be avoided which could signify that original sin is only contracted by individual new members of the human family in this sense that from their very coming into the world, they are exposed within themselves to the influence of human society where sin reigns, and so are started initially on the way of sin.

## 3. **With regard to the conception of Jesus by the Virgin Mary.**

The Commission of Cardinals has asked that the Catechism openly profess that the Blessed Mother of the Incarnate Word always enjoyed the honor of virginity, and that the fact itself of the virginal conception of Jesus which is in such great conformity with the mystery of the Incarnation itself, be taught clearly. In consequence the Catechism should offer no excuse for abandoning this factual truth - in face of the ecclesiastical Tradition founded on Holy Scripture - retaining only a symbolic signification, such as the complete gratuity of the gift which God has given to us in His Son.

## 4. **The "satisfaction" made by Christ Our Lord.**

The essential elements of the doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ which pertains to our faith are to be proposed without ambiguity. God so loved sinful men as to send His Son into the world to reconcile men to Himself (Cf. 2 Cor. 5, 19). As St. Augustine says: "We were reconciled to a God who loved us even when we were at enmity with Him because of sin" (*In Ioannes Evangelium* Tr. CX, n.6). Jesus therefore, as the first-born among many brethren (Cf. Rom. 8, 29) died for our sins (Cf. 1 Cor. 15, 3). Holy, innocent, immaculate (Cf. Hebr. 7, 26), He underwent no punishment inflicted on Him by God, but freely and with filial love, obedient to His Father (Cf. Phil. 2,8) He accepted, for His sinful brethren and as their Mediator (Cf. Tim. 2, 5), the death, which for them is the wages of sin (Cf. Rom. 6, 23; Conc. Vat. II, Const. *Gaudium et Spes*, n. 18). By this His most sacred death, which in the eyes of God more than abundantly compensated for the sins of the world, He brought it about that divine grace was restored to the human race as a good which it had merited in its divine Head (Cf. v.g. Hebr. 10, 5-10; Conc. Trid., sess. VI Decr. *De justificatione*, cap. 3 e 7, can. 10)

## 5. **The Sacrifice of the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Mass.**

It must be clearly stated that Jesus offered Himself to His Father to repair our wrong-doing as a holy victim in whom God was well pleased. For Christ "...loved us, giving himself up in our place as a fragrant offering and a sacrifice to God" (*Eph.* 5,2).

The sacrifice of the Cross is perpetuated in the Church of God as eucharistic sacrifice (Cf. Conc. Vat. II, Const. *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n.47) In the eucharistic sacrifice Jesus as the principal priest offers Himself to God through the consecratory oblation which priests perform and to which the faithful unite themselves. That celebration is both sacrifice and banquet. The sacrificial oblation is completed by communion, in which the victim offered to God is received as food, to unite the faithful to Himself and to join them with one another in charity. (cf. *1 Cor.* 10,17).

## **6. The Eucharistic presence and the Eucharistic change.**

It is necessary that in the text of the Catechism it be brought out beyond doubt that after the consecration of the bread and wine the very body and blood of Christ is present on the altar and is received sacramentally in Holy Communion, so that those who worthily approach this divine table are spiritually renewed by Christ Our Lord. Furthermore, it must be explained that the bread and wine in their deepest reality (not in appearance or phenomenologically), once the words of consecration have been spoken, are changed into the body and blood of Christ; and so it comes to pass that where the appearance of bread and wine (the phenomenological reality) remain, there, in a way most mysterious, the humanity itself of Christ, lies hidden together with His divine person,

Once this marvellous change has taken place, a conversion which in the Church is termed transubstantiation, the appearance of bread and wine, - since they actually contain and present Christ Himself, the fountain of grace and charity to be communicated through the sacred banquet, take on as a consequence indeed a new signification and a new end. But they take on that new signification and that new end precisely because transubstantiation has taken place (Cf. *Encycl. Paulus VI, Mysterium Fidei*, AAS, 57 (1965) p. 766; *Schreiben der Deutschen Bischöfe an alle die von der Kirche mit der Glaubensverkündigung beauftragt sind*, n. 43-47).

## **7. The infallibility of the Church and the knowledge of revealed mysteries.**

It should be more clearly stated that the infallibility of the Church does not give her only a safe course in a continual research, but the truth in maintaining doctrine of faith and in explaining it always in the same sense (Cf. *Conc. Vat. I, Const. Dei Filius*, cap. 4, et *Conc. Vat. II, Const. Dei Verbum*, cap. 2). "Faith is not only a seeking of the truth but is above all certain possession of truth" (Paulus VI, *Alloc. Ad Episcoporum Synodum*, AAS, 59 D9671 p 966). Nor is it to be allowed that readers of the Catechism think that the human intellect arrives only at verbal and conceptual expressions of the revealed mystery. Care must be taken rather that they understand that the human intellect is able by those concepts "through a mirror in an obscure way" and "in part", as St. Paul says (*I Cor. 13, 12*), but in a way that is altogether true, to express and grasp the revealed mysteries.

## **8. The ministerial or hierarchical priesthood and the power of teaching and ruling in the Church.**

Care must be taken not to minimize the excellence of the ministerial priesthood, that in its participation of the priesthood of Christ, differs from the common priesthood of the faithful, not only in degree, but in essence (Cf. *Conc. Vat. II, Const. Lumen Gentium*, n. 10); *Instructio de Cultu Mysterii eucharistici*, AAS, 59[1967] n. II, p. 548).

