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 and Outcomes 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 be able to describe what the Church teaches on these various topics)
- **interact with** official Catholic moral teachings critically and reflectively (that is, you will be able to say something about Church teachings with your own informed views explaining 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’)
- **ask** 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
- **engage** 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Active and well-prepared class participation</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Eight short preparatory writings on assigned readings + One video guide to be filled in on a movie we’ll see</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Three papers (2 essays + 1 project): each worth 15% (due: February 11th, March 12th, April 16th)</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Regular contributions to the online class conference + Responses to three online surveys</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Final exam (Thursday, May 8, 1:45-3:45)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 “Reading Guide” on your syllabus. Look at the Reading Guide before you read, and think about it as you read. The issues on the Reading 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 Reading 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 Susan Vanek (Associate Dean for Advising & Director of First Year Studies: 121 Le Mans) will be considered unexcused. More than 8 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 also 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.

Note: There will also be two evening meetings of the class during the semester. Plan your schedule accordingly. These are on Tuesday, March 25th (6:15-7:45 PM)—for a trip to the South Bend Center for the Homeless; and Sunday, March 30th (6:00-7:45 PM)—for a showing of the movie Romero. This film is also on reserve in the library, and so you may watch it yourself outside of class if that’s more convenient for you. You’ll get a class off during the day at an earlier point of the semester to compensate for one of these two evening meetings. If I ever need to cancel a class at any other time due to illness, I will email you all or make arrangements for you to be notified of the cancellation.

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. But you’re also able to go beyond the text to provide a point for discussion or debate which hadn’t been previously considered. You’re able to ask challenging questions of the material and of your classmates.)
- **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.)

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 Susan Vanek (Associate Dean for Advising & Director of First Year Studies: 121 Le Mans) will be considered unexcused. More than 8 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 also 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.

Note: There will also be two evening meetings of the class during the semester. Plan your schedule accordingly. These are on Tuesday, March 25th (6:15-7:45 PM)—for a trip to the South Bend Center for the Homeless; and Sunday, March 30th (6:00-7:45 PM)—for a showing of the movie Romero. This film is also on reserve in the library, and so you may watch it yourself outside of class if that’s more convenient for you. You’ll get a class off during the day at an earlier point of the semester to compensate for one of these two evening meetings. If I ever need to cancel a class at any other time due to illness, I will email you all or make arrangements for you to be notified of the cancellation.

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. But you’re also able to go beyond the text to provide a point for discussion or debate which hadn’t been previously considered. You’re able to ask challenging questions of the material and of your classmates.)
- **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 demonstrate the ability to argue a point persuasively and change the opinions on it of others. You take the lead in asking questions and raising topics for discussion. When in smaller groups, you facilitate progress. 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. This also means refraining from extraneous side conversations. 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 in my office for scheduled appointments with questions or comments to discuss (= your comments and conduct give every impression that you’re well prepared for class and interested in the material. You take responsibility for your own learning such that you ask questions and do what you need to do to learn 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 available for purchase in the Bookstore. The packet is also on electronic reserve through Blackboard. (To access the online version of the XP, go to “Online XP” under “Handouts” in the left frame of the course website listed below on p. 8 of this syllabus. Log in with your Saint Mary’s username and password, and then click on “Course Documents” on the left. Then just click on “Course Packet” and find the pages you need.) There are hard copies of the other two readings listed below on reserve at the SMC Library (though 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 (Sixteenth Edition: Volumes I & II)
- Sr. Helen Prejean, C.S.J., Dead Man Walking
- U.S. Catholic Bishops, The Challenge of Peace

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 Reading 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 the class prepare for discussion, I ask that students 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. Early in the semester, I'll divide the class up alphabetically into 4 groups. On days when you see ☐₁ next to the date, Group #1 will do the prep writing. On days when you see ☐₂ next to the date, the second group, and so on. Each group (and hence each student) will end up doing eight of these prep writings during the semester.

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 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 into two paragraphs as follows and number the two main parts and draw a line between them (see the required format in the diagram below):

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. Use the “Reading Guide” questions on the syllabus to help you write your summary. You need not address every question asked about a particular reading (whether in print or online), but you should address at least one question for each reading assigned. 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 …,” or “This relates to a previous topic we studied, because …,” and so on. Think about doing these readings as visiting a foreign country. Things won’t be familiar initially, but exploration will make them so. The first part of the prep writing assignment asks you to narrate what you saw or encountered on your visit (summary). The second part of the prep writing assignment asks you what you thought important enough to bring home with you (personalize).

At the end of class, I want you to turn in the other copy of your paper marked up with any corrections or notes to Part #1 that you discovered during class. Speaking up in class and offering a point from your paper will usually be an automatic √+, (assuming your summary of the readings was satisfactory), because then the prep writing will have done what it was supposed to do: prepare you to contribute to class discussion. So, when you make a comment in class 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. If you don’t call attention with circle & star to what you said in class, I will grade your paper and may not remember particular comments you made. (The same deal will hold for the Viewing Guide on the movie.) On the other hand, if you don’t say anything in class on that day a paper is due, give yourself a √ before you turn it in. I could then raise that √ to a √+ or lower it to a √- depending on the quality of what you submit (see grading scale 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.
Papers will usually be returned the following class. 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(s) 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 a low B.

√- Your paper does not indicate an adequate reading of the material. A “√-” corresponds to a high D.

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 these Papers: The first two papers should be around 5 pages typed and double-spaced. The third should be about 7-8 pages. 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. Put your ID# (the one starting with 98******) on this checklist. For the first two papers, your name should not appear anywhere on your paper. 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 for the 1st or 2nd essays, 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 on any of your essays 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.”)

☆ **Presentation:** 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, in general, to the following letter grades (*individualized rubrics for each assignment are on the website*):

**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. You demonstrate that you understand the other side of the position you’re taking, and you respond to that other side with cogent reasons that bolster your own arguments. 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. You make an attempt to respond to the other side of the position you’re taking, but either do not capture the other side of it well or respond to it effectively.

**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. You may cite the other side of the argument, but your response to it is practically nonexistent. 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.
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.

**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

Once you've launched your web browser, 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.

If you're concerned about the online component of the course, 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 above, then you're home free, since that site takes you everywhere else. 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 Websites" (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 READINGS** (if the link on the webpage takes you to a reading I want you to do, which just happens to be online), or **WEB ASSIGNMENTS** (if the link takes you to a website where I want you to do some other kind of activity or comparison, rather than just read what's there).
- "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 Resources" (in teal) give you additional internet resources that you can pursue if you're interested in a particular topic or want to do more research for one of your papers. 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 usually be listed on the syllabus under **ONLINE RESOURCES.**
When the course website first loads, the right frame features 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 contact information, 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 preview and review. 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 print out the outline (exactly how you do this will vary by your operating system and preferred browser). 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. Read the instructions carefully, as they will help you log into the ICA and tell you about its features. 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 a specific question that I will ask and put online at least 3 days before your response is 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, the use of 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 on which you’re posting exceptions past stated deadline. If you have a previous commitment the night the posting is due that will prevent your getting it in by 6:30, then do it ahead of time since, as said above, the question will be there three days in advance. Your grade will be lowered on anything posted late, and if your submission is more than 1 hour late, you will receive no credit at all. Each of the four groups will post on a given question.

*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 either 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. The postings (of the first kind) done in response to my questions do not count towards your two required postings (of the second kind). 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 are 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 with the icon to the right.

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. 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.) Almost certainly, there will be developments in the news during the semester that will bear on the subjects discussed in this class. Bringing these in would be a useful contribution. 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 Reading 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. That is, use the forum to continue a conversation we began in class. This is an especially valuable use of the forum that I very much want to encourage. Reflect on the class as a whole, on what we’re studying and how we’re learning from each other is the key here. This is an especially valuable use of the forum to reflect on what you haven’t done the reading and are just spouting off about something, or if your posting shows any failure of respect in how you respond to a fellow student. I encourage you to be critical of perspectives with which you disagree, but you need to be critical in positive, responsible ways. That is an important skill to acquire, especially in discussions of ethical matters.

Each posting has to be a good, solid paragraph at least 6 sentences long. These will typically be graded on an all-or-nothing basis. For the first kind of posting, you have a maximum of 6 points: 2 points for a posting of (at least) the required length, 2 points for responding to (or interacting with) another student (or directly responding to the question by interacting with the readings if you’re the first person to write in), and 2 points for having your posting in by the deadline. For the second kind (the Cyber-café ones), you have a maximum of 3 points for each of the two required postings that month: 1 point each for length, interaction, and getting your postings in on time. Do not forget. Note: I do reserve the right to lower your posting grade if it’s clear that you haven’t done the reading and are just spouting off about something, or if your posting shows any failure of respect in how you respond to a fellow student. I encourage you to be critical of perspectives with which you disagree, but you need to be critical in positive, responsible ways. That is an important skill to acquire, especially in discussions of ethical matters.

