The flame that was fanned by an
coldness has possessed the mind of a
nation. But let it not be overlooked
that their minds and hearts accepted
the heat of that flame. This strange
and insidious social climate was to
spread beyond the Fatherland.

Another social climate is with us
today. It has to do with another group
of lives, the unborn. This strange
atmosphere spread beyond the Fatherland.

It has to do with another group
this attitude
toward human life. The essentials of
certain rights concerning my life. I
have
to eliminate whatever or whomever
trespasses on my right. I have a right
to take as
pressure, sickness, worry and work as
eliminate whatever or whomever
much food, sex and fun out of this
world as I can. I have a right to

Justification for this attitude is
first.

These ideas actually take a practical
and very appealing form. They appear
as human efforts to correct man's
failures in cases of incest and rape, to
combat the ravages of infections and
serve as an antidote to the crippling
after-effects of some wonder drug. The
justification for this attitude is
concern for the mental and physical
health of the parents. The reasoning:
oner's health is more important
than another's life.

Hatred is something supple and
evasive. It can change form and move
in different directions. It did not
spend itself with the annihilation of
the Kiev Jews. It was present as a final
sporting gesture for the Dynamo
Soccer Team that the combined
German athletes could not defeat in
several games. Their prize was to taste
the dirt of Babi Yar. The undefeated
Roman gladiator fared better. Hatred
also rode the deadly "Gasemagen" to
the gully from which the soldiery, looted
harlotry were carried to the furnace,
supposedly gassed. But the dead do
not snore and the prisoners reported
snorers.

Even Titus did not behave like this.
Titus was Kuznetsov's cat. I did not
lose a pound in three years. He, too,
was a killer, but an understandable
one. He killed for food. He survived.
He was an animal, and the kill for
survival was natural for him. The
killing around him was more natural.
The human beings of his time were not
killed for food or in self-defense. He
must have wondered.

It is true that no monument stands
over Babi Yar. What monument would
be proper? A stone? A flag? And what
inscription would we put on it? Could
we not say: "Here lies the remnant
of the innocent"? For all we know,
nothing remains. The evidence is gone.
Perhaps no physical monument could
be erected to bear witness to the awful
truth of Babi Yar.

But I believe we can have a
monument. We have a perpetual
reminder. It is a simple statistic. One
every four potential babies will
be destroyed by another wish this
year. We will attempt to simplify it.

We march bravely to the cadence of
the modern beat. We are on step with
the changing mores, the new social
climate. We do not want to hear about
Babi Yar. It is too threatening. It is
too pertinent. It was only a generation
ago and we shrink from the thought of
it. We live for now and the fun of now.
We want comfort and life. We abhor
the thought of death.

We will kill our own kind of life at
the rate of 20 million lives this year.
Our monument to Babi Yar is murder.
often, Pope Paul's is a solitary voice. As bishops we cannot simply abandon our duty as teachers of the Faith and pass it to the theologians. We must make sure that when they propose a new presentation of the doctrine — and sometimes these are excellent — they clearly and without subterfuge show that their speculations are in line with accepted doctrine.

This speech was in no way an attack on theologians. On the contrary. Earlier in the speech I had said:

"Before discussing errors this Synod should say a word in praise of the many theologians who are working to present Catholic teaching in a way people can grasp. This is hard work and is not without its dangers. Nevertheless, it is work which the Church must not neglect. If we are to preach the Gospel to the men and women of our time we must use language which they find intelligible. But if we praise those earnestly seeking a new language for the ancient truths of Faith, what are we to say of those who admit no limit to theological speculation? Some who lack any deep formation in theology do not hesitate to write on the subject and thereby cause great harm to souls. These writings need to be put in their place, but this should not distract us from our main task of helping genuine theologians. We propose that a commission be set up consisting of theologians representing every school of thought."

We bishops are exercising the magisterium with an unsure touch. To question brash theological opinion has become increasingly hazardous. No wise bishop courts popularity for its own sake but, if only to preserve his authority with his clergy and people, he wants to eschew the reputation of being reactionary. Unfortunately, if a bishop criticises brash theological opinion today he is said to be curantist. The magisterium is thought unenlightened whenever a question of novel interpretations of Catholic doctrine.