Care should be taken that in describing the priestly ministry there is brought out more clearly the mediation between God and men which they exercise not only in preaching the word of God, in forming the Christian Community and in administering the Sacraments, but also and chiefly in offering the Eucharistic sacrifice in the name of the whole Church (cf. *Conc. Vat. II, Const. Lumen Gentium*, n. 28; *Decr. Presbyterorum ordinis*, nn. 2, 13).

Furthermore, the Cardinals asked that the new Catechism clearly recognize that the teaching authority and the power of ruling in the Church is given directly to the Holy Father and to the Bishops joined with him in hierarchical communion, and that it is not given first of all to the people of God to be communicated to others. The office of Bishops, therefore, is not a mandate

given them by the people of God but is a mandate received from God Himself for the good of the whole Christian community.

It is to be brought out more clearly that the Holy Father and the Bishops in their teaching office do not only assemble and approve what the whole community of the faithful believes. The people of God are so moved and sustained by the spirit of truth that they cling to the word of God with unswerving loyalty and freedom from error under the leadership of the Magisterium to whom it belongs authentically to guard, explain and defend the deposit of faith. Thus it has come about that in understanding the faith that has been handed down, in professing that faith and in manifesting it in deed, there is a unique collaboration between Bishops and the faithful (Cf. Conc. Vat.II, *Lumen Gentium*, n. 11, and *Dei Verbum*, n. 10)). Sacred Tradition and the Sacred Scripture - which constitute the one and only holy deposit of the word of God - and the magisterium of the Church are so joined that one cannot stand without the other (Cf. Conc. Vat.) II, Const. *Dei Verbum*, n.10).

Finally, that authority by which the Holy Father directs the Church is to be clearly presented as the full power of ruling, a supreme and universal power which the Pastor of the whole church can always freely exercise (Cf. Conc. Vat. II, Const. *Lumen Gentium*, n.12).

### **9. Various points concerning dogmatic theology.**

In the presentation of the mystery of the three Persons in God, the Catechism should not seem to deny that Christians do well to contemplate them with faith and love them with filial devotion not only in the economy of salvation where they manifest themselves but also in the eternal life of the Divinity, whose vision we hope for.

The efficacy of the Sacraments should be presented somewhat more exactly. Care must be taken that the Catechism does not seem to say that miracles can only be brought about by divine power insofar as they do not depart from that which the forces of the created world are able to produce.

Finally, let open reference be made to the souls of the just, which, having been thoroughly purified, already rejoice in the immediate vision of God, even while the pilgrim Church still awaits the glorious coming of the Lord and the final resurrection (Cf. Conc. Vat. II, Const. *Lumen Gentium*, n. 49 et 51).

### **10. Certain points of moral theology.**

The text of the Catechism is not to make obscure the existence of moral laws which we are able to know and express in such wise that they bind our conscience always and in all circumstances. Solutions of cases of conscience should be avoided which do not sufficiently attend to the indissolubility of marriage. While it is right to attach great moment to the moral habits, still one must be on guard lest that habit be presented without sufficient dependence upon human acts. The presentation of a conjugal morality should be more faithful in presenting the full teaching of Vatican II and of the Holy See.

The above observations, though not few and not insignificant, still leave untouched by far the greater part of the New Catechism with its praiseworthy pastoral, liturgical and biblical character. Neither are they opposed to the laudable purpose of the authors of the Catechism, namely, to present the eternal good tidings of Christ in a way adapted to the understanding and the thinking of the present day man. Indeed The very fine qualities which make this an outstanding work demand that it ever present the true teaching of the Church in no way obscured or overshadowed.

JOSEPH Card. FRINGS  
JOSEPH Card. LEFEBVRE  
LORENZ Card. JAEGER  
ERMENEGILDO Card. FLORIT  
MICHAEL Card. BROWNE  
CHARLES Card. JOURNET

October 15th, 1968,  
Pietro Pallazzini, Secretary

### **The Impact on Holland**

A fully documented analysis of the situation in Holland by Fr. Van der Ploeg, O.P., Professor at the Catholic university of Nijmegen, Master in Theology, '*The Evolution and Crisis of Catholicism in the Netherlands*' is obtainable from The Secretary, C.P.A., St. George's Presbytery, Polegate, Surrey.

## Democracy and Authority

*'Once a religious doctrine is put to a vote then win or lose, it can scarcely carry the force of ordained truth. Will all those who favour the divinity of Jesus say "Aye". Truth in such circumstances must be seen as mere opinion. When authority is open to a vote, then church fathers become nothing more than politicians. Let the bishops beware of the Gallup poll.'*

*'When liberal Catholics suggest that democratisation (and the ecumenisation that goes so handily with it) is going to strengthen their Church, they can only be thinking of it as a political or social institution. Perhaps they believe that democratic reforms can stop at the water's edge - a chancy hope. For that process once begun has a way of going further.'*

*'Democracy is a sure antidote for infallibility. The Pope is not immune. God Himself is not immune. And, anyway, who can the Democrats nominate? Please, Teddy, sit down.'*

This is a continuation of Walter Goodman's comment (see p. 90) which appeared in the October 19, 1970 issue of the secular humanist *NEW LEADER* (New York).

