



Saint Mary's College  
Spring Semester, 2002  
Religious Studies 240

# *Catholic Social Thought*

**Professor:** Joe Incandela  
**Office:** 160 Madeleva Hall  
**Office Hours:** MWThF 10:00-11:15; Tu by appointment  
**Phone:** 284-4534 (RLST dept.); 284-4613 (office); 271-0435 (home)  
**E-Mail:** [incandel@saintmarys.edu](mailto:incandel@saintmarys.edu)  
**Home Page:** <http://www.saintmarys.edu/~incandel/homepage.html>  
**Course Website:** <http://www.saintmarys.edu/~incandel/CST.html>

## ***Course Description***

This course examines Catholic positions on some of the most controversial social, ethical, and religious issues of our day: abortion, birth control, the relation between official Catholic teachings and individual conscience, reproductive technologies, cloning, stem-cell research, physician-assisted suicide, euthanasia, the allocation of scarce health resources, the ordination of women priests, capital punishment, nuclear weapons, terrorism, waging war vs. embracing peace, poverty and the United States economy, and the effect of being a member of the Church on being a citizen of the state. In each of these areas, we shall be trying to determine what specific difference the Catholic tradition makes for the way we approach these issues. The readings present a wide range of moral and theological points of view. Some of them will be critical of the official Catholic position. But listening to such critical voices is crucial for what we do here: for to understand and evaluate the *Catholic* position better, we need to listen to *non-Catholics*; to understand and evaluate *theological* arguments better, we need to examine *secular* ones as well. And since many of these issues impact rather directly upon women, it is especially important to hear *their* voices.

I hope you will come away from the course better able to think about these matters and better able to articulate and defend what you think. This class takes its place as part of the General Education Requirement at Saint Mary's by sharing its goals of fostering the ability to think clearly about complex problems, promoting the capacity to communicate with precision and style, and studying freely and critically the rich heritage of the Catholic tradition. And because there are different ways of doing ethics within the Catholic tradition, we shall examine and evaluate not only the conclusions that various writers have reached about these issues, but also the kinds of ethical reasoning they use to reach their conclusions.

## Goals of the Course

The goal of this course, *ultimately*, is not just to enable you to reproduce the positions of the Catholic Church, but to produce positions of your own that will enable you to find and evaluate your own place in the Catholic tradition.

More specifically, the student who successfully completes this course will be able to

- ☆ **explain** official Catholic moral teachings on the issues we cover (that is, you will know what the Church teaches)
- ☆ **engage** official Catholic moral teachings critically and reflectively (that is, you will be able to say something about them with informed views that explain why you agree with what you do or why you disagree with what you do)
- ☆ **form** your conscience and argue as ethicists do—namely, you will
  1. **take** a position on a debatable issue
  2. **support** this position with evidence (namely, reasons drawn from a variety of sources—theological, philosophical, scientific, experiential, legal, etc.—which are brought forward in relation to your position or thesis)
  3. **draw** a normative conclusion based upon this evidence (viz., ‘this is right’ or ‘this is wrong’)
- ☆ **determine** whether and where ‘American’ values and ‘Christian’ values are in tension
- ☆ **demonstrate** through written and spoken words habits of critical thinking and problem solving
- ☆ **view** the world, its people and its problems, against broader horizons
- ☆ **appreciate** the challenges, difficulties and struggles of Christian living at the dawn of this new millennium

## Requirements and Grading

To complete this course successfully, you must ① participate actively in class discussion, ② turn in regular 1-page preparatory writings on the assigned readings, ③ submit two (approx.) 5-page essays and 1 (approx. 8-page) project, ④ make regular postings to the online conference through the class’s website, and ⑤ pass the final exam.

The grade you receive at the end of the course is broken down in this way:

<b>1.</b> Active and well-prepared class participation	15%
<b>2.</b> Short preparatory writings on assigned readings	15%
<b>3.</b> Three papers (2 essays + 1 project): each worth 15% (due: February 13 <sup>th</sup> , March 6 <sup>th</sup> , April 19 <sup>th</sup> )	45%
<b>4.</b> Regular contributions to the online class conference	10%
<b>5.</b> Final exam (Thursday, May 9, 1:45-3:45)	15%

① **CLASS PARTICIPATION** This course will depend heavily upon student input. You should come to class having read the assigned material and with something to say about it. On the syllabus, I give you some study questions to help focus each reading assignment and occasionally provide some comments or background on the assigned readings. Both questions and comments are listed under “Study Guide” on your syllabus. Look at the Study Guide *before* you read, and think about it *as* you read. The issues on the Study Guide will form the basis for class discussion. You’ll be done preparing when you’re able to answer *all* the questions I ask you about the upcoming readings. If there are any points you can’t figure out on your own, you should either contact me before class or ask questions about at the start of the following class. You will also be able to ask your classmates for help through the course website (early in the semester, I’ll show you how to access it and interact with other students through it). It wouldn’t be a bad idea to take some notes for yourself on the Study Guide questions, as these will help you later on to review for the final exam.

To maximize the opportunities for participation *during* class, we will occasionally break the class up into groups. We only come to know something when we are able to find words that make sense to ourselves and to others. Talking clarifies thinking. Group conversations, therefore, help the learning process by allowing more than one voice to go on in the classroom at a time. I try to run the class as informally as possible. Do not, however, abuse this informality: behavior not conducive to learning (e.g., extraneous side conversations) will not be tolerated. In general, I expect the kind of behavior from you that you would appreciate were you in the front of the room. This means making eye contact, sitting up straight, and looking attentive and interested.

You are expected to attend class regularly. Attendance is taken daily. Since your presence in class is a kind of participation, more than 3 unexcused absences will lower your grade. All absences for which I do not receive a written excuse from either Teresa Marcy (Assistant to the Vice President: 136 Le Mans) or Susan Vanek (First Year office: 121 Le Mans) or the relevant office at Notre Dame will be considered unexcused. More than 6 such absences may result in failure of the course. In rare circumstances, even an excessive number of *excused* absences (more than one-fourth of class meetings) may not allow you to pass this course. *It is the student's responsibility to inform the professor of any extenuating circumstances affecting attendance or class performance.* Coming in more than 5 minutes after the start of the period counts as one-half absence. Consistent tardiness less than 5 minutes late will also count against you. And if I ever see you with your eyes shut in class or otherwise zoning out or nodding off, *that will count as an absence for that day.* You will receive a 1-grade deduction in Class Participation for the ‘first offense’ and an “F” for Class Participation for any additional infraction. Mere physical presence in the classroom class participation. *If you're drowsy or otherwise out of it, do not come to class.*

There will also be three evening meetings of the class during the semester. Plan your schedule accordingly. These are on Tuesday, February 19 (7:00-8:15 PM)—for a guest speaker; Thursday, March 21 (6:15-7:45 PM)—for a trip to the Center for the Homeless; and Wednesday, March 27 (6:00-7:45 PM)—for a showing of the movie *Romero*. This movie is also on reserve in the library, and so you may watch it yourself before the 1st if that’s more convenient for you. For the first and third of these evening meetings, you’ll get classes off during the day.

Class participation will be assessed according to these criteria:

- ☆ **Frequency:** demonstrated consistency in contributing to the class (= getting an “A” for class participation requires, but is not *solely* determined by, frequent—that is, *daily*—contributions to class discussion and consistent readiness to speak up in class to voice your insights or answer questions on the class readings.)
- ☆ **Understanding:** demonstrated familiarity with course content (= your comments show your comprehension of ideas, concepts, and theories presented in the readings and in class.)
- ☆ **Presentation:** demonstrated ability to express yourself with clarity, fluency, and conciseness (= you avoid rambling speeches and raw opinions that we could just as easily get from the average patron at the nearest bar who has never heard of this course and its assigned reading.)

- ☆ **Interaction:** demonstrated skill in asking questions, answering questions or in otherwise contributing to the process of learning (= your contributions fit into the flow of the discussion, and your comments build on those of others to lead to a new insight, question, or conclusion. You take the lead in asking questions and raising topics for discussion. What you say draws others into the conversation. The class participation I value most enhances the interest and enthusiasm of others for the material and thereby leads them to participate as well.)
- ☆ **Respect:** cooperation in creating a supportive learning atmosphere (= you listen to and respect the views of others. You are critical of ideas, not people. If you disagree with others, you do so *constructively* in ways that make the issues clearer for everyone. In general, your conduct in class is conducive to the learning of others in the room. That means being attentive to whoever is speaking and not interrupting others or taking the discussion off on a tangent. You adhere to the standards of behavior set out in the handout 'A Modest Proposal to Students.')
- ☆ **Engagement:** demonstrated preparation for class, demonstrated reflection and *enthusiasm* about the course content either in class or outside of class by showing up during office hours or scheduled appointments with questions or comments to discuss (= your conduct in class gives every impression that you're well prepared, and interested in what's going on. You take responsibility for your own learning such that you ask questions and do what you need to do to assimilate the material and clarify any misunderstandings about it. Profs respond and teach better to an alert, attentive, and interested class in just the way a band puts on a better show for an enthusiastic crowd.)

**2** **PREPARATORY WRITINGS ON ASSIGNED READINGS** Careful and thorough reading of the day's assignment is absolutely necessary to make our time together more productive. The following required texts are in the bookstore and also on SMC Library reserve (the last reading listed below, *The Challenge of Peace*, is also available online). *In addition, you will need a Bible to consult and to bring to class occasionally* (the days when you need a Bible in class are marked on the syllabus). All Bible readings are also available on the web. A copy of the syllabus is available through the course website, but you must use Adobe Acrobat to read it (this should automatically launch if you're on a networked lab machine, but might need to be downloaded if you're not). Acrobat can also be downloaded through the website.

- ❖ Xeroxed Packet of course readings (Volumes I & II)
- ❖ Sr. Helen Prejean, C.S.J., *Dead Man Walking*
- ❖ U.S. Catholic Bishops, *The Challenge of Peace*



At first, you may find some of these readings rather difficult because you probably won't be used to ethical arguments or to how readings in ethics ask you to evaluate the coherence and persuasiveness of multiple viewpoints and conflicting values. As you progress through the course, you'll become more familiar with ethical writing; and the readings should become easier. The more practice you have in doing this kind of reading, the better you should understand it and the more you should absorb from it. The questions I ask and the comments I provide in the Study Guides for each day's assignment should help you prepare more effectively. And if you ever get stuck on a particular concept or term found in the readings, there are lots of ONLINE RESOURCES available to you. Look up the word or term in the glossaries found on the webpage under "Select handout" in the left frame or "General reference" which you can select in the right frame of the course website when it's initially loaded.

To help you prepare for discussion, I ask that you complete some writing prior to each class of the syllabus marked with a  next to the date. The purpose of these shorter papers is to clarify to both you and me where you have arrived on your own with the day's readings. These will then provide the basis for classroom interaction in which, together as a class, we'll build on that starting point.

**Format for Preparatory Writings on the Readings:** Prep writings to be done outside of class should be no more than 1 page long and typed. Space as you need to fit everything on one page. Put your name at the top. Bring two copies of these papers to class with you. These writings will be due at the start of class, and so hand in one copy as you walk in the door. Keep the other copy with you to refer to *and mark up* during class. ***Be ready each day to share with the class what you have written.*** Late papers may be turned in only following an officially excused absence. Organize these papers as follows and number the two main parts:

1. Summarize the main points made in the reading or readings as concisely, *but as completely*, as you can. What went on in these texts (whether in print or online? Feel free to provide brief illustrative quotations from the texts (with page numbers in parentheses after the quotations) to help you get the points out. Where there are many readings assigned, their main points generally overlap, and so just do the best you can in succinctly presenting what's most crucial.
2. On (about) the second half of the page, say what you thought was most interesting about what you read. Your aim *here* should be to *personalize* (that is, say what these readings taught you, what you found interesting or of value in them), rather than to *summarize* (as you did in the first part). So use phrases like the following: "From these readings, I learned ..." or "I didn't use to understand ..., but now I do because ...," or "What I found interesting was ..., and so on.

At the end of class, I want you to turn in your (other) copy of your paper *marked up* with any corrections to Part #1 that you discovered during class and/or a circle around a point you made in discussion that you originally wrote in Parts 1 or 2. Doing the latter will usually be an automatic +, because then the prep writing will have done what it was supposed to do: prepare you to contribute to class discussion. **When you make a comment from your prep writing, just circle what you wrote/said and put a ✱ next to it in the margin and give yourself a √+ at the top of your paper.** Otherwise, I will grade your paper and may not remember particular comments you made. (The same deal will hold for papers written in response to online postings—see below.) I won't be commenting in great depth about what you turn in, because by the time class is over each day, your understanding of the material should have progressed beyond the point found in your preparatory writing. For this reason, I may not grade every paper you turn in. The ones that do get graded, however, will receive a +, , - or 0 according to the scale found below. Papers will usually be returned the following class. For every other one you turn in which doesn't get graded, you will receive at least 1 point (2 points if you circled something you said in class). For the ones you turn in that *are* graded, you will receive 1 point for a -, 2 points for a , and 3 points for a +. At the end of the semester, these points will be tallied and a letter grade assigned.

- √+ Your summary of the material and the point you found interesting indicate a careful and thoughtful reading of the text; you demonstrate that you've put some ideas together on your own; quotations from the text are especially well chosen, and appropriate page references are supplied. You explain in some depth what you learned. A " +" is equal to an "A."
- √ Your paper indicates a basic understanding of the material read, with quotations and page references adequately in place. A " " lacks the level of depth and complexity that a + contains and corresponds to slightly below a B.
- √- Your paper does not indicate an adequate reading of the material. A " -" corresponds to a very low C.
- 0 You don't turn a paper in.

- ③ **PAPERS** Your first two papers will involve critical ethical analysis of the issue to be discussed. You must take a position and defend it with reasons. Writing is a way of learning. None of us knows exactly what we think about a topic or issue until we put our views on paper. The third paper will be a semester project that I will explain early in the course.

**Format for the Papers:** The first two papers should be around 5 pages typed and double-spaced. The third should be about 7-8 pages. For the first two papers, your name should not appear anywhere on your paper. Put your ID# (last 4 digits) on the back of the last page. Do not use a title page. When the paper topic calls for a thesis statement, it must appear at the end of the first paragraph and should be underlined. *Number your pages*. Only outside sources need to be footnoted. Information on how to cite electronic sources is available on the course webpage under "Select handout." Quotations from the XP should be referenced immediately after the quote in the body of your paper, as follows: (XP, p. \_\_). But please avoid long quotations and quote sparingly. Better to incorporate key words or phrases from the author's text that help you advance your own views.

Each paper that you submit must be accompanied by a checklist. I won't evaluate papers without them. The checklist reiterates my expectations of the work that you turn in and provides reminders to you that I hope will improve the quality of your submissions. And, to be honest, it will help to save me some time in my grading if I don't have to attend to lots of the little formatting requirements. Please be honest as you fill these out. The checklist by itself won't have any effect on your grade, but not following what's on the checklist may. I will distribute checklists in class, but these are also available on the course website (under "Select handout" in the left frame).

**Late Papers and Academic Honesty:** Papers not turned in during class on the due date will be considered late. One-day extensions are possible, but they must be approved in advance. I will not accept a late paper unless you have previously asked for an extension or told me ahead of time (= at least 1 day before the due date by noon) that it will be late. If you receive an extension, you must turn in a brief outline of your paper on the regular due date so that I have something to hold you to; and if you receive an extension and still don't turn your paper in by the *new* due date, it will be lowered 1 whole letter grade per day late. And of course, the student handbook policy on academic honesty is in effect. You are responsible for knowing it and following it.

The grade you earn on your essays is based on the following five criteria:

- ☆ **Understanding:** demonstrated and accurate grasp of ideas, concepts, and theories presented in the readings and in class (= you present ideas from the texts accurately, and you refrain from unfounded interpretations or leaps of interpretive fancy that attribute views to the author that she or he does not hold.)
- ☆ **Organization:** apparent, understandable, and orderly presentation of ideas; structured thinking, the way your paper is arranged (= your paper's structure should be apparent, easy to follow, and built into your opening paragraph. The relationship between your points is adequately spelled out by a well formulated thesis statement at the end of your first paragraph which summarizes the reasons backing up the thesis so that the reader does not have to read between the lines to figure out what you're trying to communicate.)
- ☆ **Reasoning:** demonstrated critical and interpretative skills, rational manipulation of ideas and dexterity in handling them (= you satisfactorily and thoroughly defend your thesis by the ideas and evidence you cite in its favor. Your points build on each other and assemble coherently into a discernible position or defense of a particular side of an issue. Where appropriate to the assignment, you display a knowledge of objections to your views and an ability to respond to them. Remember that an opinion is only as good as the evidence, theory, or reasoning on which it is based. You *must* back up your points with reasons.)