Like "hierarchy," the word "magisterium" has acquired an unattractive flavour. This may well be because in the past the magisterium was more often used to demand that to encourage and guide, in the value of having a magisterium recognised by thoughtful Catholics. Only last week I received a letter from a lecturer in technology. He had been converted four years ago. He continues: "The attack on the Ecclesia docens (and, of course, the Blessed Sacrament) is most unjust, because it is made by the enemy within. It is reported as coming from the work of the Council and replacing it with a caricature council. When I was an atheist I had a horror of imprimatur... When I became a Catholic, I found the imprimatur a great help while I was yet fumbling. But I soon made the discovery that nowadays an imprimatur means nothing necessarily; the grossest errors and heretical teachings have received imprimatur during the last few years. Most of the theologians writing today are — I say it bluntly — either conscious or unconscious enemies of the Church, they sow doubt and confusion in the minds of the faithful and in that passion for change, motivated by an abject human respect, they attack the very foundations of the Church."

RISKY THEOLOGY

New versions of old doctrines are creating the greatest problems for the magisterium. Christology, ecclesiology, the Eucharist and ecumenism are the chief fields of innovation. Analysing the fashionable trend among Catholic writers, it seems likely that their views are polarised by an inadequate notion of ecumenism. When they suggest, for example, that Christ is present in the Eucharist more or less in the same way as in the sick, the poor and the whole flock, they probably believe that they make the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence more palatable to those outside the Church.

The Vatican Council did not countenance this kind of approach. In the Instruction on the Eucharistic Mystery which explains the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy we read:

"In this sacrament Christ is present in a unique way, whole and entire, God and man, substantially and permanently. This presence of Christ under the species is called the Real Presence not in any exclusive sense as though the other forms of presence were not real but by reason of its excellence."

The report of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Commission on Intercommunion (May, 1968) mentions the traditional hesitation of Anglicans to "contemplate fellowship with Roman Catholics in the Mass." A footnote refers to 28 and 31 of the Articles of Religion. The first rejects as "repugnant to the plain words of scripture" both the change of the blessed Sacrament with Eucharistic doctrine has begun to do, it would be necessary to reassess this hesitation. Meanwhile, the doctrinal experiments of Roman Catholic theologians in connection with Eucharistic doctrine merit the closest attention." (Intercommunion Today, p. 50. my italics.)

The Eucharist serves as a useful illustration, but ecumenism is equally relevant. The Tablet for 17 February 1968 reports that the rabbis of Toronto regard Fr. Gregory Baum's writings as a "break-through in Roman Catholic teaching." Fr. Baum is a kindly, warm-hearted man, a convert from an agnostic Jewish family. He is reported as saying that it is no longer right to preach the Gospel to the Jews.

The Council's Decree on Ecumenism, however, declares that ecumenism is not intended as a substitute for evangelisation:

There is clearly an essential distinction between the work of preparing and reconciling individuals who desire full communion with the Catholic Church, and the ecumenical undertaking. There is no conflict between them, for they are both the development of the admirable plan of God. (Chapter I, section 4.)

This is, of course, understood by both Jews and Protestants. They obviously do not accept it but they recognise the Catholic claim to be the one true Church. What they rightly resent is any use of the ecumenical dialogue as a cloak for proselytism.
They respect us for making an honest statement of our convictions. "The claim of unicity," wrote Bishop Butler in *The Tablet* of May 4, "is absolutely basic to Catholicism." The bishop is one of the great theologians and ecumenists of our day. The tragedy is that popular theology is so often written by men of lesser erudition.