## **APPENDIX 7**

**Brother Gabriel Moran**

*'One of the most important works on catechetics to have been produced in recent years'*

(Derek Lance in *'New Blackfriars'* commenting on Gabriel Moran's book *'God still speaks'*.)

ooooooOoooooo

*' [Gabriel Moran] shows that there is no such thing as catechetics without tears....we have not read for some time a book that indicates so clearly the path we must be prepared to tread if religious education is really to be renewed.'*

(From the preface to *'God still speaks'* by the Revs. H.J. Richards and Peter de Rosa, Principal and Vice Principal respectively of Corpus Christi College)

ooooooOoooooo

*'It is a grave matter particularly today, when man wishes to accept only what he understands (which is not true, however, as modern man is more than ever a client and pupil of those in authoritative positions in the scientific field). But we must live by faith, that is, crediting the Word of God, even if it is above our intelligence. With two observations: faith is obscure, but it is not blind. It has grounds that justify it, outwardly and inwardly.....*

*'What is more, it can be studied, examined carefully, compared with natural knowledge, applied; and, We should like to say, verified in the experiment of life.*

*'Lived, faith becomes light; loved, it becomes strength; meditated, it becomes spirit.'*

Pope Paul VI, on May 28, 1969.

## Intellectual Honesty

By Archbishop R.J. Dwyer, Archbishop of Portland in Oregon, U.S.A.

(In the following article reproduced from the May-June 1970 issue of 'Kephias', Archbishop Dwyer gives us a most illuminating appraisal of Bro. Gabriel Moran, doyen of 'new' Catechists - and of the 'new' catechetics.)

*'To me it was irrelevant. I don't know if what I am teaching is at variance or not. He just doesn't use any of the language that I use. I can't figure out if what I teach is absolutely contradictory, because his statements don't say anything to me. It's not that they're false. They just don't say anything.'*

(This is not a passage from an unpublished chapter of 'Alice in Wonderland'. Would that it were. Would that we could all enjoy the joke. But the joke is wearing very thin.)

So much for Pope Paul VI and his 'Credo', the amplified yet succinct statement of fundamental Catholic belief which he proclaimed at the end of the Year of Faith, in June, 1968. The above-quoted reaction was registered, not by some violently anti-Roman Evangelical nor by a Pentecostal enthusiast, not by some liberal Protestant of the Cox-Altizer-Van Buren school of thought, but by a man who wields perhaps paramount influence in the teaching of catechetics in the contemporary American Catholic Church - Brother Gabriel Moran.

In the hubbub of controversy which followed shortly thereafter with the publication of the encyclical *Humanae Vitae* these extraordinary comments were somewhat smothered. Yet they remain one of the most forthright repudiations of the obligation to conform the catechesis to the authentic teaching of the Church ever enunciated. Not only this, but today this eminent Brother of the Christian Schools, professor of theology at Manhattan College, New York, continues to exert his influence as one of the chief consultants of the central catechetical office of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Washington, D.C. In this we flatter ourselves that we are a bit more perceptive than Brother Moran: for this says a great deal to us.

Admittedly, it is a trifle difficult to discover what Brother Moran's semantic problem is. Hardly, it would seem, that he does not verbally comprehend what the Holy Father sets forth as authentic Christian doctrine. If that were so, we might hopefully recommend that the distinguished educator go back to the days of his childhood, and con again, tediously and laboriously the old Baltimore Catechism to learn just what Christianity is all about.

We suspect, though, that the suggestion, even were it apposite, would hardly be accepted with enthusiasm, since Brother Moran's strenuous objection to that antiquated text is that it candidly teaches doctrine, than which there is no more heinous a pedagogical error in the catalogue. For in his analysis doctrine is the very last and least important thing to be taught to the child, if indeed it ought to be taught at all. Rather let it spring full-armed, like Athena from the head of Jove, by spontaneous generation.

Closer to the mark, quite obviously, is Brother Moran's frank assumption of theological superiority over the poor Holy Father. All very well, he seems to say, for a simple, unsophisticated Italian priest, brought up in the narrow, deplorable Roman tradition, in the bad old days before Vatican II, to come out with pious *ferverinos* for the edification of the Catholic Booboisie (do you recall your H.L. Mencken?), but we of the Enlightenment require more subtle fare. Did the Pope mention something about the existence of God? He should never have raised so embarrassing a question. But since he has, he must know that we would never dream nowadays of formulating any such theological concept in terms so bare and bald, so denuded of

those overtones of controversy and speculation which so enrich it. To say God exists without simultaneously exploring the whole fascinating theological dimension of his Death were juvenile stuff: to speak of his Being, without at the same time balancing against it the probabilities of his non-Being, were merely puerile. So too for even more recondite assumptions, such as the Virgin Birth and the Divinity of Christ.

Far better, then, in the considered opinion of Brother Moran and his corps of catechetical experts, to eschew any sort of Credo, any doctrinal profession of faith. '*I believe in Nothing*', while jejune, is plainly a more legitimate approach to the Faith than the injustice of assaulting the infant mind with hard, cold facts, which may do his whole emotional and psychological apparatus, harm.

'*It is not that they're false. They just don't say anything.*' Here is raised a vastly interesting point. If you were Pope, how would you go about communicating with Brother Moran? Were you to use the traditional vehicle of language you could not possibly hope to break through. Were you to employ the McLuhan approach, massaging him with the message, slightly better results might be anticipated, though even here trouble lurks. For Professor McLuhan however contemptuous he is of the written word, puts great faith in the spoken, which so handsomely rewards him. Pictures might help in a feeble sort of way. But basically the only real hope is to tell Brother Moran what he wants to hear, and let him do what he wants to do. This he will understand with surprising readiness; no difficulty at all.

It must come as a consolation to the Holy Father to know that Brother Moran does not accuse him of deliberately spreading falsehood: only of being irrelevant, only of issuing what he calls, with charming condescension, '*nice statements*'. '*We'll put them in the folder,*' he says, '*and consider them as part of a long tradition which has survived worse things than this.*' But bluntly, as for accepting the Holy Father's Credo as imposing an obligation to use it in the teaching of authentic Christian Doctrine Brother Moran. describes that as '*intellectually dishonest*'.