- ☆ **Originality:** exhibited creativity, personal appropriation of the issues and questions surrounding the topic (= you go beyond what the readings and class say to formulate some creative ideas of your own. Support for your ideas is drawn from your own insights and reasoning rather than only borrowed from class or the text. You take some chances with the material and show creativity by—in the words of Professor Barbara Walvoord (of Notre Dame’s Kaneb Center for Teaching and Learning), “making unusual connections, looking at something in a fresh way, noticing unusual relationships or aspects of the topic, pushing beyond surface observations, challenging what others take for granted, or taking a risk with ... a difficult topic.”)
- ☆ **Mechanics:** sound grammar, spelling, writing style, sentence structure (excessive instances of poor grammar, poor spelling, or poor proofreading or general sloppiness will definitely lower your grade. Good writing is precise writing, and mistakes in grammar, spelling, or proofreading do not contribute to precision. In general, I expect *professionalism* in the presentation of your work.)

These criteria correspond to the following letter grades:

- A** Excellent in all or nearly all of the above aspects. The interest of the reader is engaged by the ideas and presentation. Style and organization seem natural and easy. The paper is marked by originality of ideas. You provide evidence that you see complexities and can confront inadequate explanations and that you can answer questions and question answers. I can hear a lively, intelligent, interesting human voice speaking to me as I read the paper.
- B** Good, technically competent, but with a lapse here and there. The thesis is clear and the prose is generally effective. There may be some gaps or flaws in the argument or some deficiency in one or two of the five criteria listed above. But these tend to be redeemed by the paper’s good points.
- C** A competent piece of work, but not yet good. C papers are more or less adequately organized, and the thesis is usually just satisfactory. In some C papers, very good ideas are marred by poor presentation—in development, organization, or technical errors. In other C papers, the organization, structure, and grammar are not flawed, but the ideas and how they are developed need a lot of work. Basically, a C paper contains problems with two or three of the five criteria listed above without the good points of a B paper to raise it to that level.
- D** A piece of work that demonstrates some effort on the author’s part but that is too marred by technical problems or flaws in thinking and development of ideas to be considered competent work.
- F** This grade is reserved for papers demonstrating minimal effort on the author’s part. Perhaps the writer has drastically misinterpreted the assignment or left it almost completely underdeveloped. There are serious problems in all of the above five criteria.

- ④ **ONLINE CONTRIBUTIONS** This class will conduct online discussions over the internet. We’ll make use of software called “Internet Classroom Assistant” (or “ICA” or “Nicenet”). I will provide instructions on how to use this software. The course also has an extensive list of web resources which will function as either required and recommended reading. The course syllabus, class handouts, and paper assignments are also available online. You can access both the discussion forum and the web resources through the course’s website at the following address:

<http://www.saintmarys.edu/~incandel/CST.html>

This site is optimized for the latest versions of Netscape or Internet Explorer. If you don't use these browsers or a browser which doesn't support both frames and JavaScript, you won't be able to get to many of the sites or use the class home page as intended. If you live off-campus and use AOL, you will *probably* be able to get to most of the sites, but I can't guarantee it. Download times will probably also be extremely slow. I would suggest that you try to do as much of your web work as possible when you are on campus. When you're in a lab and log in (at least on the Saint Mary's network), you will find Netscape under the Apple Menu (for Macintosh machines) or on the left side of your screen (for PCs). Once you've launched Netscape, select "Open" under the File menu (in PCs, it should say "Open Page"; in Macs it should say "Open Location in Navigator") and type in the above URL exactly as shown. This includes the case of the letters—note that the "CST" is in all capitals.

When you go to the above address, you'll see two frames. The left one takes up about 30% of the screen; the right one occupies the remainder. The left frame contains course data and information; the right one contains the online resources we'll use throughout the semester. The handout I'll pass out on the first day of class will explain these in more detail. When you first go to the course website, click "Forum" (left frame) and then the button labeled "Instructions" right below it. Read the instructions carefully, as they will help you log into the ICA and tell you about its features.

I realize that some of you may be pretty inexperienced with computers. Don't worry—lots of help is available to bring you up to speed. I really have tried to make things as simple and easy as possible. If you can get to the one address listed in the box at the bottom of the previous page, then you're home free, since that site takes you everywhere else. You should feel free to consult me or any of the attendants on duty in the lab. None of this is very difficult or anything you can't learn in (quite literally) ten minutes. I incorporate information technology into my classes because I think there are substantial educational benefits to doing so (see below). But besides this, just about any career and any employer will require that you know how to make your way around the internet. What you learn here will be of use in your other college classes and certainly beyond college.

**Online Reading Assignments:** When you have an online reading assignment, go to the left frame of the website. Under "Course Information," go to "(Select a class)" and scroll down to the date on which the reading is due. Click the "View" button. The class will come up in the right frame. Under the date, you'll see some or all of the following:

- ☆ "Class Outline" (in blue) will take you to the PowerPoint slides for that day's class.
- ☆ "Required Online Reading" (in red) has the links to the readings that are required for the particular class. Required readings from the internet will be listed on your syllabus as **WEB ASSIGNMENT**.
- ☆ "Online Versions of Required Readings" (in purple) gives you internet versions of readings in your text. You might use these to search for a particular passage or just to read things online if that's more convenient for you. All of the Bible readings assigned for the class are also available here.
- ☆ "Recommended Online Readings" (in teal) give you additional web resources that you can pursue if you're interested in a particular topic. Most of the official Catholic teachings we'll be examining this semester are also available on the web. All of them are searchable as well, and that could be very handy if you're looking for a precise word or phrase. There are also additional resources for when it comes time to write your papers, and you will be responsible for consulting the ones I suggest on particular topics. *These readings would also be great things to explore and write about in your online postings.* Recommended online readings will be listed on the syllabus under **►ONLINE RESOURCES**.

When the course website first loads, the right frame features an online searchable Bible; resources on Catholic beliefs, practices, history, and theology; links to non-Catholic Christian denominations and non-Christian religions, and additional information about all the subjects we'll study this semester. You can also access my own home page through this site (bottom of the left frame). There you'll find my office hours, my résumé, descriptions of the other courses I teach, and information about the Department of Religious Studies.

**PowerPoint:** The slides that will be projected up in front during class will be available on the web for your review and preview. Go to the website and find the particular class in the frame on the left. When it comes up in the frame at the right, select "Class Outline" right after the date. When that comes up, you'll again see two frames. In the top of the frame at the left, there will be two arrows, one ↑ and the other ↓.



Select the down arrow to expand all the outlines on the frames for that class. You can then select "Print Frame" from the "File" menu in Netscape to print out an outline. *I would strongly suggest that you do that before class, as this will save you lots of time taking notes.* There will, of course, still be material you'll need to fill in, but you won't have to copy off lots of things from the screen.

**Online Discussions:** Once you get to the course website for the first time, click on "Forum Instructions" (in the left frame) to get to the discussion forum where you will be dialoguing with your classmates online. The goal of this exercise is to have you all connecting outside of class and writing for and helping out everyone else. And so the more you mention other classmates by name and refer back to—or build onto—their points, issues, or questions to agree or disagree with them, the better all of this will work, and the better those of us reading the messages will be able to follow the discussion. The BEST THING TO DO would be to put something in the "Subject" line of your posting that summarizes your contribution by referring to a classmate and indicating the way you're bridging off that person's comment, as in "Disagreeing with Katie." There will be two kinds of forum postings that you'll do for this class:

The first kind will be in response to specific questions that I will ask and put online at least 3 days before it's due. Your goal in these postings is twofold: address the question I ask as best you can, *and* provide some feedback on someone else's posting. Feedback can include gratitude for helping you see something in a new way, praise for how something is worded or presented, constructive disagreement, building a bridge from what one person says to create a new insight of your own, and so on. But, of course, don't just say, 'I agree' or 'I disagree,' but say *why* either of these is the case. That is, if you agree, add a new point to the discussion on top of the one with which you're agreeing. And if you disagree, try to understand why the person said what she said even as you go in a slightly different direction with it. And so feedback = something which can help the author of the original post to look at her ideas in a new light and the authors of future posts on this topic to see something unique added in the feedback. The first kind of web posting assignment is indicated on your syllabus with an icon in the margin that looks like the figure to the right: You'll need to post a contribution by (at the latest) 6:30 PM on the *night before* the class where we take up the particular issue you're posting on (or by 4:00 on Sunday if you're posting over a weekend for readings on Monday). No exceptions. The grade will be lowered on anything posted late, and if your submission is more than 2 hours late, you will receive no credit at all. To make sure that the comments posted come back into class the next day, I'll divide you up alphabetically:  $\frac{1}{2}$  the class will do the posting, and the other  $\frac{1}{2}$  will do a prep writing on those postings (*not* the readings per se). Use essentially the same format as in the prep writings: Namely, in the first half of the paper, briefly summarize the postings. In the second half, respond to (at least) one of the postings in some depth. Your response could indicate your agreement, disagreement, or raise a question that you'd like to address to the author of the posting. Or you can say what's still unclear to you after reading all the postings. Identify the people you're responding to by name.



The second kind of web posting will be more open-ended. I will ask that at least twice in each of the months of February, March, and April; you visit the forum to raise an issue that in some way bridges off what we're talking about in this class or to respond to what someone else said. (More frequent participation than twice in each of these months will yield *extra credit*.) When you log into the ICA forum, read what has been posted by everyone else and post a substantial response of your own, or begin a new topic that you'd like others to pursue (instructions on how to do each of these things is available on the course website). This is meant to be an online discussion, so please respond to one another, debate ideas, and have fun! Think of this as a **Cyber-Café** to dialogue with others in class about topics related to the subjects we take up. The goal here is not to have a series of isolated statements, but to create a virtual community and a thread of conversation that allows you to interact with each other and respond to issues that others raise.



That's why mutual feedback is essential! This is *your* forum, and communication with—and learning from—each other is the key here. This is an especially good opportunity for quieter students to make their views heard. *So get in the habit of visiting the forum every couple days and see what's there—or what you'd like to leave there for others.* Please don't wait until the very end of the month to make your postings, since it just defeats the purpose of what this exercise is supposed to be about if everyone writes in at the same time at the last minute. I'll give you reminders in the margins of the syllabus.

More specifically, what does all this mean? All of the postings you do will either add to a previous discussion on an already existing topic or will initiate an entirely new topic. What's most important about the former category of postings is that you provide some feedback (as described above) to other students who have already posted their contributions to the discussion. Here are just some ideas about what you can do in the Cyber-Café. Try to connect ideas from the course with things outside the classroom. (The more that participants can relate their life experiences and what you already know to the context of the online classroom, the deeper will be your learning.) Or, look at the recommended websites I've collected for each topic, follow the links, find something interesting and report back on it to ask for other people's views (*this would be an especially good strategy if you're finding it difficult to come up with something to say*). Try to relate ideas from one part of the course with ideas from another part of the course. Identify connections that you now see, but didn't use to. Direct questions to other students to promote collaborative learning, as this will help to create an online community of inquiry. Address some of the Study Guide questions on individual readings. Since there are no time constraints on the web, mention something we didn't get to in class that you think is important and worthy of further consideration. Reflect on the class, on what we're studying and how we're studying it. All online contributions will be assessed according to these criteria:

- ☆ **Reflection:** obvious thoughtfulness behind your comments and questions (= your online posting must demonstrate that you've carefully done the reading and are bridging off it with the comment you make or the question you pose.)
- ☆ **Initiative:** demonstrated active search for information and insight (= you take the lead and move the issue along creatively and coherently. This may come with asking a good question. Or it might come in directing your classmates' attention to something that hasn't been mentioned yet—something from the text or something else from the web or from your own experiences or insights.)
- ☆ **Interaction:** demonstrated ability to give constructive feedback and to respond to, and dialogue *with*, others' contributions; demonstrated ability to synthesize previous postings by bringing together what has been said to form a new insight, question, or conclusion (= your comments build on others' comments and your questions elicit your classmates' response. In general, building these kinds of bridges which lets us see how one particular topic is related to other significant issues is a very helpful thing to do.)
- ☆ **Respect:** cooperation in creating an effective, supportive learning atmosphere, demonstrated ability in constructive disagreement (= your comments advance the discussion while always treating others with dignity and respect.)

These criteria correspond to the following grades, which have the same values as those listed on the bottom of p. 5 of the syllabus. All postings are worth 3 points. You'll receive **1 point** for your response being in on time, **1 point** for making use of the readings in a substantive way, and **1 point** for responding to your classmate(s) in a substantive way (unless you're the first one to post on a particular question or initiate a new topic). Now, what do I mean by a "substantive way"?

- √+ "Substantive" in this context means that it becomes clear that you've put some things together on your own and the steps of your thinking are apparent. For example, you may reference specific ideas or concepts in the assigned reading and reflect on them articulately and with evident understanding. Or, you make interesting connections (between different parts of the class, or between what's in the class and what's outside the class in terms of relating personal experience or focusing on related subjects to those we're discussing) that provide especially helpful feedback for others and interact well with what they had to say. Doing both of these things in a posting that comes in on time is 3 points and a +.

- √ Your comment or response to another posting is adequate but doesn't go into the depth or level of originality that a + requires, *especially* in your reference to other postings (2 points).
- √- You do a posting on time, but don't do much with the readings or with what others have said. Your posting does not indicate an adequate reading of the material or others' postings; or what you say does not rise to a satisfactory level of critical thinking and review of concepts (1 point).
- 0 Your posting is more than 2 hours late.

I'll be monitoring the postings and bringing into class points that people have made online. I will also give you an evaluation at midsemester of how you're doing.

**Why are we doing this?!** From my own perspective, five good things come out of using the web like this: {a} Working online insures universal participation, guarantees that everyone in the class has a voice, and requires that all views be heard. In every class, there will be quieter students and more vocal students. Online postings give everyone an equal voice. {b} Computers cannot replace face-to-face communication, but they can be a marvelous extension of it by eliminating spatial and temporal constraints. More specifically for our purposes, the computer makes class time more productive, as many times we will already have discussed certain issues or raised certain questions before we even set foot in the classroom.



We will come in, then, already prepared with points we need to clarify or explore. Along the same lines, you can follow up a class discussion by raising a relevant point that you either didn't think of before or didn't get a chance to say. If you think something crucial was left out of a previous discussion which we ought to have attended to, let the class know. {c} This exercise should make you a more critical, thoughtful writer. Writing out your ideas encourages you to think through your positions very carefully. Doing this over a computer network gives you a wider audience than just me and makes your writing public. {d} Working online makes you more active learners. Asking you to go to the web for information and dialogue with others in the class puts *you*

in control of what is being learned and how it's being learned. To a certain extent, you're being left to your own devices to make sense of—and even to, in some ways, *create*—a particular body of knowledge associated with this course. {e} Online discussions create a community of learning. Not only will this exercise give you a wider audience than just me, *it will give you more teachers than just me*. These postings will make you dependent on each other. This interdependence produces collaboration, which produces community. The goal, then, is to increase peer communication and learning.

Some final comments: First, note that the web is a volatile place, and lots of sites appear and disappear from moment to moment. When you can't get through to a particular site, the most common cause is that its server is busy or overloaded. You'll usually get in if you just try back later (this is *especially* true of the ICA class forum). When it will be down longer than this, I'll post a sign in the webpage alerting you to the problem and giving an indication of when to try again. But the best thing for you to do whenever you can't access something is to e-mail me immediately to alert me to the problem. Second, *just because something appears on the internet doesn't guarantee its veracity*. While I've tried to select sites that I thought contained pretty sound information, you should feel free to verify with me or other sources things that you're unsure of. And see also "Tips for Evaluating Internet Resources" on the website.

- 5 **FINAL EXAM** The final exam will be cumulative, although heavily weighted to the material from the end of the course. It will contain both essay and objective questions. You will receive the essay question ahead of time to prepare your answer. The objective questions will be drawn from the Study Guide questions on the assigned readings. I'll pass out a review sheet describing all this in greater detail when the time comes.

# I. Introduction to Catholic Christian Ethics

## JAN 16 A. Syllabus, course description and requirements

- In addition to the assigned readings for January 18, also read pp. 1-11 of the syllabus to be clear on course policies, due dates, etc.
- Also by tomorrow (Thursday) night at 6:30 PM, introduce yourself online to the rest of the class (name, hometown) AND briefly describe your hopes and expectations for the course.

