

voices voices voices



Vol. VII : No. 2-3

Special Documentary Issue

August, 1992

CONTENTS:

- *The Bishops and the Pastoral: What They Said—and What's Next* — page 1.
- *June 1, 1992 Statement to Bishops on pastoral draft by WFF/CPC* — page 3
- *Bishops' discussion on the draft pastoral letter, "Called to Be One in Christ Jesus"* — page 6
- *Affirmation for Catholic Women* — page 21
- *'92 WFF Conference* — 23

The Bishops and the Pastoral...

What They Said — and What's Next

This special issue of VOICES contains a transcription of the taped interventions of bishops who addressed the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) June 18, during their first open discussion of the third draft of the pastoral letter, "Called to Be One in Christ Jesus". The draft will now be reviewed by the bishops, and each bishop may submit amendments to the pastoral's Writing Committee. Debate and vote on the draft and amendments will take place at the bishops' November meeting.

The bishops' comments were taped by **Sherry Tyree**, VOICES press representative to the June meeting held at Notre Dame. Media accounts following the conference quoted a few bishops; but so far only Bishop Raymond Lucker's comments, taken from his pastoral letter to the diocese of New Ulm, have been fully published. Bishop Lucker's pastoral was published in its entirety in *Origins*, the official NCCB publication, June 18 (Vol. 22: No. 6, pp. 91-92).

The **Statement to Bishops** issued jointly by Women for Faith & Family and the *Consortium Perfectæ Caritatis*, and sent to every U. S. bishop (see page 3), was also quoted in *Origins*, as was a statement issued by a coalition of extremist feminist groups, Catholics for a Free Choice, National Assembly of Religious Women, the National Coalition of American Nuns, Quixote Center, the Women's Ordination Conference and New Ways Ministry. This coalition also commissioned a Gallup Poll of 800 people which received much publicity at the time of the NCCB meeting. Pressure from most of these same groups had led to formal "dialogue" with NCCB representatives, initiated in 1979. These talks resulted in the process of writing the controversial "women's pastoral," begun in 1983.

Mrs. Tyree also represented WFF on a television broadcast of Good Morning America very early on June 18. Also featured in the brief interview was the primary spokesman for the extremist coalition, **Sr. Maureen Fiedler**, of the Quixote Center, a homosexual advocacy group. On June 23, **Helen Hull Hitchcock** represented WFF's Catholic viewpoint on a night-time call-in talk show on KMOX (St. Louis), also with Sr. Maureen Fiedler speaking for the extremists. Mrs. Hitchcock was also featured on a PBS-Chicago radio panel on the pastoral draft and its implications. (This followed a broadcast which featured only radical feminists.)

Other media coverage of the controversy surrounding pastoral draft citing WFF included an article in TIME magazine (June 22), which quoted both Mrs. Hitchcock and **Dr. Joyce Little**, a theologian at the University of St. Thomas, Houston. Dr. Little is an associate of WFF who has frequently addressed WFF's annual conferences. WFF was interviewed, also, by a wide variety of major secular daily newspapers. Many Catholic and secular papers also quoted the WFF/CPC Statement to Bishops. (The VOICES staff is grateful for many clippings from local papers sent to our office.)

Continued, page 2

Bishops... (continued from page one)

There will be no fourth draft of the pastoral. Bishop Joseph Imesch, chairman of the pastoral's Writing Committee, emphasized that in his introductory remarks to the bishops. Any member of the bishops' conference may submit amendments to the committee, however.

The usual procedure for an official statement of the NCCB is that the committee evaluates each proposed amendment, and either accepts or rejects it. Each of the accepted and rejected amendments could then be introduced for debate and vote at the November NCCB meeting. In view of the controversy surrounding this document, this debate could be lengthy.

Finally, a vote would be taken on the entire draft as amended. The amended draft would require a two-thirds affirmative vote to become the official pastoral statement of the U. S. Bishops.

Some observers speculate that the pastoral will not achieve this majority, basing their opinion on a straw vote taken by Archbishop Pilarczyk following the bishops' discussion. Thomas Reese, S.J., reporting in *America* magazine (July 11) said that "bishops who support ordination of women believe they have only about thirty votes." Reese speculates that amendments from the bishops will probably reflect opposition to ordination.

A motion to table the pastoral is a possibility, and other alternatives may be proposed. Those who support feminist reform hope the "process" will continue, and urge that the pastoral's recommendations continue to be implemented.

Some may believe that if the pastoral is not approved, its recommendations *already* being implemented will also cease to plague the Church. Others apparently believe that approving the pastoral even in its current form will cause no very serious harm because it will be ignored by most people.

But, unless the document is fundamentally, radically revised to correct its many errors, approving it would be approving a blueprint for continued destructive action and would foster further confusion and dissent.

Approval of the current pastoral would simply give it authority as "the will of the bishops." No one—no parish priest or seminarian, no religious or lay man or woman—who objected even to the most extreme feminist spirituality workshops, feminist "liturgies" and scripture translations, or feminist "theology" taught in seminaries and Catholic schools at all levels, would then have any defense.

We must hope—and pray—that the bishops may yet

transform the pastoral into the genuine teaching document so many of us have pleaded for since the first "listening sessions" began in 1984. That would be occasion for great joy and thanksgiving. Nothing less would allow an authentic "healing process" to begin—after nearly two decades of unchecked feminist/liberationist erosion of the deepest truths of the Catholic faith.

If this cannot be done, it should be dropped; for *the authority of the bishops will inevitably be used to support those whose stated goal is to divide and harm the Church.*

But even if the very best pastoral is issued—one which teaches *with* the Church on the critical issues it attempts to address—the divisions and confusion will persist. Incalculable harm has already been done by this "process" which has been going on continuously since the mid-seventies.

Church support and sponsorship must be withdrawn from all individuals, workshops, spirituality and education programs, etc., that do not actively and authentically present the liberating truth of the Catholic faith. Activities which *genuinely* aid the Church's mission must be energetically promoted.

Again, we *urge prayers for all bishops*, and for all who advise them, during this critical—and far too short—time of deliberation on issues which will profoundly affect the future of the Church in America. ■

WFF's complete 29-page
Commentary on
"Called to be One in Christ Jesus"
(sent to all U.S. Bishops June 1, 1992),
including **WFF/CPC Statement**, essays
by **Dr. Susan Benofy**, **Dr. Janet Smith**
and **The Rev. Paul Mankowski, SJ**; and
a **Statement on Feminism, Language**
and Liturgy, can be ordered from the
WFF office.

(Suggested donation: \$5.00.)

VOICES Vol. VII : No. 2-3 — August 1992

VOICES is published quarterly by **Women for Faith & Family**, P.O. Box 8326, St. Louis, MO 63132, ph. & fax (314) 863-8385. Helen Hull Hitchcock, President, Sherry Tyree, Vice-President, Susan J. Benofy, Treasurer, Germaine F. Murray, Secretary. Copyright © 1992, Women for Faith & Family. All rights reserved. Second-class postage paid at New Hope, Kentucky. **Women for Faith & Family** is a non-profit organization incorporated in the State of Missouri, established in 1984 to help provide Catholic women a means of expressing unity with the teachings of the Catholic Church, deepening their understanding of the Catholic faith, and transmitting it to others. **VOICES** provides information on events and issues of concern to all Catholics, especially to Catholic women, their families and/or religious communities.

TAX-EXEMPT DONATIONS, INQUIRIES AND CHANGES OF ADDRESS may be mailed to **Women for Faith & Family, P.O. Box 8326, St. Louis, MO 63132**. Editorial mail should be addressed to **VOICES** c/o WFF, P.O. Box 8326, St. Louis, MO 63132. Ph/ Fax : (314) 863-8385.

To the Bishops of the Church in the United States:

We wish to express our concern about the current draft of the proposed pastoral letter, 'Called to be One in Christ Jesus.'

We understand the purpose of a pastoral letter to be essentially catechetical in nature; and that the intention of the bishops in writing such letters is for instruction and formation of the faithful. Therefore, it would seem essential, in order to achieve this, that any pastoral letter should present the teachings of the Church in such a way as to be truly formative, positive and unifying.

We are now convinced that this pastoral effort was fundamentally flawed from the beginning, in that it is not actually the bishops exercising their teaching function, but their 'response' to a limited set of 'women's concerns.' Furthermore, the pastoral's basic agenda, process and content have been principally determined and governed by the feminist critical perspective, although the recent draft obscures this, to some extent, by use of more vague means of expression. All the pastoral drafts adopted an inverted perspective of the feminist critique of the Catholic Church. None have offered critical appraisal of feminism from the point of view of Catholic teaching, however.

The draft's fundamentally feminist theological perspective is revealed in its repeated emphasis on 'sexism' as a 'sin' which is the basis of virtually all other sins and evils of mankind. This view which virtually equates 'sexism' with 'original sin' pervades the pastoral. Particularly clear examples are found in Chapter 1, ¶ 16-18; footnotes 6, 8; and in ¶ 32, which says,

"The biblical account of sin's entrance into history in the third chapter of Genesis depicts the particular way women have suffered as a result of sin: the unjust domination of men over women, the violation of equality in relationships and the failure to respect women as persons. These sins, described so vividly in Scripture, are characteristic of what we have termed the 'sin of sexism.' They reflect from a biblical point of view a threefold disorientation toward power, pleasure and possession. The craving for power not only competes with God; it also prompts stronger people to dominate those who are weaker ..."

No critique is attempted, here or elsewhere, of the basic feminist/liberationist assumption that all relations between human beings are essentially relations of power. No critique is attempted of feminist spirituality and feminist theology which, although radically opposed even to the most fundamental dogmas of Christianity, have now become pervasive within the Catholic Church itself, and their influence seriously threatens the faith of all — in particular that of Catholic women.

The bishops' document contains no critical appraisal of the manifold errors of feminism: its distorted view of the nature of human beings, of relations between the sexes, of attitudes towards sexuality, of the nature and mission of Christ and His Church; nor are the multitude of sins (e.g. abortion, abortifacient contraception, sterilization) which are intrinsic to feminist ideology so identified.