There are three opportunities to earn extra credit for your work with the class forum. (1) For the first kind of posting (those done in response to a particular question I ask), you can earn 3 additional points in the class for which the posting is due by making a comment or raising a question about someone else’s posting. This applies both to when your group is assigned to do the posting and when some other group does the posting. To get the 3 points, you have to do two things: [a] mention by name someone else’s contribution and make a comment about it or raise a question to that individual, and [b] email me after that class and before the next one to remind me that you did this to get your 3 points. Note: don’t trust my memory to remember who said what about whom. You need to email me a reminder. (2) For the Cyber-Café postings, if you have your two required postings submitted by the 25th of the months of February, March, or April, you will receive an extra point. Think of it as an early-bird special to encourage you not to wait until the last minute. It’s a great deal! (3) Finally, you will receive 3 points for each ‘good, solid paragraph’ you submit over the two required for the months specified above. Again, your group’s response to a particular question is not included here.

I’ll be monitoring the postings and bringing into class points that people have made online. I will also give you an evaluation at mid-semester of how you’re doing in the class and with the postings.
**Online Surveys:** Twice in the semester, for the classes on February 13th and 29th, you will be asked to respond to a poll question to express your initial thoughts about the topic under consideration for those days. Submitting your response before class will be worth 1 point. In addition, your response to a mid-semester evaluation of the course will also yield one point.

**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. Obviously, we only have so much time together each week. Don't hesitate, therefore, to bring up ideas, texts, etc. that we didn't get to in class or that we didn't say enough about during class time. {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: The web is obviously a volatile place, and lots of sites appear and disappear from moment to moment. 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 helpful information, you should feel free to verify with me or other sources things of which you're unsure.

**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 Reading Guide questions on the assigned readings. I'll pass out a study guide describing all this in greater detail when the time comes.
I. Introduction to Catholic Christian Ethics

JAN 14

A. Syllabus, course description and requirements

• In addition to the assigned readings for January 16th, also read pp. 1-11 of the syllabus to be clear on course policies, due dates, etc.
• Also by tomorrow (Tuesday) 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 16

B. Ethics: Is Morality Relative or Objective?

• John C. Dwyer, “Good and Evil, Right and Wrong” [Xeroxed Packet = XP, Volume I, pp. 2-6]
• David Carlin, “Floating in Mid-Air: Are All Opinions Created Equal?” [XP, p. 7]
• ________, “Take a Stand, or Several: On Not Being Nonjudgmental” [XP, p. 8]
• John Leo, “Decadence, the corporate way” [XP, p. 11]
• John Kavanaugh, “Conscience Qualms” [XP, p. 12]

Reading 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 18

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

• WEB READING: William Lane Craig, “The Indispensability of Theological Meta-Ethical Foundations for Morality”
• David Carlin, “What Makes an Act Good?” [XP, pp. 18-19]
• 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. 20-25]
•(a) **The Purpose of Life**: John’s Gospel 17:20-21; Ephesians 1:9-10; I Corinthians 6:17; (b) **The Example of Jesus**: John’s Gospel 13:15; Ephesians 5:1-2; I Corinthians 2:16.

**Reading Guide:** We’re really doing two related things today: First, we’ll pick up on issues discussed Wednesday 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 Wednesday? 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. What do the Scripture verses under (b) say about the example of Jesus? Why does St. Paul in I Corinthians 2:16 say that having the example of Jesus is a pretty handy thing?

**JAN 21  D. Catholic Christian Ethics: The Sources of Moral Guidance for Catholics**

•Fr. Thomas Massaro, “The Four Sources of Christian Ethics” [XP, pp. 26-37]
•Bishop Kenneth Untener, “*Humanae Vitae*: What Has it Done to Us?” [XP, pp. 38-40]

**Reading Guide:** What does Fr. Massaro say are the four sources of Catholic Christian ethics? How do they help to supplement each other? What is the Kingdom of God? What is “the fundamental belief of a natural law approach to ethics”? For what issues that we’ll explore in this class do you think the Church will appeal to the natural law? Why? Bishop Untener presents an interesting analogy involving those who draw up maps and those who actually explore the terrain those maps attempt to chart. How do these two groups interact? What is the point of that analogy? (The actual issues relating to *Humanae Vitae*, the Church’s encyclical about artificial birth control, are those we will explore next in the course.) What do the Scripture passages say about the duty of the office of bishop?
II. Ethics at the Edges of Life

JAN 23

A. Birth Control
1. Official Church teaching
   • Gregory Baum, “The Natural Law,” [XP, pp. 41-43]
   • WEB READING: “Natural Law and Human Sexuality”
   • Pope Paul VI, Humanae Vitae (=Of Human Life—1968) [XP, pp. 44-55]: §§ (= Sections) 1-18 are required; §§19-30 are recommended.
   • U.S. News & World Report, “The Gospel on Sex” [XP, pp. 56-60]
   • WEB ASSIGNMENT [SEMESTER PROJECT]: By today, I want you to indicate which of the semester projects you have chosen. You can submit your choice online through the form located on the website for today’s class. If you choose to write to death row inmates, be sure to provide at least three names of those to whom you’re interested in writing. You can find names through the links provided.

Reading Guide: At the last class, we mentioned the natural law. We will go into this in more detail today as we begin Humanae Vitae. The Baum reading describes what natural law reasoning entails and will help you 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 previous 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.” This response came from the congregation formerly headed by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, now Pope Benedict XVI.

JAN 25

2. Natural family planning & Differing views on birth control
   a. background on natural vs. artificial contraception
      • WEB READING: “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. 61-62]
      • Robert Heaney, “Sex, Natural Law and Bread Crumbs” [XP, pp. 63-67]
      • Daniel Callahan, “What’s Natural? It’s Hard to Say” [XP, pp. 68-69]
      • RECOMMENDED: “To fight AIDS, condoms may be OK” [XP, p. 70]
   c. support for the pope’s views
      • Janet Smith, “Barnyard Morality” [XP, pp. 71-73]
      • Pope John Paul II, The Gospel of Life, §13 [XP, p. 74]
      • Lisa Everett, “Natural Family Planning: Understanding body language of love” [XP, p. 75]
Jennifer & John Campbell, “Young couple discusses NFP in their marriage” [XP, p. 76]

WEB READING: “What are the Benefits of Practicing NFP?”

WEB ASSIGNMENT: Ovulation Calendar Pro & Lady Timer

Reading 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? 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? What moral difference does Janet Smith see between natural and artificial forms of contraception? Why are some couples drawn to natural family planning (see the last two readings above). What benefits does Lisa Everett see in this method of birth control? What is the “Theology of the Body”? Why do both Everett and Smith think that those who use artificial contraception not give themselves completely to their partner? How does Smith’s essay respond to Heaney? What does Daniel Callahan think it’s hard to say what’s natural? and how does he sum up “the entire history of modern medicine”? Ovulation Calendar Pro and Lady Timer give you some modern ways to chart your fertility.

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

JAN 28*  
3. Conscience and dissent from official Church moral teachings
   a. can dissent be beneficial?
      • Ann LeBlanc, “Confessions of a Bad Catholic” [XP, pp. 77-78]
      • WEB READING: [RECOMMENDED—ESPECIALLY IF YOU’RE CATHOLIC!]
        “What kind of Catholic are You?”—answer 23 questions and find out!
      • Fr. Edward O’Heran, “Don’t Lose Faith in Dissent” [XP, pp. 79-81]
      • WEB READING: “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?
      • WEB READING: Cathleen Kaveny, “Could the Church Have Gotten It Wrong?”
      • Bishop Glennon Flavin, “Artificial Contraception Called Ban to Receiving Communion” [XP, p. 82]
      • Fr. Charles Curran, “Authority and Dissent in the Church” [XP, pp. 83-85]
      • Fr. Richard McBrien, “Medieval papal shenanigans remind us how lucky we are” [XP, p. 86]
   c. the Church and the formation of conscience
      • Pope John Paul II, Sections 62-64 from The Splendor of Truth [XP, p.87]
      • Darlene Fozard Weaver, “Conscience: Rightly Formed & Otherwise” [XP, pp. 88-92]
      • Marcus C. Grodi, “Can I Trust My Conscience?” [XP, p. 93]
   d. the sexual abuse crisis and its effect on Church authority
      • RECOMMENDED WEB READING: Sr. Joan Chittister, “Small, long-smothered voices shake the walls”
      • RECOMMENDED WEB READING: Gabriel Moran, “Church Hierarchy? Yes”

Reading Guide: Is Ann LeBlanc a ‘bad’ Catholic? Even more importantly, why does she disagree with what she does? 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 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.” To arrive at your position about this statement, consider these 4 issues as you do the reading: First, how does the O’Heron reading argue that dissent may be beneficial, or at least that blind conformity may be harmful? (See also the Weaver essay on this latter point.) In particular, why does O’Heron say that dissent should have a “place of honor” in the Church? 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, as well as Cathleen Kaveny, 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....”) Does Kaveny think that those in the Church who failed to condemn slavery in the past were wicked? If not, what does that mean? Are changes in Church teaching always changes for the better? 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.) Fill in the blank in this sentence: “Catholic Church teaching on following one’s conscience says that ___________. (Again, the Weaver essay will help here.) Fourth, can one’s informed conscience ever be wrong (= deliver incorrect information by telling you that what’s wrong is really right)? The Weaver essay picks up on the objective vs. subjective views of ethics with which we began the course. Is conscience the source of right and wrong? What does it mean to form conscience, and what is the difference between invincible and culpable ignorance? What is Marcus Grodi’s analogy with height? What is the “trustworthy yardstick” he proposes to correct the subjective view of conscience?