## JAN 18 B. Ethics: Is Morality Relative or Objective?

- John C. Dwyer, "Good and Evil, Right and Wrong" [Xeroxed Packet = XP, pp. 1-5]
- David Carlin, "Floating in Mid-Air: Are All Opinions Created Equal?" [XP, p. 6]
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Take a Stand, or Several: On Not Being Nonjudgmental" [XP, p. 7]
- Robert L. Simon, "The Paralysis of 'Absolutophobia'" [XP, pp. 8-9]
- John Leo, "Decadence, the corporate way" [XP, p. 10]
- John Kavanaugh, "Conscience Qualms" [XP, p. 11]

**Study Guide:** According to what Dwyer *himself* thinks, are moral standards objective (= really there whether we acknowledge them, like them, or even know them: for example, 'the earth goes around the sun' is an objective truth in that what makes it true is the way the universe is independent of me)? Note that the statements Dwyer puts in quotation marks usually represent views he's *opposing*. The Kavanaugh essay does an excellent job defining this notion of objectivity. **Or**, are moral standards relative/subjective (= every person or society makes up their own standards by doing what is 'right for them': for example, 'my favorite color is blue' is a truth relative to me, one that is purely subjective in that what makes it true is whatever *I* decide)? Why does Dwyer say that "the acceptance of what I feel is right as the ultimate moral standard may well be the only true degeneracy of which the human being is capable...?" (where "degeneracy" = the ultimate decline in moral standards, decadence). What are the two types of tolerance David Carlin describes and what are their characteristics? What's wrong with the second type? In particular, why would it be self-contradictory for someone who was tolerant in Carlin's second sense to say, 'Everyone should be nonjudgmental'? Why does Simon say that relativistic views are "so pervasive"? and what examples come from the Leo essay to illustrate how pervasive relativism is in our culture? What does Simon think faculty members can do to combat such views? In particular, what does he mean when he says that students cannot have it both ways? That is, what "logical objection" is relativism open to (similar to Carlin's point)?

►►► **ONLINE RESOURCES:** The website has a very clear description of what moral relativism is if you're still not sure after today's readings.

## JAN 21 C. Christian Ethics: How does Belief in God Matter to Morality?

- Harold Kushner, "What Makes Some Things Wrong?" [XP, pp. 12-16]
- **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** William Lane Craig, "The Indispensability of Theological Meta-Ethical Foundations for Morality"
- David Carlin, "What Makes an Act Good?" [XP, pp. 17-18]
- Pope John Paul II, Sections 72-74, 77-80 from *The Splendor of Truth*, Sections 35, 38, 48 from *The Gospel of Life*, & Sections 7-12 from *Faith and Reason* [XP, pp. 19-24]
- (a) *The Purpose of Life:* John's Gospel 17:20-21; Ephesians 1:3-10; II Peter 1:3-4; (b) *The Example of Jesus:* Matthew's Gospel 7:21; John's Gospel 13:15; Ephesians 5:1-2; I Thessalonians 1:6; I Corinthians 2:16 & 11:1; I Peter 2:21; I John 2:3-6; III John 1:11.



(Web Posting due for everyone by 6:30 PM on Thurs., Jan. 17. Sign up on the class forum and introduce yourself to everyone else.)

**Study Guide:** We're really doing two related things today: First, we'll pick up on issues discussed Friday about the objectivity of morality and what it is to do ethics. What are the three "components" or "sources" of moral action that Carlin and the Pope (in *The Splendor of Truth*) describe? Second, we'll bring in a religious dimension to ethics and see what difference *that* makes for thinking about good and bad, right and wrong. In this regard, how do Kushner, Craig, and the pope in *The Splendor of Truth* think belief in God affects what one thinks about morality? (Carlin should help you understand the pope better, and the Craig essay will do the same for Kushner.) Why does Kushner say that the affirmation that there is only one God is a moral statement? In what way? As said above, Craig's essay nicely complements Kushner's, and though the title of that essay is a philosophical mouthful, it basically comes down to trying to make the case that morality needs God. In particular, how does what Kushner and Craig say relate to the issues we discussed in class on Friday? What does Craig think it means 'to say that there are objective moral values'? Why does *he* think that God must exist for morality to be objective? In light of this, why does he agree with Michael Ruse that "The man who says that it is morally acceptable to rape little children is just as mistaken as the man who says,  $2+2=3$ "? (By the way, it would be a good idea to print the Craig essay off the web in case you need something to refer to in class.) Finally, in three words or less (!), what do the Bible verses under (a) and the pope in *The Gospel of Life* say is the purpose of life? Namely, what does the pope identify in that reading as the "definitive goal," the "final end," the "very purpose of life," "the ultimate end"? How does the pope in *Faith and Reason (Fides et Ratio)* connect the revelation of God in Jesus Christ with the meaning of life? This comes out most clearly in section 12.

**JAN 23**

D. Catholic Christian Ethics: Scripture & the Church as Sources of Guidance

- Nicholas Lash, "Performing the Scriptures" [XP, pp. 25-30]
- Jean Porter, "The Shock of Your Life" [XP, pp. 31-33]
- (a) *Selected New Testament Teachings*: Matthew 5:38-48 and Romans 13:1-7 on whether Christians should ever be violent; Matthew 25:36-41 and Acts 2:44-45, 4:32-35 on responsibilities toward the poor; Matthew 5:1-12 and Matthew 19:16-22 on mercy killing (active euthanasia); Galatians 3:27-29 and Ephesians 5:21-33 on women
- (b) *The Office of Bishop*: I Timothy 3:2; Titus 1:7-9.
- (c) *Christ and the Church*: I Corinthians 12:12-13; Ephesians 4:11-12, 5:29-30.  
Please bring your Bible to class today.

**Study Guide:** What is Lash getting at in his comparison between a musical score and the New Testament, and what does he mean when he speaks of 'performing the scriptures'? Why does he think that "Christian living, construed as the interpretative performance of scripture is, for two reasons, necessarily a collaborative enterprise"? and how does his first answer to this question point towards the role of Catholic Church hierarchy? Why does Jean Porter think that being shocked by the Gospels is a necessary part of the Christian's life? Suppose, as she puts it, you really tried to live your life by what you read in the assigned Bible passages under (a). As you come into class today, be ready to respond to what that would mean about the morality or immorality of these four issues: [1] killing in war, [2] redistributing wealth from the have's to the have-not's, [3] mercy killing, [4] the use of artificial birth control? What do the passages under (b) say about the duties of bishops? Finally, what is the relationship between Christ and the Church (c)?

## II. Ethics at the Edges of Life

### JAN 25 A. Birth Control

#### 1. Official Church teaching

- Gregory Baum, "The Natural Law," [XP, pp. 34-36]
- WEB ASSIGNMENT:** "Natural Law and Human Sexuality"
- Pope Paul VI, *Humanae Vitae* (=Of Human Life—1968) [XP, pp. 37-48]: §§ (=Sections) 1-18 are required; §§19-30 are recommended.

•U.S. News & World Report, "The Gospel on Sex" [XP, pp. 49-53]

**Study Guide:** There's a good description of what the natural law is and what natural law reasoning entails on the website. Look this up to help familiarize yourself with the kind of ethical reasoning that Pope Paul VI is using in *Humanae Vitae*. The website above first gives a very brief (trust me!) overview of the natural law and then applies these ideas to human sexuality. This will give you great background on what Pope Paul VI is saying in *Humanae Vitae* and will nicely complement what you read in Gregory Baum's "The Natural Law." Be able to define natural law with the help of both the WEB ASSIGNMENT and the Baum essay. In general, what does it mean to say that something is part of the natural law? To whom does the natural law apply? When does it apply? For whom is the natural law natural? (For a clue to this, note to whom the pope addresses *Humanae Vitae*.) What is the pope saying about the morality of artificial birth control? In what section of *Humanae Vitae* does the Church's main teaching about artificial birth control appear? What reasons does the pope give to back up that teaching? Namely, explain how what Pope Paul says is natural leads to his conclusion. (Note on the last page of the last essay the role that the current pope, John Paul II, apparently had in the writing of *Humanae Vitae*.)

◆**ONLINE RESOURCES:** You can find extensive background to *Humanae Vitae* on the website, including the history behind it and analysis of what it's saying. And on the topic of using birth control for therapeutic or health-related reasons (§15 of *Humanae Vitae*), see "Responses to Questions Proposed Concerning 'Uterine Isolation' and Related Matters."

### JAN 28

#### 2. Natural family planning & Differing views on birth control

- a. background on natural vs. artificial contraception
  - WEB ASSIGNMENT:** "NFP and Artificial Contraception: Are They the Same?"
- b. criticism of the pope's views
  - Rosemary Ruether, "Why I Believe in Birth Control" [XP, pp. 54-55]
  - Robert Heaney, "Sex, Natural Law and Bread Crumbs" [XP, pp. 56-60]
  - Clare Keats, "Does Abstinence Make the Heart Grow Fonder?" [XP, pp. 61-64]
  - George Howard, "The Lesser of Two Evils" [XP, pp. 65-66]
  - Fr. Robert Drinan, "Catholics must stop the silence on world overpopulation crisis" [XP, p. 67]
  - Daniel Callahan, "What's Natural? It's Hard to Say" [XP, pp. 68-69]
  - RECOMMENDED:** *National Catholic Reporter*, "Church leaders mix condoms and caveats" [XP, p. 70]
  - RECOMMENDED:** Luigi Mastroianni, M.D., "The pill is now safe and far surer overall than NFP" [XP, p. 71]
- c. support for the pope's views
  - Janet Smith, "Barnyard Morality" [XP, pp. 72-74]
  - Jo McGowan, "Condom antithetical to Church teaching on sex" [XP, p. 75]
  - Pope John Paul II, *The Gospel of Life*, §13 [XP, p. 76]

•**RECOMMENDED:** Demetria Martinez, "NFP forces find new allies, energies in the 1990's" [XP, pp. 77-79]

**Study Guide:** Compare and contrast artificial and natural forms of birth control in terms of what each does and what each morally *intends*. According to *Humanae Vitae* and the web assignment, what's the moral difference between artificial and natural contraception? Why doesn't Ruether think there is a *moral* difference between them, and what could Pope Paul VI mean when he says that natural forms of family planning are "open to the transmission of life" in ways artificial forms are not? What moral difference does Janet Smith see between natural and artificial forms of contraception? From his perspective as a biologist, what does Robert Heaney think is wrong with saying that separating sex from procreation is *unnatural*? Related to this, what's the significance of Heaney's reference to "bread crumbs" in his title? How does Smith's essay respond to Heaney? What disadvantages did Clare Keats find in Natural Family Planning, especially in relation to the quotations she cites from Fr. Andrew Greeley? Why does Danie Callahan think it's hard to say what's natural? and how does he sum up "the entire history of modern medicine"? How has the Church responded to the population crisis?

■ **ONLINE RESOURCES:** On the course website, there's a great deal of background about natural and artificial forms of contraception.

**JAN 30\***

3. Conscience and dissent from official Church moral teachings

a. can dissent be beneficial?

• Bishop Kenneth Untener, "*Humanae Vitae*: What Has it Done to Us?" [XP, pp. 80-82]

• Fr. Edward O'Heron, "Don't Lose Faith in Dissent" [XP, pp. 83-85]

• **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** 'Can Catholics Disagree with the Pope?' (read through some of the responses to this question)

b. can the Church's official moral teachings be wrong?

• Bishop Glennon Flavin, "Artificial Contraception Called Ban to Receiving Communion" [XP, p. 86]

• Fr. Charles Curran, "Authority and Dissent in the Church" [XP, pp. 87-89]

• Fr. Richard McBrien, "Medieval papal shenanigans remind us how lucky we are" [XP, p. 90]

• \_\_\_\_\_, "Some popes not good definers of Catholicism" [XP, p. 91]

• **RECOMMENDED:** Fr. Joseph Gallagher, "24 popes, some good, in years leading up to first millennium" [XP, p. 92]

c. must one's informed conscience be followed?

• Pope John Paul II, Sections 62-64 from *The Splendor of Truth* [XP, p. 93]

• Fr. Richard Gula, "Moral Conscience" [XP, pp. 94-96]

• Sidney Callahan, "Conscience Reconsidered" [XP, pp. 97-99]

• Fr. John Cavanaugh, "Conscience Matters" [XP, p. 100]

**Study Guide:** The readings for today raise the question of whether Catholics must always obey official Church moral teachings or whether it's possible for Catholics to *make up their own minds* about these issues and dissent from or disagree with the Church. And so the other side of the issue of dissent is the priority placed on following one's own conscience. This is a tough topic, and so think about what questions you have about Church teaching on following one's conscience. For example, John Paul II has made it clear that the teaching of *Humanae Vitae* is not a theological opinion open to discussion. In addition, the pope has stated, "It has also been noted that there is a tendency on the part of some Catholics to be selective in their adherence to the church's moral teachings. It is sometimes claimed that dissent from the magisterium is totally compatible with being a 'good Catholic' .... This is a grave error." I would like the half of the class designated to the left to respond online over Nicenet to agree or disagree with the pope's statement. To arrive at your position about this



(Web Posting due by 6:30 PM on Tues., Jan. 29 for first ½ of class; \*second ½ does a prep writing on their postings.)

statement, consider these 4 issues as you do the reading: First, how do the first two readings argue that dissent may be beneficial, or at least that blind conformity may be harmful? The answer to this question is related to whether the Church magisterium can ever be wrong in its official teachings. Second, how would Frs. McBrien and Curran respond to Bishop Flavin's argument that the pope always speaks directly for God? (See especially the moral McBrien draws in the second to last paragraph from the history he narrates in "Medieval papal shenanigans...") Third, what do the remaining readings on conscience say about whether it is always right to follow one's informed conscience? More specifically, what did the Catholic Church in the Second Vatican Council teach about conscience, and how does that relate to whether a Catholic may disagree with official Church teachings on ethical issues? (The Second Vatican Council [= Vatican II] was a series of meetings between the pope and the world's Catholic bishops held from 1962-1965 in Rome which sought to re-evaluate or reappraise all aspects of the Catholic faith as they related to the modern world.) Be able to fill in the blank in this sentence: "Catholic Church teaching on following one's conscience says that .... Finally, can one's informed conscience ever be wrong (= deliver incorrect information by telling you that what's wrong is really right)?"

**ONLINE RESOURCES:** There's a website called "Syllabus of Papal & Magisterial Error," which picks up on some of the points made in the Curran and McBrien essays by citing several examples of erroneous teaching and immoral conduct by popes. On March 12, 2000, the pope himself also apologized for various sins committed by those in the Church, and this apology ("Confession of Sins and Asking for Forgiveness") is also online. In an essay entitled "Who Says the Church Can't Change?" Christine Gudorf gives some examples of changes in Church teaching over the centuries (particularly as they have related to women). There are also some good websites about conscience and dissent from official church teachings (especially when theologians do the dissenting). You can read in more detail what Vatican II said about following one's conscience, as well as what the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* says about it. And you can read about Fr. McCormick's recent run-in with the Archbishop of New Orleans and about the excommunication of Fr. Tissa Balasuriya, a Sri Lankan priest, following a book he wrote (this penalty was later lifted in January, 1998). In addition, Pope John Paul II removed Bishop Jacques Gaillot from his diocese in France in 1996 and sent him to a desolate spot in northern Africa following some outspoken stances Gaillot took on sensitive areas of Church teaching. Bishop Gaillot then set up a website to what he calls his "virtual diocese." You can read what got him into such trouble and even e-mail him through the course website.

## **FEB 1**

### B. Abortion

1. The Church's voice
  - a. the Church's official position
  - b. ••The Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, "Declaration on Abortion" *R*[XP, pp. 101-107]  
*E*•*U.S. News & World Report*, "The Theology of Abortion" [XP, pp. 108-109]
  - b. •Comparison with the State's official position  
*O*United States Supreme Court, majority opinion in *Roe v. Wade* [XP, pp. 110-113]  
*M**Christian Century*, "Abortion Crossroads" [XP, pp. 114-115]  
*E*•**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** The 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution  
*N*•**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Look up the laws of your home state on abortion. Just *D* search under your state's abbreviation.  
*E*•*New York Times*, "Abuse Laws Cover Fetus, a High Court Rules" [XP, p. 116]  
*D*•**RECOMMENDED:** "How Rare?" "Bare Facts on Childbearing" & "Means to an End: Three Abortion Techniques" [XP, p. 117]  
 •**RECOMMENDED:** David Whitman and Stacey Schultz, "A little pill but a big *C* dispute" [XP, pp. 118-120]  
 •**RECOMMENDED:** "The first step is the wall" [XP, p. 121]

ommonweal letter to the editor, "The veto was right" [XP, pp. 122-124]

**Study Guide:** Be able to summarize the Catholic Church's conclusion about the morality of abortion and explain where that conclusion comes from. That is, what *reasons* is the conclusion based upon? In particular, what two kinds of sources does the Church appeal to in Roman numeral II of the document (sections 5-7)? and what source does it appeal to in Roman numeral III? Now do the same with the U.S. Supreme Court's conclusion on the legality of abortion—provide the court's conclusion and its reasoning for that conclusion. What laws does your home state have about abortion? What distinction is the Vatican Document pointing to in §13 when it speaks of a human "being" or "life" vs. a human "person" (be sure to read footnote #19 on the last page of the Church statement)? What did the Catholic Church teach during the middle ages about when the fetus became a person? Why does the Vatican say that "Respect for human life is not just a Christian obligation"? When does the Supreme Court say that the fetus becomes a person (note: this point is relevant to the issues related to so-called 'partial-birth abortions' described in the essay "Abortion Crossroads"). The 14th Amendment plays an important part in what the court says about personhood (see XP, p. 116). What does the 14th Amendment state? In this regard, read the fascinating case of Cornelia Whitner who was arrested and jailed for child abuse after her baby was born with traces of cocaine in its system. This obviously raises all sorts of legal questions about the rights (and equal personhood) of fetuses and the women who carry them. The first two recommended readings discuss RU-486, the French abortion pill. The third and fourth concern the issue of partial-birth abortion (or "intact dilation and evacuation" as it's sometimes called).