There is a fundamental conflict between feminist/liberationist social analysis and the teachings and tradition of the Church. This essential conflict, which is at the root of much of the confusion and dissent in the Church today, is recognized both by orthodox Catholics and those who reject essential Church teachings; however, this, too, is substantially ignored by the pastoral draft.

Since the draft fails to address this conflict in a way consistent with the fundamental nature of the Church, it also fails to offer useful and consistent suggestions for the inevitable encounter of individuals with ideologies alien to Christianity or to the resolution of problems, conflict and confusion within the Church and in society which result from this encounter.

To the extent that the draft pastoral has failed to accede fully to feminist demands, feminists within the Church are angered by the result. To the extent that the draft erodes Church doctrine and authority by its concessions to these

demands and by its conciliatory tone towards those who do not accept Church teachings (nor her authority to teach), it compromises its character as a pastoral letter.

Some further problems include the following:

1. The pastoral does not actually respond comprehensively to 'women's concerns', nor did the "listening sessions" on which the pastoral was based accurately reflect the experience of most Catholic women. The "consciousness raising" format of the meetings tended to attract discontented women, and the questions posed tended to elicit predictable critical responses. The data from these sessions was given far too much weight in formulating the pastoral's response and recommendations.
2. Not all of the pastoral's twenty-five recommendations follow consistently from Church teachings. In some instances the recommendations contradict the body of the text itself. Implementation of several of the pastoral's recommendations not only cannot help, but can actually hurt the Church's mission. In fact, no consensus in support of many policies recommended by the pastoral exists, either within the Church or in society, and certainly not among Catholic women.
 - a) The recommendations contain an ominous blueprint for increasing Church bureaucracy and setting in motion machinery (through establishing "women's commissions") effectively to exclude both the testimony and the work for the Church of orthodox women, who already have difficulty enough making effective witness of their faith. Will establishing 'women's commissions' in every diocese actually promote authentic unity within the Church?
 - b) Is a 'sensitivity-to-women test' for seminarians the most important factor in determining a man's suitability for the priesthood?
 - c) Would the bishops' official support for social programs such as "flex-time", "comparable pay for comparable work", government sponsored day-care, and similar 'family' legislation genuinely help most Catholic women or their families?
3. Of particular concern to many Catholics — both women and men — is the project of mandating "inclusive" (feminist) language in the liturgy and Scripture translations. A great many women are, in fact, offended by this deliberate distortion of the language, seeing it, correctly, as a capitulation to feminist demands.

Feminist language in the Church is not merely an inconsequential annoyance. Because these new translations frequently alter the substance of the Catholic faith, they jeopardize authentic belief in order to appease feminist reformers.
4. A central concern of a multitude of Catholic women — the religious and moral formation of the future generation of Catholics — is inadequately addressed by the pastoral. In actuality, Catholic mothers and fathers responsible for the religious and moral formation of their children usually receive little support from bishops when they object to defective or even destructive moral and religious education programs which now exist within all levels of the Catholic school system, from elementary school through the university. Many Catholic teachers and university professors are equally concerned and frustrated.

The bishops, who are ultimately responsible for the content of morality ('sex-education') and catechetical programs taught to Catholic children and young adults, should monitor personally and carefully all such programs used within their dioceses. This is a growing problem which must no longer be ignored by the bishops, nor consigned to educational 'experts' within the bureaucracy.
5. There are many social plagues afflicting women and their families in our modern world: divorce, artificial contraception, fornication, sterilization, abortion, abortifacient pills & IUDs, infanticide, pornography, homosexual perversions, AIDS and other venereal diseases, sex education propaganda, euthanasia, artificial reproduction, child and spouse abuse, to name a few. While the draft mentions some of these which can be related to 'sexism', it omits those which do not fit well within the standard feminist social analysis.
6. Many Catholic women religious encounter problems living their faith within their religious communities. The pastoral entirely ignores — in fact, denies — the virtual decimation of religious orders of women when it asserts in ¶116 "*Partly as a result of Vatican II and partly through the influence of the women's movement, women religious and lay women are discovering a new solidarity. ...Such woman-to-woman support is a contributing factor to the emergence of new forms of consecrated life.*"

The pastoral ignores the fact that there are serious conflicts within religious orders over essential matters of faith. It provides no useful support for orthodox women religious who too frequently are intimidated into silence by dissenting leadership.

7. There is a deep desire for spiritual development among Catholic women in all states of life — a desire which, when vital and authentic Catholic doctrine is missing, can often lead to disordered and distorted quasi-pagan forms of religious expression. This is a growing problem, especially within some religious communities of women; yet the pastoral offers no critique of these esoteric, alien and spiritually destructive forms of worship, nor does it offer suggestions for replacing them with genuine devotions which enrich and enliven true faith.
8. The draft contains sections on two critical issues which have been the subject of considerable controversy due to feminist critiques (ordination and contraception), but its treatment of these questions is insufficient. Although official Church documents and papal statements are cited, the draft's use of these materials is inadequate, and the compelling reasons for the Church's perennial teaching are not effectively presented. In fact, the pastoral still cites works of feminist theologians (e.g. Margaret Farley, Elizabeth Schussler-Fiorenza) who are radically critical of Church teachings in these as in other matters, as if such opinions offer important insights in elucidating these issues, equal in importance with magisterial teaching.

We are convinced that, if approved by the bishops, the pastoral 'Called to be One in Christ Jesus' will not help to resolve conflicts nor to restore harmony in the Church — among women and men, in women's religious orders, in parishes or diocesan offices. It will not increase authentic vocations to the religious life or to the priesthood. Neither can it help to settle disputes about legitimate roles for laity and women in the work of the Church. This document will not help to dispel confusion about the Church, her teachings or her mission. It will not help Catholic people to understand and accept the teachings of the Church. It will not help women to deepen their spiritual lives nor to increase personal holiness.

If this pastoral were issued in the name of the bishops of the United States, we are convinced, it would actually be divisive, not unifying; it would intensify polarization among Catholics, encourage dissent, and increase the temptation of some confused Catholics to ignore the authentic message of the Church when it conflicts with their own notions; and it would, in the perception of many Catholics, diminish, rather than enhance, the magisterial authority of the bishops themselves.

Therefore, we urge the bishops to terminate all further work of the Committee on the Pastoral on Women in the Church and in Society, and to discontinue the process which began thirteen years ago (in 1979) with "dialogue" between the Women's Ordination Conference and the Bishops' Committee on Women.

Instead, we hope that the bishops will find means to disseminate throughout the United States the teachings contained in such papal documents as *Familiaris Consortio*, *Mulieris Dignitatem*, and *Christifidelis Laici*, the 'Charter of the Rights of the Family' *Redemptoris Missio*, and other such teachings which do respond directly to the principal concerns and needs of most women and their families. It seems clear that these documents, two of which were issued soon after the first draft of this pastoral letter appeared, were intended especially to address central issues affecting the role of women raised by feminism which have gained currency in the West, as well as providing the groundwork for vigorous and authentic evangelical action by the laity consistent with the salvific mission of the Church. Surely the Holy Father's intent was that these teachings be used by the entire Church.

We would like to see the resources of the bishops' Conference (NCCB/USCC) used to produce and promote study guides, workshops, symposia, audio and video tapes which are *faithful* to the teaching contained in these papal documents, thus making this invaluable resource available to everyone.

We further suggest that the bishops of the United States request that the Holy Father, Pope John Paul II, give serious consideration to issuing an apostolic exhortation (or an encyclical) addressing the critical subject of feminism.

Finally, we pledge to the bishops our prayers, our support and assistance in any way available to us which might be useful to them in their often difficult task of nurturing the true faith which subsists in the Catholic Church and of carrying Christ's liberating message of redemption to the entire world.

WOMEN FOR FAITH & FAMILY
CONSORTIUM PERFECTÆ CARITATIS
June 1, 1992

Bishops' Discussion on the Third Draft of "Called to Be One in Christ Jesus"

A note about the transcription: Despite our best efforts in transcribing the tapes, some words were inaudible. These are indicated by ellipses. In a few cases where the meaning seemed obvious, a word (or words) in brackets replaces the inaudible portion. No other attempt has been made to edit or correct the bishops' extemporaneous interventions.

*The transcription follows the order in which the bishops spoke, after **Bishop Joseph Imesch's** introduction; although the first speaker, **Bishop Francis X. DiLorenzo**, Auxiliary Bishop of Scranton, was not recorded because WFF representative, **Sherry Tyree**, was being interviewed by another paper while he was speaking. **Bishop Sheets** was the second to address the conference.*

Bishop John R. Sheets, S.J.

As I indicated to the committee, I think this is a vast improvement over the documents that have come forth from this committee up to this point. I'd like to bring up something which perhaps—I think—is extremely important—but how this would fit into your committee I don't know. That is the subtitle of the paper, "Called to Be One in Christ Jesus" (taken from the Galatians), the "Pastoral Response to Women in Church and Society."

One of the things, I think, which really should concern us is simply this: that there is such a differentiation of those positions among women that it's very difficult to work towards what is the ideal — Christ in the Church, to be one in Christ Jesus. What I'm saying is this: that there are "women's concerns" which are really difficult to reconcile with anything that we know in terms of doctrine in the Church, positions in the Church. I'm not talking about all women of course.

There's something that's happened in our recent society which is unprecedented in the whole history of the world: that is, the unique combination of historical, sociological, psychological and subliminal factors. And these have brought back

broad threats to the unity of the Church of a special kind; they have never been faced before throughout the whole of the history of the Church — the whole of mankind. They've been brought about by a unique sense of "feminine" identity. A strong major movement is most revealing — its great power for good as well as for evil. My present concern is the potential that it has to divide the Church in a way that goes beyond anything that has happened in the past. Its basic thrust is dynamically opposed to the scripture text quoted above: "called to be one in Christ."

I do not think it is possible to write a pastoral of women's concerns about the Church without expressing the concerns the Church has about certain positions that some women have that threaten the unity of the Church. Here are some of those that point to the ... reasons:

It is even impossible to talk in a common way about God. God is understood or spoken of as the god or goddess or a hybrid of a Mother and a Father.