**ONLINE RESOURCES:** There’s also 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. 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. Finally, we cannot in our day speak about Church authority without thinking carefully about the recent and ongoing sexual abuse crisis. According to Sr. Joan Chittister, what has silence done to the Church? What has the pedophilia crisis exposed? What is the “bigger problem” that Moran sees stemming from the sexual abuse crisis, and how does he think this bigger problem goes back to Humanae Vitae? What other models of hierarchy does he propose?

**JAN 30**

**B. Abortion**

1. The Church’s voice
   a. the Church’s official position
      • The Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Declaration on Abortion” [XP, pp. 94-100]
   b. comparison with the State’s official position
      • United States Supreme Court, majority opinion in *Roe v. Wade* [XP, pp. 103-106]
• Martha Brant & Evan Thomas, “Reality Check for ‘Roe’” [XP, pp. 107-108]

• WEB ASSIGNMENT: The 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution

• WEB ASSIGNMENT: Look up the laws of your home state on abortion. Just search under your state’s abbreviation.

• WEB ASSIGNMENT: Statistics on abortion in the United States. This collection of sites gives you the number of abortions and methods of performing them. It also says who’s having abortions and when in the pregnancy they’re having them.

• RECOMMENDED: David Whitman and Stacey Schultz, “A little pill but a big dispute” [XP, pp. 109-110]

• Antony Barone Kolenc, “Legal Failure or Moral Success? An evaluation of the ban on partial-birth abortion” [XP, pp. 111-114]

• WEB ASSIGNMENT: Cathy Kaveny, “Regulating Abortion: What Did the Roberts Court Do?”

• New York Times, “Abuse Laws Cover Fetus, a High Court Rules” [XP, p. 115]

• RECOMMENDED: Debra Rosenberg, “The War Over Fetal Rights” [XP, pp. 116-121]

Reading 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? Why does the Vatican say that “Respect for human life is not just a Christian obligation”? 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? 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’—or “intact dilation and evacuation” as it’s sometimes called—described in the essay “Legal Failure or Moral Success”). How does the online essay by Cathy Kaveny understand “from a symbolic perspective” the recent action of the Roberts court in upholding the ban on partial-birth abortion? The 14th Amendment plays an important part in what the court says about personhood (see XP, p. 105). 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. These questions come up for similar reasons in “The War Over Fetal Rights” in relation to violence done against pregnant women. The Scott and Laci Peterson case recently brought this issue into greater prominence. The first recommended reading discusses RU-486, the French abortion pill. “Reality Check for ‘Roe’” gives a nice overview of the current legal landscape for abortion rights, including a law passed in South Dakota in early 2006 which outlaws all abortions not necessary to save the life of the mother (that law was later overturned in the November 2006 elections).

• 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, information about partial birth abortion is on the website. President Clinton twice vetoed laws outlawing this form of abortion on April 10, 1996 and October 10, 1997. On November 5, 2003, President Bush signed a law banning partial-birth abortion, but this law was immediately challenged in court. In 2007, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld this law. 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. There is also more information on the Unborn Victims of Violence Act, which is mentioned in “The War Over Fetal Rights.” There is also more online about the South Dakota law, named the “Women’s Health and Human Life Protection Act.”
c. indirect abortions and the principle of double effect

• Susan Teft Nicholson, “The Roman Catholic Doctrine of Therapeutic Abortion” [XP, pp. 122-124]
• Daniel P. Sulmasy, “Heart and Soul: The Case of the Conjoined Twins” [XP, pp. 130-132]

Reading 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? 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. Finally, there is additional information about ectopic pregnancies.

---

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. 133-136]
• Mary Anne Warren, “On the Moral and Legal Status of Abortion” & “Postscript on Infanticide” [XP, pp. 137-147]
• Carol Tauer, “The Moral Status of the Early Embryo” [XP, pp. 148-150]
• John F. Kavanaugh, “Being Human” [XP, p. 151]
• “Dangerous Words”: An Interview with Professor Peter Singer [XP, pp. 152-154]

Reading 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 (e.g., 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.) According to Tauer, what proportion of fertilized eggs are lost (viz., spontaneously aborted) purely naturally before or during the process of implantation? 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 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: Princeton’s former president, Harold Shapiro, discusses the controversy surrounding Singer’s hiring.
b. choice and morality

- Daniel Callahan, “An Ethical Challenge to Prochoice Advocates” [XP, pp. 157-163]
- David Carlin, “Americanizing the Anti-Abortion Argument” [XP, pp. 164-167]
- Pope John Paul II, Sections 68-71 from The Gospel of Life [XP, pp. 168-169]
- “Forum on Abortion” [XP, pp. 170-177]
- RECOMMENDED: Francis Kissling, “Pro-Choice and Catholic” [XP, pp. 178-179]

Reading 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? In the “Forum on Abortion,” 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 8
Study / Writing Day: Class Canceled

FEB 11
3. Taking a Moral Stance: Abortion and Politics

- Governor Mario Cuomo, “Religious Belief and Public Morality: A Catholic Governor’s Perspective” [XP, pp. 180-189]
- Fr. Tad Pacholczyk, “Imposing our beliefs on others” [XP, p. 198]

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

ONLINE RESOURCES: “Public Life, Public Dissent” by Joe Feuerherd will give you good background into the Cuomo/Myers debate. In addition, the Catholic Bishops’ 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 Bishop (actually now, Archbishop) 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. A recent Vatican statement is entitled “Doctrinal Note on Some Questions Regarding the Participation of Catholics in Political Life.” You’re welcome to read this Vatican statement as you write your paper, but note that it doesn’t say much that Myers didn’t first say himself. As you work on these issues, 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.

FEB 13
C. Reproductive Technologies
1. Introduction to the Vatican statement

- Anna Mulrine, “Making Babies” [XP, pp. 201-206]
- The Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Instruction on Respect for Human Life in its Origin [XP, pp. 207-219]
WEB ASSIGNMENT: Visit some of the online sperm banks.
WEB ASSIGNMENT: Test your knowledge of infertility treatments.
WEB ASSIGNMENT [ONLINE POLL]: Respond via the course website 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 the link to go to the poll, then fill in your responses and click “Done>>.”
Reminder: doing this is worth one point on your online postings grade.
Reading 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” (XP, p. 203)? The Streissand essay will give you some background on sperm donation, as well as some recent information about how the privacy of the donation is being compromised. 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. The Donor Sibling Registry mentioned in “Who’s Your Daddy?” is also available. Finally, there’s an interesting story of a Wisconsin woman who was fired from her job at a Catholic school after she announced that her child was conceived through in vitro fertilization.

WEB ASSIGNMENT: Visit some of the online sperm banks.
WEB ASSIGNMENT: Test your knowledge of infertility treatments.
WEB ASSIGNMENT [ONLINE POLL]: Respond via the course website 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 the link to go to the poll, then fill in your responses and click “Done>>.”
Reminder: doing this is worth one point on your online postings grade.
Reading 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” (XP, p. 203)? The Streissand essay will give you some background on sperm donation, as well as some recent information about how the privacy of the donation is being compromised. 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. The Donor Sibling Registry mentioned in “Who’s Your Daddy?” is also available. Finally, there’s an interesting story of a Wisconsin woman who was fired from her job at a Catholic school after she announced that her child was conceived through in vitro fertilization.
express their preference about what to do with any excess frozen embryos
conceived through in vitro)

**WEB READING:** William E. May, “Do Married Couples Have a ‘Right’ to a Child?”
John Garvey, “The Seven McCaugheys: Babies as Products” [XP, p. 243]
**Newsweek,** “Fewer Bundles of Pain” [XP, p. 244]
**WEB READING:** “The Fetal Reduction Procedure”

**Reading 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.) How does Heidi Schlumpf describe “the spiritual test of infertility”? Lisa Everett comes at this issue from a different perspective than Schlumpf. How does Everett explain the link between giving and taking life? What is “selective reduction”? When it is used, and why? What does Everett say is “the only morally acceptable way to obtain a semen sample”? The writings of Lisa Cahill and Fr. McCormick offer a critical response 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:** There are sites offering embryo adoptions of left-over fertilized eggs from infertility procedures and a story about the popularity of college women serving as egg donors. Also, you can read more online about the selective reduction abortion procedure explained in “Fewer Bundles of Pain” and “The Fetal Reduction Procedure.”

