

THE  
SCANDAL  
OF  
MAYNOOTH

A Dossier on Episcopal Policy  
in Contemporary Ireland

An Approaches Supplement

Dedicated to these Irish priests and religious whose testimony and documentation made this 'Dossier' possible.

SINCE THE COMPILATION OF THIS DOSSIER WE HAVE LEARNED OF THE MARRIAGE WITH DISPENSATION OF THE REV. JAMES MACKEY, D.D., D.Ph., WHO HAD PREVIOUSLY BEEN REDUCED TO THE LAY STATE.

THE OFFICIATING PRIEST WAS THE REV. GERARD WATSON, S.T.L., M.A., Ph.D., PROFESSOR OF ANCIENT CLASSICS AT MAYNOOTH.

## THE SCANDAL OF MAYNOOTH

### THE HUNGRY SHEEP LOOK UP AND ARE NOT FED

*'For the triumph of evil all that is necessary is that good people do nothing.'*  
Thus Edmund Burke.

This dictum is surely pertinent to the Irish Hierarchy's responsibility for the Pontifical University, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth - and indeed for Ireland as a whole. Despite the constant, repeated and publicly expressed views of many Maynooth professors who are openly at variance with Papal teaching and with *Humanae Vitae* especially, the Irish bishops have chosen to remain silent. They have done so to the utter confusion and bewilderment of both clergy and laity. They must therefore be held responsible before Almighty God for the doubts, if not loss of faith, suffered by many trusting and sincere Catholics.

### CARDINAL CONWAY

Cardinal Conway, as Chancellor of the Pontifical University, has a special obligation to ensure that no unorthodox doctrine is taught there. Regarded as weak by many clerics and lay people because he has chosen to ignore difficulties rather than face up to them, he has displayed a tendency to belittle the Maynooth problem. This is seen by many as moral cowardice rather than prudence. Because of his failure to take effective action at an earlier stage, his position is now almost impossible.

### POPE PAUL ON THE BISHOPS' DUTIES

With a few noble exceptions, who seem powerless, the other bishops must share much of his

guilt for neglecting this fundamental obligation of their high and onerous office. For as Pope Paul has said: 'It is up to us bishops above all, the teachers and witnesses of the faith as we are, to take a stand with positive affirmation of the word of God and the teaching of the Church which is derived from it. And where that is not enough we must denounce, calmly and sincerely, the errors circulating sometimes like an epidemic.' (Address to Bishops of Italy, 7, April, 1967.)

In his Exhortation to the Bishops of the World in *L'Osservatore Romano*, Eng.ed., 14 Jan., 1971, Pope Paul declared:

'We would like, in a fraternal spirit, to make together with you an examination of our fidelity to the commitment we bishops undertook in our message to humanity at the beginning of the Council: "We shall take pains so to present to the men of this age God's truth in its integrity and purity, that they may understand and gladly assent to it." (20.10.62)

'Many of the faithful are troubled in their faith by an accumulation of ambiguities, uncertainties and doubts about its essentials... the moral requirements concerning, for instance, the indissolubility of marriage or respect for life...

'All of us, therefore, who through the laying on of hands have received the responsibility of keeping pure and entire the faith entrusted to us, and the mission of proclaiming the Gospel unceasingly, are called upon to witness the obedience we all give the Lord. It is an inalienable and sacred right of the people in our charge to receive the word of God, the whole word of God... It is a grave and urgent duty for us to proclaim it untiringly... In the recent past it has been rightly said: "Theology being the science of

faith can only find its norms in the Church... When theology rejects its postulates and understands its norm in a different way it loses its basis and its object." (Declaration of the German Bishops, 27, Dec. 1969)...

#### NEED FOR COURAGE

'Dearly Beloved Brothers, let us not be reduced to silence for fear of criticism, which is always possible... However necessary the function of theologians, it is not to the learned that God has confided the duty of authentically interpreting the faith of the Church... It is for the bishops to tell the people what God asks them to believe...

'This demands much courage of each one of us... It is, none the less, the question of a personal and absolutely inalienable responsibility for us to meet the immediate daily needs of the People of God.

'This is not the time to ask ourselves, as some would have us do, whether it is really useful, opportune and necessary to speak; rather it is the time for us to take the means to make ourselves heard.... "Proclaim the message, and, welcome or unwelcome, insist on it. Refute falsehood, correct error, call to obedience." (2 Tim. 4, 2).....

'Therefore, Dearly Beloved Brothers, let each of us examine himself on the way in which he carries out this sacred duty....

'Even from your own ranks, as in the time of St. Paul, "there will be men coming forward with a travesty of the truth on their lips to induce the disciples to follow them (Acts, 20, 30.)".'

'Therefore the legitimate authority of the Church is guilty of no injury or no offence to any of those to whom it has given a canonical mission, if it desires to ascertain what they, to whom it has entrusted the mission of teaching, are proposing and defending in their lectures, in books, notes, and reviews intended for the use of their students, as well as in books and other publications intended for the general public....

'And this care and prudence of the legitimate Teaching Authority does not at all imply distrust or suspicion.... Indeed the Holy See, whenever it inquires and wishes to be informed about what is being taught in various seminaries, colleges, universities and institutions of higher learning, in those fields which pertain to its jurisdiction, is led by no other motive than the consciousness of Christ's mandate and the obligation by which she is bound before God to safeguard and preserve sound doctrine without corruption or adulteration.'

#### POPE ST PIUS X

Pope St Pius X himself had stated? 'All these prescriptions and those of our Predecessors are to be borne in mind whenever there is question of choosing directors and professors for seminaries and Catholic Universities. Anybody who in any way is found to be imbued with Modernism is to be excluded without compunction from these offices, and those who already occupy them are to be withdrawn... The same policy is to be adopted towards those who favour Modernism.... refusing obedience to ecclesiastical authority... but most of all in the choice of professors, for as a rule students are modelled after the pattern of their masters.... Let the Bishops who form the governing board of such Catholic Institutions or universities watch with all care that these Our commands be constantly observed.' (Pascendi Dominici Gregis.)

#### THE NEW ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

The New Anti-Modernist Oath, published in 1968, should be taken by professors in such institutions. Vatican authorities say it embraces all the essentials of the old oath, including Anti-Modernism. The following words of the oath come after a recitation of the Nicene Creed.

'I firmly embrace and accept all and everything which has either been defined by the Church's solemn deliberation or affirmed and declared by its ordinary magisterium concerning doctrine of faith and morals.'

#### CANON LAW

According to Canon 2317: 'Clerics who knowingly teach or defend, either publicly or privately, a doctrine that has been condemned by the Holy See or by a General Council, even though not as heretical, are to be suspended from preaching, hearing of confession, and any office of teaching.'

The Ordinary can, after a warning, if he deems it necessary, inflict further punishments. The removal from offices of teaching applies not only to clerics but also to lay people. The prohibition from teaching, preaching and hearing confessions is of obligation and must be carried out by the ordinary. (Coronata, Institutiones Juris Canonici, Vol.V, 1872, pp.302-3)

#### THE STATE OF AFFAIRS IN IRELAND TODAY

In Ireland these obligations are honoured more in the breach than in observance. Although these prescriptions have been publicly and repeatedly violated by progressive clerics and



laymen to the confusion and scandal of the ordinary faithful, little or no action has been taken. Only one priest, as far as we know, has been suspended. Dr Good was punished by Dr Lucey, Bishop of Cork and Ross, but he is still allowed to teach in Limerick, and this in spite of the fact that commentators on c.2317 say: 'The legislation affects not only Church institutions of theology and philosophy, or merely ecclesiastical subjects... at least in schools built and supported by the Church; it also applies to State or civil schools in matters pertaining to sacred or religious knowledge or having an intimate connection with Christian education.' (Coronata, source indicated.)

It is therefore not altogether surprising that Dr Good feels aggrieved that he has been disciplined while so many men of his ilk at Maynooth go scot free.

Alas! the overwhelming majority of Irish Bishops do not seem to have the moral courage required to put these grave episcopal obligations into force.

#### IRELAND COMPARED WITH OTHER COUNTRIES

The Irish hierarchy might well take courage from the example set them by bishops in other countries more conscious of their obligations.

#### THE U.S.A.

##### (1) CARDINAL O'BOYLE

In what led to a *cause célèbre*, His Eminence Cardinal O'Boyle of Washington, D.C., took severe action against priests who dissented from *Humanae Vitae*, suspending a large number of them. He was backed in his stand by Pope Paul VI, who wrote praising his stand and asking

dissenting priests to reconsider their position. He was later backed by the findings of a Roman commission which asked offending priests who wished to be re-instated to approach the Cardinal individually and make their submission. Significantly enough, however, by this time many of them had already left to be married. It was stated in Rome that, contrary to complaints to the contrary, due process had been observed by the Cardinal at every stage. (*L'Osservatore Romano*, 20:5:71. cf. *Media Receiver* 30:4:71, p.15)

##### (2) BISHOP McNULTY OF BUFFALO

The late Bishop McNulty removed seven major seminary professors who disagreed with *Humanae Vitae*. In doing so he stated: 'The laws of the Church impose on the bishop of a diocese the responsibility to protect the integrity of the teachings of the Church. Catholic doctrine, without distortion, is to be taught in our seminaries, colleges, schools... The seminary is a particularly sensitive place of education in the doctrine of the Church. In the seminary we form priests for tomorrow. The priest professor, by his lectures in the classrooms and by his personal attitude exerts a deep and enduring influence upon the seminarian. Fidelity to the Vicar of Christ is a requisite for a seminary.' (*Magnificat*, Sept. 5, 1968)

##### (3) BISHOP MARLING OF JEFFERSON CITY.

Complete conformity with *Humanae Vitae* was demanded by Bishop Marling, who stated: 'To contradict it will draw from us an immediate request to desist from the teaching role. Choice must be made between the Holy Father as Supreme Teacher in the Church and those who claim to know better.' (*N.C. News*, 3:9:68)

(4) BISHOP FLETCHER OF LITTLE ROCK

Bishop Fletcher suspended Father James Drame and removed him from his position as a professor in St. John's Seminary because "he showed a disregard for the Church's teachings by stating that people should follow their conscience on the matter of birth control." (N.C. News, 5:7:67)

(5) ARCHBISHOP TOOLEN OF MOBILE

Archbishop Toolen was responsible for the closing of a theological forum due to be held at Springfield College, the Jesuit house of studies in Mobile. He demanded an assurance from all faculty members that they upheld Pope Paul's teaching in *Humanae Vitae*. "I really do not feel in conscience," he said, "that I could cooperate in a programme that offers every chance of opposing the teaching of the Church on birth control both in theory and practice."

(6) CARDINAL CARBERRY OF ST LOUIS

Fr Edwin Falteisek, S.J. Chairman of the Department of Moral and Pastoral Theology at St Louis University's School of Divinity, was dropped as a lecturer from a series on 'Contemporary Issues in Moral Theology' because he signed a statement dissenting from *Humanae Vitae* (N.C. News, 1:10:68).

(7) ARCHBISHOP BOLAND OF NEWARK

Archbishop Boland vetoed the choice of Fr Leo Farley as a speaker for a series of theology lectures. Fr Farley had denied that he had signed the Washington anti-encyclical statement, although his name was on the list, but he upheld a version of the meeting published by the anti-Cardinal O'Boyle theologians. (N.C. News, 14:10:68)

(8) BISHOP BERNARDIN (GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE U.S. CATHOLIC CONFERENCE) IN CONSULTATION WITH ARCHBISHOP DEARDEN (ITS PRESIDENT.)

These two prelates cancelled a Radio Catholic Hour series on 'Is there a New Morality?' because they felt it would further confuse the 'Current controversial publicity surrounding the publication of the encyclical on Human Life'. (N.C. News, 9:9:68)

AUSTRALIAARCHBISHOP KNOX OF MELBOURNE

Archbishop Knox withdrew the faculties of Fr. Crotty, C.P. professor of moral theology at the Passionist Holy Cross Seminary, because he publicly opposed the Pope's teaching in *Humanae Vitae*. He also suspended Fr Peter Phelan for a similar reason. (N.C. News, 20:8:68 and 16:9:68)

CHILEARCHBISHOP SANTOS HERNANDEZ OF TEGUCIGALPA

Archbishop Santos Hernandez asked for the removal of three American priests because they had made it known 'that they could not accept the teaching on birth control'. (N.C. News, 3:3:69)

GREAT BRITAIN

Many individual priests were suspended for opposition to the encyclical although it must be admitted that the bishops were far from uniform in their actions.

Father Benedict Sketchley, Headmaster of St Michael's Catholic School, Stevenage, Herts, had to resign because he signed a letter which expressed dissent from some aspects of *Humanae Vitae*. (*Irish Independent*, 19/12/68).

(1) BISHOP ELLIS OF NOTTINGHAM

This courageous bishop was bitterly and unjustly attacked for suspending five priests who dissented from the Church's teaching on birth control. 'The bishop', it was stated, 'had no option but to apply a sanction that is mandatory under the Church's legal system.' (*N.C. News*, 3/9/68)

(2) BEDA COLLEGE

Father Michael Winter was dismissed from his position as professor of theology at the Beda College, Rome, for a similar reason. (*N.C. News*, 4/9/68)

(3) CARDINAL HEENAN OF WESTMINSTER

In a Radio talk in October 1968, Cardinal Heenan stated: 'These men are being asked whether or not in conscience they can follow the teaching of the Pope, and if they feel they cannot it is for them to resign. This was for the protection of the faithful and the clergy.' (*N.C. News*, 29/10/68)

(4) THE ENGLISH HIERARCHY

The bishops of England and Wales firmly told dissident priests that they must accept Pope Paul's ruling on marriage or leave the priesthood. This ultimatum was decided on at the mid-October meeting and released on 24th October, by Cardinal Heenan in a letter to the Westminster clergy dated October 24, 1968.