▣ **ONLINE RESOURCES:** In §6 of its Declaration of Abortion, the Vatican mentions the Didache (a Christian document from the first century of the Church). The text of the Didache is online. Also, the text of the House bill outlawing partial-birth abortions (HR 1833), is on the website. This was later vetoed by President Clinton on April 10, 1996 and re-vetoed on October 10, 1997. There is also a site called "The Ultimate Abortion Law Home Page" which contains a wealth of information about the present state of American abortion law. The "Abortion Questions and Answers" site offers a helpful explanation of just what the Roe v. Wade decision said. And for further information on partial-birth abortion and RU-486, see the website under recent developments on abortion.

#### FEB 4



(Cyber-Cafe postings due by the end of this month.)



#### c. indirect abortions and the principle of double effect

- Susan Teft Nicholson, "The Roman Catholic Doctrine of Therapeutic Abortion" [XP, pp. 125-127]
- Fr. Richard McCormick, "Abortion: Rules for Debate" [XP, pp. 128-132]
- Daniel P. Sulmasy, "Heart and Soul: The Case of the Conjoined Twins" [XP, pp. 133-135]

**Study Guide:** Why are the first two cases in the Nicholson reading considered indirect abortions? What's the difference between an indirect and a direct abortion? Can you summarize *in one sentence* this difference? Look back at the definitions of absolutism and consequentialism you were given on the second day of class. When Fr. McCormick characterizes the Church's official teaching in cases of therapeutic abortion as 'Better two deaths than one murder,' is this absolutism or consequentialism? This same principle very much applies to the tragic case of Mary and Jodie, conjoined twins born on August 8, 2000, in England. How would you decide *that* case? And how would your decision there affect your views about the cases in Nicholson's article where the Church would officially forbid abortion?

▣ **ONLINE RESOURCES:** See the website for more on the Principle of Double Effect and its application to abortion cases. Double Effect was also used in §15 of *Humanae Vitae* to discuss whether artificial contraception could be used for therapeutic or health-related reasons. There's also an online statement from the Church's magisterium about this. And if you're not familiar with the Letterman show, you'll need to be for this class. Follow the link to Dave's website.

**FEB 6** 

## 2. Moral issues on both sides of the abortion debate

## a. the personhood of the fetus

- Andre E. Hellegers, M.D., “Fetal Development” [XP, pp. 136-139]
- Mary Anne Warren, “On the Moral and Legal Status of Abortion” & “Postscript on Infanticide” [XP, pp. 140-150]
- Carol Tauer, “The Moral Status of the Early Embryo” [XP, pp. 151-153]
- John F. Kavanaugh, “Being Human” [XP, p. 154]
- “Dangerous Words”: An Interview with Professor Peter Singer [XP, pp. 155-157]
- Pope John Paul II, *The Gospel of Life*, §23 [XP, pp. 158-159]

**Study Guide:** What distinction is Warren making when she refers to the “moral sense of ‘human’” vs. the “genetic sense”? In particular, relate this distinction to one we’ve seen earlier between human life or human being (what something *is*) and human personhood (what something is worth, what rights it has). What does Warren mean when she says, “in the absence of any argument showing that whatever is genetically human is also morally human, ... , nothing more than genetic humanity can be demonstrated by the presence of the human genetic code”? At what point does she think the fetus becomes a human person? How would Fr. John Kavanaugh respond to Warren (he doesn’t discuss her directly, but he does analyze very similar views to the ones she holds)? How would the pope respond to her? (See the last paragraph of Section 23 of *The Gospel of Life* and what he says about “the criterion of efficiency, functionality and usefulness.”) At what point do those who raise the subject of twinning (eg., Fr. Curran and Fr. McCormick) think the fetus becomes a person? (See the Tauer essay for this, though McCormick makes roughly the same point in the essay we read for last class.) What do you think about Warren’s view of personhood and the view found in the points about twinning? Do you think that the fetus becomes a person only when (or just when) the woman carrying it says so? Are we back at Dwyer’s ‘Auschwitz Principle’? The last page of the Warren essay features a blurb about the recent hiring of Peter Singer to a prestigious professorship in Bioethics at Princeton University. Singer is controversial because he holds views very much akin to Warren’s and he’s not hesitated to state their implications for children born with birth defects (for example) and also to justify certain instances of infanticide based upon a view he shares with Warren about when personhood arrives.

► **ONLINE RESOURCES:** If you’re interested in pursuing the Singer issue, there is additional information online, such as a response by Princeton’s former president, Harold Shapiro, in which he discusses the controversy surrounding Singer’s hiring.

**FEB 8** 

## b. choice and morality

- Daniel Callahan, “An Ethical Challenge to Prochoice Advocates” [XP, pp. 160-166]
- David Carlin, “Americanizing the Anti-Abortion Argument” [XP, pp. 167-170]
- Pope John Paul II, Sections 68-71 from *The Gospel of Life* [XP, pp. 171-172]
- “Forum on Abortion” [XP, pp. 173-180]
- David Heim, “Pro-Choice: Saying Something Theological” [XP, pp. 181-182]
- RECOMMENDED:** Francis Kissling, “Pro-Choice and Catholic” [XP, pp. 183-184]

**Study Guide:** What does Daniel Callahan mean when he says that “choice itself is not the end of the moral matter,” and how does he use that point to challenge pro-choice advocates? How does Sidney Callahan (who is married to Daniel), and who considers herself a pro-life feminist, think that emphasizing the woman’s right to private choice can legitimate male irresponsibility for unwanted pregnancies? The other essays comment on the issue of choice and will all be relevant and potentially useful in your paper assignment. The short reading from the pope complements the Daniel Callahan point about choice and the second point Carlin makes about rights.

•••ONLINE RESOURCES: There are links on the course's webpage to some interesting groups which seem to cross stereotypes on the abortion issue. See, for example, Catholics for a Free Choice, a pro-choice Catholic group. On the other side, you'll find a link to the Feminists for Life of America (a pro-life feminist group) home page. For more on the pro-choice perspective, you might also see the Reproductive Health and Rights Center.

**FEB 11**

**STUDY / WRITING DAY: CLASS CANCELLED**

**FEB 13**

3. Taking a Moral Stance: Abortion and Politics

•Governor Mario Cuomo, "Religious Belief and Public Morality: A Catholic Governor's Perspective" [XP, pp. 185-194]

(**Note:** Should you wish to see a videotape of former Gov. Cuomo's speech, one is on reserve for this course at the Saint Mary's Library.)

•Bishop John Myers, "The Limits of Dissent: Abortion and Catholic Obligation" [XP, pp. 195-202]

•James R. Kelly, "Abortion: What Americans *Really* Think and the Catholic Challenge" [XP, pp. 203-204]

•**RECOMMENDED:** U.S. Catholic Bishops, *Living the Gospel of Life: A Challenge to American Catholics* (online)

•••ONLINE RESOURCES: The Catholic Bishop statement just mentioned contains sections about the role and responsibility of Catholic politicians concerning the issue of abortion (see especially §§21-39). Their points run fairly parallel to the ones made by Bishops Myers. Myers has his own home page on the WWW which you can access through our website. The text of the above article is also available online. As you write this paper, you might also want to consult other online sources of information, including an explanation of Medicaid funding for abortion (as well as a description of Medicaid in general) and different state laws regarding abortion and public funding for it. At the "Abortion Questions and Answers" site, there's some very well documented information about illegal abortions.

*1st Paper Due*

**FEB 15**

C. Reproductive Technologies

1. Introduction to the Vatican statement

•Sharon Begley, "The Baby Myth" [XP, pp. 205-213]

•The Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Instruction on Respect for Human Life in its Origin* [XP, pp. 214-226]

•**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Visit some of the online sperm banks.

•**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Test your knowledge of infertility treatments.

•**WEB ASSIGNMENT [ONLINE POLL]:** Respond via e-mail to whether you agree or disagree with the quotation from Arlette Schweitzer (see below). To respond online, select this class's date from the pop-up menu in the left frame of the website, click whether you agree or disagree and then press "E-mail your response." *Do this by 7:00 PM on Thursday, February 14.*

•"Widow requests sperm extraction" [XP, p. 227]

•Frances D'Emilio, "Birth of child occurs after death of mother" [XP, p. 227]

•**RECOMMENDED:** John Leo, "Promoting no-dad families" [XP, p. 228]

**Study Guide:** How do some of the most common reproductive technologies work? How does the teaching from *Humanae Vitae* and the teaching from the *Declaration on Abortion* enter into the Vatican Declaration on reproductive technologies? That is, what are the two "fundamental values connected with the techniques of artificial human procreation"? After visiting some of the sperm banks, what are your thoughts about online reproduction? What moral issues are involved in bringing third parties into human procreation? Finally, I want you to do two other things online. First, take the quiz to test your knowledge of reproductive technologies. It's fast, it's fun—you answer 13 multiple choice questions and then can click a button to check your answers. Second, after you've done all the above, I want you to say whether you agree or disagree with this

statement from Arlette Schweitzer, a woman whose twins came into the world through reproductive technology: Schweitzer said, “If you can give the gift of life, why not? If medical science affords that opportunity, why not take it?” Think whether you agree or disagree with this statement and what your reasoning is for doing so. I’ll ask you this same question in a couple of classes; and so it’s important that you be clear what your initial views are about this topic (which, right now, you may know very little about) and why you hold them. So, note down your initial views somewhere, even if only to say what you’re unclear about or have questions about before you can render any moral judgment. As we go through these classes, you can then say how your initial questions or doubts have been answered, resolved, or further challenged.

**ONLINE RESOURCES:** There’s a great deal more information online about all of the procedures you’ll read about today, as well as a helpful glossary of terms associated with reproductive technologies. See also the *Ethical and Religious Directives for Catholic Health Care Facilities*, which spell out what’s allowed and what’s not allowed in Catholic hospitals where reproductive technologies are concerned. “Helping Childless Couples Conceive” is another good site for background on Catholic teaching.

## FEB 18

### 2. The Church's moral concerns about artificial fertilization: *Instruction on Respect for Human Life in its Origin* (continued)

- a. *how* the new life comes into existence: reproduction outside of sex
- Traci Watson, “Sister, can you spare an egg?” [XP, pp. 229-233]
  - Time*, “Eggs on the Rocks” [XP, pp. 234-235]
  - Arthur L. Greil, “The Religious Response to Reproductive Technology” [XP, pp. 236-239]
  - Lisa Cahill & Fr. McCormick, “The Vatican Document on Bioethics: Two Responses” [XP, pp. 240-242]
  - Fr. Richard McCormick, “Document is Unpersuasive” [XP, pp. 243-245]
  - Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, “Science and the Creation of Life” [XP, pp. 246-249]
  - RECOMMENDED:** Gina Kolata, “Soaring Price of Donor Eggs Touches Off Debate on Ethics” [XP, pp. 250-251]
  - RECOMMENDED:** Claudia Kalb, “How Old is Too Old?” [XP, p. 252]
  - RECOMMENDED:** Frederic Golden, “Boy? Girl? Up to You” [XP, pp. 253-254]
- b. *what happens to that new life:* the problems of spare embryos and multiple births
- In Vitro Fertilization Cryopreservation Permit* from the Atlanta Reproductive Health Clinic (this is the form that couples sign allowing them to express their preference about what to do with any excess frozen embryos conceived through *in vitro*)—handout
  - WEB ASSIGNMENT:** William E. May, “Do Married Couples Have a ‘Right’ to a Child?”
  - John Garvey, “The Seven McCaugheys: Babies as Products” [XP, p. 255]
  - Newsweek*, “More is Not Merrier” [XP, p. 256]
  - Newsweek*, “Fewer Bundles of Pain” [XP, p. 257]
  - RECOMMENDED:** Sue Browder, “When Infertility Treatment Works Too Well” [XP, pp. 258-261]

**Study Guide:** This class picks up with the Church’s concerns about artificial forms of reproduction. First, what concerns does the Church have about the way most reproductive technologies achieve procreation? In particular, what does the Church mean in Section II.B.4 when it speaks of the “language of the body” and says, “The conjugal act by which the couple mutually express their self-gift at the same time expresses openness to the gift of life”? In this letter, the Church draws a distinction between science helping God’s work along and science taking God’s place or playing God. According to the Church’s teaching, when does science help God’s work along and when does it take God’s place where reproduction is concerned? (Hint: see Section II.B.6.) The essay by the late Cardinal Bernardin is also helpful in this area—note too that this essay features an excellent explanation of natural law ethics. The writings of Lisa Cahill and Fr. McCormick offer a critical response



(Reminder:  
2 Cyber-Cafe  
postings due  
by the end of this  
month.)

to Church teaching in this area. Second, what concerns does the Church have about the children that come about through reproductive technologies? In particular, what does the Vatican declaration say about whether married couples have the *right* to a child? (See May's essay for help on this one.) Theologically, what should a child be considered? How does the Church's teaching about abortion and the sanctity of unborn life enter into the document on assisted reproduction? How does John Garvey relate abortion, assisted suicide and reproductive technologies? What's he most concerned about? Why should those who are religious "be annoying to the larger culture"? What are the options available for excess frozen embryos at the Atlanta Reproductive Health Clinic? What's the reason for the higher incidence of multiple births using reproductive technologies?

► **ONLINE RESOURCES:** You might take a look at a site called "Ron's Angels," which is run by fashion photographer Ron Harris and is an online auction of eggs donated by various supermodels that he knows (bids start at \$15,000). There are sites offering embryo adoptions of left-over fertilized eggs from infertility procedures. Also, you can read more about the selective reduction procedure explained in "More is Not Merrier." Finally, there are pictures of all seven of the McCaughey septuplets born November 19, 1997.

### FEB 19 (Tu)

3. Guest speaker, 7:00 PM: Dr. J.R. Reineke will speak in Science Hall Room 105 on the ethical issues involved in reproductive technologies, especially *in vitro* fertilization, which is the one he performs most often. (This lecture takes the place of class on Monday, September 18, which you had off to work on your paper. Before you come to the lecture, write out a question on a 3 x 5 index card on the ethical or medical aspects of reproductive technologies that you would like to ask our speaker. When you arrive, hand your question in with your name—not your ID#— on it.)
  - Richard H. Asch, M.D., "G.I.F.T.: Gamete Intra-Fallopian Transfer" [XP, pp. 262-268]
  - Barbara Katz Rothman, "The Frightening Future of Baby-Making" [XP, pp. 269-273]

► **ONLINE RESOURCES:** See the website for more on the *in vitro* and G.I.F.T. procedures and the unresolved state of Church teaching on the latter procedure. There is also a state-by-state listing of infertility clinics across the country.