**FEB 18 [3]**

### 3. Cloning

- **Cardinal William Keeler,** “The Problem with Human Cloning” [XP, pp. 245-247]
- **Nancy Gibbs,** “Cloning: Where Do You Draw the Line?” [XP, pp. 248-251]
- **Leon R. Kass & Daniel Callahan,** “Ban Stand” [XP, pp. 252-253]
- **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** “How is Cloning Done” and “Therapeutic Cloning” (brief animated explanations)
- **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 READING:** Gina Kolata, “More Babies Being Born to be Donors of Tissue”
- **WEB READING:** Charles Krauthammer, “Of Headless Mice ... and Men”

**Reading Guide:** Both today’s topic, cloning, and the next class’s topic, stem cells, can be grouped together 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). This is why I included the reading on babies being conceived to act as tissue donors for others. The basic point raised by something like this and by cloning (and potentially by therapy derived from embryonic stem cells) is whether human life can be a means to another end (whether it’s curing disease, ‘replacing’ a loved one, or even
one’s own pride in making a copy of oneself). 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? (The Gibbs essay does 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? Why do Callahan and Kass think that permitting so-called therapeutic cloning would inevitably lead to reproductive cloning?

4. Stem Cells

• **WEB READING:** Catholic Bishops Criticize Bush Policy on Embryo Research
• **WEB READING:** Ann Carey, “Stem Cells Revealed”
• **WEB READING:** “Stem-cell breakthrough uses no embryos”
  • Helen Fields, “What Comes Next? Scientists are now grappling with a major setback to stem cell research” [XP, pp. 254-255]
  • Nancy Frazier O’Brien, “Stem-cell debate has personal ramifications for Catholic family” [XP, pp. 256-257]
  • Anthony Komaroff & George Daley, “Harnessing Stem Cells” [XP, p. 258]
  • Jonathan Alter, “The ‘Pro-Cure’ Movement” [XP, p. 259]
• **Time**, “The Bush Decision” [XP, p. 260]
• Nancy Gibbs & Alice Park, “What a Bush Veto Would Mean for Stem Cells” [XP, pp. 261-263]
• Charles Rice, “Bush’s decision devalues life” [XP, p. 264]
• Charles Krauthammer, “Mounting the Slippery Slope” [XP, p. 265]

**Reading Guide:** A similar tension between possibly beneficial consequences vs. potentially objectionable means that we saw in cloning 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? How does the Charles Rice piece raise the complicity issue when he says, “The Bush policy involves the government in scandalous complicity in murder”? What is Patricia Payne’s reservation about benefiting from embryonic stem cells? According to the online readings, what does the Church support and what does the Church oppose where stem cells are concerned? What is the advantage of using cloned embryos as a source for stem cells? What is the main objection offered by the Catholic bishops to embryonic stem cell research? What are Jonathan Alter’s arguments in favor of using embryonic stem cells for therapeutic reasons? 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? What are some alternative methods to procure stem cells for therapeutic reasons? Would all of these proposed methods involve the creation and destruction of embryos? What is the “breakthrough” mentioned in the third online reading? Which moral issues involving stem cells might it address? What other problems could it create? Finally, and more generally, how has your thinking developed on reproductive technologies? Three Reading 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:** President Bush did veto the stem cell bill. There’s also 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.
5. Surrogate motherhood
   a. the Baby M case from 1986
      • Mary Gordon, “Baby M: New Questions About Biology and Destiny” [XP, pp. 266-268]
      • Mary Beth Whitehead, Testimony before Congress [XP, pp. 269-271]
   b. arguments for and against surrogate motherhood
      • Hugh V. McLachlan, “In Defence of Surrogate Motherhood” [XP, pp. 272-273]
      • Thomas Shannon, “Against surrogate motherhood” [XP, pp. 274-276]
      • Newsweek, “And Baby Makes One” [XP, pp. 277-278]
      • WEB READING: Joe Incandela, “The Catholic Church and Surrogate Motherhood”
      • WEB READING: “Outsourcing surrogacy to overseas women”
   c. online surrogates
      • 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, and find someone you like.)
   d. the surrogate contract
      • WEB ASSIGNMENT: Information about Surrogate Motherhood: the surrogacy contract
      Reading 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? (What moral issues does the ‘Outsourcing’ online piece raise for you?) What about unpaid (or voluntary) surrogacy? Would you ever consider acting as a surrogate for a close relative or friend who couldn’t give birth on her own? 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. (If you’re interested, there’s a very brief video on Reserve Tape #1 which provides an 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.” If you’re interested in the aftermath of the Jaycee case, information is available online.

D. Euthanasia
1. Physician-Assisted Suicide
   a. the current legal landscape
      • Margo Roosevelt, “Choosing Their Time” [XP, pp. 279-281]
   • WEB ASSIGNMENT: “Right-to-Die issues divide Americans”
   • WEB READING: Patient’s and Physicians’ forms for assisted suicide in Oregon
      • Time, “A License to Kill?” [XP, p. 282]
   b. arguments for physician-assisted suicide
      • Free Inquiry, “Medicide: The Goodness of Planned Death: An Interview with Dr. Jack Kevorkian” [XP, pp. 283-286]
      • Harriet Goetz, R.N., “Euthanasia: A Bedside View” [XP, pp. 287-290]
      • Frederick Ellis, “The right to die” [XP, p. 290]
c. arguments against physician-assisted suicide
   • Louis Vernacchio, "Physician-Assisted Suicide: Reflections of a Young Doctor" [XP, pp. 291-294]
   • Daniel Callahan, "Aid-in-Dying: The Social Dimensions" [XP, pp. 295-299]
   • Randall Otto, "Bottom of the Slope" [XP, pp. 300-301]
   • Pope John Paul II, Sections 12, 15, & 66 from Evangelium Vitae (The Gospel of Life) [XP, pp. 302-303]

WEB ASSIGNMENT [SELF-ASSESSMENT]: Respond via e-mail about how you’re doing in this class thus far by filling out the form located on the website for today’s class. Please do this some time this week before you leave for break.

Reading Guide: The first web reading is a very good update on where things stand now across the country with physician assisted suicide. It mentions the Oregon law, Dr. Kevorkian, and the role of religion in people’s views about assisted suicide. How does Oregon represent a “new frontier in the right-to-die movement”? What did you think of the forms that the patient and physicians have to sign in Oregon before a legal assisted suicide can occur? How does the law in Oregon compare to the law in the Netherlands? 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?

ONLINE RESOURCES: Important recent court cases concerning physician-assisted suicide from the Second and Ninth Circuits are online, as well as the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision on this topic. 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 this Oregon law went into effect in October, 1997 after lengthy court challenges, almost three hundred Oregonians have legally committed suicide with the help of their physicians.

FEB 27

2. Euthanasia: Background and Concepts
   • Lisa Sowle Cahill, “Catholicism, Death and Modern Medicine” [XP, pp. 304-307]
   • Robert Kanigel, “A Time to Live and a Time to Die?” [XP, pp. 308-312]
   • Kevin P. Quinn, “Intending to Kill” [XP, pp. 313-314]
   • “How to Be Prepared” [XP, p. 315]

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, which you can do through the course website. If you’re in a lab, you probably won’t need to do the download, since lab machines generally have it installed already, and it should launch automatically.)

Reading 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)? The Cahill essay contrasts the death of Terri Schiavo and Pope John Paul II. How does the author explain the difference between “ordinary” and “extraordinary” means of life
support? What is the “key point” in this distinction? Please come to class with the Living Will form from your home state filled out (though we may not get to it until Wednesday’s class); and as you do the reading, pay particular attention to the details of the Karen Quinlan case on XP, pp. 308-309.

**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, and a lot of information on the 2005 Terri Schiavo case from Florida. Schiavo’s physical condition in many ways was a close parallel to Nancy Cruzan’s. After discussing Nancy Cruzan’s case, you should have some opinion about whom to side with in the dispute over Schiavo.

**FEB 29**

3. The Church’s view

- Thomas Shannon, “How Long Must We Preserve Life? Catholic Ethics at the End of Life” [XP, pp. 316-319]
- John Garvey, “We Are Not Our Own” [XP, pp. 320-321]
- The Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Declaration on Euthanasia” [XP, pp. 322-325]
- Jay Tolson, “Wrestling with the Final Call” [XP, p. 328-329]

**WEB ASSIGNMENT [ONLINE POLL]:** Respond 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, then click the link to go to the poll, fill in whatever option best corresponds to your view and then click “Done>>.” Responding to this poll is worth a point towards your grade for online contributions.