'It is evident that no priest in the exercise of his ministry may repudiate the solemn teaching of the supreme authority of the Church which gives him his mandate. The open refusal of a group of priests to accept the Pope's guidance has caused dismay to many fellow-priests, who while being no less aware of the pastoral problems, give loyal obedience to the Holy Father. The opposition of these priests to the Pope's teaching has bewildered and saddened the loyal members of the laity... Priests are required in preaching, teaching, in the press, on radio, television or public platforms, to refrain from opposing the teaching of the Pope in all matters of faith and morals. If a priest is unwilling to give this undertaking the bishop will decide whether he can be allowed without scandal to continue to act in the name of the Church. Although he need not be required to cease saying Mass, a priest may not normally hold faculties to hear confessions, without undertaking to declare faithfully the objective teaching of *Humanae Vitae* in the confessional and when giving spiritual guidance. A priest who is unwilling to accept these conditions will be maintained by the diocese until he has been able to secure suitable employment. This is, of course, in keeping with current canonical practice.' (*N.C. News*, 25/10/68)

MAYNOOTH

In the light of all these facts let us see what has happened in Ireland, particularly in Maynooth.

The Bishops failure to deal with unorthodoxy in the Pontifical University of Maynooth is nothing short of a national scandal. The situation became so serious that a year or so ago a group of senior professors found themselves

bound in conscience to draw up a document protesting to the Hierarchy about the state of affairs within the University. Copies were sent to every bishop in the country.

PROFESSOR DENIS O'CALLAGHAN

There are many professors in the College who have repeatedly dissented from *Humanae Vitae* in the public media. Dr Denis O'Callaghan had in fact to be publicly rebuked by Dr McQuaid the then Archbishop of Dublin, in which diocese Maynooth is situated, in a special pastoral letter read in all the Churches. That same professor is, nevertheless, on the episcopal Theological Commission which drew up the recent Pastoral Letter, '*Change in the Church*', which is considered by some to be anaemic, vague and ill-defined. He has also been appointed by the Hierarchy as Secretary of the Catholic Marriage Advisory Council. Not surprisingly he is reported to have quoted this as proof that he enjoys the confidence of the Bishops.

DR ENDA MCDONAGH

Another Maynooth professor, Dr Enda McDonagh, was prohibited from speaking in Corpus Christi by Cardinal Heenan because of the '*unorthodoxy of his views*'.

In *The Tablet* of January 8, 1972, in an article, '*Crisis at Corpus Christi*', following Cardinal Heenan's acceptance of the resignation of the staff of Corpus Christi College, it was stated that Cardinal Heenan had declared '*that no public opponent of Humanae Vitae could remain on the staff or be a lecturer...The Cardinal further requested that five wellknown personalities who had already been engaged to lecture during the 1971-72 academic year should be removed from the list, since they represented*

a type of theology which he considered dangerous. The names of three of the five have been published. These are Father Enda McDonagh, professor of moral theology and dean of the faculty at Maynooth, Dr John Marshall and Father Gregory Baum from Toronto.'

But it seems that anything is good enough for Maynooth.

A RECENT MAYNOOTH DEGREE

Recently a priest was awarded a post-graduate degree in Maynooth although some professors felt that his paper was at variance with *Humanae Vitae* on some points. It was hard to blame him as some of his professors shared his views. It is more difficult to excuse Cardinal Conway who, as Chancellor of the Pontifical University, conferred the degree, although he was aware of the professors' objections and had seen both the question and answer papers.

PROFILE OF THE FACULTY OF ST PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH

DR ENDA MCDONAGH, Dean of Post-Graduate Studies and sometime Professor of Moral Theology.

Despite his public acts and utterances Dr McDonagh was appointed Director of Post-Graduate Research at the October, 1970, meeting of the Irish Bishops.

DR MCDONAGH AND THE AMSTERDAM MEETING

Many priests and not a few bishops have been seriously concerned about Dr McDonagh's attitudes for some time. But until the notorious Amsterdam meeting of September 18-19, 1968, justice demanded that an open mind should be preserved in this regard. His name was listed

by the *Tablet* of September 28, 1968 among the theologians attending the meeting. Cardinal Conway is reported to have stated that McDonagh denied signing any paper. But does anyone sign a 'consensus' paper? He was certainly publicly in some very dubious theological company, and if his presence did not give consent, his subsequent silence would surely appear to do so. For though his name was publicly associated with the Amsterdam document, to the best of our knowledge he has never disowned it. This Amsterdam document was regarded by competent authorities as one of the most impertinent documents to appear on *Humanae Vitae*. If McDonagh did not agree with it, he could have quite easily said so.

The statement saw no difference between rhythm and other forms of contraception. According to the report in the *Tablet* of September 28, 1968, it stated:

*'Without wishing in any way to question the principle of authority, we are forced to take account of the confusion among the faithful concerning the Encyclical and to ask ourselves if the conditions under which it was promulgated - in disagreement with the great majority of those who had been consulted as experts in the matter - are able to be brought into agreement with the manner of exercising authority which contemporary culture demands in the name of human dignity, and with the role of all the faithful in the people of God which is the Church.'*

#### MCDONAGH AND CHARLES DAVIS

There were some straws in the wind in Father McDonagh's review of 'A Question of Conscience' by Charles Davis. He praised not only its 'tone and manner of expression' but also the 'consequence of the thinking'.

People are sick and tired of hearing people like McDonagh sing the praises of defaulters. Indeed, delinquency in ecclesiastical life seems at the moment to be the quickest way to success. It is one thing to be privately charitable and merciful to someone in the position of a Charles Davis; it is quite another matter to mislead the ordinary faithful by praising the consequence of his thinking.

According to McDonagh, the Church for Davis had become a 'zone of untruth'. 'So far from being a community of love it was an unhappy, fear-racked, power-conscious organization.' Yet McDonagh had the temerity to describe Davis's assessment as 'honest, comprehensive and credible'.

According to McDonagh, 'He [Davis] recognizes Bishops and Pope Paul as in the main good and honest men. It is the corrupt system in which they are caught to which one objects.'

One could hardly be blamed for inferring, perhaps erroneously, that McDonagh is at one with him in this. He thinks that Davis made a mistake in leaving the Church because he could not admit the 'Universal and immediate jurisdiction of the Papacy over the whole Church'. He did not have to leave because of that, McDonagh feels, for 'One can visualise a quite different understanding of the Papacy as well as a quite different style of its exercise.' Shades of Hans Kung and Cardinal Suenens!

How prophetic were the words of Pope St. Pius X concerning these turbulent days. In his encyclical, *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* he wrote:

*'.....there is no surer sign that a man is on the way to Modernism than when he begins to show his dislike for this system...Modernists try in every way to diminish and weaken the authority of the ecclesiastical magisterium*

itself by sacreligiously falsifying its origin, character and rights, and by freely repeating the calumnies of its adversaries.... When one of their number falls under the condemnation of the Church the rest of them, to the horror of good Catholics, gather round him, heap public praise upon him and venerate him almost as a martyr to truth.'

McDonagh's vision of a 'different understanding of the Papacy' and a 'different style of its exercise' is strangely reminiscent of a view put forward in the following IDOC account of the Boston College symposium on 'The Underground Church': 'The Pope is called the Visible Head of the Church and is defined as the supreme repository of all authority. In their way men are rejecting this extreme model of authority, which, in any event, seems to be based more on the divine right of Kings than the example of Christ and Peter. They are not opposed to leadership itself but to a style of leadership and authority which seems at once pretentious, omniscient, vacillating and removed from our times. These attitudes contribute to a rising alienation from Papal authority, which finds some solace in the easy informality of the Underground Church...

'There will have to be drastic changes in the structures of the Church and in the attitudes of the hierarchy... A Pope is needed who would immediately declare himself un-Pope, a visible head of the Church who would declare himself invisible. The Church must cease to be Papocentric, and must have as its head a leader rather than a monarch, a Pope who guides rather than rules. He should probably be a younger man and his term of office should be limited to five or ten years.' (Donal P. Warwick, 'The Underground Church', IDOC, No.68-30, July 28, 1967. Emphasis added.)

Is this by any chance McDonagh's 'new vision of the Papacy'? Is this what is implied in his review of 'A Case of Conscience', in which he sympathises with Davis who rejects the universal jurisdiction of the Pope over the whole Church? Davis wrote: 'I wanted to be free from a system which was oppressing and tormenting me.' Even though Davis, it is said, had been friendly with the woman he was to marry for four years, McDonagh fails to see that it might, conceivably, if unconsciously, have blinded Davis's doctrinal vision. For he seems more inclined to blame those who remained loyal rather than the renegade who rejected Christ and His Church.

This is apparent from his extraordinary conclusion: 'That a man as honest, intelligent and committed as this book and his previous work show Davis to be should react to the Church in this way calls for repeated self-searching from all of us.' (Hibernia, Dublin, Dec. 1967, p.10.)

Does it not rather call for self-searching on the part of Davis and McDonagh?

#### MCDONAGH AND CELIBACY

On Sunday, February 22, 1970, a large section of the Irish Radio programme 'This Week' was devoted to the celibacy issue. Joe Foyle, editor of Guide Bulletin, made a transcript of the discussion. He wrote:

'When the Pope is doing his best to close off the discussion of priestly celibacy, is it proper that the man referred to as "probably Ireland's most distinguished theologian" should regard the issue as fit for nation-wide discussion and even speculate that there will be a change eventually?'



Dr McDonagh claimed that 'the Pope had left the door open' and had given 'no official answer to the Dutch bishops yet'. In fact, as Foyle points out, the February 2 letter from the Pope to the Cardinal Secretary of State 'explicitly referred to the communique from the Dutch... The Papal Letter went to great pains to reaffirm categorically that there could not be any change in the celibacy law... Was McDonagh justified in interpreting that Papal Letter as he did... in broadcasting to the nation at large?.....

'I know that the media people have a vested interest in keeping issues open as long as possible, regardless of what Rome says.... But ought such as Fr McDonagh, a person appointed by the Hierarchy to one of the most important positions in the country, facilitate them?' (Guide Bulletin, B.NO. March 26, 1970)

The interviewer declared: 'We talk to an Irish theologian who says Ireland can learn from the Dutch and forecasts a married clergy'. (Excerpt from transcript.)

#### MCDONAGH AND VIETNAM

Father Denis Corrigan was suspended by Bishop Young of Hobart, Australia, because of his activities with a 'Peace-in-Vietnam' group. We have seen the trouble caused by priests in the U.S.A. on this issue. Yet in Ireland McDonagh and a small group of priests caused dismay by similar antics - particularly since no one could remember any Irish priests holding demonstrations of protest against the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia.

An Irish Press account of a 1970 anti-Vietnam demonstration stated: 'over 50 people carrying torches and placards protesting against U.S. intervention in Vietnam attended an

inter-denominational prayer meeting outside the American Embassy [in Dublin] last night. Readings from the Bible were given by John Horgan and Enda McDonagh'.

'Nusight' (a now defunct Dublin periodical) had this to say of the matter in its May 1970 issue: 'Enda McDonagh has finally been out of favour with the bishops because of his participation in an Anti-Vietnam prayer meeting outside the U.S. Embassy... All the old-guard bishops are in favour of U.S. policy in Vietnam due to their fear of atheistic Communism'.

What the views of the bishops are can only be a wild surmise on the part of the writer but there can be no doubt that the Anti-Vietnam movement is Communist-inspired and liberally larded with extreme left-wing socialists.

It is an understatement to say that many good Catholics are shocked to see a leading professor of theology appointed by the Hierarchy to the country's National Seminary, a Pontifical University, behaving in such a manner.

#### MCDONAGH, BISHOP ELLIS AND BROTHER MORAN

The 'Catholic Herald' of June II, 1971, published the following letter from Dr McDonagh:

'With reference to your story of May 14, on the banning of Brother Gabriel Moran in Nottingham, I wish to point out that when I accepted an invitation to speak there I was not aware of any such difficulty. As an admirer of Brother Moran's work and a respector of freedom in the Church I do not wish to endorse any action of this kind.'

Brother Gabriel Moran, a man of some notoriety in the American catechetical field, was to have addressed a seminar in Nottingham but Bishop Ellis of that diocese refused to grant him permission to do so. McDonagh was invited in his stead, which seems, to some people, a case of 'out of the frying pan....'

To understand the background to the situation it is necessary to understand two things: (1) Some priests of the diocese of Nottingham are still suspended for their opposition to *Humanae Vitae*; (2) John Horgan, a friend of McDonagh, had written a series of unfortunate articles in the *Irish Times* which were regarded by many priests as an uncalled for attack on a bishop for doing his duty.

The *Approaches 'Dossier on Catechetics'* says this of Brother Moran:

'Confronted with the Credo of Pope Paul, VI, 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 make use 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 is not just that they are false. They just don't say anything."

'Brother Moran 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 communion in which man's answer is part of revelation."' (*Approaches*, No.23, Dec. 1970, pp.36-8.)

Referring to Moran's attack on Pope Paul's Credo, Archbishop Dwyer of Portland, Oregon, U.S.A., said: 'The above quoted reaction was registered not by some violent anti-Roman evangelical nor by a Pentecostal enthusiast, nor

by some liberal Protestant of the Cox-Altizer-Van Buren school of thought, but by a man who wields, perhaps, paramount influence in the field of catechetics in the contemporary American Church, Brother Gabriel Moran.... These extraordinary comments remain one of the most forthright repudiations of the obligation to conform catechesis to the authentic teaching of the Church, ever enunciated.' (*Dossier on Catechetics*, p.173.)

But let not Brother Moran have any sleepless nights. He can rest peacefully in the knowledge that Dr Enda McDonagh of the Pontifical University of Maynooth is an admirer of his work.

#### MCDONAGH AND HUMANAЕ VITAE

Apart altogether from his connection with the Amsterdam consensus paper there is other evidence of his opposition to *Humanae Vitae*. His attitude may have been predictable in view of his previously expressed opinions which simply ignored Pope Paul's insistence that we still had to abide by the teaching of Popes Pius XI and XII.

In 1965 the following question was asked at a U.S. Press Panel: 'With what binding force does the Church forbid artificial contraception?' Dr Francis Connell, CSSR, of Catholic University, Washington agreed with Father Ford, S.J. of the same institute, and Monsignor Kelly of the N.Y. Family Life Bureau that the Church's position was unchangeable. But Dr McDonagh said he 'was not certain that a clear statement of the binding force intended by the Church could be made'. He felt that universal consent had been the basis for certain teaching and added: 'It is difficult to say whether this statement expresses the "universal consensus" today. That consensus was developing



very slowly in regard to sexuality. Theologians must recognise today the changes which are affecting this consensus.' (N.C. News, 7:10:65)

Is this a form of situation ethics?

