

**COPY**

A M D G  
Edward P. Kirby  
379 Harvard Street  
Whitman, MA 02382  
Tel/fax 781-447-4081

December 31, 2001

Reverend Father Philip C. Rule, S.J.  
Department of English  
College of the Holy Cross  
One College Street  
Worcester, MA 01610-2395

Dear Father Rule,

Thank you for your letter containing scholastic argumentation against our petition. It is very clever of you to lay a trap by turning to rhetoric and logic. If we thoroughly debunk your scholastic argument against our letter, then you can say: "There, and you think we ought to require everyone to learn that stuff." If I fail you can say: "What good was that old-time training? Undaunted, I will draw my rusty sword to hack and thrust at your classy armor and glistening shield.

The rooks of definition are dispatched readily: by what authority do you set forth a limited number of definitions of secularization and secularism? Webster, Oxford, American Heritage? But first let us turn to what we really said. We did not use the term secularism in our letter nor accuse anyone of rejecting "any form of religious faith and worship" (assuming that "any" means "all," not "some"). Nor were we talking about separation of church and state. We said and meant "secularization," but none of the four meanings you set out in your letter. We used the term secularization and meant to. We assert that this is what is happening at Holy Cross.

We all know that language changes constantly, and that dictionaries do not print all meanings that people use aptly, especially when context helps to convey meaning. For our definition we take the same meaning we think Superior General Kolvenbach did, which I expect others understand to be a growth away from good Catholic educational policies of the past. What better word is there to describe what has happened at Holy Cross since the 1970's which we said was the beginning of the secularization? Incidentally, subsequent reference to Father Kuzniewski's "Thy Holy Name" indicates it began sooner before public manifestation, amid discussions about administrative concerns and amid worries that it (secularization) would result from certain measures.

You refer to de facto secularization in your letter to us. That implies that you consider secularization to be an apt term for discussing the process we wrote about. How then can you claim we meant secularism when we said secularization, and then go on to define secularism as rejecting "any form of religious faith and worship"? We were not guilty of such exaggeration

Steps along the road were elimination of required attendance at daily Mass, elimination of core courses in religion and philosophy, vacating the college's place in loco parentis and more. One could go on. Much changed in the time of academic panic during the war in Vietnam. The merits of each decision could be debated but now there is enough evidence for a finding that there has been a process of secularization at Holy Cross. It resulted from many things, both within and without the control of the College's leaders, and our purpose is not to place blame if there is any. Our purpose is to improve the College.

Defenders of the status quo say the objective of some changes was to achieve academic freedom and acceptance by academe. There has been success in gaining freedom and acceptance. That is good with regard to secular disciplines.

It would have been possible, however, to retain doctrinal control over religious studies, and perhaps over philosophical studies with religious implications. This could have been done while pursuing the goal of academic freedom and acceptance by academe. The College did not exercise its rights under the principles of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) to exercise control of the teaching of Catholic Doctrine. Beyond that, the College resists the authority of the Magisterium. It pursues the respect of academe to the detriment of giving full Catholic formation to all students, many of whom have been sent to it by parents who want their children to find rational support there for the faith.

We did not say in our letter that there is no Catholic formation at Holy Cross, nor that the efforts to give the students Christian sustenance through extracurricular means such as retreats and projects to help the disadvantaged do not bear fruit. I do contend that faith and reason are best united in classroom studies for credit as a common experience for the student body.

There is much talk among alumni about a perceived effort to emulate the Ivies. In 1885 Harvard took the words "Christo et Ecclesiae" out of its seal and substituted the word "Veritas." A noble word. But that change prompted the remark that year: "If it is not the Christian theory (that is taught) it is a fatal skepticism or some kindred phase of secularism." See The Dying of the Light, Burchtael. William B. Eardmans Publishing Co., 1998, p.46. Today Harvard's faculty teaches many theories of philosophy, but none more influentially than the relativism that leads to nihilism. The quest for truth unsupported by Christian faith can lead into the darkness as it has so often in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

We decline to concede that we have impugned the integrity of the lay faculty. Where have we said we oppose lecturing on Catholic doctrine by Catholic lay people? Would others wish to?