**Reading 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 (he speaks of “an important theological context for discussions of forgoing or terminating life-support therapies”) and what Garvey 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 penultimate reading, and you might also look back at XP, pp. 302-303 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 relates to your answer to the first question in this Reading Guide and may also have affected how you filled out your living will.) Is the Church’s moral reasoning in the Declaration on Euthanasia absolutist or consequentialist? The Tolson essay shows that a diversity of views continues to exist in the Catholic Church about the removal of feeding tubes from a PVS patient.
4. Removing food and water: killing or letting die? murder or mercy?
   a. the Cruzan case and the persistent vegetative state
      - On-class video: Nightline on the Nancy Cruzan case (Reserve Tape #1)
      - Cruzan by Cruzan v. Harmon [XP, p. 330]
      - Time, “Whose Right to Die?” [XP, p. 331]
      - Newsweek, “To Him, It was Still 1988: The ‘Coma Cop’ Awakens” [XP, p. 332]
      - Christine Gorman, “When Does the Brain Go Blank?” [XP, p. 333]
      - WEB READING: Coma vs. Persistent Vegetative State
      - WEB READING: How a feeding tube works
   b. critics of removing feeding tubes
      - Patrick Derr, “Why Food and Fluids Can Never Be Denied” [XP, pp. 337-339]
      - WEB READING: “Responses to Certain Questions of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops Concerning Artificial Nutrition and Hydration”
   c. supporters of removing feeding tubes
      - Catholic Bishops of Texas, “On Withdrawing Artificial Nutrition and Hydration” [XP, pp. 344-345]
      - Paul Lauritzen, “Caring at the End: How the Schiavo Case Undermined Catholic Teaching” [XP, pp. 351-353]
      - Commonweal letters to the editor, “More lessons from the Schiavo case” [XP, p. 354]

Reading Guide: The Gorman piece and the WEB READING 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. The Lauritzen essay is helpful on what some consider a recent change to Catholic teaching about removing feeding tubes. Does the letter to the editor by Fr. O’Rourke in Commonweal think that a feeding tube is always morally required? Does he think that the pope changed “the traditional teaching”? The most recent development of Church teaching about the use of feeding tubes for PVS patients came in August, 2007. You’ll read this online in the “Responses to Certain Questions of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops Concerning Artificial Nutrition and Hydration.” It’s now completely clear what side of this issue the Church hierarchy advocates: feeding tubes for PVS patients are ordinary care and morally obligatory. Though note that not too long ago, the Catholic bishops of Texas were arguing just the opposite: that removal of feeding tubes from PVS patients was completely moral. In 1994, the U.S. Catholic bishops said that the morality of withdrawing feeding tubes from PVS patients was not one “already resolved by the magisterium.” And in 2002, the bishop of St. Petersburg, Florida (where Terri Schiavo resided) said that the Church would “refrain from passing judgment on the actions of anyone in this tragic moment.” Come with any questions you have about the Cruzan case.

ONLINE RESOURCES: In 1992, the U.S. bishops produced a document entitled “Nutrition and Hydration: Moral and Pastoral Reflection.” This document is online and may be helpful for your thinking about the moral issues of the Cruzan case. You might also consult “Schiavo autopsy points up need for end-of-life discussions,” which shows the lack of consensus in the Church on removing feeding tubes from PVS patients. 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 12

Taking a Moral Stance: The Cruzan case

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.
III. Love, Justice, and Society

MAR 14

A. Social Justice

1. Social Justice and the Economy
   a. perceptions of being poor: myths, stereotypes, and statistics
      *Poverty in America*
      - WEB READING: Mira Sotirovic, “Media use and perceptions of welfare”
      - WEB READING: Frequently Asked Questions about Welfare
      - “Census Data and the Poor” [XP, p. 355]
      - Anna Quindlan, “A New Kind of Poverty” [XP, p. 356]
      - “Being Poor” [XP, p. 357-359]
      - Joannie Fischer, “Those Rugged Individuals” [XP, pp. 360-362]
      - Marjorie Hope & James Young, “Stereotypes and Blurred Images” [XP, p. 363]
      - America editorial, “The Meanest Cities” [XP, p. 364]
      - Jonathan Kozol, “Are the Homeless Crazy?” [XP, pp. 365-367]
      - Daniel C. Maguire, “Catholicism in Crisis: A New Orthodoxy Test” [XP, pp. 368-369]

      **WEB ASSIGNMENT:** “Poverty Tour”

      **Reading Guide:** I want you to make an estimate before you come to class today: If you were living by yourself in South Bend, IN, and were relatively healthy, how much money could you earn per month to just get by at the absolute minimum? Come up with a mini-budget for all your major expenses for the month. The online “Poverty Tour” will help you do this. We’ll do an exercise in class today with the number you derive. *If you have a laptop with wireless internet access, please bring it to class today.* My goal for this class is for us to begin thinking about how we see the poor in this, the richest country in the world—namely, what stereotypes about people do we have and what myths about our country accompany them? The Sotirovic online reading presents a study of popular perceptions about welfare and who receives it. What stereotypes and presuppositions are embodied in these perceptions? What “myth” does Anna Quindlan talk about? Why does Maguire say that the poor are frequently blamed and ‘systematically vilified’ for their plight? How is this treatment exhibited in “The Meanest Cities”? What can criminal records then do for homeless people to compound their problems? Why do we have the stereotypes that Hope and Young discuss? Why does Kozol say that we tend to (maybe even *like* to) think of the homeless as mentally ill? What does he say that living on the streets can do to one’s mental health? What is ‘rugged individualism’ and how do views (myths, stereotypes) about America dovetail with particular views about the causes of poverty and the character of the poor? “Being Poor” tries to give the reader a sense of what poverty feels like. That’s obviously difficult if you’re not poor, but how do you react to these statements in light of the other readings for today?

MAR 17

b. causes of being poor: what’s up to you vs. what’s not up to you
   *Welfare and Welfare Reform*
   - Teresa McCrary, “Getting Off the Welfare Carousel” [XP, p. 3]
   - Barbara Ehrenreich, “Battered Welfare Syndrome” [XP, p. 4]
   - “Welfare: A White Secret” [XP, p. 5]
   - U.S. Catholic editorial, “The end of morality as we know it” [XP, p. 6]
   - America editorial, “More Homeless, Less Housing” [XP, p. 8]
   - Susan Dentzer, “You’re not as entitled as you think” [XP, p. 9]
**Stories of Poverty and Homelessness**

- Alesia Redding, “The Forgotten Ones” [XP, pp. 21-23]
- **WEB READING:** “[Indiana’s] child-poverty rate on the rise”
- Robert Ball, “Homeless center is rebuilding lives,” [XP, pp. 24-25]
- **WEB READING:** Anonymous Saint Mary’s student who used to be homeless
- **WEB READING:** Health Care and Homelessness
- **WEB READING:** “Homeless Children”
- Anna Quindlen, “Our Tired, Our Poor, Our Kids” [XP, p. 26]
- **WEB READING:** “Study: 1 Out of 4 Homeless are Veterans”

**Reading Guide:** Last class, we came up with a bare-bones budget of how much it would take for you to live on your own for a month at the absolute minimum. “Welfare Reform at 10” does a good job of giving some background on developments over the last several years in this form of assistance to the poor. What have been the successes? What problems still remain? In “The end of morality as we know it,” you’ll see the response of Archbishop Rembert Weakland (of Milwaukee) to welfare laws. Note the symmetry here: for abortion, a Catholic bishop criticized a Democratic governor; for social programs, a Catholic bishop criticized a Republican governor. Secondly, 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 articles and 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 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. What statistics in “Rich Man, Poor Man” most clearly bring out the stratification in wealth to you? And how does economic stratification affect educational opportunities and achievements? 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.

**ONLINE RESOURCES:** There’s a very interesting essay on the website for today entitled “Do Pretty People Earn More?” There are also extensive sites on poverty and welfare on the web, including all sorts of statistics and data about who’s poor in this country. 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 19**

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

*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, and 88 [XP, pp. 30-31 and p. 111]
- Charity vs. Justice [XP, p. 32]

*The Importance of Community*

- St. Paul, I Corinthians 12:12-26
- Kevin Clarke, “Taxation without equal education” [XP, p. 33]
**Reading Guide:** On the basis of these readings, be ready to say how you would differentiate love (or charity) and justice. How do they differ (see XP, p. 32 or look online)? The reading from the U.S. Bishops on XP pp. 30-31 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)? *(Please bring to class today a completed progress report on your semester project.)*

**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.

---

**MAR 25 (Tu eve.)**

*Trip to the South Bend Center for the Homeless* (6:00-7:45 PM)
- Cokie Roberts and Steven Roberts, “South Bend’s Center for the Homeless is setting nationwide example” [XP, p. 34]
- **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 READING:** Bill Shore, “They Dare to Do Good” (from *Parade Magazine* about the South Bend Center for the Homeless)
- **WEB READING:** “Why Are People Homeless?”
- **WEB READING:** Lars Eighner, “On Dumpster Diving” [XP, pp. 35-38]
- **WEB READING:** Ed Marciniak, “Shortchanging the Homeless” [XP, pp. 39-40]
- **WEB READING:** Jodie Morse, “Cracking Down on the Homeless” [XP, pp. 41-42]
- **Reading Guide:** The Cokie Roberts’s essay will give you some good background on the Center and its goals, as will the online piece by Bill Shore. Note, especially, the continuum of care model, which you may be hearing 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. According to Marciniak, how are the homeless being ‘shortchanged’? What steps are some communities taken to ‘crack down on the homeless’?
- **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 26**

**Class discussion:** *The Center for the Homeless* (Be sure to come to class with the reaction sheet that I passed out on before break filled out.)