Moreover, as we have already observed, at the June, 1971, meeting of the Irish Bishops a post-graduate degree award was made to a priest whose views, in the opinion of some members of the theological faculty, were at variance with the official teaching of *Humanae Vitae*. And a former professor of the college has stated that nearly all the young priests are being indoctrinated with these false opinions.

Incidentally, it is unpardonable that men such as Fathers McDonagh and O'Callaghan should be invited by *The Irish Missionary Union* to give lectures to returned missionaries. All the missionary organizations are supported by ordinary decent orthodox Catholics. They certainly would not be prepared to continue subscribing to the *Union* if they knew that its funds were being used for purposes contrary to the authentic teaching of the Church.

#### FR. MCDONAGH AND THE LEGALISING OF CONTRACEPTION

In Ireland at present there are strong pressure groups working for the repeal of the laws banning contraception and divorce. These are mostly humanist and Protestant. But despite the opposition to this movement expressed in a joint statement of the Hierarchy, a minority group of priests, including some Maynooth professors, are publicly supporting these pressure groups. It is for example public knowledge that they have made their views known to Medical Associations.

It is hardly surprising, then, to find the

*Irish Medical Association*, in a unanimous decision, calling for a repeal of the law banning contraception and demanding that contraceptives be available to all. (*Sunday Independent*, 15, October, 1972.)

It is hard to blame the doctors, if, as they say, some theologians apparently in good standing, are advising them in such a fashion. But this would have been impossible but for the Bishops' failure publicly to censure the theologians in question and to remove them from posts of responsibility.

Addressing the *Irish Family Rights Association*, which quite openly 'aims at making legal the importing and selling of contraceptives' Dr McDonagh declared:

'I have come to the conclusion that the present law should be changed to allow all individuals and families to make their own decisions on the means of contraception.' (*Catholic Media Receiver*, no.8, 1971-72, p.9.)

He has recently gained support from an unexpected quarter - from Dr Birch, Bishop of Ossory, whose statement along similar lines was reported in the October 6, 1972 issue of the *Irish Times*.

The fact remains, however, that both Dr Birch and Fr. McDonagh are at variance with the views of the Irish Bishops as published in the joint statement of March, 1971 which declared:

'The bishops fully share the disquiet, which is widespread among the people at the present time, regarding pressures being exerted on public opinion on questions concerning the civil law on divorce, contraception and abortion..... These questions involve issues of grave import for society as a whole which go far beyond purely

private morality or private religious belief. Civil law on these matters should respect the wishes of the people who elected the legislators and the bishops confidently hope that the legislators themselves will respect this important principle.' (Irish Times, 6, October, 1972.)

Dr McDonagh's public statement is hardly calculated to ease the bishops' problems in their dealings with the government on this delicate issue.

FR. MCDONAGH AND  
HIS GRACE, DR DERMOT RYAN, ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN

It was certainly difficult for Dr Ryan to succeed the outstanding Dr McQuaid who was so widely respected by both priests and people on account of his fearless defence of Christ's Vicar and the magisterium of the Church.

When Dr Ryan appeared to approve of mixed schools (in the canonical sense(I) ) in a television interview soon after his appointment, this was first ascribed to inadvertent error in the heat of a public interview.

But there could be no such excuse for the presence of Dr O'Callaghan, as a lecturer, at the 1972 Dublin diocesan retreat.

It is also a matter of deep regret, in view of what has already been said, that the name of Enda McDonagh appeared on a list of lecturers

(I) Mixed schools, in the canonical sense, are schools attended by children of different religious denominations who receive secular instruction together but religious instruction separately. 'Neutral' schools are those where no religious instruction is imparted.

for a course to be given to Dublin priests in November 1972.

One would have expected a higher standard of loyalty to Pope Paul from the new Archbishop.

DR ENDA MCDONAGH AND 'CHOICES IN SEX'

(The following section is a reproduction of (a) a review of the 'Living Parish Pamphlet' 'Choices in Sex' issued by Fathers L.E. Whatmore and John-W. Flanagan, Chairman and Secretary respectively of the Catholic Priests' Association, and (b) an open letter by Fathers Whatmore and Flanagan to the Cardinal, Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland and also to Fr Enda McDonagh and (c) a further letter from the Chairman of the Catholic Priests' Association.

(a) CHOICES IN SEX

A Living Parish Pamphlet

A Booklet for Young People

Edited by Lawrence Bright

Authors: Quentin & Irene de la Bedoyere

Nihil Obstat - John M.T. Barton (Censor)

Imprimatur - Victor Guazzelli, V.G.

Westminster, Aug. 24th, 1972

In a letter sent to the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland on 5th June, 1973, 'The Catholic Priests' Association' complained that the above mentioned publication had a ~~postscript~~ 'postscript' written by Rev. Fr Enda McDonagh, of St Patrick's College, Maynooth, in which he strongly recommends 'Choices in Sex', particularly for 'those in the second half of their teens, who take their religion seriously'. We deplored the recommendation:

of a booklet, based as is 'Choices in Sex', on 'Situation Ethics', and asked the Irish Hierarchy to take appropriate action to counteract the scandal given - the removal of Fr. McDonagh from his post and even from his ministry, would not have been more than the necessary steps to negative the scandal he created.

As a result of some Irish National papers giving our criticism full coverage, Fr. McDonagh's 'fellow-traveller' at Maynooth, Fr. P. Hannon, demanded an apology from the Editor of the *Sunday Independent* which was duly given by the Editor, Sunday 24th June, 1973. Fr. Hannon considered our criticism as offensive to truth and justice, as the quotations we had taken from the booklet were 'selective' ones 'totally divorced' from the whole context. The Editor of the *Sunday Independent*, in expressing his public apology, declared that 'the booklet carried the Nihil Obstat of the Archdiocese of Westminster. This means, that the relevant Church authorities in Britain, guarantee that the booklet contains nothing contrary to the teaching of the Catholic Church.'

So there is nothing in 'Choices in Sex' contrary to the teaching of the Catholic Church, and we have this on the guarantee of the ecclesiastical authorities of the Archdiocese of Westminster! Hence, Catholics in Britain at least, can now hold the following propositions as true - as they are affirmed in 'Choices in Sex':

- 1) 'Wherever love is given God is present; whether it be in the ecstasy of the mystic or the concern of the prostitute to give her client good value for money.' (p.3)
- 2) 'Many Christians wonder about the morality of intercourse between couples seriously engaged and close to the date of their marriage.' (p.9)

- 3) 'Masturbation is an intrinsic part of human growth.' (p.19)
- 4) 'It is not right to condemn the many sincere doctors who practice abortion for humanitarian motives.' (p.35)
- 5) 'Orgasm is the best way to bring petting to an end.' (p.29)
- 6) 'In engagements, it (intercourse) could be equally well used to express the lesser friendship.' (p.10)
- 7) 'Petting is a good halfway house (between puberty and economic independence) where young people can explore sexual relationships, and make a better choice of a permanent partner.' (p.28)

The above seven propositions are only a few of the many doctrinal errors contained in 'Choices in Sex', but now on the GUARANTEE from 'the relevant Church authorities in Britain' - to quote the words of the Editor of the *Sunday Independent* 'the booklet contains nothing contrary to the teaching of the Catholic Church'. So in Britain at least, intercourse before marriage, masturbation, petting ending in orgasm, abortion for humanitarian reasons, are no longer ethically immoral. The 'guarantee' that the booklet is free from teaching contrary to the Catholic Church, should be enough to settle the minds of many of the ordinary faithful. A new impetus is given to the advance of the 'permissive society' in Britain. The Catholic Church looked up to by millions outside its fold as the one surviving bastion in the world against moral corruption has come tumbling down, to pander to the desires and lowest instincts of man. 'The Permissive Society' receives the Blessing of the 'Permissive Church'. Yet the editor of the *Sunday Independent* prostrates himself before Fr. McDonagh, for daring to publish an article of

news that would even give the impression that Father Enda would dream of supporting a doctrine at variance with Catholic Church teaching. Shades of our memory of *Humanae Vitae*.

As I pondered over the incredible, that the ecclesiastical authorities of Westminster Archdiocese, would give a 'GUARANTEE' that 'Choices in Sex' was free from error, the thought struck me that the 'Censor' of the Archdiocese, the 'Grand Old Man' whose Biblical and Theological lore thrilled us in the past, was not likely to 'guarantee' anything such as the Editor of the *Sunday Independent* declared. I therefore contacted Rt. Rev. Monsignor Canon Barton by letter and phone, and then light was thrown on the problem. In a letter dated June 26th, he wrote: 'MANY THANKS FOR YOUR LETTER. I AM MORE AND MORE CONVINCED THAT I NEVER SAW THE GREAT WORK, i.e. UNTIL AFTER ITS PUBLICATION ... I MAY HAVE SIGNED THE CARD INADVERTENTLY.'

In the course of the letter, Monsignor Barton indicated his rapidly failing sight, since 1966.

So this is the heart of the matter! The old *fait accompli* tactic has been used again by our charity-loving Modernists. The 'guarantee' of orthodoxy has burst into thin air, and the time has now come when the Editor of the *Sunday Independent* owes to the ecclesiastical authorities of the Archdiocese of Westminster, a *public apology*. It is time that 'truth and justice', so dear to the heart of Fr. Patrick Hannon in his letter in defence of Fr. Enda, should now be vindicated. Once more the responsibility to remove the trace of scandal from the Irish Church, falls heavily upon the Bishops.

The 'Living Parish' series of pamphlets, edited by some monks of the Benedictine Monastery

at Ealing Abbey, and including such well known 'liberal thinkers' as John Coventry, Rosemary Haughton, Bishop Butler, Bishop Worlock and others, continue to pour out so much doctrinal waffle, some harmless, some not so harmless. As for example the late Peggy Janiurek in her 'Preparing our Children for the Sacraments' writing, on p.12, that Communion can be compared to the sex act, and hence 'married people find woven into their thanksgiving, the very phrases used at the height of their sexual act of love'. What a 'preparation' for Holy Communion for 'our children' !

On behalf of The Catholic Priests' Association, a public apology is hereby demanded from the Editor of the *Sunday Independent* to the ecclesiastical authorities of Westminster. How dare any paper leave the cause of moral rotteness at the door of Cardinal Heeran, his auxiliary Bishop and his revered and highly respected 'Censor Deputatus' Monsig. Canon Barton.

Sincerely yours (Rev.) Fr. L.E. Whatmore, Chairman,  
(Rev.) Fr. John W. Flanagan, Secretary.

(b) OPEN LETTER TO THE CARDINAL, ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF IRELAND AND TO REV. DR. ENDA MCDONAGH.

Your Eminence, Your Grace, Your Lordship,

Rev. Enda McDonagh in a statement issued to the *Irish Independent* (June 18th, 1973) accused the Catholic Priests' Association of Great Britain and Ireland, of giving brief quotations from the booklet 'Choices in Sex', which he recommended for the teenagers of our day, saying they had been taken 'from their context... even to the point of making the authors say the opposite of what they intended'. Dr McDonagh endeavours to justify his approval of this morally corrupting book, by falling back on the

fact that it had received the approval of the ecclesiastical censor of the Archdiocese of Westminster, Monsignor J.M.T. Barton, a 'reputable Churchman and theologian'. Dr. McDonagh then concludes that the booklet is 'free from doctrinal error'.

May we remind Rev. Dr. McDonagh, that in publications produced by 'The Living Parish Series' of which 'Choices in Sex' is one, a note is appended that 'The Nihil Obstat' and the 'Imprimatur' are not to be construed that those who give them 'agree with the contents opinions and statements expressed' .....

If Dr McDonagh seriously believes there are no doctrinal errors in this booklet, will he then openly and without ambiguity tell us that the following propositions are true:

'God is present in the ecstasy of the mystic and in the concern of the prostitute to give her client good value for money.' (page 3)

'Masturbation is an intrinsic part of human growth.' (p.19)

'Intercourse between engaged couples is permissible.' (p.10)

'Orgasm is the best way to bring petting to an end.' (p.29)

'It is not right to condemn sincere doctors who practice abortion for humanitarian motives.' (p.35)

Perhaps Dr McDonagh will enlighten us too, as to why the authors gave the title 'CHOICES in Sex' to this publication? Even a casual study of the work makes it obvious that the 'choice' lies

in the fact that for the authors, there is no (Catholic) *absolute prohibition* to indulge in sex outside marriage - the 'commandments' are only 'guidelines' which leave one free, according to circumstances, to make a 'choice' between Catholic ethics and one's own impulses and preferences. In brief, the authors are devotees of 'Situation Ethics'.

Dr McDonagh can hardly have read the book himself if he sincerely believes that the points of our criticism are only a 'few quotations divorced totally from their context'. There is no difficulty in discovering over 70 doctrinal errors - that is, no difficulty for anyone who accepts the magisterium of the Church in moral matters rather than the 'Situation Ethics' of the authors.

Once again, we call upon the Cardinal, Archbishops, and Bishops of Ireland, who on their consecration day as Bishops of the Church, swore to defend the faithful not only from positively false doctrine, but also from that which is *dangerous*. Immense scandal continues to be given by retaining Rev. Dr. McDonagh in his present position, indeed in his ministry.

Rev. Fr. Leonard E. Whatmore, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.,  
Chairman.

Rev. Fr. John W. Flanagan, S.T.L., D.C.L.,  
Secretary of the Catholic Priests' Assoc.

(c) LETTER FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CATHOLIC PRIESTS' ASSOCIATION

St. Wilfrid's.  
Hailsham, Sussex.

Dear Sir,

As the Catholic Priests' Association has been brought into the imbroglia surrounding the

booklet "Choices in Sex" of the 'Living Parish Series', edited from Ealing Abbey and often on sale in Catholic Churches, may I be allowed to try to put the record straight in so far as the Association is concerned.

1) In early June, we protested to the Irish Hierarchy individually, about the pernicious nature of this book, with its ambivalent views on a wide range of sexual matters, contrary to Catholic morality, endorsed as it is by a post-script from the noted Professor of Moral Theology in Ireland's National Seminary, - Maynooth. Much was written in the Irish National Press, but we are glad to say that on approach to Cardinal Conway, his Secretary, writing on the Cardinal's authority, assured us that Fr. McDonagh had now publicly dissociated himself from the objectionable booklet.