**THE DANGERS OF THE COUNCIL**

What use will students of the future find for the works of Billot, Franzelin, Bellarmine, Alphonsus, Aquinas, Ambrose or Augustine? They may be of interest only to antiquarians. Preconciliar theology is almost completely at a discount. I often wonder what Pope John would have thought had he been able to foresee that his Council would provide an excuse for rejecting so much of the Catholic doctrine which he whole-heartedly accepted. Pope Paul may have had this in mind when on 3 April this year he spoke to an international audience largely composed of students:

The word of Christ is no longer the truth which never changes, ever living, radiant and fruitful, even though at times beyond our understanding. It becomes a partial truth and is thus deprived of all objective validity and transcendent authority. It will be said that the Council authorized such treatment of traditional teaching. Nothing is more false, if we are to accept the work of Pope John who launched that agiornamento in whose name some dare to impose on Catholic dogma dangerous and sometimes reckless interpretations.

The Pope did not specify what are these dangerous and reckless interpretations. It is not papal custom to do so on such occasions. Before the Council it was the duty of the Holy Office to inform the bishops of deviations in theological writing. But the Holy Office became so unpopular during the Council that successively even its name was changed. Art without guidance from the Holy See it is virtually impossible for diocesan bishops to condemn risque theology. They authorise publications, books in their own dioceses but there are not in a position to evaluate new theological views. That is the task of the supreme authority of the Church.

Meanwhile the magisterium languishes, because if the Holy See were to condemn every dangerous piece of current writing an author would disappear in a cloud of anathemas. Traditionally the Church allows opinion on matters before expressing approval or condemnation of theological speculations. The Church will not be able to give verdicts on the theologians arising from the Second Vatican Council much before the end of the century. The deeper meaning of the Council's teaching will appear only after study of what preceded the promulgation of the Council's decree. There are hundreds of papers in the Vatican archives which presumably will reveal to scholars of the future the proceedings in seven commission meetings. Clerical journalists have described the intrigues and quarrels which led to the acceptance or rejection of conciliar documents. The most significant activities within commissions have not yet been fully revealed. The framing of amendments for the vote of the Fathers was the most delicate part of a commission's work. A determined group could work down opposition and produce a formula patient of both an orthodox and modernistic interpretation.

Theologians of tomorrow will know more about the Council than those who took part.

**BIRTH CONTROL**

There is a more potent reason why the ordinary magisterium seems to have lost its nerve. The voices of the bishops are hampered mainly as a result of the universal confusion concerning contraception. Confessors, penitents and doctors repeatedly seek guidance which the shepherds of the flock are unable to provide because the Pope has asked them to do no more than repeat the teaching laid down in recent papal documents. The Pope has declared that this teaching must be followed until he feels obliged in conscience to change it.

It is important to remember that it was the Pope personally who reserved this matter to himself. I was surprised to read in *Fr. Murphy's* article last week that the "bishops are to be held blameworthy for the misery of Catholic couples whose number is legion. . . . Their plight seems to be callously neglected by the members of the Church's magisterium who have decided to hold this traditional line no matter what the cost." "A large number of Catholics," Fr. Murphy adds, "are convinced that the magisterium is dragging its feet on this issue. Apostolic Catholics feel themselves betrayed by the failure of responsible members of the magisterium to solve the problem in the light of the progressive stand taken by the Vatican Council over the nature of marriage . . . The failure of the hierarchy to involve itself explicitly in the argument is all but criminal (my italics). Leaving the burden solely in the hands of the Pope does not, under the present circumstances, seem right or proper."

It happens that Fr. Francis Xavier Murphy is an old friend of mine. He knows well that the bishops did not choose to leave the burden solely in the hands of the Pope. I refer him to that splendid book *The Third Session* by Xavier Rynne (p. 128) where the distinguished author says: "The Holy Father has reserved to himself a final decision in this matter." The option of defying the Pope is tempting to bishops and, indeed, has been adopted by some. The majority, however, believe that they would give a poor example to their flock if they withheld obedience. Their reluctance to take the initiative does not demonstrate a lack of compassion.

Until the Pope gives the promised guidance, most bishops will continue to act with restraint. Every day their task becomes more difficult. The Pope has said that the doctrine of the Church is not in doubt. This does little to console the millions of Catholics who believe that although the teaching of Pius XI and Pius XII still holds the field a new interpretation is bound eventually to be approved by the Holy See. If indeed the old principles are to be adapted to the changed conditions of our time, Catholics resent this prolonged period of suspense.