Here he has raised the real issue. It deals with intellectual dishonesty the Church today. And the plain, ugly fact is that there are all too many now teaching in our Catholic schools and instructing our catechetical classes who either hang very loose to any recognizable formulation of Catholic doctrine, or who blindly ignore the positive defined dogmas of the faith.

They would empty out the whole theological content of the texts put into the hands of our children under some persuasion that they are thus serving a '*formational, non-doctrinal pedagogy*', a substitution of a miserable part for the divinely given whole.

And for this to be done in the name of the Church, in open disregard for the teachings of the Holy Father and the universal episcopate, often in sheer contempt for the doctrinal bases of the Christian faith is nothing less than flagrant intellectual dishonesty. It is peddling Modernism under the Catholic name, Liberal Protestantism in the thinnest guise of methodology.

Time was when the Church referred such aberrations to the Holy Office, now restructured as the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. But the Congregation today makes few attempts to police the teaching of doctrine throughout the Christian world.

It prefers to rely on the integrity of teachers everywhere, on their decency and honour - on their intellectual honesty.

## **APPENDIX 8**

### **The 'Penny Catechism'**

## That 'Penny Catechism'

by M.A. McGarvey

*'Those engaged in the work of Christian education' (this, by the way, is a quotation) 'see enough in the present day to make them anxious. The dangers to which young people are exposed in regard to their faith are already very serious; and there is a prospect of their becoming more so. It is a great safeguard if they have a thorough and intelligent knowledge of their religion.... there is no reason why the scholar should not be as much interested in the subject of religion as in other subjects - if only it is taught as methodically, skilfully and thoroughly as they are.'*

This is what we heard not very long ago, when religious education (like secular education) was given a new look. My quotation is however from a book written in 1892, *The Catechumen - An Aid to the Intelligent Knowledge of the Catechism* by J.G. Wehnam.

And now, a more recent quotation:

*'This catechism is especially suited to the present day, when the pursuit of material interests, self-indulgence, and pleasure engross the attention of so many. This catechism is nothing more or less than an abstract of Our Lord's teaching, and may be called a guidebook for the Christian on the road to Heaven. The state of society and the spirit of the age have been taken into consideration in the preparation of this book - to combat the self-seeking, pleasure-loving materialism of the day. '(1899, this one: *The catechism explained*, by Rev. Francis Spirago.)*

And one last introductory quotation:

*'We must agree with those who hold that the main cause of the present lassitude and torpor, and of the most serious evils that flow from it, is to be found in the prevailing ignorance of divine things... the teaching of the catechism, when properly done, never fails to be of profit to those who listen to it. '(St. Pius X., in his Encyclical letter 1905)*

Until a few years ago, the old 'Penny Catechism' was an essential part of Catholic life. It was in the home, the school, the presbytery. The convert studied it. The teachers and the children knew it by heart. It held a place of honour. Then, suddenly, it became almost an object of scorn, contempt. What happened?

Catholic bishops, priests, teachers, and parents were becoming increasingly aware of 'the leakage'. Children were leaving the school allegedly well versed in the contents of the catechism. They knew it, it was claimed, having learned the questions and answers 'parrot-fashion'. Yet, despite their knowledge, they were either giving up the practice of the faith once they left school, or had already given it up, while continuing to recite the time-worn, dull loveless words of the catechism during their last boring years of religious instruction in the Catholic school. And the catechism-type religious education was largely blamed for the leakage.

Parallel with this criticism, was the statement that, whereas in other subjects great strides had been made, new and interesting methods of presentation had been developed and introduced, religious education had stood still. The teaching of history, geography, maths, reading and the rest had been up-dated, modernised, modified, and subjected to numerous experiments so as to compete successfully, for the attention of the children, with what the mass-media were putting across. So, two things happened. Massive and enthusiastic efforts were made to do for religious

education what had been done for secular education, at primary and secondary level. And the poor old 'penny catechism' was relegated to the museum.

Now here, I believe, many people (some of whom were not teachers) followed a pedagogical will o' the wisp. It was assumed that because certain trends, methods, approaches, attitudes were being widely adopted in primary and secondary schools all this must be good, and must be imitated. And many of the people who exercised pressure on those involved in religious education to jump on the progressive bandwagon had already been instrumental in inaugurating the new improved look in education generally. I believe that the *Black Paper*<sup>49</sup> was right. There, A.M. Hardie wrote:

*'I believe the pundits have been trying so hard to dissolve early difficulties that they have emasculated primary education, and given the child a completely false impression (if a cosy one) of what lies ahead. Much of this nebulous teaching is carried out under a plea for self-expression, in the mistaken idea that children should not be compelled to learn anything unless they are ready and willing to do so. Later we hear "maths can be fun", "art is fun".... to inculcate the notion that the whole discipline is fun, reducing it, in the childish mind, to the level of snakes and ladders, is to court disaster, unless the groundwork is very carefully laid, amid all this "fun-making".' The same Black Paper relates what was overheard in a college of education: "At primary school, children are taught nothing: at secondary school they discuss what they have been taught." And Angus Maude, writing of the 'Egalitarian', states: 'He will advocate a variety of new teaching methods which, in fact, absolve anyone from teaching, and anyone from having to learn.'*

So, for all the excellence of the efforts of those who saw religious education in this new, exciting, and interesting way, the lack of real, solid knowledge (such as there was in the old catechism days) was soon seen to be lacking. The new visual and audio-visual aids began to appear to be ends in themselves rather than aids. There appeared a tendency to forget the essential task of the priest, the teacher, the parent, which is to ensure a knowledge of the truths of the faith hand in hand with its practice.