2) The centre of gravity has shifted to the Archdiocese of Westminster, because Fr. McDonagh initially justified his action, on the grounds that the work bore the official approval of the Archdiocesan authority, in the shape of a 'Nihil Obstat', from Monsignor Barton, its Censor and a Scriptural Scholar of International Reputation. Monsignor Barton in the course of continuous correspondence to the Secretary, dated June 28th, July 20th, July 25th, July 31st and August 8th, disavowed the contents of the book, denied seeing it until June of this year - nearly a whole year after publication, submitted numerous photostat copies of proof that "forgery" was taking place, gave photostat copies of the legal advice given him by a life-long Canonist friend of his, and asked the Secretary to give the widest possible publicity to the affair in our "Newsletter" and in a special letter to be sent to the Irish Bishops and to the National papers of Ireland.

3) Whatever attempts may be made to obscure or confuse this question by the intervention of Monsignor-Ralph Brown and others, - as reported in the English National Press - the fact remains that Cardinal Heenan, the highest Catholic authority in the land, has found the contents of "Choices in Sex", morally objectionable, and ordered changes to be made. We deplore the refusal of the Authors, Quentin and Irene de la Bedoyere and the chief Editor of the series, Fr. Laurence Bright, O.P., to obey, and to promote the sale of this unexpurgated and morally damaging book, especially aimed at the young. The word "forgery" was not originally used by the C.P.A. in this context, but was taken into quotations from Mgr. Barton's correspondence. But we still remain puzzled as to how the booklet was able to be in circulation since August of 1972, with the "Nihil Obstat" on it, if, as Monsig. Barton, now contends, the Nihil Obstat card was given "at the end of last year".

It is disgraceful that a book so subversive of Catholic morals in the realm of sex, should have come into circulation, and remain unchallenged for so long. The extenuation of the contents by Monsig. Ralph Brown of the Westminster Curia, should now receive 'quietus' from the action taken in the interest of Catholic morality, by His Eminence.

The question still needing an answer is how Dr Enda McDonagh, who recommended this book so warmly to youth "who took their religion seriously", and presumably has read it, could find the booklet deserving recommendation rather than condemnation. His stand on this matter was supported by Frs. Hammon and Donal Flanagan, also of Maynooth. (Sunday Press, 24th June, 1973)

Sincerely yours,

(Rev.) Fr. Leonard E. Whatmore, Chairman.

DR DENIS O'CALLAGHAN

Dr O'Callaghan has gained much notoriety because of his publicly expressed views on some aspects of *Humanae Vitae*.

A symposium on 'Family Planning' - The Doctor's Dilemma', held in the Irish Medical Union, Dublin, in November 1970, was addressed by Dr O'Callaghan. Consternation and grave scandal were caused to many Irish Catholics by the statements attributed to Dr O'Callaghan on this occasion. According to the *Irish Independent* of November 17, 1970, he declared that contraception was 'a question of conscience...contraception is the individual's conscience; a doctor or priest can only give his opinion.'

In reaction, an 'Irish Mother' felt that 'The contribution of Dr O'Callaghan left the audience in a state of confusion...Married women like myself should know that the opinion of priests, no matter what their academic qualifications, maybe don't speak with authority.... they are not the teaching authority of the Church. The Pope, Christ's successor on earth, is the Supreme Teacher on faith and morals. The hierarchy, in their joint Lenten Pastoral, upheld the Pope's *Humanae Vitae*. All sincere Catholics must reject the teachings of those who are at variance with the successor of Christ and the hierarchy. Maynooth has produced quite a few mini-Popes lately.' (*Irish Press*, Nov. 22, 1970).

Mr John D. Sheridan, noted Irish author and defender of orthodoxy wrote:

'Professor Denis O'Callaghan of Maynooth is quoted as saying, with reference to *Humanae Vitae*, "There is no need to open a highly controversial debate again, a debate

which serves to foster bitterness and to isolate the Pope from the Church as if he were over it and not in it." But the choice is not between one and the other, for the Pope, as Professor O'Callaghan should know, is both over the Church and within it; within it like the rest of us, by virtue of his baptism; over it when by virtue of the mandate entrusted to him he issues a ruling to the entire Church on a question of faith or morals.

"If anyone," says Vatican I, "says that the Roman Pontiff has not Supreme Power over the Universal Church...or if anyone says that this power is not inherent in his office and immediately effective as regards every pastor of the Church and every individual Catholic, let such a person be anathema."

'And Vatican II says: "The definitions of the Popes of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church, are justly styled irrefragable."

'Dr O'Callaghan speaks of a "highly emotive debate" but the furor which followed *Humanae Vitae* was not so much a debate as a revolt (hence its bitterness) since once the Pope had spoken the question of artificial birth control was outside the field of free discussion by theologians.' (*Irish Independent*, November 19, 1970).

Father John Flanagan, Secretary of the English Catholic Priests' Association publicly challenged the statements of Dr O'Callaghan in the *Sunday Press* on the First Sunday of Advent, 1970. Commenting on this, Gabriel Fallon wrote in the December 11, 1970, issue of the *Catholic Herald*: 'On the assumption that Dr O'Callaghan was correctly reported, Dr Flanagan accused him of being either a Modernist or one who has fallen a victim of the Hans Kung type of



situation ethics, or that he has failed to study the teaching of the Church on contraception since earliest times... Others were taking scandal at the fact that a Professor of Moral Theology at Maynooth and some of his peers hold views which are in conflict with those held by the Archbishop. All things considered, the issues involved must be brought openly to a head. Otherwise the faith for which Ireland has long been famous may be put dangerously in jeopardy.'

Joseph Foyle has quoted the case of a bewildered parent who, citing a *Sunday Press* article in which Fr O'Callaghan was quoted as saying that '*Humanae Vitae* was not the last word and that the Pope was careful not to say that the use of contraceptives was a mortal sin, asked: "Are we to take it that all the fuss is over a venial sin?"'

### THE TRUTH

The truth concerning the Church's attitude to contraception has of course never been in doubt. As Cardinal Felici, Secretary General to Vatican 2 stated: 'Thus all means or contrivances which aim at voluntarily preventing procreation were condemned as being "intrinsic et graviter mali" (intrinsically and gravely evil)": (Acta et documenta Series, II, Praeparatoria, Vol., II, Pars III, Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1968, P. 919; Continuity, Coherence, Steadfastness of Doctrine, Vatican brochure.)

And Monsignor Ferdinand Lambruschini, who introduced Pope Paul's encyclical to a Press conference on July 29, 1968, declared that it was 'binding on the conscience of all the people of God'. (L'Osservatore della Domenica.)

In his introductory press interview he said (according to L'Osservatore Romano of August 8, 1968) that *Humanae Vitae* 'excludes the possibility of a probable opinion... in contrast with the

pronouncement itself, whatever the number and the authority (hierarchical, scientific and theological) of those who have in recent years maintained that it is possible to have such a probable opinion. The pretext of a presumed doubt in the Church owing to the long silence of the Pope is not consistent and conflicts with the repeated appeals of the Pope and the Council to abide by the previous directives of the Magisterium, which were still binding.'

Mgr. Lambruschini, who voted for a repeal of the ban on contraception when he was a member of the Pope's commission, said he could not understand the reasoning of some theologians who said that '*the Pope's encyclica is not merely not irreformable. but reformable.*' (L'Oss. della Domenica, 6, Oct., 1968.)

As the American Bishops Pastoral '*Human Life in our Day*' (Nov. 15, 1968) stated: 'It is an authoritative statement solemnly interpreting imperatives which are divine rather than ecclesiastical in origin. It presents without ambiguity, doubt or hesitation, the authentic teaching of the Church concerning the objective evil of that contraception which closes the marital act to the transmission of life, deliberately making it unfruitful.... There is no warrant in the text or in the action of the bishops which would permit by implication the right for the penitent to conceal in the sacrament of confession the sin of contraceptive usage, or permit the reception of the Holy Eucharist without previous absolution.'

Yet one is bound to confess only grave sins and one can always receive Holy Communion if one is not in the state of mortal sin.

We know of two formal letters of protest sent to Cardinal Conway by Catholic organisations,



one from a lay society in Dublin, the other from the *Catholic Priests' Association* in England. His Eminence in answering both of these letters agreed that the teaching was wrong and that scandal might have been caused and also that he was writing privately to Dr O'Callaghan on the matter.

#### WHY NOT A PUBLIC STATEMENT?

But what is the point of writing privately when the offence was committed publicly? People all over the country keep quoting McDonagh, O'Callaghan and other Maynooth professors against orthodox confessors and loyal priests. How many people have we heard saying: *'What they say must be all right. After all, the bishops know their views and they have confirmed their appointment in Maynooth.'*

This is an argument that is almost impossible to answer so long as the bishops preserve a frightened silence.

TO DISPEL THE CONFUSION IT IS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY FOR THEM TO TAKE EFFECTIVE ACTION. THESE MEN SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO TEACH IN WHAT IS A NATIONAL SEMINARY AND A PONTIFICAL UNIVERSITY. NOR SHOULD THEY BE ALLOWED TO CREATE ANTI-PAPAL CONFUSION IN THE COMMUNITY.

#### FATHER FLANAGAN'S LETTER TO CARDINAL CONWAY

What follows is an excerpt from the letter of Dr Flanagan to Cardinal Conway: *'I am writing to you on behalf of the Catholic Priests' Association...asking you to repudiate the statement in the Sunday Press (15, Nov. 1970) in which Dr O'Callaghan of Maynooth is alleged to have said: "Some members of the Irish hierarchy have given directives to their priests on the lines of his own views on the Pill.... IT IS A SCANDAL TO PRIESTS AND FAITHFUL ALIKE TO*

*READ THAT HE CAN PRACTICALLY DECIDE TO REDUCE THE CHURCH'S TEACHING ON CONTRACEPTION TO JUST AN IDEAL RATHER THAN A STRICT PRECEPT. IT MAKES FOOLS OF CONSCIENTIOUS PRIESTS WHO ENDEAVOUR TO FOLLOW THE PAPAL TEACHING AND THE TRADITIONAL TEACHING OF THE CHURCH ON BIRTH CONTROL AND HOLDS THEM UP TO RIDICULE BY LAY PEOPLE WHO ARE ONLY TOO WILLING... TO SEIZE ON ANY PRETEXT TO CAST ASIDE THE AUTHENTIC TEACHING OF THE CHURCH.'*

#### DR O'CALLAGHAN REBUKED BY DR MCQUAID

In a Pastoral Letter dated November 25, 1970, read in all the churches of Dublin Archdiocese and obviously aimed at Dr O'Callaghan, the then Archbishop, Dr McQuaid stated:

*'In a Diocese there is only one teaching authority, who, under the Pope and in union with him, is competent, by virtue of his sacred office, to declare the authentic and objective moral law, that is binding on all the faithful of his Diocese, both priests and lay people. That authority is the bishop.'*

*'Accordingly, to correct the confusion that has been caused in the minds of the Faithful of this Diocese, we hereby formally declare the doctrine of the objective moral law concerning the regulation of birth: every action, which either in the anticipation of the marriage act or in the accomplishment of that act; or in the development of the natural consequences of that act, proposes, either as an end or as a means, to make procreation impossible is unlawful in itself. In other words, any contraceptive act is wrong in itself.'*

*'This is the constant teaching of the Church. This is the teaching recently reaffirmed by the Pope, Supreme Teacher of the Law of God in the Church of Christ.'*

Dr James Good of Cork, suspended by his own bishop because of his opposition to *Humanae Vitae*, publicly criticised the Archbishop's letter in an article in the *Irish Times* of Jan. 24, 1971. In this article he also stated: 'Professor Denis O'Callaghan of Maynooth had stated that a number of Irish bishops were privately instructing priests in their own dioceses to advise their parishioners on moral problems in a very different way from that outlined by the hierarchy in official pronouncements.... It was a serious specific charge: a charge that urgently demands confirmation or rebuttal.'

So far there has been a deafening silence. Commenting on this Joe Foyle wrote in *The Media Receiver* of January 25, 1971: 'The unfortunate thing about the foregoing is that episcopal silence made it possible, and sustains the situation it exploits.' (*Media Receiver*, 25, Jan., 1971.)

#### DR O'CALLAGHAN AND LECTURES ON HUMANAЕ VITAE

Speaking at a 1972 course in Glenart for returned missionaries, sponsored by the Irish Missionary Union, Dr O'Callaghan said: 'There is a code morality and there is an ideal morality... There is very little in common between the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. In the Ten Commandments there is a "Thou shalt not" morality.'

'Code morality is that of the Pharisees... Code morality is necessary to lay down minimum rule. The ideal is one thing but... Tradition allows exceptions to all moral principles if the exception can be kept in its proper place, that is if the exception depends on some chance occurrence rather than on man's choice... The sociological factor is important.'

'Christ implied that the Code Decalogue morality is not enough (in his reply to the rich young man).'

'Formulation of moral principles is a human enterprise. It is man who by his moral insight formulates moral principles. They are not given ready-made to men by God. God has given man his intellect... Because of better insight and better understanding of moral values and because of new needs, that is new situations, (man has been) led to reformulate his moral principles.'

'On concrete moral questions no one knows the answer. Authority does not solve the theoretical doubt. It merely says what should be done in a practical case... The magisterial teaching of the Church (on morals) was always practically oriented rather than theoretical. There is no infallible decree on a moral question; therefore the formulation may change.'

Speaking specifically on *Humanae Vitae*, he said: 'Middle of the road theologians say that if it had avoided the biological criteria and distinction between right and wrong methods of birth control... and if it had avoided the words "intrinsic evil" it would have been quite acceptable.....'

'It is no longer sufficient to say that a thing depends on authority....'

'Most theologians did not expect any other encyclical. It is not as bad as it might be... It avoided the language of Pius XI... The Pope acted according to his lights and couldn't have done anything else, given the man he was and the situation in which he lived... I+ did bring to a head the whole situation of the teaching of the Church and I'd say it was very salutary in that respect'.....'