---

**MAR 28 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)
  - Richard Bauckham, “The Political Christ” [XP, pp. 43-47]
  - Chaire Shaeffer-Dufy, “Catholic teacher fired for failing to display flag” [XP, p. 48]
  - Alice Camille, “Almost Heaven” [XP, pp. 55-57]
•Jack Jezreel, “What is a preferential option for the poor?” [XP, p. 58]
•Fr. John Kavanaugh, “It’s a poor Christian who ignores poverty” [XP, pp. 59-61]
•St. Clement of Alexandria, “Is It a Sin to Be Wealthy?” [XP, p. 62]

WEB READING: interview with John Dominic Crosson about the Kingdom of God in the teachings of Jesus
WEB READING: the political significance of the crucifixion of Jesus
WEB ASSIGNMENT: look up how many times Jesus refers to “money,” “rich,” and “poor” in the New Testament. 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 READING: Biblical Statements of God’s Option for the Poor
WEB READING: Statements from the Catholic tradition on the Preferential Option for the Poor
•Fr. Walter Burghardt, “Because We Are Catholic” [XP, pp. 63-65]

Reading Guide: Based upon the description given in the Bauckham essay, what is the kingdom of God? (You’ll find help for this question in Alice Camille’s “Almost Heaven,” which tries to flesh out what Christians mean when they pray ‘Thy kingdom come on earth as it is in heaven.’) The essay about the fired Catholic teacher presents a fascinating case. What are the issues there? What was Stephen Kobasa’s rationale for not displaying an American flag? If you were on the school board, what would you have decided here? 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? What do you think this means about Jesus’s mission and how we ought to think about it? Why does Kavanaugh think it is also true, though, that “Possessions need not contaminate us”? Does St. Clement of Alexandria say that it is a sin to be wealthy? Why or why not? 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?

MAR 30 (Sun. eve.)
e. the Church and the poor: a case study
movie: Romero [Note: This film will be shown tonight from 6:00-7:45 in Vander Vennet Theater in the Student Center. 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 class on Monday. 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.]
•Archbishop Oscar Romero, “The Political Dimension of the Faith from the Perspective of the Option for the Poor” [XP, pp. 67-72]
•James R. Brockman, “Archbishop Romero, the United States and El Salvador” [XP, pp. 73-77]
•Rüben Zamora, “The Empowering Spirit of Archbishop Romero: A Personal Testimony” [XP, pp. 78-79]
•Leslie Wirpsa, “Salvador’s new brigadier causes outrage” [XP, pp. 80-81]
Reading 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. What three ways does Rúben Zamora say that Romero’s spirit might continue to empower? How has El Salvador’s current archbishop, Fernando Lacalle, apparently reversed Romero’s legacy? Among other things, he moved Romero’s tomb from the main cathedral into its basement.

**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.

---

**f. the Church and the United States economy**

*Application to the United States Economy*

- Rebecca Blank, “Viewing the Market Economy Through the Lens of Faith” [XP, pp. 82-89]
- Gary MacEoin, “Papal doubts about unbridled capitalism” [XP, pp. 90-91]
- Fr. Albert Nolan, “Four Stages of Spiritual Growth in Helping the Poor” [XP, pp. 99-102]
- William P. Quigley, “The Living Wage and Catholic Social Teaching” [XP, pp. 105-109]

**Reading Guide:** Rebecca Blank is an economist by training, but she writes a great deal about the intersection of economics and faith. Where does she see some tensions between the self-interest that is the basis of the market and the goals of Christian faith? What are some of the roles of government in limiting the freedom of the market—namely, in limiting individuals’ unfettered pursuit of their self-interest? 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 relate to these ideas? Reading these essays will help you understand better (I hope!) the issues in John Paul II’s writing. “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. Lots of students have trouble figuring out what John Paul II is up to in *Centesimus Annus*, and so please come with questions on which you do not understand. 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)? Quigley’s essay on the so-called “living wage” will give you an example drawn from the Catholic tradition that is consistent with John Paul II’s concerns in *Centesimus Annus*. What does Fr. Nolan mean when he refers to poverty as “a structural problem”?

**ONLINE RESOURCES:** “The Busy Christian’s Guide to Catholic Social Teaching” summarizes all the major papal teachings on economic justice from Leo XIII to John Paul II.
g. what’s a right and what rights do people have?

WEB ASSIGNMENT: Statements from the Catholic tradition on rights and duties
• Pope John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus*, § 11 [XP, p. 112]
• Pontifical Justice and Peace Commission, Sections III & IV from “The Church and the Housing Problem” [XP, pp. 113-116]
• Catholic News Service, “Rome summit asks: Is food ‘right’ or ‘goal’?” [XP, p. 117]
• George M. Anderson, “Hungry in America” [XP, pp. 118-120]
• George Will, “Our Expanding Menu of Rights” [XP, p. 121]
• John Leo, “The spread of rights babble” [XP, p. 122]

Reading 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. 112)? What does the essay by Michael Perry say about whether human rights make sense without God (this brings us back to issues from very early in the course about the difference that God makes for ethics)? 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 previous class and gives you an excellent summary of what rights are in the Catholic tradition: “the minimum conditions for life in community.”

h. immigration

• Richard Fossey & John Francis Burke, “Pernicious Immigration Law: Why Catholics Should be Concerned” [XP, p. 66]

WEB READING: *Strangers No Longer*, a joint pastoral statement by the bishops of the United States and the Bishops of Mexico. Read the online summary.

WEB ASSIGNMENT: Podcast on immigration, Catholic social teaching, and economics

WEB READING: Cardinal Roger Mahoney, “The Challenge of ‘We the People’ in a Post 9/11 World: Immigration, the American Economy and the Constitution”

Reading Guide: The topic of immigration is meant as an example that allows us to step back and ponder how many of our recent topics come together. Certainly, this issue picks up on the topic of rights, the political nature of Christian commitment, economic justice, and the relation between being a member of a worldwide Church and a citizen of the United States. Moreover, dignity, community, and preferential option for the poor are all crucial components of this discussion. You really should be able to see these ideas at work in the readings and audio for today. The podcast features economics professor Teresa Ghilarducci of Notre Dame. She discusses the differences between viewing immigration as an economic issue and viewing it through the lens of Catholic social teaching. Where are the main differences? The essay by Cardinal Mahoney picks up on some of these themes by highlighting scriptural references to treatment of the alien and outsider. What does the Bible say here? This excursion through Scripture then leads the cardinal to ask who the “we” is in “We the People” and to ponder the relationship between justice and the law. What does he say about these things? According to Fossey and Burke, why should Catholics be concerned about immigration? What do the U.S. and Mexican bishops say about national boundaries in light of the human rights they identify pertaining to immigrants (see Chapter 1 or their joint letter)? Here’s where the issue of the Kingdom of God having no boundaries becomes very important. How do the bishops define who a “migrant” is (§1 of the summary)? How do the bishops in §§6-8 of the summary appeal to biblical examples of immigration and hospitality, especially those relating to Jesus himself? How would you respond to what the bishops are saying about the rights of immigrants in §9?
ONLINE RESOURCES: There are many other readings online about the history of the Church’s teaching about immigration, as well as various legal attempts to control it. You can also hear a brief NPR interview with Cardinal Mahoney.

2. Social Justice and the Distribution of Health Care
   a. health care and human dignity: a Catholic ethic

   Justice in Health Care Distribution: Catholic Perspectives
   • WEB READING: The Chapin Street Clinic
   • Edward M. Welch, “Plain Talk About Health Care” [XP, pp. 126-128]
   • Lisa Sowle Cahill, “Realigning Catholic Priorities: Bioethics and the Common Good” [XP, pp. 129-131]
   • Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, “Health Care and the Consistent Ethic of Life” [XP, pp. 132-133]
   • Melissa Maykuth (’99), “Experiencing Medicine as True Service to Others” [XP, p. 134]
   • U.S. Bishops, “Pastoral Letter on Health and Health Care” [XP, p. 135]

   The Marginalized and the Excluded
   • WEB READING: Basic facts about uninsured children
   • WEB ASSIGNMENT: See where Indiana ranks within the 50 states on health statistics. Look under the category labeled “Child Health in Indiana” 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. (This is an Adobe PDF document.)
   • Scott Morris, “Kicked off the rolls: The Consequences of Medicaid Cuts” [XP, p. 136]
   • Sidney Stevens, “When Times Were Tough, We Went ‘Bare’” [XP, p. 137]
   • Time, “The Crucial Early Years” [XP, p. 138]
   • Time, “Why Do Blacks Die Young?” [XP, pp. 139-141]
   • WEB READING: “Racial disparities in the treatment of breast cancer”
   • Meredith Minkler, “Poverty Kills” [XP, pp. 142-143]

   Reading Guide: This section on access to health care 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). What is the Chapin Street Clinic? Who started it, what population does it serve, and how does it operate? According to the essays by Welch and Cahill, why is the Church in health ministry? Cardinal Bernardin articulates the crucial notion of the “consistent ethic of life” (sometimes called the “seamless garment”). What does he mean by this, and how does it function in the Church’s concern about social issues? Namely, what relationship does Cardinal Bernardin see between right-to-life and quality-of-life issues? (The Cahill essay is really trying to take the Church to task for not paying more attention to the consistent ethic of life by focusing disproportionate attention on topics like abortion, cloning, and euthanasia, at the expense of more political issues like health care for all.) How do you see all these values from the first three essays exemplified in the piece by Saint Mary’s graduate Melissa Maykuth (’99) in her work at the Chapin Street Clinic? What has the Catholic Church historically taught about the right to basic health care? 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.? Consider the example of the Stevens family in “When Times Were Tough, We Went ‘Bare’.” (You might also recall, here, “Health Care and Homelessness” and “Homeless Children,” which you read for the March 17th class.) How have Medicaid cuts hurt the poor? 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?
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.