The dilemma of the Holy Father is more complex than readers of last week's *Tablet* might gather. When Pope Paul withdrew contraception from the Council debates, he doubtless believed that a commission of theologians, doctors and scientists would soon give him the facts he needed for his statement. When their advice was not forthcoming he grew anxious and pressed them to make more haste. With the passing of the months he was to learn that neither theologians nor laity could decide unanimously.
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The publication of the so-called majority and minority reports did not reveal the full intricacy of the discussions. It was not, as Fr. Murphy suggests, merely a question of holding the traditional line no matter what the cost. This is clear from the minority report which, although I presided at many meetings of the Pontifical Commission, I had not seen before it appeared in The Tablet. It was not signed by any of the cardinals or bishops. I assume that the priests who signed sent their views privately to the Pope. This does not constitute what in England we would call an official minority report.

DOCTORS DISAGREE

The problem facing the Pope concerns not only contraception itself but the morality of certain methods. This does not mean that the Pope must adjudicate on the various contraceptive appliances, chemicals or pills. This is obviously not the task of the Church. Herein, I imagine, the chief difficulty lies. Everyone knows that some contraceptives are abortifacients while others induce temporary sterility. It follows that the morality of sterilisation and abortion might need to be reconsidered. Medical science is not yet ready to pronounce on the likely effects of contraceptive pills. Many doctors regard them as reasonably safe. A strong minority will have nothing to do with them in the present state of medical knowledge. They will not permit their wives to take the risk of using them. It may not yet be possible to prove a causal connection between smoking and lung cancer. A causal connection between the use of certain contraceptive pills and thrombosis is similarly under investigation. There are doctors who fear that deleterious effects may reveal themselves only in a future generation. They refer poetically to the lesson provided by the thalidomide babies. All this has to be weighed by the Pope before he gives the Church his guidance. It would be irresponsible to attempt to force the Vicar of Christ to make a pronouncement before he is ready.

Nobody knows what the world will be like in ten years' time. Under God it depends largely on the great powers. Before the end of this decade China will almost certainly have developed every kind of nuclear device. We know from scientists that if testing continues on a large scale the effects will be unpredictable. Thirty years ago the experts warned us of the risk of depopulation. We now know that they were wrong. The experts today give warning of intolerable overpopulation by the end of the century. They, in turn, may be made wrong by genetic changes in mankind. What the Pope says will, of course, have comparatively small effects on total world population. The majority in Asia, Africa and South America is not likely to be guided by papal pronouncements. Those most anxiously awaiting guidance are the devoted Catholics living mainly in the West who are troubled less by the threat of over-population than by the physical and psychological hazards of married life in modern conditions. It is these people and their clergy who desperately await the promised statement. Today in the same town, and even in the same parish, priests in the confessional offer conflicting advice. I believe this to be the chief reason for the present state of the magisterium.

Moral Principles Applicable to Organ Transplantation

Benedict A. Paparella, Ph. D.

Recent advances in transplant surgery have created a need for a re-evaluation of the moral principles which might be applied in the resolution of certain of the problems consequent upon such medical progress. The present article makes no pretense at giving to the medical or moral worlds definitive answers which would make their respective tasks a simple matter of "application of principle." One might criticize the work as being but a repetition of what has already been said by eminent theologians and moralists. Such a criticism would indeed be justified; for it is the purpose of the author to present a collation of thoughts and principles, mainly from the Christian point of view, which would be applicable to the possible resolution of the moral problems of organ transplantation, and at the same time open the many doors of the "house of dialogue" which follow from such a presentation.

MEANS OF PRESERVING LIFE

Since man is obliged to use all reasonable and moral means of preserving his bodily health and well being, let us for the moment briefly consider the moralist's distinction of ordinary and extraordinary means of preserving one's life and bodily integrity. Fr. Murray is brief but concise in this matter in saying:

Ordinary means might best be defined as those that are at hand, and do not entail effort, suffering, or expense beyond that which prudent men would consider proper for a serious undertaking according to the state of life of each individual person. Extraordinary means, on the other hand, are means that are not commonly used by prudent persons, and that involve serious difficulty or inconvenience.¹
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