(It seems that at an earlier course, when asked about *Humanae Vitae*, his colleague, Dr Enda McDonagh, replied: 'You can read it for yourself. See if the Pope's arguments satisfy you. They don't satisfy me.' He was of course careful to add that he would never go against the teaching of the Pope. He does not however appear to have reminded those there that it is a condemned proposition which says that the force of the Pope's teaching depends on the force of the arguments he uses.)

Dr O'Callaghan also lectured to priests of Cloyne Diocese in the presence of the bishop, Dr Ahern. We have no recording of what he said on this occasion, but certain priests who were there have quoted him as saying that Catholics may use not only the Pill but any contraceptive.

Similarly, some priests who heard him in Killarney had the impression that (according to Dr O'Callaghan) *Humanae Vitae* was but an interim measure, that the Pope was going to allow contraceptives but if he had done so right away it would have come as too great a shock; the minds of the people had to be gradually prepared for it.

When some of the priests present argued that his views seemed to conflict with the teaching of the Irish Hierarchy, he is alleged to have said that he had been teaching these views for some time and that the Bishops were fully aware of this, and that he must have the confidence of the Bishops since they had appointed him Secretary of the Catholic Marriage Advisory Council. (He might have added that he is also a member of their Theological Commission and a Professor in the theological faculty at Maynooth, despite all the regulations to which reference has been made at the commencement of this *Dossier*.)

Knowing how artful certain theologians can be in the use of words to convey impressions

without explicitly saying what is taken as having been implied or said, we cannot confirm that at Cloyne or Killarney Dr O'Callaghan actually said what he is alleged to have said. We can testify however to the impression created on certain priests who heard him.

It seems he also created confusion on the occasion of the 1972 retreat for priests of the Dublin Archdiocese. The very fact that he had been invited to address the priests of the Dublin Archdiocese was seen as a public slap in the face for the former Archbishop, Dr McQuaid, who had publicly condemned Dr O'Callaghan's views. It is certainly difficult to imagine that Dr Ryan was unaware that he had been invited. It is also regrettable that he should have been invited to indoctrinate returned missionaries in the Irish Missionary Union centre at Glenart.

It is even more regrettable however that at grass roots levels all over Ireland at present the general impression is that it is the erroneous teaching of the Majority Report of the Papal Commission on Birth Control that has prevailed rather than the teaching of *Humanae Vitae*.

#### DR O'CALLAGHAN ON THE LEGALISING OF CONTRACEPTION, DIVORCE AND ABORTION

(The following section is a reproduction of pages 7-13 of the *APPROACHES* 24-25 editorial entitled 'Thank God for John Charles')

#### Subversion's objectives

If in fact there is some degree of disunity within the Irish episcopate at present, this is particularly unfortunate. It is certainly not for us to comment on how Their Lordships should exercise their pastoral

responsibilities. We cannot but observe, however, that if they are at loggerheads concerning the *pastoral* implications of *Humanae Vitae*, they are scarcely likely to be of one mind concerning the *legal* implications of Catholic doctrine concerning marriage and the family.

It is not as though the legal implications of Catholic doctrine concerning marriage and the family were a mere academic question. For in Ireland at present there is a concerted campaign to legalise contraception and divorce. (For tactical reasons abortion is not yet mentioned). Nor can this campaign be dismissed as the work of fringe, crank subversives without influence. It is true that the campaign is spearheaded by the *Irish Family Rights Association* and the associated *Fertility Guidance Clinics* (sponsored by the *International Planned Parenthood Federation*). And needless to say there is also the usual assortment of secular humanists and 'progressive' Catholics. But these people enjoy the undisguised backing not only of the media but also of the ruling party in the *Dail*, which would justify these 'reforms' on the grounds that this would facilitate the re-uniting of Ireland, by conceding in advance the Protestant's 'right' to contraception and divorce.

The imminence of the threat can be gauged from the following statement which appeared in the Friday, March 12, 1971 issue of *The Irish Press*, mouthpiece of the ruling *Fianna Fail* party:

*'A decision in principle to change the existing law on contraception has been taken by the Government. A bill to legalise the import and sale of contraceptives, subject to certain conditions, is in course of preparation. After it is considered by the Government and the Fianna*

*Fail Parliamentary Party, it will be introduced in the Dail.'*

To appreciate the full significance of the above paragraph it must be added that this was part of a front-page story headed '*CONTRACEPTION BILL IS BEING DRAFTED*'. Indeed this could be described without exaggeration as the ruling *Fianna Fail* party's reply to a statement by the Hierarchy which had just been published.

This collegial statement by the Hierarchy had this to say about the legalising of contraception, divorce and abortion.

*'The bishops fully share the disquiet, which is widespread among the people at the present time, regarding pressures being exerted on public opinion on questions concerning the civil law on divorce, contraception and abortion.*

*'These questions involve issues of grave import for society as a whole, which go far beyond purely private morality or private religious belief. CIVIL LAW ON THESE MATTERS SHOULD RESPECT THE WISHES OF THE PEOPLE WHO ELECTED THE LEGISLATORS AND THE BISHOPS CONFIDENTLY HOPE THAT THE LEGISLATORS THEMSELVES WILL RESPECT THIS IMPORTANT PRINCIPLE.....'* (Emphasis added.)

#### Consensus Law-making

Not indeed since the foundation of the Irish Republic has the Hierarchy been faced with a crisis such as this. Hitherto, the moral authority of the Church sufficed to prevent the passing of specifically anti-Christian legislation. But the Hierarchy can no longer take this for granted. For the mind of contemporary Ireland is formed by the media rather than by the clergy.

Perhaps it is because of this that the Hierarchy decided to settle for 'consensus law-making' in its collegial statement. But given the suggestion of disagreement among their Lordships concerning the pastoral approach to problems concerning marriage and the family, a cynic might be forgiven for describing the Hierarchy's mid-March, 1971 statement as a 'consensus pastoral'.

It is of course true that both Cardinal Conway and the Hierarchy have made it clear that the legalising of abortion must be bracketed with the other two 'reforms'. Nor is it suggested that any Irish bishop would argue that contraception and divorce are not intrinsically evil. The fact remains, however, that the Hierarchy appears to have deliberately chosen NOT to base its opposition to the legalising of contraception and divorce on the fact that they are evil. Their Lordships instead confine themselves to hoping confidently that Irish politicians will abide by the consensus of the Irish people, and that the consensus of the Irish people will reflect the widespread disquiet referred to in the Hierarchy's statement.

As shrewd observer Joe Foyle notes in 'The Media Receiver' of March 22, 1971: 'The most significant thing about the Cardinal's argument [in a radio-television interview on Sunday March 14, 1971] is something negative it shares with the Hierarchy's statement of last week. Nowhere is there to be found a statement saying that contraception, divorce and abortion are evil, violate the Natural Moral Law grievously. Both the interview and the statement are content to rely on the consensus of Irish opinion - if it were known - being opposed to legislation permitting such practices as contraception and divorce.'

The position of the Hierarchy, acting collegially, would appear to be reflected in the

following statement by the Rev. Denis O'Callaghan, Professor of Moral Theology at Maynooth, speaking at Limerick on March 15, 1971:

*'The question of contraception law cannot be debated on the objective morality or immorality of contraception itself. If the original law took its stand on this it was not entitled to do so.'*

*'Neither can the question be decided by the private consciences of the legislators, because THE LAW MUST REFLECT THE GENERAL CONSENSUS OF THE PEOPLE TO WHOM IT APPLIES.'*  
(Emphasis added)

As Joe Foyle puts it: 'This O'Callaghan lecture can only be seen in the light of the Hierarchy's and the Cardinal's views of the past week. Not only does he [Professor O'Callaghan] occupy a post previously held by Cardinal Conway, but it is reasonable to suppose that he was one of the advisers at last week's Hierarchy meeting. Furthermore, we may suppose that his lecture took the Hierarchy attitude into account and was guaranteed not to be inconsistent with it. More than likely it would have received some kind of official approval.'

*'After his contraception faux pas of some months ago, which earned him private rebukes and evoked a clarifying letter from His Grace of Dublin, we may presume that both he and his Maynooth episcopal superiors would have arranged that the orthodoxy of his public statements would be ensured in the various ways possible.'*

*'Father O'Callaghan is anything but the sort of priest who sets about bishop-baiting by means of highly speculative, highly publicised personal views, as the present writer can vouch for from acquaintance over a number of*



years. He is merely, therefore, explaining current Catholic Irish orthodoxy for the benefit of all and sundry.'

With all due respect to Their Lordships, we must say that we would have found their collegial statement surprising, to say the least, even were there certain to be a consensus of opinion in favour of Christian legislation. But merely to appeal to the general will of the people in an Ireland that has already been subjected to intensive brainwashing by the media of communication, and permeated at all social and political levels (not to speak of certain ecclesiastical levels) by rotten liberalism: this is to invite disaster. Under these circumstances it is scarcely surprising to find Joe Foyle saying: 'It can now be assumed very safely that the battle is lost. Permissive legislation is well on the way.' For no one knows the mind of contemporary Ireland better than Joe Foyle.

#### A sign of the times

'...the law must reflect the general consensus of the people to whom it applies.'

Does this mean that theft must cease to be an indictable offence once 'the general consensus of the people' esteems honesty to require heroic virtue?

And what of societies obsessed with race- or class-hatred? Does 'the general consensus of the people' in such instances suffice to endow the extermination of 'inferior' races or 'bourgeois' social strata with the dignity of legality - as in Hitler Germany, Stalin's Russia and Mao's China?

Once laws are no longer framed in accordance with objective moral norms, but in deference to

'the general consensus of the people', right cannot but make way for might - for the dictatorship of the mob.

Not of course that the mob is capable of exercising a dictatorship. As we know from the experience of both National Socialist and Revolutionary Marxist dictatorship, the role of the mob is merely that of a blind instrument in the hands of those who excite its lusts and fears.

'Consensus Law-making' therefore cannot but hasten the advent of the unrestricted rule of the media manipulators who prefabricate 'public opinion'.

It is, alas! one of the 'signs of the times' we are forever hearing about nowadays that the advent of the Leviathan Servile State should be justified in advance by the Professor of Moral Theology in Maynooth.

#### Role of the loyal Christian laity

Yet the Cardinal-Primate dares to be optimistic. He says that he will be surprised if there won't be a powerful public response against the legislation of contraception. There may well be.

If there is a public response sufficient to withstand the consensus of opinion in favour of the legalisation of both contraception and divorce that is now being sedulously prefabricated - this will be possible only if a sufficient number of loyal Christian layfolk base themselves securely on fidelity to Christian principles and the natural law, and proceed to mobilise the considerable forces in Ireland that continue to respect objective truth rather than the dictates of 'public opinion'.

In other words, nothing can stop the present rot, nothing can prevent the de-Christianisation of Irish society but the emergence of a sufficiently dynamic Christian lay elite.

-000-

DR WATSON

Some of Dr Watson's Maynooth colleagues regard him as a lightweight in the theological field, but to other layfolk he is a professor in Maynooth and therefore an authority. Yet he had never been heard of by most Irish people until he wrote a foolish article in the *Irish Times* of September 10, 1968, calling for the rejection of the teaching of *Humanae Vitae*. In it he gave the impression that he approved of the opinion of others, especially of certain priests teaching theology, who reckoned that 'the encyclical would be of only historical interest within a few years'.

With even more appalling naivete he declared: 'And surely the fact that thousands of loyal Catholics, after sincere reflection, experience such severe conflict of conscience, must indicate doubt that the teaching is clear enough to be binding.'

Displaying more than a nominal resemblance to his more famous namesake, he made himself theologically ludicrous by citing Hans Kung.

'Hans Kung,' he wrote, 'in what we hope was not an understatement said that it was another Galileo case.'

Although continuing to be a professor at Maynooth, he felt that pressure should be brought to bear on the Irish bishops to disown the

Encyclical. 'Yes,' he said, 'I feel an attempt should be made to indicate to the bishops before their October meeting the extent and depth of feeling on the matter in this country.' One would think that he was hearing of anti-contraceptive teaching for the first time. He went on to say: 'We still have a month to the meeting of the Irish bishops.' The lay people, he felt, could write letters to the papers, theologians could put their views privately [would to God they had done so PRIVATELY!] to the bishops, and priests should organise groups and present their statements.

He concluded by saying: 'There can be no question of forcing the bishops to make a statement - but we shall never be able to raise our heads again in Ireland if at this juncture we fail to do all that our conscience asks of us.'

This young man is a priest who is doubly subject to Cardinal Conway: first as a priest of his diocese, and secondly as a professor in the Pontifical College of which the Cardinal is Chancellor. After such a tirade one would have expected that this would have definitely been his last appearance qua Maynooth professor. But it was not to be. In the *Irish Times* of March 20, 1969, he again made what can only be regarded as an attack on the Irish Bishops' Pastoral on *Humanae Vitae*.

'A reading of the Pastoral' he said, 'might give the impression that some people do interpret conscience as a right of purely private judgment, and that, for Catholics, in the question of birth control, the possible alternative is an informed conscience, that is one that obeys the teaching of *Humanae Vitae* on the matter. This, however, is a false dichotomy because one of the alternatives is non-existent, and that is the concept of "a

purely private judgment". It belongs rather to the language of religious controversy than that of moral reasoning.'

He goes on to cite the outworn argument that is illogical and hardly worthy of a serious theological discussion: 'When couples have been married for, perhaps, fifteen years and have had first-hand experience of the difficulties of preserving married love and giving their children the Christian education that they are entitled to, it is strange to expect a priest to come from outside and make the final decision.'

On that argument a doctor could not treat a patient for a disease unless he had had it himself. But what precisely does Dr Watson mean by 'the Christian education that they are entitled to'?

The final gem of this masterpiece came in what appeared to be more than just a careless omission. He quoted the Belgian bishops' statement (as reported in *The Tablet* of September 9, 1968) as saying: 'Someone, however, who is competent in the matter under consideration and capable of forming a personal and well-founded judgment - which necessarily presupposed a sufficient amount of knowledge - may after a serious examination before God, come to other conclusions on certain points.' But he conveniently omits the following observation in the next paragraph: 'He must also beware of compromising the common good and the salvation of his brothers by creating unhealthy unrest, or a fortiori, by questioning the very principle of authority.' (par.4)

The right of dissent is actually an exception made by theologians. According to Dr Ford, Professor of Theology, Weston College, Mass.,

U.S.A., where a theological expert in the field (I) is unable to give his assent, 'he is permitted to present his reasons to the proper ecclesiastical authority. No theologian that I know of ever said a priest or any other member of the faithful in those circumstances could outwardly reject the teaching of the Church, much less that he could incite others, gather names of others, or work up petitions.' (N.C. Report 3:9:68)

That position is supported by any number of authorities and bishops' pastorals; it was honoured by the U.S.A. Bishop Shannon before his marriage but it was recklessly disregarded by Dr Watson in his first *Irish Times* article.