While post hoc ergo est non propter hoc is of course fallacy, introduce causation and there is no fallacy. An expert opinion is not needed to prove the presence of cause and

effect. I believe it is apparent to the ordinary intelligent observer in this as in many cases. It is arguable that, and I believe, that secularization was not simply because of property transfer, but because of the pursuit of approval by secular academe that shifted the priorities of the College. You say that the faculty has for years frequently discussed core courses, which implies that they were thought by some to be useful and effective. We agree.

As for the shortage of Jesuits to serve Holy Cross, many men might become Jesuit priests if they have the prospect of teaching at a Jesuit or other colleges or universities, though some observers think some novitiates would not support such a trend.

On your second page you argue that Father Kolvenbach may not have had Holy Cross in mind. Then you cite "reasons why Catholic colleges are what they are today." To cite these reasons is to agree there is a problem. And you agree that Holy Cross has changed its approach to religious studies. Was it necessary or appropriate for Neuhaus to have quoted names? Doesn't the prospect stated cause concern in those who care about Holy Cross?

We now come to comment on your enumerated points:

1. Your concern that we are calling Jesuit priests and Catholic lay professors "secular" is hard to understand. We did not say so nor do we believe so. In a reductio ad absurdum immediately following you analogize faculty with pastor, asking whether it is secularization when a lay person takes action in the absence of a priest. Of course not, unless you are talking about laity purporting to perform specifically priestly functions. Qualified lay people can teach religion and philosophy. Our concern is not with individuals on the faculty, but on the policy of the College.
2. Isn't it "faculty opposition" if some though not all of the faculty oppose core courses in religion and philosophy? People I have spoken to at the College have said that faculty control of curriculum would be a problem for our proposal. Is their statement incorrect?
3. Certainly one disc jockey is not a trend, but when the college magazine celebrates what he does, that's an established judgment of approval.
4. If the student activity funds bringing advocates of abortion by choice, or sexual license in some form do not occasion administrative disapproval, does it make any difference whether the expenses and fees are paid out of the college-sponsored Student Activities fees paid (involuntarily?) by the students, or whether the College pays? Either way the prestige of the College is given to harmful trends that the Church opposes. Will not Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual organizations on a campus facilitate active sexual practices? Are such practices morally wrong or not? If wrong why enable them? We do not think Professor Berman referred specifically to Holy Cross, but to a widespread phenomenon among secularizing Catholic colleges, so it was a legitimate reference in our letter.

5. Of course shortcomings of the students that they brought as freshmen are not the fault of the College. It is true that the students have been sorely harmed by the culture of the nation. Does that mean that the alumni and administration should not vigorously oppose harmful behavior? Holy Cross does, and should, try to lead its students out of the noxious culture of the media and the entertainment industry. We advocate core courses in philosophy and religion as part of the College' effort. C.S. Lewis said: "the hardness of God is kinder than the softness of man." You speak of the value of Daily Mass. It would be a wonderful curative measure, as would return to the confessionals.

I join you in admiration of John Henry Newman and think his point was that reason alone will not make a martyr. Faith will do it, and faith can be strengthened by reason. Not that we hope for the need of new martyrs.

I agree that classroom learning is not enough to inspire great Catholics, but believe that the campus features you mention, when supported by good classroom studies, would do so more effectively. They did so for years at Holy Cross. Christ's deeds have inflamed us at retreats. They are effective. So also are apologetics, inspired philosophy, and knowledge of the Catholic faith.

Thank you for enclosing your remarks made at the installation. I recognize the work that went into the mission statement and your remarks. Honesty draws me to say reluctantly that the absence of specifics about the Faith in the mission statement reminds me of Father Burchtael's tale in The Dying of the Faith about when Harvard substituted Veritas for Deus et Ecclesia in its seal in 1885. It is their business. Good for Holy Cross?

Enclosed is copy of a speech by John E. Murray, Jr., former President of Duquesne University, which I heard recently at Catholic University.

God bless you and me, the whole Holy Cross community, students, alumni, priests, faculty, administrators and trustees. (Forgive the paraphrase. It was recently the season of Tiny Tim.)

I thank you for your fifty years as a Jesuit and the kindly tone of your letter. Let us hope a similar tone will prevail over all future discussions wherever our initiative takes us and the college.

With my respect,