It must admittedly remain a matter of taste whether or not the Beatles, the Rolling Stones and the rest produce good music. And I must admit that a religious lesson which begins with a most dreadful noise of apparently demented young people howling against a background of drums and guitars may well be a good and profitable religious lesson. But it has also been noticed that many who use this type of aid show more anxiety to entertain than to instruct.

Coming back to the catechism, its rejection seems most final and complete among those who reject lots of other things - such as authority in the Church, the teaching of the Vicar of Christ on vital matters of faith and morals, Original Sin, even sin itself. A passionate love for The North Vietnamese, an active and even generous support of Oxfam, and an enthusiasm for banning the bomb seem to many much more important than a factual knowledge of the truths of the Catholic faith.

There are two mistaken notions quite common, even among teachers. One is that the catechism was something instituted by the Council of Trent. The other is that the catechetical movement was inaugurated by Fr. Hoffinger. The truth is that from the very earliest days of the Church devoted men have produced catechisms, and equally devoted men have tried to produce better catechisms. The council of Trent did in fact, propose a universal catechism. For a variety of reasons this was not done. But the Council did decree that it is the solemn duty of the parish

---

<sup>49</sup> Reveiwed by G.A. Lawman in *Approaches* no. 19.

priest to ensure that the children and adults of his parish be taught the catechism - the catechism being the one approved by the bishop of the particular diocese.

The catechetical movement began not with Fr. Hoffinger but with Christ. He preached the gospel, the good news, the truth. He told his followers to do likewise. There has been, since the war, and especially since the Second Vatican Council, a renewal of the catechetical movement. Along with the excellent work in this field there have, unfortunately, been some undesirable developments. Masses of books and booklets have poured, and are pouring, into the schools which have the very fault underlined in the *Black Paper*: *'in the schools we now begin by doing too little too early, and end by trying to do far too much too late.'*

I contend that it was wrong to assume that the leakage was due to the traditional use of the catechism. If it be argued that no such assumption was made I must reply that it was made and is still being made. A university chaplain within the last few weeks wrote: (of the university students' unapproachability, mentally)

*'One of the saddest commentaries on much of the religious education they have had before coming here is that there is nothing to build on in all too many cases, and in fact it has made them mentally unapproachable. Because the old catechism was used in their day, and is still used in some Grammar schools, together with older books, like Sheehan's Apologetics, and Howard & Ingram, many students just assume there has been no change...'*

One of the catechism's worst crimes seems to have been that it is in question and answer form. This is, it seems, dull, unimaginative, stupifying, antiquated, scholastic, savouring of ancient Greece and Rome. And yet, there is something to be said for the question and answer method. To condemn the method out of hand is to neglect tradition. We are told: Our Lord used the parable. He did. But not exclusively. He also employed the question method: *'What do you think of Christ? Whose son is He? Whom do men say that the Son of Man is? Whom do you say that I am? Which of these was neighbour to him who fell among robbers?'* And, in my experience and in that of many other teachers, children like to be asked precise questions, and take pride in giving correct answers. I think the old religious examination was a very good thing. By and large, teachers and children liked the system. It was a spur to effort over the whole year - with a spurt towards the end.

Well, to wind up my thesis. What, indeed is it? The old catechism had many advantages as a *vademecum* for pupil, priest, child, parent, convert. (I can tell you this: it is still widely used in Catholic schools.) There was a leakage, from the Church in the old catechism days, I admit. But in those days you did not meet the problem, as a head teacher, of young teachers coming from training college and saying: *'I did divinity at college, but I do not want to teach religion'*, and *'I don't know what to teach'*. I don't remember in the bad old days hearing what I heard a young teacher say at a teachers' discussion group meeting recently: *'As far as the hosts left over after Mass are concerned, they could be trampled on as far as I'm concerned: for me Holy Communion is something personal.'*

So, let us have a catechism. I do not say, *'Reprint the same catechism, returning to square one.'* No. Let us keep on trying to make religious education as interesting and attractive as we can, with our new-found aids, visual, audio-visual, and every other kind. Let us stimulate the interest of our young people in others, in the relief of suffering, in the banning of war, the promotion of peace. But let us have a catechism, a systematic exposition of the doctrines of the Catholic Church, let us teach and teach directly the laws of God.

Bishop Harris told a good story some time ago - of a man who had spent his life in and out of prison. Very old and near death he answered the prison chaplain who suggested, tentatively, that

he might like to receive the last sacraments, by quoting what he had obviously learnt parrot-fashion: 'Doesn't it say ...Is any man sick among you let them bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord.' That old penny catechism had its points.

### **Catechetics S.O.S.**

(The following S.O.S. has been sent to all Scottish Bishops, and also to a number of English Bishops, by the distinguished Jesuit Father Alexander GITS.)