### FEB 20

4. Cloning & Human Stem Cells
  - a. cloning
    - Thomas Shannon, "The Rush to Clone" [XP, pp. 274-276]
    - Cardinal William Keeler, "The Problem with Human Cloning" [XP, pp. 277-279]
    - Joe Incandela, "Double Trouble" [XP, pp. 280-282]
    - Nancy Gibbs, "Cloning: Where Do You Draw the Line?" [XP, pp. 283-286]
    - WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Visit Clonaid, a company offering to clone you for \$200,000 and offers "a service called 'INSURACLONE®' which, for a \$50,000 fee, will provide the sampling and safe storage of cells from a living child or from a beloved person in order to create a clone if the child dies of an incurable disease or through an accident. In the case of a genetic disease, the cells will be preserved until science can genetically repair it before recreating the child (or an adult)."
    - WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Charles Krauthammer, "Of Headless Mice ... and Men"
  - b. stem cells
    - Time*, "The Bush Decision" [XP, p. 287]
    - Kevin Clarke, "Unnatural Selection: How Biotechnology is redesigning humanity" [XP, pp. 288-293]
    - Sharon Begley, "Cellular Divide" [XP, pp. 294-298]
    - Mortimer B. Zuckerman, "A Rare Gift of Life" [XP, p. 299]
    - Charles Rice, "Bush's decision devalues life" [XP, p. 300]
    - Charles Krauthammer, "Mounting the Slippery Slope" [XP, pp. 301]

**Study Guide:** I grouped these issues together today because they both *seem* to value new life not so much as an end unto itself, but for what it can *do* for others—what Cardinal Keeler calls “a utilitarian view of human life” (see the third page of the Gibbs essay on this). First, is this a fair characterization of these procedures? After reading the material about cloning, what do you think should be the response of a Christian to this new reproductive technology? What possible abuses might it bring? But what potential benefits might it offer? (See the essays by Nancy Gibbs and Kevin Clarke, which do a good job of spelling out both the promise and the peril of several controversial new procedures.) How do *you* answer the question in Gibbs’s title? A similar tension between possibly beneficial consequences vs. potentially objectionable means takes us to the topic of stem cells, *most often* derived from spare embryos left over from infertility treatments, but also occasionally harvested from embryos expressly produced for this purpose. Should tissue obtained in either of these ways ever be used to treat a host of medical problems, or is this an immoral means to a good end? Does using this tissue involve one in the kind of formal cooperation (we might say *complicity*) that Bishop Myers warned against? What are Mortimer Zuckerman’s arguments *in favor of* using such cells? What ‘slippery slope’ concerns does Charles Krauthammer have (in the online piece) about cloning and (in the xeroxed piece) about the use of human stem cells? How does the Charles Rice piece raise the complicity issue (similar to what Bishop Myers called ‘formal cooperation’) when he says, “The Bush policy involves the government in scandalous complicity in murder”? On November 25, 2001, a Worcester, MA company named Advanced Cell Technology announced that it had produced the first embryonic human clone. This takes the stem cell issue one step further: if it is possible to clone human beings, then stem cells can be taken from these clones and not from other embryos. This would eliminate the possibility of rejection. Finally, and more generally, how has your thinking developed on reproductive technologies? Three Study Guides ago, I asked whether you agreed with this statement: “If you can give the gift of life, why not? If medical science affords that opportunity, why not take it?” If I asked you that same question today, would your response be the same as before? If the same, what have you learned over the last three classes which has confirmed your initial view? If different, what have you learned which has made you change your mind?

**ONLINE RESOURCES:** There’s a good bit more information on the web about cloning and the use of human stem cells, both concerns about the potential for abuse as well as a description of the potential benefits. President Bush’s statement from August 9, 2001 is also available in its entirety. There are also letters from people who want to be cloned, and some articles on the first cloning of a human embryo announced on November 25, 2001 by a Worcester, MA company named Advanced Cell Technology.

**FEB 22**

Meet in  
Moreau  
324  
today

5. Surrogate motherhood
  - a. the Baby M case from 1986
    - George Annas, “Death Without Dignity for Commercial Surrogacy: The Case of Baby M” [XP, pp. 302-305]
    - Mary Beth Whitehead & Gena Corea, Testimony before Congress [XP, pp. 306-310]
    - Mary Gordon, “‘Baby M’: New Questions About Biology and Destiny” [XP, pp. 311-313]
  - b. arguments for and against surrogate motherhood
    - Hugh V. McLachlan, “In Defence of Surrogate Motherhood” [XP, pp. 314-315]
    - Thomas Shannon, “Against surrogate motherhood” [XP, pp. 316-318]
    - Newsweek*, “And Baby Makes One” [XP, pp. 319-320]
    - WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Joe Incandela, “The Catholic Church and Surrogate Motherhood”

- c. •**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** shopping (online!) for a surrogate through the American Surrogacy Center, Inc., classified ads (This link will take you to a listing of classified ads that both couples and surrogates have taken out in search of a surrogacy arrangement. Browse through these ads.)
- d. the surrogate contract
- WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Information about Surrogate Motherhood: the surrogacy contract
- Study Guide:** What are your reactions to the classified ads in the WEB ASSIGNMENT? (You might consider making a post to the **Cyber Cafe** about this.) What did you think when browsing through these ads for surrogates and egg donors? If you were picking a surrogate, which of these women would you choose and why? Based upon all the above articles and resources, should paid surrogacy be against the law? If so, why? If not, what (if any) restrictions would you impose on the practice? In “And Baby Makes One,” why did the judge declare that in the eyes of the law, little Jaycee effectively had no parents? Is a surrogacy arrangement more like adoption or prostitution? Fill in blanks to complete the analogy: “Surrogate motherhood is like \_\_\_\_\_, because \_\_\_\_\_.” One final point: suppose you were one or the other party writing up a surrogacy arrangement; what would you want included in the contract? Base your answer on the online information about the surrogacy contract. (**Note:** If you’re interested, there’s a very brief video on Reserve Tape #1 which provides a recent update to the Baby M case.)
- ONLINE RESOURCES:** As we’ve seen, the laws relating to reproductive technologies tend to be very variable across the different states. Surrogate motherhood is certainly no exception. For the laws in your state relating to surrogacy, consult the site “Surrogacy and the Law.”

**FEB 25\***D. Euthanasia

## 1. Physician-Assisted Suicide

 in-class video: excerpt from a 1998 *60 Minutes* episode, “Death by Doctor”

(**Note:** All videos shown in class are also on Reserve at the Saint Mary’s Library.)

This one is on Reserve Tape #3)

- a. the current legal landscape
- *Newsweek*, “Is It a Wonderful Life?” [XP, p. 321]
  - *Time*, “Death’s Door Left Ajar” [XP, p. 322]
  - **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** The Law on Physician-Assisted Suicide
  - *Time*, “A License to Kill?” [XP, p. 323]
- b. arguments for physician-assisted suicide
- *Free Inquiry*, “Medicide: The Goodness of Planned Death: An Interview with Dr. Jack Kevorkian” [XP, pp. 324-327]
  - **RECOMMENDED:** Joseph Shapiro, “Dr. Death’s Last Dance” [XP, p. 328]
  - Harriet Goetz, R.N., “Euthanasia: A Bedside View” [XP, pp. 329-332]
  - Frederick Ellis, “The right to die” [XP, p. 332]
  - Courtney Campbell, “Give me liberty and death: Assisted suicide in Oregon” [XP, pp. 333-335]
  - **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** The Self-Deliverance Computer Program (the demo version of computer software developed by Dr. Philip Nitschke of Australia’s Northern Territory which he used to allow his patients to self-deliver a lethal dose of medication. An IV in the patient’s arm was connected to Nitschke’s laptop. Say “yes” to the last question-prompt on the screen, and you kill yourself. I stress: this is a demo version! Take a look.)
  - **RECOMMENDED:** Dr. Timothy Quill, “Death with Dignity: A Case of Individualized Decision Making” [XP, pp. 336-338]
- c. arguments against physician-assisted suicide
- Louis Vernacchio, “Physician-Assisted Suicide: Reflections of a Young Doctor” [XP, pp. 339-342]



(Web Posting due by 4:00 PM on Sun., Feb. 24 for second ½ of class; \*first ½ does a prep writing on their postings.)

- Daniel Callahan, "Aid-in-Dying: The Social Dimensions" [XP, pp. 343-347]
- *U.S. News & World Report*, "Assisted suicide's slippery slope" [XP, p. 348]
- Randall Otto, "Bottom of the Slope" [XP, pp. 349-350]
- Pope John Paul II, Sections 12, 15, & 66 from *The Gospel of Life* [XP, pp. 351-352]

**Study Guide:** What do you think about the Self-Deliverance Computer Program? According to Dr. Kevorkian, what is the "highest principle in medical ethics"? How would Vernacchio respond to Kevorkian's points about assisted suicide? Daniel Callahan says that "there are two classical arguments in favor of ... assisted suicide: our right of self-determination, and our claim upon the mercy of others." How does his criticism of physician-assisted suicide come out of his observation that the joining of these arguments is "perfectly arbitrary"? And how is this thesis apparently borne out by the Dutch experience with physician-assisted suicide, as described in the essay "Bottom of the Slope"? (**Note:** Reserve Tape #1 has a video showing a doctor giving a lethal injection to a patient in the Netherlands as well as an episode of *60 Minutes* on the Oregon Death with Dignity Act.) What are the characteristics of what the pope refers to as a "culture of death" and how are they displayed in the topic of euthanasia? The recommended article by Dr. Quill comes from the 1991 *New England Journal of Medicine*. With that article, Quill became the first practicing physician in the United States to publicly admit aiding a patient's suicide.

**ONLINE RESOURCES:** You might want to see the Dr. Kevorkian Home Page on the web, which profiles many of the patients Kevorkian has assisted in suicide. The court cases mentioned above in "Is It a Wonderful Life?" from the Second and Ninth Circuits are also online, as well as the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision profiled in "Death's Door Left Ajar." In addition, you'll find the text of the Oregon Death with Dignity Act. When the law was first passed in 1994, it made Oregon the first place *in the world* to make doctor-assisted suicide legal. Since the Death with Dignity Act went into effect in October, 1997 after lengthy court challenges, over forty Oregonians have legally committed suicide with the help of their physicians. You can also read what the Hippocratic Oath says.

**FEB 27** 

## 2. Euthanasia: Background and Concepts

- Ginny Cunningham, "Science hasn't made it any easier to die" [XP, pp. 353-358]
- Robert Kanigel, "A Time to Live and a Time to Die?" [XP, pp. 359-363]
- Kevin P. Quinn, "Intending to Kill" [XP, pp. 364-365]
- John J. Paris, "Autonomy and Physician-Assisted Suicide" [XP, pp. 366-369]
- "How to Be Prepared" [XP, p. 370]

**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Download the living will form from your home state. Each state has a slightly different form. You have the Indiana form, and I'm asking you to download the particular form from your own home state—unless you're from Indiana! (You may also first need to download Adobe Acrobat Reader. Surprisingly enough, this is not as hard as it sounds! Just go the site for the living wills and follow the instructions. If you're in a lab, you probably won't need to do the download, since lab machines generally have it installed already.)

**Study Guide:** We'll speak today in class about the distinction between active euthanasia (= when one person directly aims at the death of himself or herself—if a suicide—or another person using means which directly bring this death about, so that the person ends up dead from something he or she was *not* originally suffering from) and passive euthanasia (= the removing or withholding of life-support means so that the person ends up dead from something he or she already had). What do these readings say about whether there is a moral difference between directly killing someone (by lethal injection or drug overdose) and withdrawing treatment that keeps the patient alive (see Kevin Quinn and John Paris essays)? Please come to class with the Living Will form from your home state filled out (though we may not get to it until Friday's class); and as you do the

reading, pay particular attention to the details of the Karen Quinlan case on XP, pp. 359-360.

► **ONLINE RESOURCES:** The website also provides a summary of some of the cases we'll be talking about today and Friday, like Karen Quinlan, Clare Conroy, and Nancy Cruzan and a very helpful "Timeline on Physician Assisted Suicide," which lists all the major developments in the euthanasia debate over the last thirty years. There's also a glossary of terms relating to euthanasia.

### MAR 1



(Cyber-Café postings due by the end of this month.)



#### 3. The Church's view

- Thomas Shannon, "How Long Must We Preserve Life? Catholic Ethics at the End of Life" [XP, pp. 371-374]
- James Gaffney, "The Vatican on Euthanasia and Some Reflections on Christian Ethical Methodology" [XP, pp. 375-379]
- John Garvey, "We Are Not Our Own" [XP, pp. 380-381]
- The Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, "Declaration on Euthanasia" [XP, pp. 382-385]
- U.S. Bishops, *Ethical and Religious Directives for Catholic Health Care Services*, Part 5: "Issues in Care for the Dying" [XP, pp. 386-387]
- **WEB ASSIGNMENT [ONLINE POLL]:** Respond via e-mail to this question: "If you were nearing death, would you want everything done as long as physically possible to maintain your life?" To respond, select this class's date from the pop-up menu in the left frame of the website, click whatever option best corresponds to your answer and then press "E-mail your response." **Do this by 7:00 PM on Thursday, February 28.**

**Study Guide:** Is death the worst thing there is? Might someone who believed in God and a positive afterlife have any reason to answer these questions about death and dying any differently than someone who didn't? Based upon your reading of the Vatican Declaration on Euthanasia and the accompanying articles which explain it, does the Church ever allow active euthanasia? Why or why not? (The answer relates to what Shannon says about what belief in God means for ethical discussions of euthanasia and what Gaffney means when he says that on the Christian view of life and death, 'we are not our own.' Related to this, what conceptual link does Garvey see between abortion and euthanasia?) The U.S. bishops discuss the same issue in the third paragraph of the last reading, and you might also look back at XP, pp. 351-352 for John Paul II's presentation of Church teaching on active euthanasia.) Does the Church ever allow passive euthanasia? If so, when and why? If not, why not? In particular, what does Thomas Shannon mean when he speaks of life as a "finite good"? (The answer to this question relates to your answer to the first question in this Study Guide and may also have effected how you filled out your living will.) Now, use your responses to these questions to explain what James Gaffney means when he says that the Vatican Declaration steers a "mid-course" between absolutism and consequentialism in its respective positions on active and passive euthanasia?

### MAR 4

#### 4. Removing food and water: killing or letting die? murder or mercy?

##### a. the Cruzan case and the persistent vegetative state

► **in-class video:** *Nightline* on the Nancy Cruzan case (Reserve Tape #1)

- *Cruzan* by Cruzan v. Harmon [XP, p. 388]
- *Time*, "Whose Right to Die?" [XP, p. 389]
- *Newsweek*, "To Him, It was Still 1988: The 'Coma Cop' Awakens" [XP, p. 390]
- **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Coma vs. Persistent Vegetative State

##### b. critics of removing feeding tubes

- Gilbert Meilaender, "On Removing Food and Water: Against the Stream" [XP, pp. 391-393]
- Patrick Derr, "Why Food and Fluids Can Never Be Denied" [XP, pp. 394-396]
- **RECOMMENDED:** Catholic Bishops of Pennsylvania, "Nutrition & Hydration: Moral Considerations" [XP, pp. 397-400]

- c. supporters of removing feeding tubes
- Catholic Bishops of Texas, "On Withdrawing Artificial Nutrition and Hydration" [XP, pp. 401-402]
  - Fr. Richard McCormick, "Caring or Starving?" [XP, pp. 403-407]
  - RECOMMENDED:** Ronald E. Cranford, M.D., "A Hostage to Technology" [XP, p. 408]
- Study Guide:** The WEB ASSIGNMENT will fill you in on the difference between a coma and a PVS. The other articles here give you pro and con about removal of feeding tubes. Come with any questions you have about the Cruzan case, persistent vegetative states, or artificial nutrition and hydration.
- ▣▣▣**ONLINE RESOURCES:** For a profile of the patient with the longest known survival time in a PVS, see "Questions Surrounding the Withdrawal of Artificial Hydration and Nutrition."

**MAR 6**

Taking a Moral Stance: The Cruzan case

- RECOMMENDED:** *Journal of the American Medical Association*, "Persistent Vegetative State and the Decision to Withdraw or Withhold Life Support" [XP, pp. 409-412]
- ▣▣▣**ONLINE RESOURCES:** Both the majority and dissenting views in the United State Supreme Court's decision in the Cruzan case are available on the WWW.

*2nd Paper Due*

### III. Love, Justice, and Society

**MAR 8**

#### A. Social Justice

##### 1. Social Justice and the Economy

###### a. introduction

 in-class video: *Miracle on South Michigan Street* (This program is also on Reserve Tape #3.)

• **WEB ASSIGNMENT [SELF-ASSESSMENT]**: Respond via e-mail about how you're doing in this class thus far. Please do this before break.