Secondly, there are those who reject the tradition of Christology ... they cannot accept a Savior who is a male.

Thirdly, there is an object which sees all human culture up to this point as marred by a patriarchal mentality. They see it as their mission to peel away this one-sided event of our culture which has suppressed or distorted reality because it has suppressed the feminine dimension.

Fourthly, there are those who refuse to partake in the Eucharist offered by a male priest and there are some women who would carry out their own Eucharistic liturgy without a male priest.

Fifthly, some see the unfolding of a new form of consciousness which is bursting upon the world. It is feminine consciousness — it's for providing new and different perspectives on the past, the present and the future.

Sixthly, in former times in the movements which have

divided the Church, they were based upon different interpretations of the Christian faith, ethnic loyalties, pragmatic decisions, cultural differences. However, never before in the history of the world has there been such potential for division as we find it in some aspects of what is called the "women's movement." It crosses all boundaries, whether geographical, ethnic, cultural, economic and religious.

I feel we would be remiss as pastors of the Church if we did not point out our concerns over the threat that some aspects of the women's movement poses for the Church. It's not like leaving a Church for another church or another religion. The movement takes on the aspects of a universal religion; there is sense of a transcendence which arouses a sense to divide; a sense of community far deeper than they feel for the Church in which they were baptized; a sense of evangelization which has all the identity of a religious faith. It promises both liberation from all the bondages of the past and an openness to an unlimited future filled with promise—a kind of secularized beatific vision.

Nothing will be able to stop this movement. It is still uncertain what form it will take in the future. There are no traditional arguments that can be used to resist it. There is no authority that can control it. We have two options: We can be silent spectators—like people watching a storm build up in the distance—or we can at least alert the faithful that there are threats to the union of the Church today which have never been faced before.

Bishop John R. Sheets, S.J., was ordained a Jesuit priest in 1953, received his doctorate in theology in 1957 in Innsbruck, Austria, and was professor of theology at Creighton University. Bishop Sheets was ordained auxiliary bishop of Fort Wayne-South Bend, Indiana in 1991. He is a member of the bishops' Committee on Doctrine, and advisor to the committee on Priestly Life and Formation.

Bishop Raymond A. Lucker

I just want to strongly affirm the process that we have undertaken in the development of this topic. To go back to the early days when we had our first hearings, our diocese asked people, especially women, how they felt appreciated, affirmed or discriminated against in Church and society. And we asked for suggestions of what would contribute most to the affirmation of equality of women in Church and society. So the first drafts had a lot of quotes from women themselves, naming their own experiences. A lot of people felt that that was a healthy thing.

Then we had a second kind of statement and in the next draft we noted the contributions of Christian feminism; we talked about sexism in the Church. We talked about the importance of

family life and commitment and fidelity and dignity and faithfulness. We talked about inclusive language and other issues that were surfaced by the consultations.

And then the third consultation involved the bishops... And right from the beginning there were very serious difficulties. And I think the most serious of all was the fact that we had a very difficult time applying the basic teachings about women—that is, that men and women are created equal; men and women are equally seen by Jesus; men and women are equally called to holiness; men and women are equally gifted. And we have difficulty applying that to the daily life of the Church itself. We seem to be able to make a lot of suggestions about how the condition of women could be improved in society, how we could work on inclusive language and we could do other things but we had a hard time applying that to our own case.

And I think that what's happened is that we've become so polarized that we have people on *both* ends who now feel that [this pastoral] would not solve *anything*; that as a matter of fact it would further divide them—and are calling for the document to be dropped.

My own modest suggestion is that in fact we do drop the pastoral, but not just drop it. We need to continue the dialogue, and I think that we should issue a brief positive statement, a brief positive statement, that would say thanks to all the people who participated—it's been a very difficult project—thanks especially to the committee for all the incredible amount of time they have put in, acknowledge the process itself, acknowledge what we've learned, come to a kind of consensus that sexism is wrong, see the offensiveness of exclusive language, and then continue the dialogue. And I think *especially* we need to mainly underline the issues that still divide us.

I think we especially need an open, honest study on the question of the ordination of women.

Bishop Raymond A. Lucker was ordained priest in 1952; director of USCC department of education, 1968-71; ordained auxiliary bishop of St. Paul/Minneapolis, 1971; appointed bishop of New Ulm, December, 1975. Bishop Lucker, with Bishop Victor H. Balke (Crookston), wrote a pastoral letter on "women's concerns", Male and Female God Created Them in October, 1981. He is a member of the NCCB Committee for the Selection of Bishops, the Evangelization committee, and the Administrative Committee..

Bishop Roger L. Kaffer

Recently, I said to Joe Imesch, my boss, "Before reading this draft I figured I'd support it for your sake, but last night I nearly finished reading it, and I was thrilled and most especially

with Chapter 2 on personal relationships and now I find support, not for your sake, but for the sake of the document and our people.”

He told me not to get up today—it would look rigged—and I said I would. And this is not the first time we’ve disagreed and he has no idea what I’m going to say now. But today I rise in support for the sake of our people, thirsting, I believe, for years for this kind of articulate guidance from their bishops.

Just a few examples, a few specifics. A senator last year told me he hadn’t heard a sermon on moral guidance in years. This document, I believe, gives moral guidance. A zealous advocate of a newly-opened facility for unwed mothers told me last week she feels so unsupported by the clergy. Well, this document supports her work. And as Archbishop May said we would do in his farewell address as president of the Conference—and as I read this—I thought how thrilled our family life, our natural family planning office, our pro-life office and our tribunals will be. They’ll know that their bishops support them. I think this is a long-overdue and sorely needed life-giving rainfall for Catholics, including priests, parched for guidance.

Singles have told me how excluded they feel; we include them. We affirm *Humanae Vitae*, a prophetic document; and even though not all can live up to the ideal, we propose it, and compassionately help and encourage those who [do not live up to the ideal]. The same for active homosexuals. We don’t condemn but we can’t condone. I think this document so refreshingly says so. And I would hate to see our deprived or thirsty 80-90% in the middle because we can’t and won’t teach what the 5-10% of both extremes want, which—as Archbishop Pilarczyk said this morning—is contrary to the teachings of Christ and the Church which we are obligated to articulate and uphold.

So I do commend Bishop Imesch and the committee. I do have some suggestions that I will submit; but I am in substantial agreement. I’m delighted with the document. I don’t think it’s supposed to be a theological treatise.

I think it would be a real cop-out to drop it. But I do think it’s a wonderful pastoral response and I hope you go on with it.

Bishop Roger L. Kaffer was educated at Gregorian University; ordained priest in 1954; ordained auxiliary bishop of Joliet, June 26, 1985.

Archbishop Rembert G. Weakland, O.S.B.

I would like to commend the Committee. I think this has been a tough, tough document and having been in the middle of a similar one, I can understand a certain amount of frustration if it doesn’t go anywhere.

But honestly, the process is as important, I think, as the

document. I don’t know how many people have read the economic pastoral since it was *published*, but I bet the number hasn’t been that great. But the *process* was very important—and so in this case as well. I think the process has been *extremely* important, more perhaps than the committee realizes. Because this issue, by them, has been sustained not only among us in the Church in the United States, but I’d say throughout the entire world—that this has been kept now up there on the main stage because of our committee.

I don’t think the question should be that we don’t have anything to *say* to our people about the issue. But the question should be: “Do we have something to *say* beyond that which has already been *said* by papal doctrine and by the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith? Do we have something to say that would be *significant*, that would take the argument, as it were, one step further—forward—and be a *major* contribution?” I don’t think we *have* done that and I don’t think we *can* do that at this point in history. That’s why I would like to see the harvest continue—the crop continue—before we try to harvest it.

I don’t think the letter’s clear yet, or the aims of it. If the letter were truly *pastoral* then I think it would try to *heal*. I find that the letter is not going to be a healing letter. It’s not ‘pastoral’ in that sense.

There are *so* many hurts out there among women, on *all* sides, on both sides. And at the same time I don’t think this letter is going to *help*—to heal those wounds and bring those people together. I find it at *times* rather brusque and harsh.

Nor do I find it a good teaching tool. I don’t feel it’s up to the *standard* of the letters we’ve put out in the past from an academic and—call it—professional/theological point of view. The anthropological section almost totally ignores an *enormous* literature out there, both in the secular world and in the theological world. The whole biblical issue of being created in the image and likeness of God—an *enormous* amount of material through the whole of our history on that text that isn’t even mentioned in the letter, yet that in[volves] questions so central to the entire issue; and I think biblicalists have to be involved in that issue.

I could go on and on through the whole document that way. I feel that the document is *not* ripe yet, it doesn’t add that kind of deep, deep reflection and theological basis. It would be an *embarrassment* in a way, to put it out in its present form. I think it’s better for us to let it go and to be *happy* with the process. The *theme* will not die but I wonder if we don’t need to step back from it a bit, and then eventually try and do it.

Archbishop Rembert G. Weakland, O.S.B., joined the Benedictine order in 1945; ordained priest June 24, 1951; abbot-primate of Benedictine Confederation, 1966-77; ordained archbishop of Milwaukee, November, 1977. He is chairman of the NCCB Committee on Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, and member of the Administrative Committee. In 1982 he issued a “Task Force Report on the Role

of Women in the Church” based on “listening sessions” he conducted in his archdiocese in 1981. In early 1990, he conducted six listening sessions on abortion—followed by another pastoral letter “Listening Sessions on Abortion: A Response” on May 20, 1990.

Bishop Edward W. O’Rourke

Dear friends, I wish to commend the committee on the long and difficult task. I’m not sure that this is the time to make this published and adopted but I’m very *sure* the [process] thus far has been very crucial and ... [inaudible] ... relationships and particularly to the issue of friendship. Much has been said about friendship down through the ages; ... have remarked on how very valuable friendship is. I think, however, that a person who really meditates about the actions and words of Jesus himself will find a kind of friendship that is not ... current among many men and women and among ... and....