*'The removal of the Penny Catechism from our primary schools seems to be a major disaster. The teachers in the first place are puzzled and confused. The Catechism was for them a short, concise, definite and reliable handbook; to take away the Catechism is like "removing the railway lines from under a train". The result is that definite religious instruction tends to peter out e.g. the children no longer know the Apostles Creed nor the Ten Commandments nor the Seven Sacraments.*

*'The alleged misuse of the Catechism in some cases is surely no argument for its abolition. The innovators seem to decry the learning by heart of phrases not fully understood by the children despite the fact that this is precisely the way that children use in learning to talk. If they never learn by heart they cannot join in social prayer nor in public hymn singing. The reformers think that children should not be allowed to pray in words that they do not understand. This thought seems to spring from lack of Faith. Does not our Father understand the prayer? Is the child to be forbidden to say the Our Father because he does not understand the words? Christ did not say this.*

*'The schemes of religious education now placed before the teachers are so vague and complicated as to be worse than useless. They seem to emanate from modernist sources; for example young children are not to hear of mortal sin, Hell, angels or devils; they are not to learn prayers by heart; they are to use baby-language in prayer. Would it not be wiser to leave all these things to the common sense of parents and teachers? The real judge in these matters should be the parish priest.*

*'Unless our spiritual authorities come to the rescue religious training will disappear from our schools very rapidly, especially in the junior classes.'*



## **'Freedom of opinion'**

*'The blunt truth is that on matters pronounced upon decisively by Our Lord his hearers were required to forego freedom of opinion. To say less than this would be to misrepresent. The faith he demanded was recognition that the Father had delivered all things to him (Matt. 11. 27, etc.) and had "shown him all things" (John 5, 20), that he "knows all things" (John 16, 30, etc.). It was the faith of Peter: "Lord to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed and have known that thou art the Christ, the Son of God" (John 6, 69-70). While natural religion involves a general commitment to what one may identify as the will of God, acceptance of the revealed religion of Christ means a comprehensive submission to his interpretation of moral law. '*

The Most Rev. W.J.Philbin in 'Does Conscience Decide?', Irish C.T.S.

## **APPENDIX 9**

### **Bibliography**

## Recommended Reference books and textbooks.

### Basic Course in Catholic Doctrine

The following books provide a comprehensive summary of the authentic Catholic faith and a revealing contrast to the travesty presented in the '*Dutch Catechism*'. Although some might appear rather expensive this would not be the case if purchased collectively for use by groups of parents and teachers. For school use they could be ordered in the normal way.

*Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, by L.Ott, Mercier Press,

This provides a complete summary of Catholic teaching for lay people wishing to have access to a reasonably advanced summary of doctrine. Its most valuable asset is that the degree of theological certainty is provided for each doctrine, enabling us to discover whether it is *De Fide* and must be believed or simply a pious opinion. With over 550 pages it is actually cheap when compared with numerous books containing less than 200 pages of verbiage issued by 'Catholic' publishers for half as much.

*The Teaching of the Catholic Church*, Edited by Karl Rahner, Mercier Press

Throughout Ott's book, and in most theological text books, there are found references to '*Denzinger*'. This is the standard collection of source material from which our doctrinal teaching is drawn, (conciliar decrees, papal encyclicals, etc.). An excellent selection is contained in this book which most usefully complements '*Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*'.

*The Catechism of Modern Man*, St. Paul Publications.

This volume is a post-Conciliar statement of the authentic Faith in Catechetical form. It is written in the language of Vatican II and related post-Conciliar documents. Complete documentation, Study or Discussion Questions, Bibliographical List.

*Catechism of Vatican II*, St. Paul Publications. A handbook of the whole teaching of the Council. Over 600 questions covering various aspects of Christian teaching, life, and work, with unabridged answers from Council Documents.

*The Faith we Live By*, St. Paul Publications. A most readable and attractive commentary on the '*Credo of the People of God*' showing how its teaching must be translated into terms of living faith.

Pope Paul VI's *Credo of the People of God*, C.T.S.

This most perfect summary of Catholic teaching in the light of the Council should be known virtually by heart by teachers and parents concerned with orthodox teaching.

*A Catechism of Christian Doctrine*, C.T.S. Despite the price this is the '*Penny Catechism*', still as reliable and relevant as ever. In no sense whatsoever can any of its answers be classified as '*out of date*'.

### Books for use with children.

*Catholic Children's Bible*. Paul Hamlyn. This is the only Bible for Catholic children which can be recommended without reservation.

It has been criticised for its traditional illustrations but surveys with children reveal that these are preferred by at least 95 per cent as compared with others in '*contemporary*' mode. The '*Bible for*

*Young Christians*, by Rosemary Haughton (G. Chapman) and *The Bible for Children* series by H. Swanston (Burns & Oates) are to be particularly avoided. The text and illustrations are unsuitable and the doctrinal emphasis dubious in places.

The value of the *'Penny Catechism'* as a basis for consolidating what has been learned in any course of instruction at Primary or secondary level is obvious. It is indispensable as ever.

The best series available for primary children is the *'Dublin Catechism'*, the *'Word of Truth'* series. It is particularly valuable as text books which the children can use. It is not simply an outline syllabus for the teacher. There are four books covering all ages in the Primary school. M.H. Gill & Son Ltd. Dublin.

For secondary schools there is no complete course of text books still in print in this country. *'The Faith we Live by'* has already been mentioned. To this may be added:

*The St. Peter Catechism*, Print Organisation.

This is an experimental catechism compiled by a team of teachers with 669 questions. It is most orthodox and criticisms are requests. Obtainable from *APPROACHES* for 2s post free.

*Our Lord's Church & Her Message*, St. Paul Publications. (by Canon Drinkwater) All the disputed doctrines of the present time are presented here in a contemporary but clearly orthodox manner. Original sin, hell, Satan, angels, the sacrificial nature of the Mass, the atonement, Papal Primacy, the Real Presence, purgatory, the separate soul: are all included. There is still a good deal of room for improvement and clarification in certain places but in the hands of an orthodox teacher these weaknesses would present no problem. The authority of the Pope's ordinary magisterium needs clarifying (this is well presented in *'The Catechism of Vatican II'*), mention should be made of the fact that an offering was made at the Last Supper (Denzinger 938), and some would consider the list of *'open questions'* somewhat too liberal. It is, however, better than anything else available for secondary children and could provide the basis of a very sound course in the home, school, or parish.