**MAR 18**

###### b. how much do you know about poverty in the United States?

###### Poverty in America

- *Newsweek*, "America's Poor Showing" [XP, p. 413]
- David Gergen, "To have and have less" [XP, p. 414]
- Ed Marciniak, "Recalculating Poverty" [XP, pp. 415-416]
- Daniel C. Maguire, "Catholicism in Crisis: A New Orthodoxy Test" [XP, pp 417-418]

###### Welfare and Welfare Reform

- **WEB ASSIGNMENT**: Fact Sheet on Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). See also the Indiana version of TANF.
- Fr. Thomas Massaro, "A Welfare Primer" [XP, pp. 419-422]
- Teresa McCrary, "Getting Off the Welfare Carousel" [XP, p. 423]
- Barbera Ehrenreich, "Battered Welfare Syndrome" [XP, p. 424]
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Welfare: A White Secret" [XP, p. 425]
- Adam Cohen, "Who Should Still Be on Welfare?" [XP, pp. 426-429]
- *U.S. Catholic* editorial, "The end of morality as we know it" [XP, p. 430]
- *National Catholic Reporter*, "Report: Welfare reform leaves most needy behind" [XP, p 431 ]
- Arthur Jones, "Welfare reform makes children prime victims" [XP, pp. 432-433]
- Susan Dentzer, "You're not as entitled as you think" [XP, p. 434]
- **RECOMMENDED**: Donald Barlett and James B. Steele, "Corporate Welfare" [XP, pp. 435-437]

**Study Guide:** Before reading these articles, take a few minutes to fill in the survey designed to determine how much you know about poverty and social programs in the U.S. We'll go over it in class today. Why does Maguire say that the poor are frequently blamed and 'systematically vilified' for their plight? According to the

Cohen essay, what has welfare reform accomplished? and what group of people has it simply been unable to reach? (Jones's pieces concentrate on the unresolved problems with welfare reform). In "The end of morality as we know it," you'll see the response of Archbishop Rembert Weakland (of Milwaukee) to this new law. Note the symmetry here: for abortion, a Catholic bishop criticized a Democratic governor; for social programs, a Catholic bishop criticized a Republican governor.

▣ **ONLINE RESOURCES:** There are extensive sites on poverty and welfare on the web, including all sorts of statistics and data about who's poor in this country. In addition, there's an especially helpful summary of the Welfare Reform Act of 1996 and an overview of the TANF (= Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) Program. One of the questions on the survey asks you to estimate the poverty line for a family of four. After you make your guess, you can check your answer on the website.

**MAR 20** ✍️ \*

c. poverty and homelessness: a first look through Christian eyes

Stories of Homelessness

- Robert Ball, "Homeless center is rebuilding lives," [XP, pp. 438-439]
- Alesia Redding, "The Forgotten Ones" [XP, pp. 440-442]
- Jonathan Kozol, "Untouchables," [XP, pp. 443-451]
- James Willwerth, "This is Your Father's Life" [XP, p. 452]
- Jonathan Kozol, "Are the Homeless Crazy?" [XP, pp. 453-455]
- **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Anonymous Saint Mary's student who used to be homeless
- **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Health Care and Homelessness
- **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** "Homeless Children"
- Anna Quindlen, "Out Tired, Our Poor, Our Kids" [XP, p. 456]

Religious Reasons why Catholics Work for Justice: Theological Principles behind Catholic Social Teaching

- U.S. Catholic Bishops, *Economic Justice for All*, Sections 13, 14, 15, 16, 61-70 [XP, pp. 457-458]
- Joe Sullivan, "Social Justice for Dummies" [XP, pp. 459-465]

The Importance of Community

- St. Paul, I Corinthians 12:12-26
- U.S. News & World Report, "The biology of soul murder" [XP, pp. 466-468]
- Kevin Clarke, "Taxation without equal education" [XP, p. 469]
- **RECOMMENDED:** George B. Wilson, "It Does Take a Village" [XP, pp. 470-472]

**Study Guide:** As these personal stories show, sometimes people fall into poverty and homelessness through little or no fault of their own. Obviously, sometimes the opposite is true. That is, many things affect your earning potential and the amount of income and savings you have. Some are up to you. Others are not up to you. After reading these stories, try to identify those factors that are up to you and those factors that are *not* up to you. Refer to some of the details in these stories to make your points, and see what insights you can gather on this topic from the websites "Health Care and Homelessness" and "Homeless Children," as well as from Anna Quindlen's essay. (The letter by the Saint Mary's student was written to me about ten years ago after we studied homelessness in this class and it very effectively presents how things beyond one's control can lead to homelessness and spiral one's life downwards after that.) What does Kozol say that living on the streets can do to one's mental health? What are some of the obstacles that prevent poor individuals from pulling themselves up out of poverty? Think about the role and impact of the community—whether family or larger society—in raising a child. For example, how is public education usually funded in the United States and what justice issues are attached to this mode of funding? You might also look closer to home by considering your own life and advantages or disadvantages. Think first of things that you can do to affect your financial future and then think of things that you've benefited from in the past and may continue to benefit from that have absolutely nothing to do with you. Also, be ready to say how you would differentiate love (or charity) and *justice*. How do they differ (see XP, p. 461 or



(Web Posting due by 6:30 PM on Tues., Mar. 19 for first ½ of class; \*second ½ does a prep writing on their postings.)

look online)? The reading from the U.S. Bishops on XP pp. 457-458 summarizes the religious rationale for working for justice. What do the bishops mean by human dignity and where do they say it comes from? Also, how do the bishops appeal to the trinity in §64 to justify their point in §63 that “Human life is life in community”? (The online glossaries at the website provide descriptions of the doctrine of the trinity. Look it up if you’re not familiar with what this doctrine affirms.) What does the option for the poor mean (§16)? The article by Sullivan should help you with these last few questions.

► **ONLINE RESOURCES:** There are many helpful summaries of Catholic social teaching on the web and the theological principles behind it. In 1996, the bishops came out with a statement entitled, *A Decade After Economic Justice for All*, which commemorated the tenth anniversary of the original letter. This commemoration is much shorter than the original document, but was meant to summarize where the United States had come in implementing the recommendations made ten years earlier. And in relation to the question about the factors which effect one’s income and earning potential, see the information on the website about the wage gap between men and women. Finally, there are several links to personal stories of homelessness.

### MAR 21(Th)



(Reminder:  
2 Cyber-Café  
postings due  
by the end of this  
month.)

#### Trip to the South Bend Center for the Homeless (6:15-7:45 PM)

•Cokie Roberts and Steven Roberts, “South Bend’s Center for the Homeless is setting nationwide example” [XP, p. 473]

•**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** look up the South Bend Center for the Homeless Home Page though the class’s website. It provides information on the history of the Center, its structure and its continuum of care model, as well as some good background on homelessness in general

•**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** “Why Are People Homeless?”

•Lars Eighner, “On Dumpster Diving” [XP, pp. 474-477]

•James Wright, “The Worthy and Unworthy Homeless” [XP, pp. 478-483]

•Jodie Morse, “Cracking Down on the Homeless” [XP, pp. 484-485]

•Ed Marciniak, “Shortchanging the Homeless” [XP, pp. 486-487]

•**RECOMMENDED:** “The Myths and Facts of Homelessness” [XP, p. 488]

**Study Guide:** The Cokie Roberts’s essay will give you some good background on the Center and its goals. Note, especially, the continuum of care model, which you’ll be hearing a lot more about tonight. The Eighner essay gives you a first-hand account of what it is to live on the streets and forage for food. What does James Wright mean by the “worthy” vs. the “unworthy” homeless? How does he divide these groups up? and what kinds of numbers does he arrive at regarding the worthy and unworthy homeless? According to Marciniak, how are the homeless being ‘shortchanged’?

► **ONLINE RESOURCES:** As you might expect, there are lots of resources to homelessness online, featuring abundant information on who’s homeless and why, and how many people are homeless in the United States.

### MAR 22

Class discussion: The Center for the Homeless (be sure to come to class with the reaction sheet that I passed out on Wednesday filled out and with a completed progress report on your semester project)

### MAR 25

d. Christian faith and social justice: politics and preferential options

► **in-class video:** *The Search for Jesus* (we’ll see about a 5 minute excerpt from this video, which is also on Reserve Tape #??)

•Richard Bauckham, “The Political Christ” [XP, pp. 489-493]

•John Cort, “The New Testament” [XP, pp. 494-499]

•Jack Jezreel, “What is a preferential option for the poor?” [XP, p. 500]

•Fr. John Kavanaugh, “It’s a poor Christian who ignores poverty” [XP, pp. 501-503]

•**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** interview with John Dominic Crosson about the Kingdom of

God in the teachings of Jesus

- WEB ASSIGNMENT:** the political significance of the crucifixion of Jesus
- WEB ASSIGNMENT:** look up how many times Jesus refers to money in the New Testament. To do this, go to “Search the entire Bible for any word”; first select RSV for “Bible Version”; second leave blank “Passage”; third enter money, rich, and poor (3 separate searches) under “Search words”; after putting Matthew - John for “Restrict Search.” Then see what you get. No need to read through all these verses, but do record how many come up.
- WEB ASSIGNMENT:** do the same search for “Kingdom of God”
- WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Biblical Statements of God’s Option for the Poor
- WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Statements from the Catholic tradition on the Preferential Option for the Poor
- Fr. Walter Burghardt, “Because We Are Catholic” [XP, pp. 504-506]
- John Gebhardt, “The Real Birth of Affirmative Action” [XP, p. 507]

**Study Guide:** Based upon the description given in the Bauckham essay, what is the kingdom of God? According to Bauckham and Cort, in what senses is it true to say that Jesus was political? What did John Dominic Crosson say that the Kingdom of God meant in the teachings of Jesus? In the second website assigned above, what did Prof. Allen Callahan say about Jesus’s danger to the Roman empire that constituted the ‘political significance of the crucifixion of Jesus’? And how did Prof. Shaye Cohen explain the significance of Jesus’s actions in the temple when he overturned the tables of the moneychangers? Why do Bauckham and Cort say that Jesus had a “preferential concern” (Bauckham) or “bias” (Cort) towards the poor? (The Jezreel essay will help you with this question. You first read about the option for the poor in §16 of the bishops’ letter on the economy. Make sure you remember how they defined it there.) According to Fr. Kavanaugh, what moral dangers does money pose? Otherwise said: Why does Jesus occasionally speak so harshly about wealth in the verses Kavanaugh cites? and how many times did Jesus speak about money or economic issues in the New Testament? Why does Kavanaugh think it is also true, though, that “Possessions need not contaminate us”? How is working for justice “an indispensable facet of every Christian’s identity” according to Fr. Burghardt? What do the online biblical statements and quotations from the Catholic tradition say about justice and God’s special care for the poor? What headstarts does Gebhardt say that white people had that produced what he terms ‘the real birth of affirmative action’?

## MAR 27

- e. the Church and the poor: a case study

 **movie:** *Romero* [**Note:** This film will be shown tonight from 6:00-7:45 in Carroll Auditorium. This movie takes the place of class during the day today. Use the handout that I passed out to take notes on *Romero* as you watch it. Turn that sheet in with your name on it at the end of the film. If you cannot come tonight, *Romero* is on reserve in the library. If you see the movie ahead of time, be sure you have the handout that provides background on it and turn it in to my office by noon on Tuesday, April 2.]

- James R. Brockman, “Archbishop Romero, the United States and El Salvador” [XP, pp. 508-512]
- Archbishop Oscar Romero, “The Political Dimension of the Faith from the Perspective of the Option for the Poor” [XP, pp. 513-518]
- Leslie Wirpsa, “Salvador’s new brigadier causes outrage” [XP, pp. 519-520]
- RECOMMENDED:** Jim Rice, “The Making of *Romero*” (including an interview with Raul Julia) [XP, pp. 521-525]

**Study Guide:** Concentrate on those parts of Romero’s essay where he talks about how his belief in God and commitment to Christian faith motivates him to work for justice. Why does he do the things he does in El Salvador? What was his religious motivation? To which biblical texts does he appeal? How are these

texts applied practically? That is, what specific practices or moral duties does Romero think follows from them? (In the movie, listen to how Romero describes God and uses the imagery of Christian faith to both understand his situation and struggle to overcome it.) Why does Romero say in this essay “neutrality is impossible” in the conflict in El Salvador? Note also what he says about God taking the poor’s side, about the Church’s involvement of politics, and about sinful social *structures*. How has El Salvador’s new archbishop, Fernando Lacalle, apparently reversed Romero’s legacy?

📖 **ONLINE RESOURCES:** There’s a brief biography and picture of Romero on the website, as well as movie reviews of *Romero* and additional information on liberation theology, as well as the current situation in El Salvador.



**APR 3** 📖

f. the Church and the United States economy

*Economic Principles behind Capitalism*

- John Cort, “Laissez-Faire Theory” [XP, p. 526]
- Robert Samuelson, “Economics Made Easy” [XP, p. 527]

*Application to the United States Economy*

- Gary MacEoin, “Papal doubts about unbridled capitalism” [XP, pp. 528-529]
- Fr. Richard Neuhaus, “The Pope Affirms the ‘New Capitalism’” [XP, p. 530]
- Pope John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus*, §§ 13, 25, 30-36, 40, 42, 51, 57-58 [XP, pp. 531-536]
- Fr. Albert Nolan, “Four Stages of Spiritual Growth in Helping the Poor” [XP, pp. 537-540]

**Study Guide:** The brief description of laissez-faire theory gives Adam Smith’s theoretical foundation for capitalism, which we’ll use to speak today about John Paul II’s monumental encyclical *Centesimus Annus*. Lots of students have trouble figuring out what the pope is up to here, and so please come with questions on which you do not understand. The Samuelson essay should also help provide some background to capitalism, and the MacEoin and Neuhaus essays provide some background to what the pope is saying about capitalism. Why does Neuhaus say that *Centesimus Annus* is “first and most importantly an argument about human nature”? How is capitalism “the economic corollary of the Christian understanding of man’s nature and destiny”? How, according to Neuhaus, does capitalism *not* assume “the practice of unqualified altruism”? Now, turn to *Centesimus Annus*. In what way is the pope supportive of the kind of capitalist economy found in the United States? What is the “fundamental error of socialism” and what is it caused by? In what way is the pope critical of capitalism (see especially §§33-34)? (*Centesimus Annus*, literally means “The Hundredth Year.” John Paul II wrote this encyclical in 1991 to commemorate the 100th anniversary of Pope Leo XIII’s *Rerum Novarum*—literally: *Of New Things*,” a letter which began the modern tradition of the Church’s concerns with social and economic justice.) What does Fr. Nolan mean when he refers to poverty as “a structural problem”? (Nolan’s ‘second stage’ gets at the distinction between love and justice.)

📖 **ONLINE RESOURCES:** “The Busy Christian’s Guide to Catholic Social Teaching” briefly summarizes all the major papal teachings on economic justice from Leo XIII to John Paul II.

APR 5



(Cyber-Café postings due by the end of this month.)



- g. what's a *right* and what rights do people have?
- U.S. Catholic Bishops, *Economic Justice for All*, §§12-19, 74-88 [XP, p. 457 (reread) & pp. 541-542]
  - WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Statements from the Catholic tradition on rights and duties
  - Pope John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus*, § 11 [XP, p. 543]
  - Catholic News Service, "Rome summit asks: Is food 'right' or 'goal'?" [XP, p. 544]
  - George M. Anderson, "Hungry in America" [XP, pp. 545-547]
  - Pontifical Justice and Peace Commission, Sections III & IV from "The Church and the Housing Problem" [XP, pp. 548-551]
  - George Will, "Our Expanding Menu of Rights" [XP, p. 552]
  - John Leo, "The spread of rights babble" [XP, p. 553]
- Study Guide:** According to the pope and bishops, why do human beings have rights? Where do rights come from (this question is addressed not only in the bishops' letter, but also in §11 from *Centesimus Annus*, XP, p. 543)? The bishops talk about two different *kinds* of rights: some called "empowerments"; others requiring "immunity from interference." What's the difference? What do the pope and bishops say that people have rights to? Do you agree with this list? What's the relationship between rights and duties (see, especially, the web assignment). Note what the bishops say in §17 of *Economic Justice for All*, as this provides the tie-in to the next class on individualism and gives you an excellent summary of what rights are in the Catholic tradition: "the minimum conditions for life in community."