I think, for example, of the kind of friendship that Jesus had for Mary Magdalene, for Martha, her sister Mary and her brother Lazarus—how they returned to the tomb with one another, loving one another in a very special way—the kind of love that Pope John Paul II has shown particularly to the young people with whom we will be involved a year from now in Denver, the kind of love he had in .., the charge of the youth ministry in his native archdiocese of Krakow, the kind of love that I have experienced over and over again in my 15[50?] years with young people at the University of Illinois.

I can state without any doubt that I was completely faithful to my vows and all the bishops and all the ... at that University can But there was truly love, and calling it anything else would be making a mistake—a very, very *serious* mistake. We can and we *must* see Christ in these individuals and *love* Christ in these individuals and love and be kind about love that Jesus has. So that is in this challenge and we mustn’t forget it and we mustn’t forget to express it. And there are many other things here but I will mention just one issue that I think is deserving of everything we have said and that’s... [end of tape.]

Bishop Edward W. O’Rourke was ordained priest in 1944; executive director National Catholic Rural Life Conference, 1960-71; ordained bishop of Peoria, July 15, 1971; resigned January 22, 1990.

Bishop Francis George, OMI

Reading through the document again, last night, what struck me was the way in which it witnessed to a very strange conversation, and a very fine witness, raises the concerns (and I’m sympathetic to what Bishop Imesch said) that we have to speak. All the more public need then, is why we don’t speak very *clearly* in the document about the subject of the nature of the Sacrament of Orders; and consequently about who can be

ordained.

This is a particularly difficult project because we’re teachers in the Church and it’s one thing to listen to the *experience*—that is extremely important. It’s equally important, it seems to me, to show that we have listened to the tradition and that we invite others who speak to listen carefully as well—a recognition (and, on our part, no matter how short) that Orders, like all sacraments, may be invisible—a certain dimension of the mystery of Christ. And that aspect of the mystery of Christ is made visible—is its relationship to the Church. And that that relationship is spousal. With the extremely important ... in advancing the conversation around that topic.

That’s not a very controversial position. It’s in the tradition. It’s firmly in the teaching of the Church. And if we *don’t* say it, then it seems to me that we say we’re not *sure* about the nature of this sacrament. And if we’re *really* not sure, then are we sure that Christ’s headship is, in fact, made visible at all? The arguments *against* it [the Church’s teaching on ordination]—and here is where two of the documents could perhaps be a bit stronger—are from the *culture*. And I think a bit of cultural discernment would be called for.

We come from a culture which some of us (and some of us even collectively) have criticized as too Lockean in its presuppositions. A Lockean presupposition about the human person says that a person is, first of all, a center of power; and secondly, a center of relationships. The nature of the Sacrament of Orders is that it is *others* that comes first—relations that come *first*. And the person serving others, serves that relationship. In the Lockean culture—the argument that what I *want* to do and what I *can* do and am able to do, I have a *right* to do—is extremely strong, strong in all of us because the culture lives in all of us. That doesn’t mean that it is consistent with our faith. So that inner dialogue between culture and faith is something that I think we could invite our people to when we discuss, far more adequately, the nature of the Sacrament of Orders in this document.

Bishop Francis George, born in 1937, educated at University of Ottawa, Catholic University, Tulane University and Urban University (Rome), is a member of Oblates of Mary Immaculate and was vicar-general 1974-86. He was ordained priest in 1963, and succeeded Bishop Skylstad (see below) as bishop of Yakima in September, 1990. He is a theologian and a member of the NCCB Doctrine committee.

Bishop R. Pierre DuMaine

I certainly want to agree with everyone that remarked on the achievements of Bishop Imesch and the committee, but I think it’s fair to say that they and the committee and the conference have gone as far as we can go in this conference. And I think that people aren’t sure that we’ve gone far enough. And I do believe that the document must be published. It cannot be lost. But I don’t believe that it can or should be published as a

[pastoral] letter. I would briefly suggest a possible alternative for a further discussion: that Bishop Imesch and ... put out a document upon women in the Church that would have at least three parts.

Part 1, mind you ..., would intend a summary of the consultations and process and the state of the questions that the bishops perceive in the Church in the United States right now.

Part 2, I think, would be sample transcripts of the ... voices of those who testified in the consultations—something along the lines that were undertaken in the first draft—but not a voting or a pastoral letter, but with the appropriate documentary record... what the conference has done...

And Part 3 could be a few, a very few—a half-dozen—brief essays by bishops' representatives to our conference, by women representatives of those who [participated] in the process. And in toto, this would be a milestone document for our conference and for the Church in the United States and would be as close as we could come to fully acknowledging ... exposition of the ... both in ... and in the Church in the United States.

I hope that we can pursue some of ... like that so that we can have the benefit of the enormous burden of Bishop Imesch's committee has done—and it would also join so strongly with Archbishop Weakland and ... and everyone else.

Bishop R. Pierre DuMaine was born in 1931, educated at University of California, Berkeley, and Catholic University; ordained priest in 1957; ordained auxiliary bishop of San Francisco, June., 1978; installed as first bishop of San Jose, March, 1981. He is an advisor to the Doctrine committee and member of Science and Human Values committee.

Bishop Alfred C. Hughes

It's clear by now that it's ... very wholesome struggle that our committee has entered into and I want to ... by saying its been a very enriching experience for us to go through together and I am deeply impressed by the hard work and the effort, the genuine effort that was entered into to try to resolve some of our difficulties that we experienced as we moved along. Because the difference of opinion in the committee is a public reality it seems only fair to identify what seem to be some of these questions. Now we have not yet been able to resolve them and therefore it prompts me to indicate at this juncture ...

The first would have to do with the anthropological analysis spelled out in a partial way in Chapter 1. As Archbishop Weakland has said there are many further ways in which that could be further developed, but basically the [image?] doctrine of the Church rooted in scripture and developed by the ... of the Church. The concern that I have is that the fundamental insights and principles that converge on that study do not get laid out in what is treated in Chapter 2 or 3. So we begin in Chapter 2 to

look at those issues that affect society and culture apart from the context of the anthropology in Chapter 1. And when we move onto Chapter 3, we are unable to go back into that anthropological concept for addressing specific issues of the Church.

The second comment that I'd like to make has to do with the notes here at the end of Chapter 2. As we look at society and look at culture it seems very important for people to move into an analysis of what is undergirding the thought and the movements that are part of our own culture today.

Bishop George was touching upon his philosophy. It does seem as though the philosophy of the elect which is impacting in an extraordinarily powerful way—a way in which we talk about the human person, we talk about freedom, we talk about equality, we talk about the family, talk about the good. And it seems to me that if we're going to make the kinds of contribution that is appropriate for us as bishops, we need to do that analysis; and then, on the basis of that, to make our comments with regard to the specific issue that we then treat in Chapter 2.

In Chapter 3, I am concerned that we do not present it as adequately as we might. At the beginning of the Chapter there is some pouring out of feelings, or criticisms about the Church. They spring from understandings of the Church that are not... [end of tape]

When we come to treat of the specific issues in Chapter 3, we don't lay groundwork—a basis—to address anew what it really means to be equal in the Church ... what it means to participate according to our own roles and gifts; an understanding of religious rights within the context of our Christian culture, and then be able to address the ordination issue, not merely just referring back to *Inter Insigniores* [Ed. note: 1976 Vatican document on the priesthood] but unfolding some of the deeper meanings of that kind of teaching in light of both our Christian anthropology and our Christology, and distinguishing *our* approach to those questions from those that spring from the philosophy of the Enlightenment that is enshrined in our culture.

Bishop Alfred C. Hughes, educated at Gregorian University (Rome); ordained priest 1957, in Rome; ordained auxiliary bishop of Boston, September 14, 1981. He is Chairman of the NCCB Committee on Doctrine, and a member of the Administrative Committee, and of the bishops' committee writing the pastoral on "women's concerns" since its inception in 1984.

Bishop Elden F. Curtiss

I think my main concern has to do with what I perceive the document and a lot of the data being promoted in this country is what I would consider [detrimental] in regard to the development of the universal Church.

We had a synod recently on priestly formation which also

indicated the clear-minded nature of the ordained priesthood, followed by a papal exhortation *Pastores Dabo Vobis* [ed. note. "I Will Give You Shepherds"] which clearly indicates the ... magisterial position of the Church in regard to the ordained priesthood. In my opinion that magisterial position is clearly defined and will continue at least until the next ecumenical council. I do not *understand*, therefore, how people can talk about a discussion of the ordained priesthood in terms of the ordination of women. That disregard for the progress that is taking place in the universal Church is, I think, ...

I think Bishop George pointed out very well what the definition of the priesthood is in the terms of the teachings of Jesus and the writings of the Church. And that, in my opinion, is a [specific fixture?] of magisterial teaching. It seems to me we have to make this clear to our people—this issue. I think Bishop Sheets pointed out the other side of the coin. He talked about sexism as sin and surely it is, in my opinion. And I spent a couple of months this year, in reviewing a lot of feminist theology.

In my opinion (and this is not alluded to in our paper) radical feminism—especially radical theology which is attempting to reinterpret the [substance] of revelation—is sin.

We make no reference to what radical feminist theology is doing to the Faith...and that's... So I believe we need to make the same case we find in view of the universal Church's position clear as [being] our position in terms of some radical kinds of things that are undermining the Church..

Bishop Elden F. Curtiss was ordained priest in 1958; ordained bishop of Helena, Montana, April 28, 1976. He is Chairman of the bishops' Vocations and Native American Concerns committees; and a member of the Administrative Committee.

Archbishop John R. Roach

I too, have a very brief personal note, this thing goes back far enough that I appointed Bishop Imesch as chairman of this committee and it's a real tribute to God's grace that our friendship has survived.

Secondly, Bishop Lucker and I were ordained in the same oil...and those oils have ...all these years and even now I agree with eighty-percent of what he's indicated. Where we depart is that I think we need this document in order to focus the dialogue. And that's my basic point. I think to go back for another consultation with an open-ended question, I think, is going to yield the same kind of data that I expect we already know and that we've gone through on two occasions.