Monsignor Lambruschini, who, prior to the Encyclical was in favour of a change in the teaching on contraception, and who said that *Humanae Vitae* was not infallible, is often cited by dissenters in their own favour. His testimony is therefore all the more relevant.

In his opinion, 'Those who in recent times uncautiously believed, even in good faith, that they could teach the lawfulness of contraceptives for the regulation of births and behaved accordingly in pastoral directives and in the ministry of confession must change their views and give the example of full adhesion to the teaching of the Encyclical.' (July, 1968)

Surely after his second outburst, Dr Watson would simply have to be removed from his Maynooth Chair. A private reprimand would scarcely suffice; the scandal being

---

(I) It must be emphasised that Dr Watson is NOT a theological expert, but merely a classics professor.



too great. Alas! neither the Cardinal (his bishop) nor the hierarchy took any public action. Dr Watson was destined to make yet a third public appearance, and one that was to secure for him even greater notoriety and still more sensational headlines. After he had addressed a meeting of *The Irish Family Planning Rights Association* he was reported in the following terms: 'A Maynooth professor in a sensational address on the contraception controversy in Dublin last night said that what was right for Catholics in the rest of the world could not be wrong for Irish Catholics.'

Apparently he said that only 20 per cent of the world's bishops supported the Pope (a most inaccurate statement) and that the others did not want to say openly that he was wrong but at the same time they could not pretend that he was right.

Is it not intolerable that orthodox Catholics should be affronted and simple people misled by such blatant inaccuracy and downright false teaching from a Maynooth professor who as often as not is quoted as a 'theological expert'?

BUT WHO IS CAUSING THE GREATER SCANDAL, DR WATSON OR THE BISHOPS WHO TAKE NO EFFECTIVE ACTION AGAINST HIM AND WHO CONTINUE TO ALLOW HIM TO TEACH IN MAYNOOTH, THUS GIVING HIS STATEMENTS A CREDENCE THEY DO NOT DESERVE?

He is said to have established that: 'It was in order for Catholics to dissent from the official Church stand on contraception....and that he put both primates (Cardinal Conway and Archbishop McQuaid) in their place.' (Media Receiver, 20, April, 1971, p.7.)

This grave scandal added to the growing confusion of priests and people, testing their patience and even their faith to the utmost.

This may be gathered from the huge newspaper headlines:

'CALL TO DISMISS PRIEST: SEQUEL TO STATEMENT ON CONTRACEPTION.'

The following statement on this matter from the English Catholic Priests' Association was given wide prominence.

'We wish to deplore and repudiate the teaching of a Maynooth professor on the question of the Papal Encyclical, *Humanae Vitae*. Many of his references are without foundation, especially his reference to Pope Paul in 1964 stating that he might change the traditional teaching on this matter. *Humanae Vitae* according to many theologians was an infallible doctrine, coming under the Ordinary Magisterium of the Church and all authorities hold it as authentic teaching of the Church unfolding Divine Law.

'WE CALL UPON THE IRISH BISHOPS TO REMOVE PROFESSOR WATSON FROM HIS TEACHING POST WHICH MAY ENDANGER THE SPREADING OF HIS FALSE DOCTRINES TO OTHERS.' (Evening Herald; 29 April, 1971.)

Can one wonder that priests and people all over Ireland are anguished and puzzled, asking plaintively: 'What is wrong with the bishops? Why don't they take some action against these priests?'

DR DONAL FLANAGAN

Dr Flanagan is Professor of Dogmatic Theology in Maynooth.

Speaking on 'The Church - Participation in Decision Making' at the Summer School of

the Social Study Conference, in Wexford, he is quoted as saying: 'We ought to democratise the Church to a degree so that she could remain true to her nature... The Office in the Church is not a mandate to act in isolation but a commission to decide in common with the members of the COMMUNIO FRATERNA which the Church is.' (Irish Independent, August 6, 1969)

He wrote the first of a series of three articles (the other two being by Drs Watson and McGrath, his Maynooth colleagues) attacking the Irish Bishops' Pastoral on Humanae Vitae in the Irish Times of March 19, 1969. Returning to his favourite theme he wrote: 'In the Pastoral Letter of the Irish bishops, Lent, 1969, the Church appears as composed of those who teach and those who obey. The faithful are given the purely passive role of being the recipients of the guidance of the Holy Spirit from the hierarchy. This is a one-sided insistence on the legitimate role of the teaching body...with prompt and willing acceptance of its judgment with no complement by emphasis of the same body's duty to listen to the voice of the Holy Spirit in the People of God before making its judgment. There is no hint in the pastoral that there exists in the Church of Christ the possibility of the hierarchy hearing the Spirit of Christ in the voice of their faithful people.'

He went on to declare: 'Married people are being guided and led and taught by the Spirit in a particular form of Christian life which is not being lived by the teaching body in the Western Church. They provide in their witness an understanding given them by the Spirit and available to the Church only through them. This witness must be heard...the very nature of the Church forbids that it be ignored or suppressed...to ignore the faithful is to ignore the Holy Spirit.'

Coming from a man with the status of a professor in a Pontifical University, such arrogant nonsense is surely intolerable.

#### THE TRUE ROLE OF THE PONTIFICAL MAGISTERIUM

The truth concerning the role of the Magisterium has of course been enunciated repeatedly by Pope Paul. Here are but a few of his statements:

(1) 'Some would like to recognise in this magisterium more than anything else the task of confirming the "infallible belief of the community of the faithful"....The office of interpreting authentically the Word of God, whether written or otherwise transmitted, is entrusted solely to the living magisterium of the Church, whose authority is exercised in the name of Jesus Christ.' (General Audience, Jan. II. 1967.)

(2) 'We know, unfortunately, that, nowadays, certain trends of thought which still describe themselves as Catholic attempt to attribute a priority in the normative formulation of the truths of the faith to the community of the faithful....This view is contrary to scripture and Christ's teaching.' (General Audience, Feb. 22, 1967)

(3) 'Many wish to abolish authority in the Church and they cannot; they wish to trace its source to the community and they are violating a constitutional character of the Church.' (Address to Clergy of Rome, Feb. 17, 1969)

(4) 'This is a charism which does not derive from the *communio fidelium* but which is for its edification.' (Address on the office of Bishop, Jan. 5, 1969)

(5) 'Another danger lies in personal claims of prophetic insight. Many who talk about the Church today say they are inspired by a prophetic spirit. They make risky and sometimes inadmissible assertions and appeal to the Holy Spirit as if the Divine Paraclete were at their service at all times. They sometimes do this, unfortunately, with an unspoken intention of freeing themselves from the Church's magisterium, which also enjoys the assistance of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit's charisms are freely granted by Him to the whole People of God, and also to the ordinary believer. BUT VERIFICATION OF THEM AND EXERCISE OF THEM ARE SUBJECT TO THE AUTHORITY OF THE HIERARCHICAL MINISTRY.' (Sept. 24, 1969)

(6) 'To use a current term, the Church, in the exercise of her authority, is democratic in her end and in her raison d'être, but not in her origin.

'She does not derive her power from below; she derives it from Christ, from God, and is responsible only to Him.' (November 12, 1969)

(7) In his allocution to the Third World Congress of the Lay Apostolate on October 15, 1967, the Holy Father, explicitly refuting the notion that there can be 'no parallel hierarchies.... existing side by side', stated: '....in the Church, efficacy is proportional to one's adherence to those whom Christ "has made guardians to feed the Church of the Lord" (cf. Acts. XX, 28).

'Anyone who attempts to act without the Hierarchy, or against it, in the field of the Father of the Family, could be compared to the branch which atrophies because it is no longer connected with the stem which provides its sap.'

As erroneous views in this matter are not confined to one Maynooth professor, Dr Flanagan,

but are shared to some extent, by Drs McDonagh, O'Callaghan, Freyne and Surlis, it might be helpful to end this section by quoting a more recent statement from Pope Paul that is peculiarly relevant:

'....The exercise of authority in the Church....is a responsibility of service in the community....that is to say, each one must serve the others, and be of use to the others.

'The others are the object, not the source of the authority established for their service, not at their service.' (Statement to the Sacred Roman Rota, Jan. 28, 1971)

#### CONDEMNED ERRORS ON AUTHORITY

The errors concerning Authority subscribed to today by so many Maynooth professors are anything but original - as can be seen from the following 'syllabus' of condemned errors:

(1) Marcilius Patavinus was condemned by Pope John, XXII in 1327, for teaching that 'all power is committed directly and immediately to the Christian people'.

(2) The Gallicans and the Regalists were condemned by Innocent XI, in 1682, for saying that Papal decisions were not irreformable until they had received the consent and acceptance of the Universal Church.

(3) The doctrine of Edmund Richer was condemned in 1612, 1622, 1681 and 1709. He taught that the prerogative of supreme power and infallibility in the Church was committed to the whole body of the people and that no Church Law had any force until it was confirmed by the People of God.

(4) Febronius (John Nicholas de Hontheim) was condemned for asserting that neither Pope nor Council has the right to issue binding decrees without the acceptance of the People of God.

(5) Finally we come to the Modernists, unhappily still with us, who were condemned for teaching that power in the Church is not absolute but is completely dependent on the religious conscience of the faithful.

FATHER DONAL FLANAGAN'S  
'ASSOCIATION OF IRISH PRIESTS'

In an article in the December II, 1969 English Edition of *L'Osservatore Romano*, Jean Guittou makes the following observations:

*'....the people find it hard to express themselves and history abundantly shows how easy it is for a small number of men to speak in the name of collectivities, without truly representing them, and indeed sometimes even terrorizing them. Opinion is fabricated by a minority, and opinion rules the world.*

*'But the Church is not of this world. It is not represented by an emperor or by opinion...Opinion is not prophetic....We should be gravely mistaken if we confused public opinion with that profound feeling which is in the Christian people but is often unexpressed through inability or reserve. It used to be called sensus fidelium. Cardinal Newman was very right when he said that the laity "must be consulted" even on the faith, and that when great numbers of bishops were partly Arian in the 4th century, the faith was saved by the laity who remained united to the Pope. The faith they saved was that which the Council of Nicea defined about Christ's divinity.'*

What Jean Guittou says about the ease with which a minority can speak for the people without truly representing them is particularly relevant to most of the 'Associations of Priests' now proliferating throughout the Church.

As was observed in the C.P.A. Newsletter (Vol. III, IV, 1972): *'It is a well-known fact that all over the world Modernists have got control of practically every group of priests.'* It is certainly true of the American National Federation of Priests' Councils. They claim to represent 30,000 priests, but Archbishop Byrne of St Paul feels that 3,000 would be closer to the truth. It is equally true in Ireland where Dr Flanagan's Association of Irish Priests accounts for only 2 per cent of Irish priests. (*Media Receiver*, 4 Oct. 1971.) A radio news item gave an account of a survey carried out by this organization in July-August, 1971; it claimed that 65 per cent of those priests responding favoured optional celibacy. Needless to say this got world-wide publicity, but not the fact that those participating accounted for only 1½ per cent of the Irish total.

No information was given about the other 98.5 per cent. Can we claim that they favoured celibacy? In fact, Cardinal Conway had claimed a week earlier that the majority of Irish priests were opposed to optional celibacy.

Yet sixteen priests of this organization in an impertinent public declaration 'strongly challenged published statements by members of the Catholic Hierarchy on contraception.' (*Irish Independent*, 26, Aug., 1971.)

But the real scandal is that the leading light of this 'Association of Irish Priests', Father Donal Flanagan, continues to be

Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the Pontifical University of Maynooth, apparently with the blessing of the Irish Hierarchy. (N.B. This small Irish splinter group is not to be confused with the already mentioned English *Catholic Priests' Association*, also headed by a Dr Flanagan. This latter group has for its purpose loyalty to the Pope and the defence of the magisterium.)

DR. P. J. MCGRATH

Dr McGrath is a professor in the Philosophical faculty in Maynooth. He wrote one of the *Irish Times* articles attacking the Irish Bishops' Pastoral Letter on *Humanae Vitae* - articles which in effect openly challenged the Irish Hierarchy. Had the Hierarchy then taken action, the Church in Ireland would not today be in such a sorry plight.

Dr McGrath's article appeared on March 21, 1969. His attack on *Humanae Vitae* was repeated in May, 1969, in a book *Morals, Law and Authority*, edited by Dr J.P. Mackey, who was denied the Chair of Dogma in Maynooth because of his suspect orthodoxy, although he was the sole applicant.

This is public knowledge. Yet, astonishingly, Dr McGrath's appointment in the Pontifical College was confirmed by the bishops in 1971, after he had completed his probationary period. Does this signify that the bishops approve of his teaching? It would surely be ludicrous, even in contemporary Ireland, to say that they approved of an attack on their own pastoral. But if they consider that the views of Dr McGrath are erroneous why was his appointment officially ratified?

In his *Irish Times* article he found the pastoral 'negative and unbalanced' in dealing

with the procreative aspects. In another passage he indicates that the 'Church's stand on contraception' does not 'cohere with the rest of her teaching on marriage'. And in an extraordinary non sequitur he asks: 'If it is permissible to use the pill for therapeutic purposes and permissible to use the safe period to avoid conception, why is it always wrong to use the pill to avoid contraception?' He goes on: 'To suppose that procreation is essential in the same way as the unitive act is to imply that sexual intercourse is an aberration when procreation is impossible.'

Even coming from a professor in a Pontifical University, such frivolous playing with words hardly merits serious comment.

He continues his criticism of *Humanae Vitae* all through the section 'Natural Law and Moral Argument' in the book, *Morals, Law and Authority* (P.56-78, Dublin, Gill and MacMillan.), which book, incidentally, has an *imprimatur* from Dr Lennon, the Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin.