APR 8

- h. "rugged individualism" vs. the common good

Rugged Individualism

- Arianna Huffington, "A damning moment" [XP, p. 554]
- WEB ASSIGNMENT:** "Rush Limbaugh's 35 Undeniable Truths"
- Rush Limbaugh, "The Socialist Utopians" [XP, pp. 555-557]
- Mortimer Zuckerman, "A Time to Celebrate" [XP, p. 558]

The Common Good

- Thomas Shannon, "Catholicism and the Politics of Get-Off-My-Back" [XP, pp. 559-560]
- Patricia Ann Lamoureux, "Assessing the Value of the Tax Plan" [XP, pp. 561-565]
- David Carlin, "The Crusoe Fallacy" [XP, pp. 566-567]
- Gaudium et Spes* (= *Joy and Hope*, from the Second Vatican Council), "The Common Purpose of Created Things" [XP, p. 568]
- "The Fathers of the Church on Private Property, Wealth, and the Universal Destination of All Created Goods" [XP, pp. 569-570]
- WEB ASSIGNMENT:** St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) on the Universal Destination of All Created Goods
- The Tablet*, "Pope says a word for Communism but little for capitalism" [XP, p. 571]
- Pope John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus*, §6 [XP, p. 572]

**Study Guide:** This class will continue and sharpen the focus of our exploration of rights. Thus far, we've seen a connection between the rights a society recognizes, the duties a society recognizes, and the nature of its societal bonds or community (relatively weak for liberty rights, relatively strong for claim rights). Today in class, we'll have a friendly debate between those who emphasize rugged individualism and those who emphasize community and the common good. We'll even split up the readings to allow you to concentrate on your part and to allow you to teach the rest of the class the material you're asked to prepare. What do Rush Limbaugh and Mortimer Zuckerman say about individualism? How, in their view, can people in society get ahead or break out of poverty? Who, for Limbaugh, are the 'socialist utopians'? How do they espouse "an anti-American credo, which abhors American political and governmental institutions and this nation's

capitalistic economy”? On the other hand, how does Thomas Shannon explain how such individualism (= ‘the politics of get-off-my-back’) comes up short? What is the common good, and how does the Shannon essay say that this concept of the common good affects the kind of duties people have in a just society? How do the three presumptions drawn from the Church’s social tradition and articulated by Patricia Ann Lamoureux (the second one, especially, has to do with the common good) relate to these ideas and help her evaluate the Bush tax cut proposal? And closely tied to this, how does the pope contrast communism and capitalism in his interview in *The Tablet*. What does *Gaudium et Spes* mean by “the universal purpose for which created goods are meant”? and how would this play with Rush Limbaugh? The Fathers of the Church also comment on this theological idea, as does St. Thomas Aquinas. For example, agree or disagree with the following: if one is starving, one can take food from someone else who has more than enough to live on. If so, what does this mean about the institution of private property?

**APR 10** 

2. Social Justice and the Distribution of Health Care

a. health care and human dignity: a Catholic ethic

*Introduction to the Issues*

•“Foundations of Catholic health ministry” [XP, pp. 573-574]

•Melissa Maykuth ('99), “Experiencing Medicine as True Service to Others” [XP, p. 575]

•Sr. Margaret John Kelly, “What Catholics should bring to the health-care debate” [XP, pp. 576-583]

•U.S. Bishops, “Pastoral Letter on Health and Health Care” [XP, p. 584]

*The Marginalized and the Excluded*

•**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Basic facts about uninsured children

•**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Compare Indiana vs. the United States as a whole on health statistics. Look under the category labeled “Healthy Start” for the number of children in who have no health insurance, the percentage of women receiving prenatal care, the percentage of 2 year-olds who are fully immunized, and the infant mortality rate in each.

•*Time*, “The Crucial Early Years” [XP, p. 585]

•Matthew Miller, “Little Baby Steps” [XP, p. 586]

•*Time*, “Why Do Blacks Die Young?” [XP, pp. 587-589]

•Meredith Minkler, “Poverty Kills” [XP, pp. 590-591]

•Joseph Shapiro, “No Time for the Poor” [XP, p. 592]

•*America*, “Medicaid and the Torn Safety Net” [XP, p. 593]

*Justice in Health Care Distribution: Catholic Perspectives*

•Dr. Robert Barnet, “Health-care reform won’t work without justice” [XP, pp. 594-596]

•Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, “Health Care and the Consistent Ethic of Life” & “The Social Dimension of Health Care” [XP, pp. 597-600]

•Laurence J. O’Connell, “The Ever-Present Poor” [XP, p. 601]

**Study Guide:** According to the first article, why is the Church in health ministry? How do you see these values exemplified in the piece by Saint Mary’s graduate Melissa Maykuth ('99) in her work at the Chapin Street Clinic? How many children in the state of Indiana lack health care insurance and what percentage lack basic immunizations? What percentage of expectant mothers are *not* receiving early prenatal care? Predict what would happen to someone who didn’t have medical care. That is, what effects would that have upon his or her life, job, schooling, etc.? (You might recall, here, “Health Care and Homelessness” and “Homeless Children,” which you read for the March 20th class.) Think carefully here about who is marginalized and excluded. How does Minkler explain that poverty (literally) kills? How does poverty and poor living conditions ‘get under the skin’? How does race seem to affect infant mortality rates? What has the Catholic Church historically taught about the right to

basic health care? What changes in health care delivery does Dr. Barnet advocate? Why does he think that the current distribution of health care in the United States is “manifestly unjust”? How does he distinguish “Catholic thinking” from dominant American values? What does Cardinal Bernardin mean by “the consistent ethic of life”? And what relationship does he see between *right-to-life* and *quality-of-life* issues? How does the O’Connell piece apply the preferential option for the poor to the issue of health care?

▀ **ONLINE RESOURCES:** There’s more on children’s health, Medicaid, and the new (1997) Children’s Health Insurance Program available online. You can also look at the introduction to the *Ethical and Religious Directives for Catholic Health Care Services*, which sets out the theological basis for the Church’s involvement in health care.

**APR 12** 

b. medicine and the market: justice for all?

*Health Care and Culture: Individualism vs. Community*

 **in-class videos:** *Life Choices: Socialized Medicine* and *Borderline Medicine* (Reserve Tape #2)

• **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Compare the average life expectancy and infant mortality rate in the United States to that in Canada.

• Daniel Callahan, “It’s the Culture, Stupid” [XP, p. 602]

• Dr. Stephen Bezruchka, “Is Our Society Making You Sick?” [XP, p. 603]

*Health Care and Capitalism*

• Gregg Easterbrook, “The National Health Care Phobia” [XP, pp. 604-606]

• Christopher Koller, “Money and Medical Care” [XP, pp. 607-610]

• Dr. George D. Lundberg, “The Best Health Care Goes Only So Far” [XP, p. 611]

• Dr. Edmund Pellegrino, “Managed care: An Ethical Reflection” [XP, pp. 612-613]

• \_\_\_\_\_, “Ethical Issues in Managed Care: A Catholic Christian Perspective” [XP, pp. 614-617]

• Fr. Richard McCormick, “The End of Catholic Hospitals?” [XP, pp. 618-623]

*Background Information, Terms, etc.*

• *America*, “The Steamroller Heads for Medicosts” [XP, p. 624]

• “Here’s how other countries handle health coverage” [XP, p. 625]

• **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Glossary of health-care terms

**Study Guide:** Today we’ll discuss what happens when medicine and the market collide. That is, is there something inherently deficient in distributing health care according to the principles and practices of a capitalistic economy? How does the average lifespan and infant mortality rate in the U.S. compare to that of Canada? What cultural factors do Callahan and Bezruchka point to that affect how health care is distributed in the United States? What links can you make to our previous discussions about individualism as a result of their essays? What tensions does the Easterbrook essay point out between a capitalistic or market-based system and distributing health care? According to the Koller essay, what are some the problems plaguing the way medical care is currently distributed in the U.S.? And what can be done about them? How does Dr. Lundberg explain the effect on health care costs of our reluctance to regard death as “natural and inevitable”? What is managed care? and why do both Dr. Pellegrino and Fr. McCormick find it morally dubious? In Pellegrino’s first essay, what does he say is *not* a concern of the managed care organization? In the second, in what do managed care entrepreneurs “have no interest”? Does he think that Catholic health organizations and professionals can also have no interest in these things? That is, what’s the distinctiveness of Catholic Christian witness in the health care field? What would it mean to think of health care as just another market *commodity*? What financial (and ethical) pressures does Fr. McCormick say that Catholic hospitals are facing if they want to remain economically viable in an increasingly crowded health care marketplace? How has health care become a business and what have been the effects of viewing it primarily as such? On the basis of your answers to the preceding questions, does the U.S. distribute medical care justly?

APR 15 

## 3. Justice for Women in the Catholic Church

## a. views of God and views of women

Two Cases: Effects of Gender-Related Stereotypes on Working Women

- *Time*, "A Slap at Sex Stereotypes" [XP, p. 626]
- **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** *Bradwell v. Illinois* (Myra Bradwell was a 19th century Illinois woman who passed the bar but was still prevented by the U.S. Supreme Court from practicing law because of her gender.)

Effects of Gender-Related Stereotypes on Women in the Church?

- "Influential Theologians' Teachings on Women" [XP, pp. 627-628]
- R. Scott Appleby, "Will women break the stained-glass ceiling?" [XP, pp. 629-630]
- Julie Donovan Massey, "God as Mother: Exploring an Alternative Image of Love" [XP, pp. 631-632]
- Sr. Elizabeth A. Johnson, C.S.J., "A Theological Case for God-She" [XP, pp. 633-638]
- Sr. Joan Chittister, O.S.B., "A Woman's Place" [XP, p. 639-643]
- Rosemary Ruether, "Can Women Stay In the Church?" [XP, p. 644]

References to God in Female Terms

- **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Female imagery for God
- **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** "A talk on feminist theology and the family"
- Pope John Paul II, "The Anthropomorphism of Biblical Language," from *On the Dignity of Women* 1988 [XP, p. 645]
- Jesus's Female Imagery for God: The Gospel of Luke 15:1-10 [XP, p. 646]

**Study Guide:** We've seen how views of God have social consequences for economic relationships (eg., God as creator leads to human dignity, God as trinity leads to the Church's concern for community). This class is asking whether views of God have social consequences for *gender* and the issues of justice surrounding it. Moreover, is there a link between the effects of gender-related stereotypes on the treatment of women in wider society and the effects of gender-related *religious* stereotypes on the treatment of women in the Church? For the latter, we'll be considering the use of predominantly male language to refer to God. The issue will be if social stereotypes about gender affect the place of women in the workplace, do stereotypes about *God's* gender affect the place of women in the Church? (Along these lines, see the cartoon on XP, p. 635.) So first, how does the Ann Hopkins case show the effect of gender-related stereotypes on the treatment of women in the workplace? and why couldn't Myra Bradwell practice law in Illinois? Namely, what did the U.S. Supreme Court say about God that led to their decision against Myra Bradwell? What echoes of the Supreme Court's view of women are found among past and present Christian theologians? For what does the pope apologize (see XP, p. 628)? How does Scott Appleby's point about the "very concept of the 'feminine'" relate to these different, but related, cases of discrimination? Secondly, what connections do Sr. Elizabeth Johnson, Sr. Joan Chittister, and Rosemary Ruether see between male depictions of God and the treatment of women? For example, what does Sr. Joan mean when she refers to maleness as the new 'golden calf' (see Exodus ch. 32 for this allusion's source)? And what does Sr. Elizabeth mean when she says, "the symbol of God functions"? Hint: the answer to this question is related to what she means when she says, "exclusive use of male God language is both religiously idolatrous and socially oppressive." What are some of the female images used in Scripture to refer to God (see the pope's writing, the online material, and the essay by Massey)? Why is feminist theology not just a women's issue but "a human one" (see the online "A talk on feminist theology and the family")? What female image for God does Jesus use in the passage from Luke's Gospel listed above?

▣ **ONLINE RESOURCES:** If you want to read more early Church views of women, they're available on the website. See especially *Saint Jerome's* letter "To Laeta" from 403 AD in which he advises young women not to bathe. See §11 of this letter

to find out why. And if you want to explore more of the *Malleus Malificarum*, excerpts from it are available through the website. Pope Pius XII's 1947 "Letter for the Woman of Today" is also available. For the development of how the Church has viewed women, see "The Church's changing views of women." You might also look at "From Words to Deeds: Continuing Reflections on the Role of Women in the Church," a 1998 document by the U.S. Catholic Bishops which commends greater leadership roles for women in the Church and increased use of inclusive language in liturgy and prayer. On March 12, 2000, the pope again apologized for sins committed against the dignity of women by members of the Church.

## APR 17

### b. *is it unjust that women cannot be ordained Catholic priests?*

#### Arguments Against Female Priests

- Vatican Commentary, "Declaration on the Question of Admission of Women to the Ministerial Priesthood" [XP, pp. 647-653]
- Pope John Paul II, "Apostolic Letter on Ordination and Women" ("Ordinatio Sacerdotalis") [XP, pp. 654-655]
- The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, "The Inadmissibility of Women to the Ministerial Priesthood" [XP, pp. 656-659]
- RECOMMENDED:** Fr. John Ford, "Infallibility: A primer" [XP, p. 660]

#### Responses to the Church's Official Position

- Leonard Swidler, "Jesus was a Feminist" [XP, pp. 661-667]
- Sr. Sandra M. Schneiders, "Did Jesus Exclude Women from Priesthood?" [XP, pp. 668-670]
- Sidney Callahan, "Is Black White?" [XP, p. 671]
- Nadya Labi, "Not Doing as the Romans Do?" [XP, p. 672]
- Janice Sevré Duszynska, "Ordination season brings on big dreams" [XP, pp. 673-674]
- Heidi Schlumpf, "Call Waiting: The stories of five women who want to be priests" [XP, pp. 675-679]
- David van Biema, "A Nun's Dangerous Talk" [XP, p. 680]
- RECOMMENDED:** Fr. William Jabusch, "Celibacy at All Costs?" [XP, pp. 681-682]
- RECOMMENDED:** Richard Schoenherr, "Numbers Don't Lie" [XP, pp. 683-686]
- RECOMMENDED:** Ivan Emke, "Ten Reasons why men should not be ordained" [XP, p. 687]

**Study Guide:** The first three essays all build on each other. The first, the Vatican Commentary, comes from 1976. The second, by Pope John Paul II, comes from 1994 and forcefully reiterates the 1976 statement. The third, from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, comes from 1995 and underscores the earlier teaching by speaking of it as "a doctrine taught *infallibly* by the church" (italics mine). What are the strongest and weakest arguments found in the Church's statements against ordaining women? Why do the Vatican Commentary and the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith say that ordaining only men is *not* unjust to women? (Hint: see XP, pp. 652 & 658.) Evaluate its argument for that conclusion. How good is tradition as an argument against ordaining women? Why does Leonard Swidler think "Jesus was a Feminist"? How does Sr. Sandra Schneiders respond to the argument from tradition? (Note that as of June, 1994, alcoholics may no longer be ordained to the priesthood. You'll see how this relates to one of Schneiders's points.) Sidney Callahan's essay was written in response to the most recent Vatican statement about women's ordination and brings us back to some of the points she made about conscience in the essay we read early in the semester. Finally, what do you think of the actions of Mary Ramerman (the Labi reading) and Janice Sevré Duszynska (who interrupted an ordination ceremony and asked to be ordained herself)? The recommended essay about Sr. Joan Chittister shows the dangers of being outspoken about women's ordination.

▮▮▮**ONLINE RESOURCES:** There is more information on the doctrine of papal infallibility which *seems* to have been invoked in the most recent statements against the ordination of women. There's also a very good presentation from the U.S. Catholic bishops in question & answer format which very clearly sets out the Church's teaching about not ordaining women. It's entitled, "Ten Frequently Asked Questions About the Reservation of Priestly Ordination to Men." There's also a companion site which makes the case *for* ordaining women. Finally, there's an overview of the ministerial roles open to women in other branches of Christianity.

**APR 19** B. Justice and Violence

1. Capital Punishment

a. introduction

Guest speaker (during class time): Fr. Paul LeBrun, C.S.C. will speak about his work as chaplain to death row inmates in the Michigan City, Indiana prison.

*Project Due*

(**Note:** No new reading assignment for today, but you should be well on your way in *Dead Man Walking*. Should you wish to see the movie version, which is significantly different from the book, you can find it on reserve for this course in the Saint Mary's Library.)

▮▮▮**ONLINE RESOURCES:** A video entitled *Angel on Death Row* is available on Reserve Tape #2. This video is a documentary about the real-life cases found in *Dead Man Walking*. A transcript of this video is online, as are newspaper accounts of the crimes and executions of Patrick Sonnier and Robert Lee Willie.

**APR 22**

b. *Dead Man Walking* and the death penalty in the United States

•Sr. Helen Prejean, *Dead Man Walking* (all)

•Stephen J. Pope, "Can One Forgive a Child Molester?" [XP, pp. 688-691]

•**RECOMMENDED:** "Opposing the Death Penalty: An Interview With Helen Prejean" [XP, pp. 692-696]

**Study Guide:** What scenes or episodes in Prejean's book most stand out for you and why? What made you pick them as most prominent? How does Sr. Helen change over the course of the book? As you read *Dead Man Walking*, note how the first part of the book gives a very nice description of how Christian faith leads to social action. I'd like everyone to come to class today with a particular passage to read either from *Dead Man Walking* or—if you took this option—from one of your letters to a death row inmate. Select something that stood out for you, that really made you think or reflect on capital punishment. What surprised you? For example, think about what you've learned about life on death row, about the justice system, about Sr. Helen's experiences and how she develops throughout the book, etc. Please depart from the usual format for the Preparatory Writings to fill in the following blank: "What I learned from *Dead Man Walking* is \_\_\_\_." Then write a brief paragraph to explain this sentence that illustrates what you learned with examples from the text. I'm including the Pope essay along with Sr. Helen's book because he gives a marvelous description of what Christian forgiveness is (and what it isn't). Since that's where Sr. Helen ends her book, it's important to understand forgiveness in more depth.