I asked our Commission on Women in the Archdiocese of St. Paul/Minneapolis to give me some recommendations and they're brief but I simply wanted you to report them. The question, and my question with them was: Will this document

be helpful as we pursued the discussion at our local Church level? And their answer was yes. They *have* made some suggestions and I will be putting some of these in the form of amendments as we move on. They have some concern in the way in which we describe feminist spirituality. They would argue that women of color do not appear to be part of the pastoral until page nine, and are dealt with in not as fulsome a way as we should. They would argue that we still have not dealt with the question of patriarchy as well as we should. The question of sexism, they have some concern. They feel that there was an absence of positive images of women religious.

However, their two recommendations specific to me were these: the document will be helpful to further discussion at the diocesan and the local level; and we must continue to clarify it and to work on the recommendations that are made in the conclusion section of the document.

Those are women who have dealt with this issue for over ten years; we celebrate the tenth anniversary of that commission this year. And they are women who are serious about their role in the Church and about their responsibility to advise me as ordinary of that archdiocese.

I'm impressed by the fact that while they have some concerns about the document, which is subject to amendment, they are equally strong in the belief that the document would help us focus our discussion. And that's really, as Bishop Imesch has indicated, this is the beginning of the process, not the end of the process. And without the document I think we're left to open-ended questions, and I think this document will help us to clarify and further advance the question of discussion and dialogue in our own dioceses. This document will be helpful for discussion on the local level.

Archbishop John R. Roach was ordained priest in 1946; ordained auxiliary bishop of St. Paul/Minneapolis in 1971; appointed archbishop of St. Paul/Minneapolis, May 28, 1975; vice-president NCCB/USCC, 1977-80; president, 1980-83. He is a member of the Women in Society and in the Church Committee, and the Administrative.

Bishop Donald W. Trautman

I share the view of Bishop Hughes that there's a need for an expanded ecclesiology in Chapter 3. The text on page 57, lines 7-10, link diaconate or sacramental orders with non-sacramental orders: lector, acolyte and servers. I believe that we are creating a false impression that this is open for discussion.

I've heard the reference from the Roman document. I'd like to hear from the committee perhaps in more detail regarding that. My understanding is the diaconate is a shared reception of Holy Orders; the diaconate is intricately and essentially related to the Sacrament of Holy Orders. To call for a discussion, to suggest that this is open for discussion of ordination of women

to the diaconate, I think, is misleading.

Bishop Donald W. Trautman educated at the Pontifical Biblical Institute and Catholic University, was ordained priest in, 1962, in Innsbruck, Austria; ordained auxiliary bishop of Buffalo in 1985; appointed bishop of Erie, 1990. He is a member of the bishops' committee on Doctrine and of the committee for Review of Scripture Translations.

Archbishop William D. Borders

Twenty years ago I was on this first committee, the diocesan committee to respond to the concerns of many, the relationship to ... the document says, in a sentence ... and it was a small group, women throughout the country, basically professional women expressing their concerns. We didn't do so well. And I especially admire Bishop Imesch and his committee for progressing so much further than we did at that time.

I'd like to reflect, not so much on the document, but on the process or limitations and maybe even on the changes. The document is trying to speak of truth but really we're dealing with the mystery of God, the mystery of the human person, the mystery of the relationship between God and human kind, the mystery of the relationship between men and women, the whole *history* of relationships that have changed down through the years, and in this process all kinds of issues came up: injustices in relationships to the economy, people working, injustices in the relationships between the sexes, sexism which can't be limited to areas ... homosexuality, we're giving many, many issues that are not necessarily connected. And so it seems to me that while we are really trying to do something that has tremendous value, we have to recognize our limitations as far as the potential is concerned.

If we really want to reflect on the years down the history of the Church, it's not ecclesiology that's changed, and now so many of us reflected on the great documents of *Gaudium et Spes*... I think we're following that process, and I certainly would hope that all this work of the committee and its hearings would not be lost.

Let's study the hearings both of religious and lay women that people are not in agreement. I discovered that religious women in the field of teaching and in hospitals so often disagreed with their provincials. We discovered in priests' councils that sometimes priests [disagreed with] bishops. Basically that's probably healthy because we're always trying to grow and mature and understand what God ... And I think that's what we're doing with this document. I think Archbishop Weakland pointed out the limitations because we tried to do so much and in no way can we develop all these fields and impact on human life and our own spirituality, so let's keep going and use this but have some type of a process where it can be accomplished.

Maybe Bishop DuMaine's recommendation might be approached. Or possibly we might suggest that the committee publish the document as an ongoing study that ... I think we're making some progress, but we really do need to call forth a commitment, the love of all men and women in the Church. We are a faith community and, please God, this will ... [End of tape.]

Archbishop William D. Borders: educated at Notre Dame University, ordained priest 1940; ordained first bishop of Orlando, June 14, 1968; archbishop of Baltimore 1974, retired April, 1989. In 1977, he issued a pastoral letter, "Women in the Church: Reflections on Women in the Mission and Ministry of the Church."

Bishop Austin B. Vaughan

I'll only give chapter headings. My first problems with the proceedings here is this is the first general debate we've had on this matter after eight and a half years. I think that's ridiculous. We have never gotten a detailed report on the meeting with the episcopal conference [at the Vatican, 1991]; I've had a slight indication, but nothing more than that.

There's never been any revelation of what the letter from the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith Commission said. My judgment would be helped if I knew what the objections and problems were, but we're never going to hear that.

There was no revelation of the minority report that was intended by two of the five bishops.

I have no idea why four of the seven women advisers left the committee in the course of its existence. I think to interpret the document it would be helpful if we had a little bit of the history and so far we've gotten nothing. On that basis if we were considering voting on the Hail Mary with that procedural basis I would vote against it.

More to the point on the subject of this document: this document doesn't deal with or even face many of the problems that are the problems of the women that I'm dealing with every day.

There's nothing on the problems within marriage, except for wife beating, and yet we're in a time when more marriages are breaking down than have ever broken down in the past. There's practically no mention of what the causes on either side—man, women or society ... There's nothing on the difficulties in finding a suitable spouse at the present time. I'm told by women that it is harder to do than it has ever been in times past. There's nothing on the expectations that are imposed on girls during courtship because of the general standards in our society. There's nothing on the pressures from society and from relations to have an abortion. There's nothing on bad direction from within the Church on birth control. The statement on the *teaching* on birth control is clear enough but that's *not* what many people are getting in the confessional—that's not what they've

been getting for a period of twenty years — and they have to deal with what's presented to them and what's given to them.

There's nothing on feminism as a problem. It's a major problem in religious life in our country; it's a problem of sufficient proportion within the Church; it's a problem within all of society. I would never guess it even existed here. The word 'sexism' recurs very frequently, but *that* form of sexism is never delineated in any way at all.

There's a bare mention of the problems of single parents in poor areas. Most of the single parents in our society are not making ground. They don't have jobs that they can very easily keep—enough to support their children. Most of the single parents I know in a neighborhood like mine are *barely* keeping themselves and their children alive. I would never guess that from this thing [third draft of the pastoral].

There is nothing on the plight of women who have given up children for abortion. I know a woman for whom the birthday of her child thirty-five years ago is a constant horror. It never can be mentioned. So there isn't any way of healing.

There's nothing on women who feel unsupported by the Church and society in raising their children. The one thing that I get almost as a constant plea from people who are looking for some kind of help and direction on facing the problems that their teenagers are facing, that *they* are facing, and most of them feel that we are giving them nothing—or nothing that's useful. Encouragement is rare—and that's okay but it's not nearly enough. That's just the beginning. I find that the committee is out of touch with the real problems of most of the women that I'm dealing with. For most women, they tell me, "how do I hold my family together, and whether the family is held together or not, how do I raise my kids decently?" But for these in *current* political terminology, I think this document is addressed to the intellectual elite. That's not really what we need.

I don't find that the messages are clear here except, for [paragraphs] five and six. It's clear in saying that sexism is a serious sin; women are oppressed by the Church (among others); we need equal pay for equal work. We preach the Church teaching on abortion, on contraception and women's ordination—but we repeat it apologetically. I would not like someone evangelizing others on the Church's teaching, not with *these* kinds of statements. It's kind of unfortunate we're stuck with this, it's almost — the reading that I come out of this with — I don't think that it's the truth we are. If pushing for more involvement in 'ministries' with no examination of current or possible prospective problems in that — I'm not saying that we *shouldn't* go ahead with that, but I don't find any *attempting* to find why there's any resistance at all to that on the part of some people.

It pushes for Commissions on Women for every diocese with no hint at what kind of commitment to Church teaching on any of the controversial issues that were mentioned above

would be *required*. Some of the people who are listed in the footnotes of this give me a little bit of concern. I wouldn't too much like to have *them* on a Commission for Women that I was dealing with.

The Christian anthropology which is the key part of it, the foundation of it, *I* find — I know others have commented — no anthropology at all. There's nothing dealing with what the key differences are between men and women, and what are their consequences, either spiritually, psychologically, emotionally or vocationally. And there's nothing on to what extent men and women need each other and for what do they need each other, and I think we're going to talk about people as they live in society. That's an important question.

The fifth thing I had received on the section of Mary. I find it's a short section; I find it's got nothing on God's initiative — it's all on Mary's response. I think that Mary herself would *never* have stressed these things. The key words that we recall in regard to Mary are "He Who is mighty has done great things for me," "Be it done to me according to Thy word," "Do whatever he tells you." *All* of her emphasis was on Jesus and on God. And the emphasis here is on what Mary thinks when she suffers. I don't believe she would have done that.

My overall judgment is if [the pastoral] goes out, I honestly think that nobody will read it after the first week, and nobody will cite it after the first day. ... but I don't think it reflects well on the [bishops]. We need another document.

Bishop Austin B. Vaughan, a theologian, was educated at the North American College and Gregorian University; ordained priest in 1951; president Catholic Theological Society of America, 1967; rector of St. Joseph's Seminary (Dunwoodie, NY), 1973; ordained auxiliary bishop of New York, 1977. He is a member of the bishops' Committee on Doctrine and of the Administrative Committee.

Bishop Edward D. Head

I do hope that this pastoral letter will be completed and passed on in November at the next bishops' meeting.