The following two series printed in the U.S.A. have been highly recommended by all the organisations of American teachers and parents concerned with Orthodoxy in religious education.

*The New St. Joseph Baltimore Catechism*, H.R. Mercer Books.

This catechism is faithful to tradition and the truths of the Catholic Faith, is clearly explained and beautifully illustrated.

In 3 Books for ages 5 to 13.

Sales of this series leapt from 10,000 in 1968 to 250,000 in 1969 as more and more Catholic parents in the U.S.A. decided to take the religious education of their children into their own hands.

*The 'Faith of Our Fathers'*, textbook series. The E.E. Lohmann Company.

Each textbook explores and explains one subject of traditional Catholic instruction and relates it to our changing world. Prepared by the Archdiocesan Director of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, the Rt. Rev. Msgr. R.G. Bandas, Ph.D., S.T.D.

1. *First Confession and Holy Communion* for ages 5 to 8.
2. *The Life of the Blessed Saviour* for ages 5 to 8.
3. *The Commandments of God and Precepts of the Church* - for ages 9 to 11.

4. *The Mass and the Sacraments* - for ages 9 to 11.
5. *The Promise of the Redeemer; Bible History, Old Testament* - for ages 12 to 13.
6. *The Life of Christ and the Apostles Creed* for ages 12 to 13.
7. *Church History, Saints Through the Ages.* for ages 12 to 13.
8. *Christ, the Light of the World* (teenagers' problems) - age 14.
9. *Christ, the Truth* (Apostles Creed) - age 15.
10. *Christ the Life.* (Sacraments & the Mass) age 16.
11. *Christ the Way* (The Commandments and Precepts) - age 17.196.
12. *Modern Questions in the Light of Vatican II* - age 16 + .

## **Visual Aids**

Particularly recommended are the '*Illustrative Catechetical Scenes*' produced by the Salesian Catechetical Centre, Hong Kong.

These like the textbook series '*Catechetical Scenes*' (in 18 volumes) also produced by the Hong Kong Catechetical Centre are three-dimensional and were highly commended by Pope Pius XII.

### **Supplementary literature**

#### **I. Literature on the nature of God, the Trinity, Incarnation & divinity of Christ.**

F.J. Ripley. *The Blessed Trinity and the Life of the Soul.*- C.T.S.

F.J. Ripley. *Christ is God.* C.T.S.

R.P. Redmond, D.D. *The Existence of God.* C.T.S.

F.J. Ripley. *God.* C.T.S.

Mother Mary Agnellus. *The Blessed Trinity.* C.T.S.

Daughters of St Paul. *The Faith We Live By.*

Roland Potter, O.P. *Creator and Creation.* C.T.S.

J. McKee, B.A. *God Stares You in the Eye.* C.T.S.

#### **2. Original Sin, Atonement & Redemption**

F.J. Ripley. *The Fall of Man.* C.T.S.

Pius XII. *Humani Generis.* C.T.S.

Mgr. P.E. Hallett. *Why Christ Died.* C.T.S.

Roland Potter, O.P. *The First Sin.* C.T.S.

#### **3. Nature of Christ's Church.**

Pius XII. *Mystici Corporis Christi.* CTS

F.J. Ripley. *The Church Christ Founded.* C.T.S.

Vatican II. *Lumen Gentium*. C.T.S.

Vatican II. *Die Verbum*. C.T.S.

Vatican II. *Dignitatis humanae*. C.T.S.

Paul VI. *Ecclesiam Suam*. C.T.S.

Daughters of St Paul. *Visible Community of Love*.

### **Authority of the Magisterium**

As for section 3 plus

Bishop Gordon Wheeler. *Let's get this straight*. C.T.S.

David Knowles. *Authority*. C.T.S.

David Knowles. *Peter has spoken*. C.T.S.

### **On various other doctrines disputed by neo-Modernists**

'*The Fall of Man*' and '*Humani Generis*' plus: '*Satan*' by E.K. Taylor. C.T.S.

R.L. Stewart. *Catholic Belief*. C.T.S.

Bishop Wheeler. *Let's Get This Straight*. C.T.S.

Doctor Lynch. *Catholic Marriage*. Corgi Book.

A Catholic Mother. *Facing up to 'Humanae Vitae'* C.T.S.

Daughters of St Paul. *Looking Ahead to Marriage*.

Dom P. Flood. *Abortion*. C.T.S.

### **The Priesthood.**

'*Lumen Gentium*' plus:

*Ad Catholici Sacerdotii* (Pius XI) C.T.S.

Vatican II. *De Presbyterorum Ministerio*. C.T.S.

### **The Mass.**

Pius XII. *Mediator Dei*. C.T.S. A firm grasp of this encyclical is all that is really necessary. It should be studied rather than read, and then re-studied and studied again. The other recommended titles derive merit in so far as they reflect the teaching of '*Mediator Dei*'.

*Paul VI Mysterium Fidei*. C.T.S.

*Instruction (of Vatican II) on the worship of the Eucharistic Mystery*. C.T.S.

(Shows very clearly how nothing essential has changed.)

F. Clark. *A 'New Theology' of the Real presence*. C.T.S.

### **A few general titles:**

K. Adam, *'The Spirit of Catholicism'*, Sheed and Ward. (This is probably still the best exposition of the title available.)

Sheed, *'Is it the Same Church?'*, Sheed and Ward.

A. Von Hildebrand, *'Trojan Horse in the City of God'*. Sandss. (This is a brilliant assessment of the neo-modernist assault on the Church.)