▮▮▮**ONLINE RESOURCES:** You can find a great deal of background about capital punishment in general and *Dead Man Walking* in particular—both the book and the movie. There are also extensive links on just about every aspect of capital punishment imaginable: news and updates on the death penalty, capital punishment facts and figures, and people put to death who may have been innocent. Another site gives a list of inmates executed thus far each year, and provides a description of their crimes. It also includes women on death row, links to other sites, death penalty statistics (executions by state, methods different states use to execute, etc.). There are also pro-death penalty sites.



(Reminder:  
**2 Cyber-Cafe**  
postings due  
by the end of this  
month.)

APR 24

c. *should Christians be in favor of the death penalty?*Background

- Fr. Robert Drinan, "Catholics and the Death Penalty" [XP, pp. 697-699]
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Catholic Politicians and the Death Penalty" [XP, pp. 700-701]
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Discriminatory, costly, death penalty lives on" [XP, p. 702]
- **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Executions in the USA in 2001 and Executions by state in 2001

The Christian Case Against Capital Punishment

- U.S. Catholic Bishops, "Statement on Capital Punishment" [XP, pp. 703-707]
- Pope John Paul II, Sections 9 & 56-57 from *The Gospel of Life* [XP, p. 708]
- *National Catholic Reporter*, "Catechism takes harder line on death penalty" [XP, p. 709]
- Sidney Callahan, "The Thirst for Revenge: Trying to Understand Capital Punishment" [XP, pp. 710-711]

The Christian Case For Capital Punishment

- Sheldon Vanauken, "The Death Penalty: What Should Be the Christian Attitude?" [XP, pp. 712-720]
- **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Kerby Anderson, "Capital Punishment"
- **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Mike Marchand, "Not peace but the sword in capital punishment" (a Viewpoint column from the April 10, 2000 *Observer*)
- Ernest van den Haag, "The Collapse of the case against Capital Punishment" [XP, pp. 721-725]

A Test Case: The Oklahoma City Bombing

- *Commonweal* editorials, "To kill, or not to kill" [XP, pp. 726-728]
- Donnetta Apple & Bud Welch, "The Families Debate McVeigh's Fate" [XP, p. 729]

**Study Guide:** How many people were executed in the United States *last* year? and which state led the way with the most executions? What position do the pope and U.S. Catholic bishops take on the death penalty (note especially the recent revision of the *Catechism*)? Why do they say what they say (briefly!)? and what is the Christian case *for* capital punishment (see Vanauken and Anderson)? What point is Sidney Callahan making about the human dignity of those who murder? Why do many in society like to see such people as "vile animals" or "inhuman scum" or a kind of pathological impurity in our collective humanity? How does van den Haag respond to the objection about racial discrimination in capital punishment? Should Christians think that *justice* was served by executing Timothy McVeigh? To answer this, critically evaluate the very interesting pro and con views expressed in the *Commonweal* editorials about whether Christians should think that the person behind the April, 1995 Oklahoma City bombing should have been put to death. (Really think about the justice issue here. I'm not simply asking whether Christians should be for or against the death penalty, but whether Christians should ever see *justice* in executing someone for crimes committed. As you consider whether Christianity inclines one towards or away from support for capital punishment, it's interesting to note that in a recent Gallup poll of American adults, 77% favor the death penalty; and among those who say that religion is *very important* in their lives, 75% favor the death penalty. Why might this be? Finally, note the very interesting fix Catholic politicians have gotten themselves into on capital punishment—shades of Mario Cuomo!

**ONLINE RESOURCES:** There are extensive sites about the role of religion in capital punishment. You can examine biblical testimony both for and against the death penalty. *U.S. News & World Report* has a good online story about "The wrong men on Death Row" in which it gives the statistic "For every 7 executions ... 1 other prisoner on death row has been found innocent." You can also see the company the United States keeps on the death penalty (countries which continue the practice of capital punishment are listed on this website as "retentionist"). There's also a fascinating piece from the September 14, 2001 *National Catholic Reporter* about 'the pope's executioner': Giovanni Battista Bugatti, nicknamed

“Mastro Titta,” who supervised and carried out several hundred executions at the Vatican in the 19<sup>th</sup> century under the direct orders of the pope. His story shows that the current Catholic position on the death penalty represents more fundamental changes than mere development of doctrine. Finally, there’s a good essay from the April 10, 2000 *Observer* entitled “Not peace, but the sword in capital punishment” which argues that being Catholic and being in favor of the death penalty are not mutually exclusive.

**APR 26\***

2. Christian participation in war and violence

a. Christian pacifism: Must Christians be Non-violent?

- The Gospel of Matthew, chapter 5, verses 38-48 [XP, p. 730]
- Fr. Richard McSorley, “Does the New Testament approve of war at all? No....” [XP, p. 731]
- WEB ASSIGNMENT:** “Pacifism at a glance”
- U.S. Catholic Bishops, *The Challenge of Peace* [§§ (= Sections) 30-31, 111-119]
- Eileen Egan, “The War in Kosovo” [XP, pp. 732-733]
- David N. Duke, “Christians, Enemies and Nuclear Weapons” [XP, pp. 734-737]
- John Garvey, “Love Your Enemy” [XP, p. 738]
- Dale Brown, “‘What If?’ Questions Asked of Pacifists” [XP, pp. 739-743]
- John Kavanaugh, “The Killing Gospel” [XP, p. 744]
- Stanley Hauerwas, “Maybe Christians Should be Excluded from Military” [XP, p. 745]
- David McMahon, “R.O.T.C. on Notre Dame’s Campus: A Blemish” [XP, p. 746]
- Michael Affleck, “The Military at Notre Dame” [XP, p. 747]
- Catherine Walsh, “Perspectives” [XP, p. 748]

**Study Guide:** What does David Duke mean when he says “I hope I am a Christian” (XP, p. 737)? How do you respond to the point that being a Christian requires being a pacifist? Why does Eileen Egan say that pacifism is poorly named? What is *her* notion of pacifism? and on what does she say this commitment is based? What point is Kavanaugh trying to make about whether Christ applies to the ‘real’ world? How does Dale Brown try to respond to many of the “What-if?” questions directed towards pacifists? What lessons do you draw from Brown’s reflections on Joan Baez’s autobiography? And what, for example, would a pacifist say about armed resistance to Hitler? How does Brown think our culture demonstrates “faith in violence”? Do pacifists think that being peaceful always “works” (= is always effective in a given situation)? What do the bishops note about the predominant attitude in the early Church towards violence (§§111 ff.)? A crucial figure in the development of Christian attitudes and practices toward war and violence is the Roman Emperor Constantine (~280-337). Find out from the website why he’s such a key figure here. In particular, find out why the events set in motion by Constantine largely led the Church to abandon its earlier pacifist commitment. Hauerwas’s essay is written tongue-in-cheek. What point is he making about Christians serving in the military? Can Christians be soldiers?

▣ **ONLINE RESOURCES:** For information on Pax Christi (a Catholic pacifist group) and other organizations dedicated to nonviolence, see the website. You can also learn more about Stanley Hauerwas, named by *Time* magazine America’s Best Theologian in 2001. The website of the R.O.T.C. unit at Notre Dame is also available for your perusal. Do you see anything there that relates to the above ethical considerations? What conclusion do you draw from this? What was the history of R.O.T.C. at Notre Dame? and what lessons do you draw from that?



(Web Posting due by 6:30 PM on Thurs., Apr. 25 for second ½ of class; \*first ½ does a prep writing on their postings.)

**APR 29** 

b. just war criteria and the use of nuclear weapons

Just War Considerations

- The Challenge of Peace*, §§56-110, 120-161
- Jean Beth Elshtain, “Just War and American Politics” [XP, pp. 749-751]
- R. Scott Appleby, “How Christians went to war” [XP, pp. 752-753]

•Charles Rice, "R.O.T.C. sets standards of noble conduct for N.D." [XP, p. 754]

The Example of the War with Iraq

•Kevin Clarke, "War by another name" [XP, p. 755]

Nuclear Weapons

•America, "Hiroshima Remembered" [XP, pp. 756-757]

•**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, "U.S. & Russian Strategic Nuclear Forces"

•Richard J. Newman, "A U.S. victory, at a cost of \$5.5 trillion" [XP, p. 758]

•Fred Guterl, "The Nagging Fear of Nukes" [XP, p. 759]

•*National Catholic Reporter*, "The Shield that would be a Threat" [XP, p. 760]

•John Barry, "Future Shock" [XP, pp. 761-764]

**Study Guide:** What does St. Augustine mean by "the 'not yet' dimension of the kingdom"? (See §§58-60, 62 for a hint.) Relate this point to what Appleby says about the tension Augustine saw between "the City of God" and "the City of Man." Do the bishops and pope say that Catholics must be pacifists? According to the bishops' letter, what kind of relationship exists between the two traditions of pacifism and just war (§§74, 120, 121)? What points of contact do they base this relationship on in §§120 & 121? There are two sets of just war criteria: *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello*. What do these terms refer to? Briefly list the criteria that come under each heading. In light of the just war framework, what conclusion do the bishops come to (and why) about whether the use of nuclear weapons is ever morally justifiable? (We will be returning to the issues of absolutism vs. consequentialism in this class. If you don't remember what these terms refer to, consult the handout distributed on the second day of class which defines them.) What point is Jean Beth Elshtain making about the just war criterion of "proportional response" or "proportionality"? What are some of the long-term consequences of the Iraqi war? See also the McClory and Lopez/Cortright readings on this point. We'll be talking briefly today about how just war norms may apply to nuclear weapons. In what way does the article from the *National Catholic Reporter* say that President Bush's proposed missile defense shield may be a "reckless invitation to a new arms race"? Online, you'll see the numbers and kinds of nuclear weapons possessed by the United States and Russia, and the Newman piece will tell you our share of the bill for the last 50+ years.

▮**ONLINE RESOURCES:** Additional resources on the just war criteria, see the website. There's also a link on the course website which lists all nations known to possess nuclear weapons, those suspected of having them, and those who are working to get them. You can also see 'where the bombs are' in the United States. For more on the Gulf War see its website.

**MAY 1**

c. Terrorism and the U.S. Response

Background on Just War Theory and Terrorism

•**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Celestine Bohlen, "Thinkers Face the Limits of a Just War"

•**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Lisa Sowle Cahill and Fr. Mike Baxter, "Is This a Just War?"

•Fr. Davud Hollenbach, "Responding to the Terrorist Attacks: An Ethical Perspective" [XP, pp. 765-766]

•Karen Armstrong, "The True, Peaceful Face of Islam" [XP, p. 767]

The Case for Violence

•**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Jeanne Kirkpatrick, "The Case for Force"

•**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Richard Perle, "Needed: a Sustained Campaign"

•**WEB ASSIGNMENT:** Michael Kelly, "Pacifist Claptrap"

•Martin L. Cook, "Soldiering" [XP, pp. 768-771]

The Case for Restraint

•Fr. Michael Baxter, C.S.C., "After September 11: What Should 'We' Do?" [XP, pp. 772-773]

•\_\_\_\_\_, "Homoly on the Feast of the Triumph of the Cross" [XP, p. 774]

- WEB ASSIGNMENT: Kevin Danaher, "Justice, Not War"
- WEB ASSIGNMENT: Colman McCarthy, "Pacifism remains a worthy alternative"
- WEB ASSIGNMENT: Howard Zinn, "Compassion, Not Vengeance"
- WEB ASSIGNMENT: Thomas E. Gouttierre, "An Abandoned Afghanistan"
- WEB ASSIGNMENT: John O. Voll, "Understanding Terrorism"
- RECOMMENDED: Peter Willis, "Ten Myths You Need to Believe in Before You Can Go to War" (online)
- RECOMMENDED: Prof. Marc Herold, "Civilian victims of the U.S.'s bombing of Afghanistan" (online)

**Study Guide:** How does just war thinking apply to the topic of terrorism? In the online assignment by Celestine Bohlen, you'll again encounter Stanley Hauerwas's pacifist views. What sense does Hauerwas make of the events of September 11, 2001, and what response does he favor? Why does Fr. Mike Baxter of Notre Dame (who was Hauerwas's student at Duke University) raise questions about who the "we" is in the question "What Should 'We' Do"? And what does he think is wrong with seeing an unreflective harmony between being Catholic and being American? Why does he think that "the problem, when it comes to Christians, is not taking religion seriously enough"? In what sense does he say that those who are engaged in a military response worshiping a false God? Why (in the online piece) does Baxter think "We should be very careful to identify ourselves as Catholic first and as American way down the line"? You'll note that we're ending the course as we began (with Cuomo vs. Myers) with an issue that has also been in the background of just about everything we've done since midsemester break: the relationship between being a 'good' Christian and a 'good' citizen. The Colman McCarthy piece on pacifism takes on the obvious question: "Ok, you're opposed to violence, but what's your solution instead?" What is his three-part answer based upon political, legal and moral solutions? What points do Danaher, Zinn, Gouttierre, and Voll make about the cycle of violence as it applies to terrorism? What, in particular, does Gouttierre say about the history of Afghanistan and earlier steps that could have been taken to possibly prevent the rise of the Taliban? What myths does Peter Willis debunk in his recommended essay of how violence leads to peace? On the other side of things, how do Jeanne Kirkpatrick and Richard Perle argue for the use of force? Michael Kelly's piece contains the argument that pacifists are actually on the side of the enemy in the struggle against terrorism. What do you think of his points? Martin Cook's essay on "Soldiering" was written prior to Sept. 11, 2001 (see especially the first two sentences on the second page of the article!), but the points he makes about why Christians can be soldiers are certainly relevant in the context of the defense against terrorism. Which of these two main sides do you agree with more?

▣ONLINE RESOURCES: In November, 2001, the United States Catholic Bishops issued a pastoral letter on the events of September 11<sup>th</sup>, entitled *A Pastoral Message: Living With Faith and Hope After September 11*.

☞ Name (as you wish to be called in class):

☞ I.D. #

☞ Hometown:

☞ Year in school:

☞ Local address (if on campus, please list hall name, room number, and P.O. box):

☞ Local phone #:

☞ Do you regularly (= at least a few times a week) check your e-mail? What is the address of the account you use most often? \_\_\_\_\_

☞ Are you acquainted with how to navigate the World Wide Web?

☞ Do you have your own home page on the web?

No       Yes, my address is \_\_\_\_\_

☞ What is (might be) your major?

☞ What would you like to do or be when you leave college?

☞ What other courses will you probably be taking this semester?

☞ Any extracurricular activities, sports, or hobbies?

☞ Are you taking this course as a core requirement or as an elective?

second core       elective

☞ Who taught your previous college religion course(s)?

☞ Why did you select "Catholic Social Thought"? (Be honest!)

☞ What do you most want to learn in this class? This could be a particular topic or a way of thinking or viewing the world. As a way of answering this question, fill in the blank: "I'll consider this course a big success if \_\_\_\_\_."

☞ Class participation will be an important part of your educational experience in this course. You learn when you formulate your own thoughts into words, and others learn from the things you say. In light of this, three questions:

- ① Do you feel comfortable participating in class discussions?
- ② If **yes** to #1, are you comfortable with my calling on you even if your hand isn't up? If **no** to #1, what can I do to help you feel comfortable in sharing your thoughts with the rest of us (in terms of setting up the class, organizing group discussions, etc.)?
- ③ Answer the following carefully, as I will give you a midsemester evaluation based upon how well you are meeting your participation goal (**so note down your answer to the following question somewhere**): In light of #1, my realistic goal is to speak up in this course ...
 

<input type="checkbox"/> more than once a class	<input type="checkbox"/> about once a week
<input type="checkbox"/> about once a class	<input type="checkbox"/> about once every _____

☞ What kinds of classes, activities, or assignments allow you to demonstrate your best work?

☞ What qualities do the best teachers you've had in college possess?

☞ Would you like this class to meet with the desks in a circle, or in rows?

☞ Is there anything else that you think I should know about you or your background that would help me teach you better in this class? Also, it might help me in my teaching if I had a sense of the way in which you learn best. Any ideas or help on this one?

☞ Do you have any other questions/comments/concerns about this course or its content? I'll get back to you as soon as possible either in person or via e-mail.