DR KEVIN MCNAMARA

Dr Kevin McNamara, Vice-President of Maynooth, is a member of the bishops' theological commission. He is Professor of Dogmatic Theology. He is generally regarded with less suspicion than the other Maynooth people we have mentioned. Yet he too has publicly expressed some very questionable opinions.

At least one Irish Catholic mother was confused and scandalised by a letter he wrote in the *Irish Times* of November 26, 1970.

She stated: 'As a Catholic mother of four I must write to say how disturbed I am



by the Rev. McNamara's letter. I am not a theologian and I am sure that the Rev. McNamara will consider my criticism very naive but he seems to say that where Pius XII was wrong now Paul VI is right. It doesn't seem very relevant to me to say that they might be agreed in principle, if in practice after *Casta Connubii* confessors absolutely forbade contraception whereas after *Humanae Vitae* they condone it. Can the true doctrine lead to contradictory practice?... He has only succeeded in making confusion more confused, as indeed did his colleague, Dr O'Callaghan. Rev. McNamara tells us that contraception is always wrong but that Pope Paul recognised that in practice it is impossible to live up to the standard of the Gospel and that we are not necessarily guilty in the eyes of God after we practise it! .... What are those of us who try sincerely to observe Paul's law on contraception to believe? Are we fools for trying so hard? And to say that the discrepancy between the Pope's statement and those of some national hierarchies is one of emphasis strikes me, with respect, as utter nonsense. All this puts me in a most embarrassing position with my friends.... When I foolishly showed the letter to a university professor he laughed heartily and said that the Rev. McNamara had got rid of Pope Pius XII's doctrine and was now whittling away at Pope Paul.... Perhaps the deafening silence from Maynooth after *Humanae Vitae* can be explained by the fact that they were as confused as I am after Rev. McNamara's letter.' (Irish Times, Nov. 26, 1970)

#### DR MCNAMARA AND HUMANAЕ VITAE. IS IT REFORMABLE?

The following two passages were quoted in an editorial of the London Tablet of August 10, 1968. The Tablet has an unhappy record on the

Encyclical (1) and published the two quotations in order to try to justify itself.

(1) 'The Holy Roman Catholic Church firmly believes, professes and teaches that outside the Catholic Church, no one, neither pagans nor Jews nor heretics, nor schismatics, can obtain eternal life, but will go to the everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels, unless before the end of life they are received into it.' (Council of Florence, 1439).

(2) 'Those also can obtain to everlasting salvation who through no fault of their own do not know the Gospel of Christ or His Church, yet sincerely seek God and, moved by grace, strive by their deeds to do His will as it is known to them through the dictates of conscience. Nor does Divine Providence deny the help necessary to salvation to those who, without blame on their part, have not yet arrived at an explicit knowledge of God, but who strive to lead a good life, thanks to his Grace. (Vatican 2).

The Tablet had reproduced the above passages with acknowledgement to Father Kevin McNamara, Professor of Fundamental Theology at Maynooth, saying that he had quoted them in the latest issue of the 'Bulletin' issued by the Catholic Marriage Advisory Council' in support of his contention that the Church can change and has changed her doctrine in the past and that she is not irrevocably committed to the teaching that contraception is intrinsically evil.

Properly understood, there is no difficulty here, except for the unlearned. Even seminarians

(1) Indeed several years before *Humanae Vitae* was published, a wag suggested that 'The Tablet' should really be called 'The PILL'.

of moderate ability would be able to deal effectively with such an objection, seeing in it but another version of the *extra ecclesia nulla salus* problem.

But on the supposition of a *transeat*, on the supposition of a contradiction between Florence and Vatican 2 (which claimed to be merely pastoral in intent) who is Dr McNamara to say that Florence was wrong and Vatican 2 right? (I)

#### DR PAUL SURLIS

Formerly a mere lecturer, notwithstanding his contribution to *Morals, Law and Authority*, he was appointed by the Bishops as full Professor of Dogmatic Theology - to the astonishment and dismay of well-informed, orthodox Catholics.

We have seen that where an expert in the field disagrees with some aspects of the teaching of the ordinary magisterium he can put his view privately to the pertinent authority, but he is not allowed to confuse people by writing publicly about it.

Apart from ignoring this himself, Dr Surlis is, evidently, not prepared to accept it, even in principle. For in the *Irish Times* of April 7, 1969 he wrote: 'On the question of the propriety of taking such discussions to the papers we must recall the service which has been done in recent years by responsible journalists in bringing Vatican 2 to the people.'

(I) Since the above was written, in *Mysterium Ecclesiae*, the Sacred Congregation for Doctrine and Faith has reaffirmed Vatican 2's statement: 'it is through Christ's Catholic Church alone... that the fullness of the means of salvation can be obtained.'

It is incredible that a Maynooth professor would not be ashamed to be associated with such illogical reasoning. In the first place, the majority of journalists and newspapers, both 'Catholic' and secular, did an immense disservice to the Church by the crude misrepresentation of the issues being debated by the Council Fathers. In the second place, even if they had all been honest, truth-loving reporters, what relevance has straightforward reporting to the dilemma facing a well-informed theological expert who for some reason or other cannot give assent to some aspects of the Church's teaching, yet knows that while he can express his views privately to the competent authorities, he must not cause confusion by expressing his views publicly?

#### DR SURLIS ON THE CREDIBILITY OF PAPAL AUTHORITY

Writing on 'The Church's Message' in *Morals, Law and Authority*, Dr Surlis stated: 'Many people felt that its [i.e. the Encyclical's] net result would be to diminish the credibility and authority of the Papal office.' (p.130). Also, 'We are not suggesting that social and doctrinal encyclicals are on quite the same level in the assent they require even although both alike are reformable'. (p.132).

This is not only a most complex generalisation; it is also an unproven assumption that is contrary to sound theological opinion.

He says of the Church: 'She is there to serve not to dominate or dictate.' But if she is to serve are there not many occasions when she must dictate?

It is certainly inexcusable that a man in his position, a professor in a Pontifical University, should attack Papal authority on the matter of *Humanae Vitae* without even trying

to think straight. But it is equally scandalous that an Irish Bishop, Dr Lennon of Kildare and Leighlin, should have given an *imprimatur* to such a misleading work, written in popular form for ordinary Catholic readers. He did not even take the trouble to get his facts right. Consider, for example, the following gem from page 13 of *Morals Law and Authority*: 'The Lambeth bishops saw in the manner in which *Humanae Vitae* was issued a "blow to collegiality", and in this view there is much justification. In fact the rather hesitant and unsure exercise of collegiality which we are now experiencing post eventum, would not have been necessary if adequate consultation with the universal episcopate had taken place before the encyclical was issued.'

In fact, of course, as Dr Surlis knows perfectly well, such consultation with the universal episcopate *did* take place. He also knows that if the Pope had decided the issue on his own without any consultation he would have been quite within his rights in doing so. But in fact, as everyone knows, there was consultation on the widest possible level. What Dr Surlis objects to of course is that having consulted all the leading experts, the Pope did not allow them to decide for him.

As Cardinal Felici and Father Gagnebet, O.P. pointed out in the October 10, 1968 issue of *L'Osservatore Romano*, the unfounded charges that the Pope decided the matter on his own, that he did not consult the bishops or the council, or that he had not taken into account the consensus of the People of God are quite inexcusable, given the extensive consultation that did take place.

DR JAMES MACKAY AND MAYNOOTH

Formerly a professor at St John's Seminary, Waterford, he is now attached to the University

of San Francisco. As we have already pointed out, he was not so long ago, the sole applicant for the Chair of Dogma in Maynooth. He was turned down precisely because of the unorthodoxy of his views, especially as expressed in his book, *Life and Grace*. This fact has been confirmed by some Irish bishops.

He is the editor of a book '*Morals, Law and Authority*', in which many attacks are made on *Humanae Vitae*. It features articles by no less than five Maynooth professors: Sean Freyne, P.J. McGrath, Enda McDonagh, Paul Surlis and Gerard Watson.

In the *Irish Press* of March 3, 1971, he is accused of having 'put his signature to a protest against *Humanae Vitae*'.

According to the *Universe* of May 2, 1969, he told a meeting of British doctors that because 'the effort to reform this admittedly non-infallible and so reformable piece of Papal teaching' had been 'so quick, so strong and so persistent', the absolute prohibition of contraception was now more doubtful than before *Humanae Vitae* was published. He also expressed the opinion that once Catholic doctors 'found full voice' and took their proper part in the evolution of Christian consciousness, 'an absolute prohibition of contraception would cease to apply and would be replaced in the Christian community by a more humane practice'.

In a television interview, '*By What Authority*', which he shared with Bishop Harty of Killaloe, he had already said that although the Pope had made one clear statement banning all forms of birth control, 'there was a range of opinion among bishops which did not amount to a straightforward condemnation.' (*Irish Independent*, Dec. 17, 1968) (This was at most a



partial half-truth. For this was true only of a very small percentage of the world's bishops.)

At the 1970 Maynooth Summer School, reading a paper on 'The Historical Church as Mediator of Faith' he stated:

'Modern man will no longer brook the assumption that there are lords who rule over him by divine right, who pass on authority from one to another as a self-propagating group.... He will not consider himself a full adult member of the people unless he has a say in what is practised or expressed by the people as a whole, unless in particular he has a direct say in choosing the leaders... (Irish Times, August 28, 1970)

It seems a grave dereliction of duty by the Irish bishops that such a man should be allowed back repeatedly to address Maynooth Summer Schools or Seminars in Ireland. This gives people the impression that he is an orthodox expert, an impression that is not warranted by his public pronouncements. As recently as the Summer of 1972, he was invited to address the Theological Congress in Bishop Russell's seminary, St. John's, Waterford, where he was formerly a professor. Dr Russell must accept responsibility for the fact that, speaking along with him, were the equally notorious Drs. McDonagh and O'Callaghan.

FATHER MICHAEL MACGREIL, S.J.

Father McGreil is a lecturer on sociology in Maynooth.

Speaking on 'Education and Cultural Development' at a three-day Western Development Conference in Galway, Father McGreil earned himself a front-page headline in the *Irish Times* of October 7, 1972:

JESUIT SAYS IRISH UNITY IDEAL WOULD BE AIDED BY MIXED SCHOOLS. And the *Irish Independent* of the same day reported that he had made a 'strong plea for schools mixed from the point of sex and denomination' and that 'he could see no argument in Ireland for separate denominational schools'.

The *Irish Times* report of his talk reveals that he served up the usual mash of arguments which are the stock-in-trade of secular humanists. He does not even seem to have considered Pope Pius XI's encyclical on *The Christian Education of Youth* or Vatican 2's *Declaration on Christian Education* as even worthy of mention.

It is indeed sad to see such blatant contempt for the Magisterium on the part of a member of the Society of Jesus, whose very *raison d'être* was loyalty to the Pope and the Hierarchy.

It is even more regrettable, however, that he should be a lecturer at Maynooth, once so renowned for its scholarship and fidelity, and that qua Maynooth lecturer, he should so openly contemn Authority with impunity.

FATHER WADDING, C.S.S.R.

Father Wadding was until recently a locum lecturer in Maynooth. While in that capacity he expressed views of rather doubtful orthodoxy. Speaking of divorce, for example, he stated (in the December 1970 issue of *Reality*): 'An increasing number of theologians.... believe in theory at least that the Church could dissolve any marriage for sufficiently grave reasons.'

This is contrary to doctrine which is *de fide Catholica*.

'On the popular level', he went on to say,

'many people would see good grounds for divorce in certain exceptional cases. For example a young girl deserted by her husband... Besides if Christians cannot be brought to accept the sanctity and indissolubility of marriage, except by having it imposed on them by law... what sort of Christians are they anyhow?'

On *Humanae Vitae* and contraception he said: 'The Pope in no place says it is a mortal sin; neither do the Irish Bishops.' This is a dangerously misleading half-truth which is certainly unworthy of a professor in a Pontifical University writing in a magazine for simple people.

By contrast, when presenting the U.S. Bishops' Pastoral in November 1968, Cardinal Wright, Prefect of the Congregation for the Clergy, and also a member of the Congregation for Doctrine and Faith, stated, without hesitation or ambiguity: 'I cannot conceive of circumstances under which a person could use contraception and not think himself committing a grave sin.' (N.C. News, 18:11:68)

### CONFESSION

Talking of communal absolution in the August 1969 issue of *Reality*, Fr. Wadding stated: 'For many people, indeed most, confession as we know it is a meaningless ritual.' Asking if it would still be necessary for people to go to confession, he answered: 'A few years ago theologians would have said, Yes. Today... there is a lot of evidence to say that it would not be necessary although individuals could do so if they wished.'

This is contrary to the teaching of the Council of Trent (cf. Denzinger, 916, 917, 919). It is also opposed to a statement issued by the Vatican Press Office on January 14, 1971. Discussing the extension of permission for

communal absolution, in conditions of grave and urgent necessity, to certain missionary countries, it denied misleading reports and stated beyond any possibility of misunderstanding the consequent need to make a full confession as soon as possible: 'It is altogether necessary that those who receive absolution in a crowd shall, the first time thereafter when they receive the sacrament of penance, duly confess all their mortal sins which they have not already confessed.' (N.C. News, Jan. 15, 1971)

### FR WILFRED HARRINGTON, O.P.

Father Harrington was for a time on the staff of Maynooth. That he has been affected by modern erroneous views on marriage and divorce may be gathered from the final sentence of his article 'Jesus's Attitude Towards Divorce', in the July 1970 issue of 'The Irish Theological Quarterly': 'Surely Jesus would want this same spirit of gentle mercy and compassion to prevail when the Church begins to apply his teaching on divorce. To grant a divorce and the right to remarry in cases where a marriage is not truly lived as such and so is not truly a marriage may open up whole new opportunities of life and love for persons, and may give individual Christians the comfort of knowing a shepherd again.'

In the same issue there is an article by Dr Denis O'Callaghan in a similar vein with strangely selective quotations.

Sad to say the number has an *imprimatur* from Bishop Lennon of Kildare and Leightin.

These and certain other Irish priests who have publicly advocated the availability of divorce should ponder the words of Gino Concetti, noted Franciscan theologian in the November 3, 1968 issue of *L'Osservatore della Domenica*.