I sense an impatience building, leading more to discouragement than to cynicism, among many active Catholic women. People's expectations will always vary, and there will never be unanimous response to any draft of the document. An introduction to this draft states that this response does not intend to bring about both reflection and action to an end but to a new beginning. With this in mind I think it's time to ... publish the document and move on to continued dialogue.

I'm aware that there are scholars, theologians and analysts on both sides of the issue who are advising that this pastoral not be completed and are calling for a fourth draft or for the project to *end*. These may be valid decisions for those involved in

academic work where new understandings are emerging and all the disciplines involved — anthropology, sociology, theology — but coming from a pastoral perspective, I believe otherwise.

Most women, young and not, need to be affirmed regarding their own worth and human dignity and understanding in relation to their faith. Most men at least, but perhaps even *most* men and women do not know that they are expected to ... They are unaware that certain matters and behaviors are no longer acceptable and can easily be described as evil or sinful. In other words, our first work, grounded in the ... of the pastoral letter, is a very great level of understanding. The pastoral letter will give us the framework to work from. To hesitate further will be interpreted as avoiding the issue and the perception, I believe, will be very detrimental.

Bishop Edward D. Head was educated at Cathedral College, St. Joseph's Seminary, Columbia University; ordained priest, 1945; director of New York Catholic Charities; ordained auxiliary bishop of New York, March 19, 1970; appointed bishop of Buffalo, 1973. He is a member of the NCCB Pro-life committee.

Bishop William K. Weigand

I'm strongly in favor of moving forward with the document. I'm nervous about the November deadline to vote on this document. This third draft has many very fine things, but I don't think it's at all ready for a final vote, and I guess I'm kind of doubtful that it can be amended to be a credible document.

Chapter One, I think, is well written. It may or may not be complete as some have suggested. It certainly does not echo Chapters Two and Three, and it's very strange and it's very noticeable. Somehow it sits there, disconnected from Chapters Two and Three. There's got to be a way for that echo in relations back to Chapter One.

Chapters Two and Three: Different elements are important, I believe in Chapter Two. Many of those sections I don't think are written well enough. I think you've got other of our statements where we've said something better and more positive — about Mary, and abortion, and natural family planning, and divorce, and so forth. There are any number of items missing, also and some others mentioned.

I was particularly — and for me pastorally — to assist marriages that [are in trouble], trying to help save them from one of the most devastating things for women, including the feminization of poverty and so forth: it's just not treated well enough there.

Bishop Vaughan mentioned another thing missing that I agree with. Now, I asked our diocesan women's commission also to give me some feedback on this. They very much think the document is useful. They also see some voids. Interestingly,

the women in my diocese, especially on this commission, are very middle of the road, very dedicated... women.

The thing that struck them as so obvious and so strange is how we have not addressed the ordination issue of women. Even to simply explain the Vatican declaration of 1976—there's no indication except we explicitly say in paragraph 111 that this is not the perfect place to comment. They thought that was strange. I think it's a terrible blindness, why we wouldn't try to use this context to help our women and to help our people in general to understand what our position is and why the Church has the position it does, and so forth.

So I strongly believe we've got to treat in some more productive way, the section on ordination, the ministerial priesthood, the relationship to the Sacrifice and so forth. I think this would be an interesting place to do it.

So I guess I'm perplexed why we haven't used—or at least it doesn't seem like we have used (that would be in the third draft) the expertise of Sister Sarah Butler. I purposely went back to her 1989 reflections on women's ordination in the March issue of *Worship*. I think she has a very good approach to this in trying to help our people understand where the Church is, and I think that would "sell". Most of our people simply haven't the faintest idea why the Church has the position that it does, affirms. [Ed. note: Sr. Sara Butler was a consultant to the writing committee since 1984. During her tenure on the committee she changed her view from advocacy of women's ordination to support for Church teaching.]

There are a number of other interesting things that my women's commission assumes: that we can't move towards any kind of affirmation of artificial contraception, for example. They thought the treatment there was too short, was not at all helpful, that there should be more on natural family planning and some more attention to what they all feel is a real concern in their lives and we're just kind of glossing over it.

There are a number of other things: I guess what I heard Bishop Imesch saying, from within the committee, some good recommendations for remodeling or filling in some voids. Since he spoke, it seems to me, I don't want to ... I don't think this is ready to be voted on at all.

Bishop William K. Weigand was ordained priest in 1963; ordained bishop of Salt Lake City, 1980. He is a member of the NCCB Administrative Committee.

Bishop Charles A. Buswell

There is a time for everything under heaven. Now is not the time for what's supposed to be the "pastoral response to concerns for women for Church and society." [What we are] discussing this afternoon seems to be more a response to our own concerns—the concerns of the Vatican—than the concerns

of women. We say, for example, that sexism is a sin, then seem to deny that the Church is guilty of sexism, even when it continues to deny ordination to half of its membership because they are women. We need however to take advantage of the hard work of the committee who prepared the proposed pastoral and continue to build on what the committee has done. With the assistance of lay people, particularly women leaders and women theologians, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, an honest and respectful dialogue is called for.

Bishop Charles A. Buswell was born in 1913; educated at American College, University of Louvain (Belgium); ordained priest in 1939; ordained bishop of Pueblo, 1959; resigned, 1979. In 1975 he wrote a pastoral letter on "women's concerns", Ecclesial Affirmative Action: A Matter of Simple Justice. In 1983, Bishop Buswell joined Bishops Maurice Dingman (Des Moines), Thomas Gumbleton (aux. Detroit), Francis Murphy (aux. Baltimore), George Evans (aux. Denver) and Archbishop Raymond Hunthausen (Seattle), in public endorsement and support of the "Woman-Church Speaks" conference of radical feminist organizations.

{*Note: biographical notes for the following three bishops appear at the end of their conversation.*}

Bishop Charles J. Chaput, O.F.M. Cap.

I have a question for Bishop Imesch. The concerns that Bishop Sheets expressed and that Bishop Hughes expressed are mine except that I would have a hesitation for both of the documents. What I would *need* to have that kind of confidence is an explanation of *why* the underlying philosophical and theological issues are not *dealt* with. Because if they are *not* dealt with, it seems like we presume that the popular thought is correct and we're just waiting [along] with the audience in the direction of the ordination of women and ... I don't go with that at all.

So I'd like to ask you to respond. Why *is* it that the issues of radical feminism in the current philosophical mood of our country aren't *dealt* with in the document?

Bishop Joseph Imesch:

Well, I think there are probably several reasons. We tried to keep the document as brief as possible and yet...[cover the issues]... Every time we wrote a draft, or rewrote it, we went back and forth on this very issue. And we thought — at least the members of the committee, the *majority* — decided the best thing for us to do was *not* to try to explain in five pages or eight pages (and I'm not sure that can be *done* in that number of pages) the reasons for the prohibition of the ordination of women. So we decided simply to repeat what was said in *Inter Ignores* and to affirm that teaching without trying to go into an explanation.

Bishop Chaput:

...That didn't answer my question. ... We're not questioning that issue. Why didn't you say anything at all—at least raise it as an issue—why didn't we warn against the dangers of radical feminism in a passing way? I know we ... in a passing way, but why not more of it?

Archbishop William Levada:

We're all still friends, too, which seems a pretty significant achievement.[*a reference to previous remarks about "still being friends" despite disagreements on pastoral*] ... To say something about the development of this process as I see it in the committee's thinking:

First of all, the committee set itself an agenda to be as faithful as we could to the consultation in which we heard both from the diocesan boards and from the various groups, and I would say, as I reflect back on this document and in our own internal discussions, that that has posed some limitations on approach to the variety of issues that we heard in the discussions today. I think that some of those limitations are correctly brought to our attention, and the document probably would not have [agreement?] on how we come to some kind of concern that, with the great variety that we hear about what direction we might take in that regard, because I would think that even if you agree with our suppositions.

Secondly, it seems to me that the committee is also ..., as I read it, more or less has the opinion that in areas which will raise controversy or touch particularly sensitive issues that it would be preferable to adopt, as an effort to be more pastorally sensitive and in a way not to sharpen the antagonisms among different groups, to address things by saying *less* rather than saying *more*. Sometimes people...

Thirdly, I think a part of this was the process. Going through the enormous process of drafting and redrafting, at times we have in fact, some of us have, sought to introduce various analyses. Bishop Hughes thought some of the people he's said would be helpful to the pastoral letter; and I can say to you that the references to the minority report that Bishop Hughes and I developed was a virtue of the of the committee. It's really nothing other than a part of the ongoing process to continue the development of helpful ways in addressing some of these issues. As it turned out we did not have a committee meeting scheduled after we had developed (it was too much volume and exuberance) the report—suggestions that we had made as the committee as a whole in our conference call—thought we should stick with what we had, and what we had I'm perfectly content with that decision. But I do think that all of us will need to take a more serious look at that lacunae and see if it's possible without extending the document to get another... pages...to address at least some of these.

Bishop Charles J. Chaput, O.F.M. Cap., was born in 1944; education St. Fidelis College (Herman, PA), Capuchin College, Catholic University, University of San Francisco; solemn vows as Capuchin, 1968; ordained priest, 1970; ordained bishop of Rapid City, South Dakota, 1988, the second priest of Native American ancestry ordained a bishop in the U.S. He is a consultant to the NCCB committee on Evangelization.

Bishop Joseph Imesch, born in 1931, educated at North American College and Gregorian University (Rome), was ordained to the priesthood in 1956; auxiliary bishop of Detroit in 1973, and appointed bishop of Joliet, IL, in 1979. He has been chairman of the ad hoc Writing Committee for the Pastoral on Women in Society and in the Church since 1984.

Archbishop William Levada, born in 1936; educated St. John's College (Camarillo, CA), Gregorian University (Rome); ordained 1961; auxiliary bishop of Los Angeles 1983; appointed to Ad hoc committee for the "women's pastoral", 1984; appointed archbishop of Portland in Oregon, 1986. He is a member of the Doctrine committee.

Bishop Richard J. Sklba

I don't want to indulge in canonization by acclamation, but I certainly want to acknowledge the hard work, the tremendously hard and difficult work, that has gone into the project thus far. The issues raised by this process also is the same issue that ...the various documents along time.