J. Maritain, *'The Peasant of the Garonne'*, Chapman. This book is valuable for its exposure of the philosophical errors of neo-modernism but is not easy reading. To be borrowed from the library before purchase. This also applies to E. Holloway's *Catholicism - A New Synthesis*, Keyway Books. Traditional Catholic doctrines are vindicated in the light of philosophy and modern science. (This is a most valuable book but it is very hard reading.)

### **Periodicals**

The following are all worthwhile obtaining and by no means too expensive, especially if purchased for use by a group would be cheap.

*The Keys* (This review should be on the Church press table.)

*The Association of St. Peter..*

*The Catholic Priests Association Newsletter.*

*'Faith'*.

*'The Wanderer'* - It is well worth the trouble of ordering this journal which has an extensive coverage on catechetical matters.

*'Triumph'* - It is the only orthodox monthly review published in the U.S.A. It has produced some invaluable studies in depth of various questions. Particularly noteworthy is its study *'Sex Education'*.

*Christian Order* - Edited by the Rev. Paul Crane, S.J.

## **APPENDIX 10**

### **BY THEIR FRUITS ...**

An appraisal of the 'new' theology and the 'new' catechetics in terms of the ravages wrought....as revealed by a random selection of cuttings from the press of several English-speaking nations.

## In the U.S.A.

'Statistics released by the 1970 Official Catholic Directory [in the USA] indicate the loss of more than three-quarters of a million Catholics during 1969.... an apparent loss of 779,797 individuals who no longer are listed on official Catholic rolls...

'Converts decreased by more than ten per cent to 92,670....

'Catholic college and university enrolments decreased by 4,843 students....

'There were six hundred and six fewer educational institutions. Full-time pupils in Catholic elementary and high schools.... declined 6.2 per cent in one year and 10.2 per cent in two years, for a numerical drop of 313,252....

'Diocesan priests in the United States decreased one hundred and eighty-two....while priests of religious orders shrank by two hundred and forty-six...

'Orders of Religious Brothers reported a loss of one hundred and thirty-two...

'Sisters showed the largest decline, losing 6236 women....

'Among institutions, there were three hundred and eighty-three fewer places where Mass is celebrated; forty-three fewer seminaries with 5084 fewer seminarians....; nine fewer hospitals; nineteen fewer nursing schools; and ten fewer homes for the aged and invalid.'

ooooooooOooooo

'Catholic newspapers and magazines in the U.S.A. and Canada lost more than two million subscribers during 1968...

'The figures were reported in the 1969-70 edition of the Catholic Press Directory'.

ooooooooOooooo

'Forty-two per cent of the U.S. adults in 1969 attended church in a typical week, seven per cent less than in 1958, according to a recent Gallup Poll.

'Church attendance steadily declined over the eleven-year period, the survey organisation said...

'Gallup reported that the fall-off was twice as great among Catholics as among Protestants. The Catholic decline was from seventy-four per cent adult attendance in 1958 to sixty-three per cent in 1969.'

ooooooooOooooo

'The 1970 official Catholic Directory of the U.S.A. reports that the number of Catholics in the U.S.A. fell last year for the first time since 1900.'

ooooooooOooooo

'Church attendance by American Catholics declined by 11 per cent between 1958 and 1969, from 74 to 63 per cent, according to a Gallup Poll survey published in Princeton, New Jersey..

ooooooooOooooo

## **In the U.K.**

*'Because of the lack of vocations, the Sacred Heart Fathers are to close down their juniorate at Woodcote Hall, Newport, Shropshire, in July, 1970 and develop it as a residential youth training centre for Shrewsbury diocese.'*

ooooooooOooooo

*'A decline in the estimated Roman Catholic Population of England and Wales is revealed in the 1970 edition of the "Catholic Directory"....*

*'The wider use of some form of birth control in Catholic marriages is thought to be having its effect....'*

ooooooooOooooo

*'The number of conversions in 1968 was the lowest recorded for over 50 years, although the Catholic population has more than doubled in that time.'*

ooooooooOooooo

## **In France**

*'The number of men entering senior seminaries in France has dropped 41 per cent in the past year, Cardinal Renard of Lyons reports... 475 candidates had entered France's senior seminaries in 1969, compared with 811 in 1968.'*

ooooooooOooooo

## **Internationally**

*'The number of young men in Western countries training to become priests has fallen by about 20,000 in only three years, according to statistics published by the Vatican ...the number of seminarists at the end of 1968 was 146,996, compared with more than 166,000 in 1965.'*

ooooooooOooooo

## **In 'reactionary' Poland**

*'Vocations to the priesthood continue to rise in Poland.'*

*'So far this year 1970, 743 students have been enrolled in diocesan seminaries. New enrolments in 1969 totalled 706.'*

*'Currently there are 3327 students of theology in the diocesan seminaries and 998 candidates for the priesthood in religious orders.'*

*'There are 385 seminarians doing their military service.'*

## **Dogmatic intolerance a moral duty**

*'When ideas are in conflict, when truth is fighting against error, and revelation against human ingenuity, then there can be no compromise and no indulgence. If Our Lord had exercised such indulgence, He would not have been crucified. When He called the Pharisees whited sepulchres and a brood of vipers, and Herod a fox, He was not inspired by any sort of hatred against individuals, but by the tremendous earnestness of truth. It was his defiant and vivid conviction of responsibility for eternal truth that caused Him to use such strong words towards error and its representatives. And if we do not fight thus for the truth, then we lose all moral and spiritual power, we become characterless, we disown God. Dogmatic intolerance is therefore a moral duty, a duty to the infinite 'truth and to truthfulness.'*

K. Adam in *'The Spirit of Catholicism'*, pp.203-204, Unicorn Books edition.