'CATHOLICS WILL NEVER HAVE THE RIGHT TO PARTICIPATE IN A DIVORCE MOVEMENT...IT IS NOT EVEN PERMISSIBLE TO PARTICIPATE ON A LEGISLATIVE LEVEL IN THE APPROVAL OF A DIVORCE PROJECT... IF THEREFORE THE FORCES OF A LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY WORK IN FAVOUR OF PROPONENTS OF DIVORCE, CATHOLICS MUST OPPOSE THE EVOLUTION OF THIS LEGISLATIVE PROCESS.'

Please God that the *Dail* takes its theology from Gina Concetti rather than from Father Harrington.

#### GENERAL COMMENTS

Maynooth has become very much a college of mixed sexes and some senior professors have had to convey complaints to the Bishops of unbecoming and even immoral behaviour. The depths of triviality to which this once hallowed hall of spirituality and learning has descended may be gathered from the following report of what happened in September 1970, when two women journalists addressed 200 theological students at the College.

Miss Maeve Binchy, Women's Editor of *The Irish Times* and Miss Kenny, Women's Editor of the *Irish Press* told the students: 'The clergy was not much help to many women trying to find out what life was all about;' and 'The clergy did not give a damn about single girls.' Miss Binchy, proceeding at this elevated level, stated: 'The day was gone when women were going to take advice from celibate priests.' And, not to be outdone, Miss Kenny condemned 'the legislation which makes you a criminal if you want to plan your family'. The whole thing, she said, 'was a network of lies and conspiracy.' (*Irish Press*, Sept. 24, 1970; *Media Receiver*, No.4, W/E, 27, September, 1970, p.17.)

When one recalls that seminarians were formerly trained to have the highest ideals and, above all, uncompromising respect for the sacred office of the priesthood, one winces at this drivel administered, apparently with official approval, to the students of Ireland's national seminary.

In view of the foregoing information, is it altogether surprising that some Irish Bishops refuse to send students to Maynooth?

Is it surprising, as Father John Flanagan of the *English Catholic Priests' Association* tells us, that many English parish priests refuse to take a priest from Maynooth because it has become so notorious a hotbed of error? As one English parish priest is reported to have said: 'I don't want to have my parish contaminated.'

#### THE IRISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, CONTRACEPTION AND MAYNOOTH

Section 17, of the 1935 Criminal Law Amendment Act states: 'It shall not be lawful for any person to sell, or expose, advertise or keep for sale, or to import or attempt to import...for sale any contraceptive.'

Of late there have been many pressure groups, supported by publicity media, endeavouring to have this Act amended so as to do away with the ban on contraceptives.

In October 1972, the influential *Irish Medical Association* predominantly Catholic in membership, came out in favour of legalising contraception.

Needless to say, this was front-page news in the *Irish Times*, which had for long been



advocating this 'reform'. The *Times* also honoured the I.M.A. with an editorial, commending the doctors for 'voicing the wishes of their patients - an electorate that may well be ahead of the Government'.

Regrettable as such a development may be, are the doctors altogether to blame? Have they not been told, time and again, by Maynooth professors and other theologians, apparently enjoying episcopal approval, that this 'reform' was desirable? And has not Dr Birch, Bishop of Ossory stated explicitly that the legalisation of contraception is desirable?

Indeed, Bishop Birch even went so far as to speak his mind most freely in this connection in what the front page of the *Irish Times* described as 'a frank interview published in a recent supplement of the *London Times*'.

THE IRISH THEOLOGICAL COMMISSION'S WORKING PARTY  
AND DIVORCE

According to the *Irish Independent* of May 27, 1972, this Working Party, with Dr Enda McDonagh of Maynooth as its Chairman, advocated radical changes in the Irish Constitution, including the removal of Article 41, 3, 2, which prohibits divorce.

Although Cardinal Conway stated in a radio interview, reported to the Dublin dailies of June 5, 1972, that he believed that the majority of Irish Catholics would vote against such a measure, he apparently considered it quite unnecessary to increase the probability of this happening by taking effective action against the Maynooth professors on the Theological Commission, or against any of the other theologians who had come out in favour of legalising divorce. The Primate's omission in this respect is, needless to say, a cause of anguish to orthodox Irish Catholics.

THE MAYNOOTH SUMMER SCHOOL, 1972

Many Irish Catholics were also irritated by some of the views expressed by lecturers at the 1972, Maynooth Summer School. As John D. Sheridan stated in the September 6 issue of the *Irish Independent*, these views 'were felt to be out of keeping with both the auspices and venue'.

Objecting to 'a school of thought in the Church which seeks to identify the Gospel with the "liberation of man" and the establishment of that vague thing called the "egalitarian society"', another critic, Mr D.F. Conlan of Birmingham stated: 'I am reminded of this by the false ideas of Father Liam Ryan and Father Vincent McNamara.' (Both of these priests are on the Maynooth staff although Fr Vincent McNamara is a member of the St Patrick's, Kiltegan, Missionary Society.) Mr Conlan continued: 'The role of the Church in the world is pre-eminently Redemptive, not social or political....By no stretch of the imagination can this work be connected with the overthrow of Capitalism or the establishment of the "Egalitarian Society".'

Mr Sheridan condemned the view, expressed by Father Liam Ryan, Professor of Sociology in Maynooth: '....There is growing acceptance of the view that so long as you have the capitalist system you cannot have a just society.' Mr Sheridan felt that Father Ryan was particularly naive in saying that socialism was preferable to capitalism, for whereas capitalism as such has never been specifically condemned by the Church, socialism as such has been condemned. He was also critical of the description of the Church in Ireland by Father Vincent McNamara as the Church of the 'haves' and not of the 'have-nots'.



According to Mr Sheridan: 'Father McNamara ... had a Hans Kung type swipe at what he termed the "hierarchically organised Church"... The Church is, was, and always must be hierarchic because that is how Christ established it, though the fact that priests can make statements like these would seem to indicate that they no longer fear sanctions from the higher echelons.'

John D. Sheridan also condemned 'the spokesmen of the new Christian left who convert the primary mission of the Church to the attainment of social justice and political freedom.'

Some of the views expressed at the 1972 Maynooth Summer School would certainly hardly measure up to the duty of priests as expressed by Pope Paul: 'Woe betide the priest who tries to be everything, do everything, the politician, the sociologist, the expert, the consultant, the organizer and so on, but fails in the specific mission which makes him a priest.' (Audience, 12<sup>th</sup> June, 1971.)

Conclusion

To paraphrase somewhat a statement of the late Bishop Adrian of Nashville, USA: 'HOW IN GOD'S NAME CAN STUDENTS TAUGHT BY SUCH PROFESSORS BECOME FAITHFUL, HOLY OTHER CHRISTS?'

We saw at the beginning of this dossier that the Church in her wisdom insists that professors in Catholic universities and seminaries who refused obedience to the magisterium should be removed immediately. Can we wonder, then, at the consternation of priests and people that some of these men are still allowed to teach in Ireland's National Seminary, the Pontifical University of Maynooth?

But although the Bishops are clearly not

facing up to their responsibilities, there is no room for doubt as to what the Church wants. For while error is being quite openly taught in seminaries, published in Catholic journals and even preached from the pulpit, the Instruction of the Synod's Doctrinal Commission states quite clearly: 'Bishops should see to it that the faith of the whole community does not suffer for lack of prudence on the part of the few.'

The Irish bishops themselves have declared that 'the Pope speaks not as one theologian among many, but as the Vicar of Christ'. (Oct.9,1968) And more recently Cardinal Conway stated: that the 'teaching of the Encyclical Humanae Vitae is authentic and binding'. (St. Patrick's Cathedral, Aug.4, 1971.) Moreover, speaking in Maynooth in 1971, he said that professors were not to teach their own views or the views of theologians but the teaching of the Church.

BUT WHAT IS THE POINT OF SAYING THIS IF HE DOES NOTHING ABOUT IT?

As Father O Saorai, a Dublin priest has stated: 'Perhaps these Maynooth professors, irrespective of the academic faculty to which they belong, experience divinely-inspired charisms "ex officio" to show the Pope and the bishops the error of their moral teaching....

'ONE FEARS FOR THE CHURCH IN IRELAND IF THIS IS THE SORT OF THEOLOGY AND ATTITUDE THEY ARE TEACHING THEIR STUDENTS...THERE IS, HOWEVER, A HUMOROUS IRONY IN ALL THIS: THE PROFESSORS WERE INSTALLED IN THEIR CHAIRS BY EPISCOPAL APPOINTMENT.' (Irish Times, March 28, 1969)

Little wonder that Cardinal Seper, Prefect of the Congregation for Doctrine and Faith found it necessary to complain: 'Bishops are often to



blame because in this crisis they are not exercising their powers as they should and Rome is not well obeyed. If all the bishops would deal with these aberrations as they occur the situation would be different. IT IS VERY DIFFICULT FOR US IN ROME IF WE GET NO COOPERATION FROM THE BISHOPS.' (Letter to Fr. Mikulich, O.F.M., Easter, 1972).

### CRI DE COEUR

We therefore conclude by appealing to the Irish Hierarchy in the words of Pope Paul on the occasion of his Apostolic Exhortation to all Bishops on the 5<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the closing of the Second Vatican Council:

'...It is to us bishops that St Paul's exhortation to Timothy is addressed: "Before God and before Jesus Christ Who is to be judge of the living and the dead, I put this duty to you in the name of His Appearing and of His Kingdom: proclaim the message and, welcome or unwelcome, insist on it. Refute falsehood, correct error, call to obedience - but do all with patience and with the intention of teaching.

"The time is sure to come when, far from being content with sound teaching, people will be avid for the latest novelty and collect themselves a whole series of teachers according to their own tastes; and then, instead of listening to the truth, they will listen to myths. Be careful always to choose the right course; be brave under trials; make the preaching of the Good News your life's work, in thorough-going service." (2 Tim., 4:1-5).

Therefore, dearly beloved brothers, let each of us examine himself on the way in which he carries out this sacred duty.' (L'Osservatore Romano, January 14, 1971).

END.

Judged by this criterion, the episcopal statement can be seen to have certain shortcomings. For while their Lordships said no more than the truth in pointing to the grave social consequences of legalised contraception, we feel that they said less than the truth in saying simply that such calamitous social influences 'should be put into the balance, along with such other factors as the actual degree of inconvenience which the present law and practice causes to people of other religious persuasions and a realistic assessment as to whether a change in the law would have any significant effect at the present time on attitudes towards the reunification of Ireland'. For, however unwittingly, this gives the impression that the achievement of a certain spurious form of national unity deriving from the appeasement of Protestant humanist opinion could conceivably justify the wholesale dismantling of Ireland's essentially Christian Constitution.

In short, welcome as is the Episcopal statement, it falls somewhat short of the truly realistic appraisal of the consequences of legalised contraception made by the late 'John Charles' who declared quite unequivocally in his Pastoral Letter of March 28, 1971:

'IT MAY WELL COME TO PASS THAT, IN THE PRESENT CLIMATE OF EMOTIONAL THINKING AND PRESSURE, LEGISLATION WOULD BE ENACTED THAT WILL OFFEND THE OBJECTIVE MORAL LAW. SUCH A MEASURE WOULD BE AN INSULT TO OUR FAITH; IT WOULD, WITHOUT QUESTION, PROVE TO BE GRAVELY DAMAGING TO MORALITY, PRIVATE AND PUBLIC; IT WOULD BE, AND WOULD REMAIN, A CURSE UPON OUR COUNTRY.'

### Ireland must not tempt Divine Providence

To put it no higher, it would seem to us that there is at the very least a possible relationship between Dr McQuaid's warning and the message of Our Lady of Fatima, who warned



that unless her requests were heeded the world would be overwhelmed by a catalysm in the course of which several entire nations would be annihilated.

There is certainly no doubt that, given the existing world situation, which could be described as a condition of chronic acute crisis capable of exploding at any moment into a thermo-nuclear holocaust, only an outsize in fools would rule out the possibility of yet another world war. And while it would be rash and temerarious to anticipate the operations of divine justice, it would be still more rash for a Catholic nation as privileged as Ireland to presume on being able to survive such a cataclysm even should some of her laws represent blasphemy in depth: blasphemy against Creation itself.

Theological realism must on the contrary surely demand consideration of the possibility - again we put it no higher - that the nations marked out for possible annihilation in the Message of Fatima may turn out to be those formerly Christian nations which submit to being stamped with the Mark of the Beast - i.e. with the hideous crime of legalised abortion (which, given modern 'contraceptive' techniques, is virtually indistinguishable from legalised contraception).

One thing as least is certain: given the state of the world today, Ireland cannot afford to tempt Divine Providence.

-----oooo0000oooo-----

READY SHORTLY!

A Third Edition of our "Dossier on Catechetics"

25p post free

from

APPROACHES, Casa Garcia Moreno, 1 Waverley Place,  
SALTCOATS, Ayrshire, Scotland.

## WHEN THE SHEPHERD TURNS WOLF

'When the shepherd turns wolf, the flock must first of all take steps to protect itself. Without doubt, as a general rule, teaching comes down from the bishops to the faithful, and the latter, being subjects of the former in the field of faith, do not ordinarily require to appraise their leaders critically. But in the treasury of Revelation there are essential truths concerning which every Christian is sufficiently well informed, and which he is obliged to defend, by virtue of the very fact of his being a Christian. The principle is the same whether it concerns belief or behaviour, morality or dogma.

'Treasonable acts such as those of Nestorius are rare in the Church, but it can happen that for one reason or another pastors remain silent under circumstances when the faith itself is involved. THE TRULY FAITHFUL UNDER SUCH CIRCUMSTANCES ARE THOSE WHOSE CONDUCT IS INSPIRED BY THEIR CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, NOT THE FAINT-HEARTED TIME-SERVERS WHO, MAKING THE SPECTACULAR EXCUSE THAT THEY MUST OBEY ESTABLISHED AUTHORITY, REFUSE TO ATTACK THE ENEMY OR EXPOSE HIS MACHINATIONS UNLESS THEY ARE GIVEN A CLEAR LEAD, WHICH, UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES, IT IS QUITE FUTILE TO EXPECT.' (Emphasis added)

Dom Gueranger in *L'Année liturgique*