Many people have spoken about the positive things that have been addressed in the process of the document: the call to equality and dignity, the acknowledgment of sexism. I think there are other things that are less successful in the current document, for example the uses of the image of God theology seems to be out of touch with the scriptural studies I'm familiar with, particularly paragraph 21.

And there are other things that I find disconcerting in the document. For example, the focus on issues of sexuality which could seem to belie the document's initial reassurance that persons are more than gender or reproductive partners. I conclude with the belief that some other way, other than the publication of the letter as it now stands, should be found to preserve the values achieved thus far in the listening dialogues, but not to signal a premature termination of the conversation or to further polarize our Church on this matter.

Thank you very much.

Bishop Richard J. Sklba, born in 1935; educated Old St. Francis Minor Seminary (Milwaukee), North American College, Gregorian University, Pontifical Biblical Institute, Angelicum (all in Rome); ordained priest, 1959; ordained auxiliary bishop of Milwaukee, December 19, 1979. He is chairman of the NCCB's ad hoc committee for Review of Scripture Translations,

advisor to the Committee on Doctrine, and a member of the Administrative Committee.

Bernard, Cardinal Law

Archbishop [Pilarczyk], I express my gratitude to the committee and particularly to Bishop Imesch for this opportunity for this kind of discussion. I think that this is a very helpful way for us to approach a very difficult and complex and timely subject.

The document deals certainly with a critical issue both to the Church and to society as a whole. The present document does not appear to me to serve as a pastoral letter for us on this issue because I believe that it fails to teach *clearly* on the issue at hand. And I cite two examples that have already been referenced:

I don't believe that it sufficiently analyzes feminism in terms of its cultural and philosophical roots and I think by doing that, then feminism itself would not be quite so isolated as an issue.

And then, secondly, I think it fails to provide an analysis of those same cultural and philosophical roots from the point of view of the faith of the Church, which is what I think a pastoral letter should do in the face of such phenomena. With that [faith] indicating that our society and Church must respond more positively in addressing the wrong suffered by women *abound*. Only this past weekend the Surgeon General, in a speech he delivered, pointed out that one out of every four women in this country suffers from domestic violence. This simply compounds data already available indicating the ways in which there are patterns of discrimination, injustice and abuse that society and the Church certainly *must* address...

Having said that, however, and having recognized that to do that is among the laudable goals of feminism, there are those occasions when feminism becomes entwined with an ecclesial agenda which has disastrous effects for the life of the Church. Eucharist becomes a sign of division, disunity. Faith is relativised according to one's life experiences, and the pastoral leadership of the Church is often marginalized due to the prism of suspicion, hostility. And it seems to me that as pastors of the Church it is essential that this more negative manifestation of feminism in the ecclesial context has to be faced. It has to be analyzed in terms of its cultural and philosophical roots and it has to be critiqued from the point of view of the faith of the Church. How the committee can do this or *whether* it can do this between now and November is a matter that I would hope the committee would have some time to consider.

Cardinal Bernard Law, born 1931; ordained priest, 1961; editor of Natchez-Jackson, Mississippi, diocesan newspaper, 1963-68; former chairman of NCCB committee on Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, 1968-71; ordained bishop of Springfield-Cape Girardeau, MO, 1973; archbishop of Boston,

1984; cardinal, 1985. He is chairman of the committee on Migration and a member of the Pro-life committee and the Administrative Committee.

Bishop Michael D. Pfeifer

I'd like to begin on a personal note. I was born into a family where there were nine girls and my own sisters don't let me forget about the concerns of women.

I appreciate the hard work of our committee. I think that many of us feel we set out on a journey that perhaps we wish we had not begun. I would like to reflect with you here on some questions that women may make ... as they study this document. The questions are for us—for me—to look at: Is this a compromise document? Is it self-serving? To whom is it addressed? (There seems to be a lack of clarity as regards our audience.) Is it a healing document? Also, as regards the purpose of the letter, we say it's to bring about oneness in Christ, but is it in effect going to create more division in our Church, especially among women?

So, having raised those questions, I have these further comments to make. I believe that we need to be totally sincere and honest at this point. I think we have to admit that in many ways we're in a no-win position. We need to be free to say what we can, but I think we have to identify very clearly, if we're going to continue in this process, what are the issues about which we cannot speak—or about which we're not ready to speak, perhaps. So I think that we need, then, to focus clearly our energies on the changes that are within our power. I think that we need to commission much more theological study, more reflection and even more dialogue, because we're in changing times and before we make a final statement, I think we have a lot of input to still receive.

Thank you.

Bishop Michael D. Pfeifer, O.M.I., was born in 1937; educated Oblate school of theology (San Antonio); ordained priest, 1964; provincial of southern province of Oblates of Mary Immaculate, 1981; ordained bishop of San Angelo, 1985.

Bishop William S. Skylstad

I, too, want to express my deep gratitude to the committee for a tremendous amount of work on an obviously complex issue. Your work over the past years has already been, I think, a great gift in the dialogue in which we have all been involved.

We talk a lot about the hurt and pain amongst our women. For these past few months I've been involved in listening sessions with various groups in my own diocese: a domestic violence center, a women's jail, a school for homeless children, a downtown drop-in center for teenagers, a transition house for the sexually abused. The anger, the hurt, the entrapment, the

sense that no one cares or no one notices are really profound and pervasive.

A comment in one of the sessions went something like this: "Bishop our family was considered to be the model parish family but I want to tell you at home it was *hell*, it was a war zone." For example, on pages 24 and 25, the brief comment: it shocks us to learn that currently one woman in four will be sexually assaulted in her lifetime. Some statistics I think even ratchet that percentage up to 33%.

My point is, it seems to me that statement tends to sanitize the reality with which we are dealing. The footnote 32 expresses in a much more graphic way, it seems to me, the urgency of the challenge we face. And I hope that the pastoral statement somehow could express that urgency with a sense of caring, love and concern for those who are very deeply hurt and healing.

Thank you.

Bishop William S. Skylstad was born in 1934; education Pontifical College Josephinum (Worthington, OH), Washington State University, Gonzaga University (Spokane); ordained priest in 1960; ordained bishop of Yakima, 1977; bishop of Spokane, 1990. He is a member of the Administrative Committee.

Bishop Enrique San Pedro, S.J.

I add my expressions of gratitude to Bishop Imesch and his committee for the work done and I think I find myself in the position that many of the other bishops find themselves. *Now*. I think we've come to this point; we must say *something*. I don't think I can give my vote in favor of the draft as presented and I don't know whether just a few amendments will change the draft [enough]...

There are three basic things which are the reason for my position, for my hesitation. The first one: I have a hard time finding in it what to me is the final test of a Catholic doctrine which is what I like to call "the balance of paradox". If we go down to any and every statement of our Faith we find that delicate balance which affirms together two things that apparently cannot be affirmed together. We affirm that God is one and three Persons—and I could go down the whole thing. I'm sure we all remember our catechism. The fact is that that same principle applies to good pastoral practice, but "the balance of paradox", I have a hard time to find it.

Another previous concern that I have is that the doctrine of presentation of Christian anthropology appears to me to be rather weak. I am, to be very honest, unsatisfied with the Biblical presentation. There is just the basic reference to Genesis 1, 2, 3. The rest of the Old Testament isn't even mentioned. There is only one quote of St. Paul, and I fear that the reason for that is precisely because we don't know how to

express that delicate “balance of paradox” which is also part of the anthropology, the Christian anthropology. And I don’t think we have — at least I didn’t see it — any effort to present the theological reflections that have enriched the theology of the Church.

The third point that would not allow me to give a positive vote is that I miss also an honest and bold effort to deal well with the phenomenon of feminism — it has been mentioned by other bishops already — as it impacts our social/cultural atmosphere. We brush aside some of the statements of the Bible by saying that they are born of the culture of the time when they were written — and there’s some truth in that — but I don’t think they’ve applied the same thing when it comes to [feminism]. I think we must analyze it and challenge it from our doctrine of Faith.

Thank you very much.

Bishop Enrique San Pedro, S.J. was born 1926, Havana, Cuba; educated Cuba, Spain, Philippines, Austria and the Pontifical Biblical Institute (Rome); ordained priest, 1957; taught Scripture and did missionary work in Vietnam, 1965-75, until he was expelled; visiting Scripture professor at St. Vincent de Paul Regional Seminary, Florida, from 1981; ordained auxiliary bishop of Galveston-Houston, 1986; Bishop of Brownsville, 1991. He is chairman of the NCCB Hispanic Affairs committee, member of the Administrative Committee, the committees for Review of Scripture Translations and Priestly Formation, and consultant to the on Liturgy committee and Migration committee.

Bishop Robert Banks

First, I wanted to thank the committee for persevering in what I consider to be one of the most difficult tasks that has been assigned to a committee, at least in recent history. Apart from the fact that the issues themselves are extremely complex, the society which we address is bitterly, not bitterly, *sharply* divided about the issues, and the *Church* is sharply divided. Some of the most committed members of our Church are divided and are vigorously opposed to some of the things that we might try to say in this document.

We are going to try to say that God wants a structure for His Church which seems to be utterly opposed to the modern, Western acceptance of women in all positions of political life. That is quite difficult today. We are going to do this as an all-male body which automatically, today, makes almost everything we say suspect. So the *task* that we are working with is certainly one of the most difficult. Now some of my own comments about the letter:

In the letter we say little—and you *decided* to say little—to explain what is, I think, most troublesome to our society—at least to our Church: the exclusion of women from significant

positions in the Church and from positions of ultimate ecclesial authority. That question is addressed to me *frequently* and if it’s addressed to me, I assume it’s addressed to other bishops. I have to give an answer. So I think we as bishops have to try to explain what the reason for our position is. I don’t think we can simply pass over it and say, “that’s our position.” So, having made the decision of not addressing that in depth, we then deeply immerse ourselves in the day-to-day relationships of men and women in our American society. I think in that area we borrow extensively from the political debate that’s going on in our nation. Frankly, I have some questions about the particular thing that we have chosen to support ... We are more confident in taking sides on these specific political solutions that are being suggested in the national debate, nor are some of them specifically Catholic positions, I might add. I’ve particularly considered in those sections that have to do with the day-to-day relationships of men and women in society. I’m particularly concerned that, without meaning to, it seems to me that the document suggests, in places, that men are the problem—or at least that marriage is. We don’t suggest or emphasize enough that men and women are committed partners in that marriage and that what they do they’re doing as partners...