- Donald Barlett & James Steele, “Health Care Can Be Cured: Here’s How” [XP, pp. 144-145]
- Jane Bryant Quinn, “Health Care’s New Lottery” [XP, p. 146]
- Diana L. Hayes, “Our individualism should shame us” [XP, p. 147]

Health Care and Capitalism

**WEB READING:** John Stossel, “Health Insurance Isn’t All It’s Cracked Up to Be”

**WEB READING:** Bryan E. Hall, “Death of the Health Insurance Industry”

- Douglas Waller, “How VA Hospitals Became the Best” [XP, pp. 148-149]
- Gregg Easterbrook, “The National Health Care Phobia” [XP, pp. 150-152]
- Dr. Edmund Pelligrino, “Managed care: An Ethical Reflection” [XP, pp. 153-154]

Background Information, Terms, etc.

- “Here’s how other countries handle health coverage” [XP, p. 155]

**WEB READING:** Glossary of health-care terms

Reading Guide: How do Bartlett and Steele say that health care can be reformed? What is the basis of their recommendations? In what ways does the U.S. healthcare system resemble a lottery according to Jane Bryant Quinn? 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? What’s at stake for our society in how we allocate health care? How does the average lifespan and infant mortality rate in the U.S. compare to that of Canada? What cultural factors does Diana Hayes 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 these essays? At the same time, how do VA hospitals practice “socialized medicine on a small scale” and how successful are they? The online John Stossel essay is a vigorous criticism of universal health insurance as both bad for medicine and for the country. He compares health insurance to insurance for other things, like cars or houses. Is that a valid comparison? What are Stossel’s objections to universal coverage? What reforms does he favor? The Bryan Hall online piece will argue the opposite viewpoint, as well as give you some of the main options for financing and running a healthcare system. In class, we’ll have a friendly debate between those advocating universal insurance and those opposed. What this debate will largely turn on is how successfully a capitalistic market can provide health care, and to whom it can provide it. What tensions does the Easterbrook essay point out between a capitalistic or market-based system and distributing health care? What is managed care? and why does Dr. Pelligrino find it morally dubious? In Pelligrino’s essay, what does he say is not a concern of the managed care organization? Does he think that Catholic health organizations and professionals can also have no interest in these things? As Pelligrino says (XP, p. 154), “the kind of health care we tolerate reflects the kind of society we are or want to be.” That’s the whole point! What would it mean to think of health care as just another market commodity? 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?

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. 156]
- Anna Quindlen, “Separate, Not Equal at All” [XP, p. 157]

**WEB READING:** 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. 158-159]
- Sr. Elizabeth A. Johnson, C.S.J., “A Theological Case for God-She” [XP, pp. 160-165]
- Sr. Joan Chittister, O.S.B., “A Woman’s Place” [XP, p. 166-170]
- Rosemary Ruether, “Can Women Stay In the Church?” [XP, p. 171]

References to God in Female Terms

- WEB READING: “A talk on feminist theology and the family”

Reading 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. 162.) 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? Anna Quindlen in “Separate, Not Equal at All” talks about male attempts to control women, to turn them “into near occasions of sin or angels in the house.” The former view would criticize women as less-than-feminine if they encroach too much on male-dominated turf. The latter view puts women on a pedestal where they’re up and out of the way. In both cases, says Quindlen, women are “apart and less.” Do you agree? What echoes of the Supreme Court’s view of women in the Bradwell case are found among past and present Christian theologians? For what does the pope apologize (see XP, p. 159)? 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.” Namely, if sexism deforms what we think about human gender roles, why wouldn’t it deform what we think about God? What are some of the female images used in Scripture to refer to God (see the pope’s writing and the online material)? 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.
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. 174-180]
- The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “The Inadmissibility of Women to the Ministerial Priesthood” [XP, pp. 181-184]
- RECOMMENDED: Fr. John Ford, “Infallibility: A primer” [XP, p. 185]

Responses to the Church’s Official Position

- Leonard Swidler, “Jesus was a Feminist” [XP, pp. 186-192]
- Sr. Sandra M. Schneiders, “Did Jesus Exclude Women from Priesthood?” [XP, pp. 193-195]
- Sr. Bridget Mary Meehan, “A Challenge to Benedict to create an inclusive Church” [XP, p. 196]
- WEB READING: “Group ordains 8 women as priests”

Reading Guide: The first two essays build on each other. The first, the Vatican Commentary, comes from 1976. The second, from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (headed at the time by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger), 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. 179 & 183.) 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.) What challenge does Sr. Bridget address to Pope Benedict XVI? What do you think about the 2006 ‘ordinations’ of 8 women on the boat outside of Pittsburgh?

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.

APR 16  B. Justice and Violence

1. Capital Punishment

a. Class discussion: Writing to Death Row Inmates (I’d like those of us who wrote to death row inmates for your semester project to share some of your experiences, reactions, new insights, with the rest of the class.)

Project Due

(Note: No new reading assignment for today, but you should be underway in reading 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.)

APR 18  b. should Christians be in favor of the death penalty?

Official Catholic Teaching

WEB ASSIGNMENT: Catechism of the Catholic Church, §§ 2266 & 2267

The Christian Case For Capital Punishment

- Olga Polites, “I Want Constantine’s Murderer to Die” [XP, p. 199]
- Justice Antonin Scalia, “God’s Justice and Ours” [XP, pp. 207-209]
- Sheldon Vanauken, “The Death Penalty: What Should Be the Christian Attitude?” [XP, pp. 210-218]

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. 219-223]

The Christian Case Against Capital Punishment
•Gary Egeberg, “Changing Sides on the Death Penalty” [XP, pp. 224-225]
•Fr. Robert Drinan, “Catholic Politicians and the Death Penalty” [XP, pp. 226-227]
•_______, “Discriminatory, costly, death penalty lives on” [XP, p. 228]

WEB ASSIGNMENT: Executions in the USA in 2006 & 2007
WEB READING: “Justices to Enter Debate Over Lethal Injection”
WEB READING: “Death Penalty Walking”
•U.S. Catholic Bishops, “Statement on Capital Punishment” [XP, pp. 229-233]
•Pope John Paul II, Sections 9 & 56-57 from The Gospel of Life [XP, p. 234]
•National Catholic Reporter, “Catechism takes harder line on death penalty” [XP, p. 235]
•Dale S. Recinella, “No to the Death Penalty” [XP, pp. 236-238]
•Gina Spitz & Alice Kim, “Women on death row” [XP, p. 239]
•America editorial, “Innocence and the Death Penalty” [XP, p. 240]

Reading Guide: How many people were executed in the United States in 2007? What about the previous year? and which states are leading the way with the most executions? The last two web readings above about lethal injection will give you an update about the most recent events in the United States relating to the death penalty and how it can be carried out. What position do the pope and U.S. bishops take on the death penalty (note especially the recent revision of the Catechism—see the Recinella essay for more on this)? Why do they say what they say (briefly!)? and what is the Christian case for capital punishment (see Vanauken and Anderson)? Why does Justice Antonin Scalia (U.S. Supreme Court) say that the more Christian a country is, the less it is against the death penalty? As you consider whether Christianity inclines one towards or away from 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 if Scalia is right (Vanauken makes some of these same points)? Note in the first Drinan essay above the very interesting fix Catholic politicians have gotten themselves into on capital punishment—shades of Mario Cuomo! Justice Scalia, for example, is Catholic and so he briefly considers on the last page of his essay how much allegiance he needs to give to the Church’s position on capital punishment. 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. This is where the van den Haag essay really comes in. What is he saying about the relationship between justice and equality? Which one, justice or equality, does he think must be given more weight? How does van den Haag respond to the objection about racial discrimination in capital punishment?