Also we don’t address some of the positions or principles of feminism that I really think we have a need to address.

And, finally, I would agree with Archbishop Weakland when he suggests that the document is not healing enough. I would say it is not healing enough when it addresses those questions of a day-to-day relationships between men and women. I think it could be better in that regard. And I’m not quite sure that it’s tone is healing enough in regard to the [teachings] of our Church...ordination, artificial contraception...

So, in my judgment, a much briefer statement would be necessary. How do you do that?! I know....

Frankly, if you bring up this document you’re not going to have a consensus. Whatever we put out has to have a consensus. If there’s a large minority vote then the document will never have a note of authority. So the thing that—I guess—[it needs is] something else about people’s dignity, and the dual partnership of men and women; indicate some of the practical problems that we have; a better, fuller explanation of the Church’s position on ordination and hierarchy; some caveats about certain aspects of feminism; and then, I think, some kind of way in which we commit ourselves to a continuing dialogue, either by keeping some of the committee in existence [or another statement].

Bishop Robert Banks educated at Gregorian University, Lateran University (Rome); ordained priest, 1952, in Rome; rector of St. John’s Seminary, Brighton, Massachusetts, 1971-81; vicar general of Boston archdiocese, 1984; ordained auxiliary bishop of Boston, September 19, 1985; appointed bishop of Green Bay, 1990. He is a member of the NCCB committee on Vocations.

Cardinal Joseph Bernardin

Bishop Imesch, I too want to thank you for all the work that you have done over the past eight or nine years. One of the questions that is raised is whether or not we should have a document at this time, or whether we should have this *particular* document.

I personally would like to see us pursue this document using a sort of process that we have for this purpose. I am very much aware of the divergence that exists. I think all of us could have anticipated what we have heard this afternoon. Nonetheless, I think it would be a serious mistake at this time simply to walk away from the letter, after all the work that has been done, including the consultation that has taken place.

I know that in the Archdiocese of Chicago, if I remember correctly, more than 5,000 women are in women's consultations. After all of that, to drop it now, we would give a wrong signal, the wrong impression. We would give the impression that we really have nothing to say or that we don't know what to say about any of the concerns of women; that we have abandoned our responsibilities on the pastoral on women. So many of them have been discriminated against, so many have been dealt with unjustly. Also, we could give the impression that we simply don't have the courage to exercise our responsibilities as teachers of the Church.

So, my answer to those who would call for dropping it, would be no, let's not do that. I do not yet have in the Archdiocese, a Women's Commission, but one is being established. There's been a Task Force at work planning for that. When that Task Force has completed its work, I can approve what they've recommended, and shortly this Commission will begin functioning. So what I did, since I didn't have this Commission, was to speak, as a number of bishops here have done, with a number of women—women who are very intelligent, very committed to the Church (in many instances they *work* for the Church) and I asked them quite frankly what they thought, and I asked them specifically if they felt we should proceed with this, because we have been hearing from both ends of the spectrum that it should be dropped.

And they said no, continue working on it because we need to affirm so many of the things that are in that particular letter. It may well be that there are items there that we don't agree with but we feel that *overall* we wish you to continue with it. In regard to the *content*, it is true that this letter is not going to heal *all* of the hurts that exist. It's not going to affirm all of the positions that are being sought, at whatever end of the spectrum, but in my judgment the pastoral does affirm a *number* of things that *need* affirmation. This is what the women—*my* consultants—this is what they were telling me. It will give a very clear signal that we must move in new directions in our life as a faith community.

I agree with what Bishop Banks said a moment ago. I think

the truly critical or neuralgic issue is that of ordination. That's [contributed] heat to so many other things. And I understand why the committee decided not to address that in such a way. But I really feel that this section needs to be enriched so that it won't look as though, well, we can't *do* anything about it now, so we'll just not talk about it.

But that's not the only issue. There are other issues, as well, that are divisive, neuralgic, especially in the areas of sexuality. And so, on these decisive issues, I think that we *have* to put forth emphasis on reasons *why* the teaching authority of the Church holds certain positions. And may I say, you know this as well as I, if recent polls are to be believed, we have a great deal of work cut out for us, in terms of our [teaching ... But to attempt to say the last word on Christian anthropology and feminism would, in effect, kill the letter].

Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, born in 1928, was ordained priest in 1952; ordained auxiliary bishop of Atlanta in 1966; NCCB general secretary, 1968-1972; Archbishop of Cincinnati, 1972; , president of NCCB/USCC 1974-1977; appointed archbishop of Chicago 1982; cardinal, February 2, 1983. Cardinal Bernardin is Chairman of the NCCB committee on Marriage and Family Life, member of the Pro-life and the Administrative committees, and consultant to the Liturgy and the Religious Life and Ministry committees.

Bishop John S. Cummins

...I think there has been great learning in the past eight years on the part of all of us and that includes the women who have ...and I decipher, discern a lot we are going to need today on how many issues that we have not looked at yet.

I would have to say my experience at home has been somewhat different from what has been evident in some of your written commissions in the archdioceses because where I have found some of the parts of the paper just about unanimous approval, there is much more dissatisfaction with the paper ...than I ever hear. I'm wondering whether, following the Cardinal, that we're dealing with a very large issue, and today it's been said more than once, this is a universal change in consciousness that has come upon us very suddenly I think in this generation. I think the *breadth* of that and the fact it is worldwide and has so many levels of awareness is really an issue.

Therefore, I guess, is the letter the way to deal with this? And I argued very strongly for that letter; I had a very clear conviction that we should have it. Now I'm wondering whether it's the best because I'm wondering whether it is *enough*. From the conversations that we have had in the diocese and in parishes the last two years, I think have been *very* fruitful and have been a very wonderful way to go with our understanding of what the issues are.

I would not want the Committee on Women in Society and

Church to be overshadowed by the Writing Committee because what I understand is that they are taking apart some of these issues, bit by bit, piece by piece, which it seems to me a very constructive way to go in the future.

I think, from another point of view, we have not written much about this as bishops individually. We did a good deal of that in trying to write when the pastoral on nuclear arms was done. And whether we are not perhaps in that kind of period, do a little more exploring.

I lastly would second very much what Bishop DuMaine said and I believe what Cardinal Bernardin at least intimated, that the record that maybe certainly should be very preserved in the state of the question and perhaps that tripartite recommendation of Bishop DuMaine, I would certainly approve and reinforce.

Now, insofar as this is a pastoral letter, I know in the past we have not been afraid of divisiveness; we've been gracious about it, I think gentle, but the fact that people disagree with us is not a factor. I think in this case it is because the ones who are expressing dissatisfaction are among our very best women in the diocese and the people who are at various levels of activity in the diocese.

For the future, it seems to me we handled the nuclear arms question by delineating it very sharply; we did not discuss modern warfare, we talked about only nuclear weapons. We did not have the broad perspective of a John XXIII *Pacem in Terris*. I'm wondering whether we should have a very diversified approach to this. Some kind of statement, but much more than that.

I do not think that if we change the nature of the letter that things are going to be lost, because the agenda that has been raised by the writing committee is now our universal agenda here in the United States. We're not going to be allowed to [change] that. I guess I was just going to appeal for as diversified an approach as can be taken at this time.

Bishop John S. Cummins was educated at Catholic University and University of California; ordained priest, 1953; executive director of the California Catholic Conference 1971-76; auxiliary bishop of Sacramento, May 16, 1974; appointed bishop of Oakland, 1977. He is a member of the NCCB Laity Committee.

At the conclusion of the interventions, **Archbishop Daniel Pilarczyk** (Cincinnati), president of the NCCB, asked "Does the body advise continuing work on this Draft?" Several bishops then addressed that question. (Bishop Donald Wuerl, Pittsburgh, asked a procedural

question which is not recorded here.) Quotations from these interventions follow:

Bishop San Pedro: On the one hand, we should say something on the issue. On the other hand, as I said before, I find the draft quite unacceptable even as a document...*(inaudible)*

Bishop Michael McAuliffe: If we back off at this particular moment... what does this say to people whom we are supposed to be serving? ...If we don't go ahead with this and improve it...we're really not doing our tasks as bishops.

Bishop McAuliffe, born in 1920, educated at Catholic University, ordained priest in 1945, bishop of Jefferson City (MO) in 1969. He is a member of the Missions committee and the Church in Latin America committee. In 1979, he was among the bishops representing the NCCB in formal "dialogues" with the Women's Ordination Conference conducted from 1979-81. Other were Bishops George Evans, Francis Murphy and Amadee Proulx (Portland, ME). (Bishop Proulx has served on the pastoral's Writing Committee since its inception.)

Bishop DuMaine: ...I think we have to *keep* this draft in place and find another vehicle for communicating it...

Archbishop Oscar Lipscomb: Are we really set still on issuing a *pastoral* [teaching] letter, or [mightn't we issue] some other kind of conference statement... as part of the dialogue?

Archbishop Lipscomb, born 1931, educated at North American College and Gregorian University (Rome) and Catholic University, was ordained priest in 1956, and first Archbishop of Mobile when it was raised to an archdiocese in 1980. He is advisor (former chairman) of the NCCB Committee on Doctrine.

Bishop Eugene Gerber: I'd like to encourage us to stay there [with the pastoral] and not walk away from the uncomfortableness...

Bishop Gerber, born 1931, educated at Catholic University and the Angelicum (Rome) was ordained priest in 1959, bishop of Dodge City in 1976, and appointed bishop of Wichita in 1982. He is on the bishops' Administrative Committee.

Following these comments, Archbishop Pilarczyk called for a straw vote, asking the bishops to indicate whether they would favor adoption of the draft pastoral if a vote were taken today. Although a majority of bishops present stood in support of the pastoral, Archbishop Pilarczyk announced that there did not appear to be the required two-thirds majority. ■