ONLINE RESOURCES: The most recent (2005) statement by the U.S. Catholic Bishops on the death penalty, “A Culture of Life and the Penalty of Death,” is online. 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 19th 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.
c. *Dead Man Walking* and the death penalty in the United States

- Sr. Helen Prejean, *Dead Man Walking* (all)
- Nathan Thornburgh, “Lethal Objection” [XP, pp. 200-201]
- **RECOMMENDED:** “10 Questions for Helen Prejean” [XP, p. 206]

**Reading 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 comment upon from *Dead Man Walking*. 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. 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. “Lethal Objection” will give you some background on the current controversy involving lethal injection as a method of execution. How is this method supposed to work? And what are the concerns about it?

**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. (Sr. Helen Prejean’s most recent book is entitled *The Death of Innocents: An Eyewitness Account of Wrongful Executions*.) A video entitled *Angel on Death Row* is available on Reserve Tape #2. This video is a documentary about Sr. Helen Prejean and 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. Finally, 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.

**APR 21**

prep writing due for **everyone** today

No need to bring 2 copies for this one.

**APR 23**

2. Christian participation in war and violence

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

**The Bible and Church tradition and love of enemy**

- The Gospel of Matthew, chapter 5, verses 38-48 [XP, p. 250]

**WEB READING:** Sisters of the Holy Cross, “Corporate stand on nonviolence”

**WEB READING:** J. David Hoke, “Thinking Biblically about Loving Enemies (Matthew 5:38-47)”

**WEB READING:** Pope Benedict XVI, “On ‘Love Your Enemies’”

**WEB READING:** “Pacifism at a glance”

**WEB READING:** U.S. Catholic Bishops, *The Challenge of Peace* [§§ (= Sections) 30-31, 111-119]

**Where should Christians’ primary allegiance lie?**

- D. Brent Laytham, “Loyalty oath” [XP, p. 241]
- Stanley Hauerwas, “Maybe Christians Should be Excluded from Military” [XP, p. 244]

**Christian nonviolence in action**

- “Disturbing for peace” [XP, pp. 245-249]
- “Religious Pacifists”
- Colman McCarthy, “Political Change Through Nonviolence” [XP, p. 252]
- Rev. Martin Luther King, “Loving Your Enemies” [XP, pp. 253-254]
- Dale Brown, “‘What If?’ Questions Asked of Pacifists” [XP, pp. 255-259]
- David McMahon, “R.O.T.C. on Notre Dame’s Campus: A Blemish” [XP, p. 260]
**Reading Guide:** What do the Sisters affirm about nonviolence? And what kind of policies do they support in light of that affirmation? How does Doke contrast “the secular mentality” about violence with the Christian response in Matthew, chapter 5? Pope Benedict picks up on that when he criticizes the view that says nonviolence is just submission or surrender to evil. Benedict says that that’s a “false interpretation” of Matthew 5. What does he think is the correct interpretation of ‘turn the other cheek’? What do the bishops in *The Challenge of Peace* 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. In particular, find out why the events set in motion by Constantine largely led the Church to abandon its earlier pacifist commitment. This relates to the question of the Christian’s primary allegiance. The Latham, Baxter, and Hauerwas readings above really frame this question for today—*where should the Christian's primary allegiance lie?* What does Laytham say about his former student in response to the questions the Department of Defense asked him? Hauerwas’s essay is written tongue-in-cheek. What point is he making about Christians serving in the military? Can Christians be soldiers? After Constantine, Christians were able to identify with the state in ways they weren’t earlier. And once Christians identify with the state, how does the question of where one’s primary allegiance lies affect what one thinks about justified uses of violence? 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 all we’ve done since mid-semester break: the relationship between being a Christian and a ‘good’ citizen. Why does Michael 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 worship a false God? On the web reading, “Religious Pacifists,” what significance does Hauerwas attach to the crucifixion? Does pacifism = *passivity before evil*? How do you respond to the point that being a Christian requires being a pacifist? How does Fr. John Dear defend and live out his pacifist commitment? Why does he think ‘disturbing for peace’ is so vital to his Christian commitment? 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”? Does violence beget more violence? Can you think of examples that prove this statement either true or false? Do pacifists think that being peaceful always “works” (= is always effective in a given situation)? Still, what historical examples does the Colman McCarthy essay furnish as evidence that nonviolence really can be effective in the world? Certainly, the struggle for civil rights in the United States is one fairly recent instance in which nonviolence significant results. Then, the essay by Martin Luther King. What three “practical” ways does Dr. King offer to love our enemies? And what three “theoretical” reasons does he give for *why* we must love our enemies?

**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?

**Just War Considerations**

- *The Challenge of Peace*, §§56-110, 120-161
- Charles Rice, “R.O.T.C. sets standards of noble conduct for N.D.” [XP, p. 261]
- Fr. John Kavanaugh, “Torturous Thoughts” [XP, p. 262]
- Gregory S. Clapper, “Wounds of War” [XP, pp. 263-264]
R. Scott Appleby, “How Christians went to war” [XP, pp. 265-266]

Reading 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. What is the principle of discrimination? How does Fr. Kavanaugh’s reflections about torture relate to the discrimination principle? In light of the just war framework, what conclusion do the bishops come to (and why) about whether the use (that is, the explosion) 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.) How does Prof. Charles Rice defend the presence of R.O.T.C. at Notre Dame? How does Gregory Clapp, a chaplain and lieutenant colonel in the Indiana National Guard phrase the question of Christians doing violence as a choice “whom to love”?

Online Resources: Additional resources on the just war criteria, see the website. In addition, you’ll find an interesting article by Tom Carney online, entitled “Americans, especially Catholics, approve of torture,” which cites surveys to indicate that roughly three out of four American Catholics support the use of torture in at least some circumstances. 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.

Was war with Iraq a just war? … And what now?
Withdraw or stay?
WEB READING: Fr. John G. Yockey, “Arguably, a Just War”
WEB READING: Msgr. Robert W. McElroy, “Why We Must Withdraw from Iraq”
WEB READING: Andrew Bacevich & Matthew Shadle, “No Exist from Iraq?”
WEB ASSIGNMENT: Iraq Body Count: the number of reported civilian deaths in the war and occupation of Iraq

Statements about the war from the Catholic hierarchy
Art Laffin, “Bishops called to speak out against Iraq war” [XP, p. 284]

This War was Just
George Weigel, “The Just War Case for the War” [XP, pp. 267-270]
RECOMMENDED: Jean Bethke Elshtain, “A Just War: Force was Justified and Restrained” [XP, pp. 271-272]
RECOMMENDED: Mortimer R. Zuckerman, “The real truth about Iraq” [XP, p. 275]

This War was not Just
George Lopez, “Ethics Outflanked” [XP, pp. 276-280]
Hal Culberton, “The Ethical Challenge of Preventive War” [XP, pp. 281-282]
RECOMMENDED: National Catholic Reporter editorial, “There’s no rationale left for Iraq” [XP, p. 283]

No Wars are Just
WEB READING: Jim O’Leary, “We’re not a Christian country”
WEB READING: Colman McCarthy, “Pacifism remains a worthy alternative”

Reading Guide: Now, five years into the war with Iraq, the most pressing moral question is what does the United States do now? The first three web readings above provide two different answers to that question: Yockey and Bacevich argue that the United States has a moral obligation to finish what we started and remain in Iraq until that happens. McElroy and Shadle argue that immediate withdrawal is the
only ethical course of action. Who do you think is right? In class today, we’ll have a
friendly debate about whether the war with Iraq was, in fact, a just war and
evenly, what U.S. troops should do now. How does Weigel argue in favor of the
war? What are the points for the against this conflict being justified? What does Hal
Culbertson say is the difference between a preemptive war and a preventive war?
Which one was the war with Iraq? What problems does Culbertson highlight with
the ethical issues surrounding preventive wars? Why does George Lopez view U.S.
policy on Iraq as “morally indefensible”? Does the number of innocent Iraqis killed
in the war (albeit indirectly) affect what you think about the justice of the actions of
the United States? What’s the U.S. bishops’ position on the war with Iraq? Why does
John Paul II teach about it? And what is Benedict XVI’s view, especially about
preventive war? Why does Jim O’Leary say that he’s a Catholic first and an
American citizen “far down the line”? The Colman McCarthy WEB READING 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?

ONLINE RESOURCES: George Weigel has an updated defense of the justice of the
Iraqi war from April, 2006. There’s also a very good essay by Chris Dowd, in which
he uses just war norms to compare U.S. military attacks on Afghanistan and Iraq. In
November, 2001, the United States Catholic Bishops issued a pastoral letter on the
events of September 11th, entitled A Pastoral Message: Living With Faith and Hope After
September 11.

APR 30 Closing Words and Review Session
Name (as you wish to be called in class + last name):

I.D. # (the one starting with 98*********):

Hometown:

Year in school:

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

Phone #:

The email address you use most often (this will be the one I’ll use for correspondence related to this class) ________________________________

Do you have your own home page or blog on the web?  

☐ No  ☐ Yes, the address is ________________________________

Is it okay to put your picture online? ☐ Yes  ☐ No

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 mid-semester 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 ... 
   - [ ] more than once a class
   - [ ] about once a week
   - [ ] about once a class
   - [ ] 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 semi-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.