INSTITUTE FOR THEOLOGICAL ENCOUNTER WITH SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

BULLETIN

DATE: WINTER, 1998 VOL: 29 NO. 1

We are inching toward the millennium. We are also embarking on our thirtieth year of corporate existence.

As we prepare for this "momentous" day we could begin to think about making resolutions. Well, one resolution anyway! We could begin to ponder (by that I mean pray) about the meaning of our freedom in Christ. To that end, we are republishing the talk given by Bishop John Sheets, S.J. at the Conference on *Fabricated Man: Freedom in a Highly Technologized Society* in April, 1976.

We might begin with the Canticle of Zechariah in St. Luke's Gospel: "Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, for he has visited his people, he has come to their rescue and he has raised up for us a power for salvation. . . even as he proclaimed by the mouth of his holy prophets. . . . Thus he shows mercy to our ancestors, thus he remembers his holy covenant, the oath he swore to our father Abraham that he would grant us, *free from fear*, to be delivered from the hands of our enemies, to serve him in holiness and virtue in his presence, all our days." (Luke 1: 68-75)

Does this "freedom from fear" extend to fear of things as well as of people? I think it does. Does freedom from fear embrace apocalyptic fear of change, in our climate, in Armageddon, in whatever new form of slavery the world prepares for us? I believe it does.

Our covenant is in the Body and Blood of the Lord Jesus. It is a covenant which is not "sacred" in any kind of reasonably tight definition of that word. It is a sacramental covenant, pointing to reality as it will be found in the world to come, the world that is now being built, whether we see it or not. In this regard I recommend for your reading Mark 4: 26-29. Free from fear! It is a notion we should begin to contemplate, each of us, as we prepare for the millennium. I have a feeling that we shall need all the freedom we can get. In the year of grace, 1998, I wish you a joyous and peace-filled New Year — in him who is our Lord.

Robert Brungs, S.J.

The ITEST Bulletin: Publisher, Robert Brungs, S.J.; Editor, S. Marianne Postiglione, RSM

ITEST Offices: Director, Robert Brungs, S.J.
Director of Communications, S. Marianne Postiglione, RSM
221 North Grand Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63103 USA

ISSN 1073-5976 (314)-977-2703; FAX (314)-977-7264 e-mail: IN:postigm@wpogate.slu.edu Website: http://ITEST.slu.edu

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Congratulations to our members who have won awards (see page 16) or have published books or articles recently. The Book of Psalms notes that "Before honor is humility" and since humility is truth, please notify us when you are honored for a particular achievement in your field and we will publish that notice in the bulletin. This information helps to keep the membership updated on the work of other members and can lead to a profitable networking in various fields.

2. Our Web Site (http://ITEST.slu.edu) continues to expand with material from our proceedings. Available now for your research or perusal are the essays (approximately 72) from the 1980's proceedings. Also included in that list is the entire Summary Volume (1983) detailing the conference topics from the first half of our existence, written by Peggy Keilholz. Material from the 1970's is being prepared for placement on the Web Site.

3. The staff is currently working on the proceedings from the October, 1997 workshop on *Evolution AND Creation.* Since we are optimistically projecting an early March printing, we intend to mail the bound edited volume to dues-paid members during the latter part of March. This workshop was so popular that we had to limit the registration to 60 attendees. Those who would have liked to attend, but couldn't, should benefit from the proceedings — the next best thing to being there.

4. Please note changes of address, e-mail and faxes (pages 17 & 18). We try to keep these items updated for the directory. If you have any such changes, let us know so that we can include them on the next published list.

5. The following excerpts are from articles in our newest publication, *Readings in Faith and Science*, 1997. ($6.95 each)

(from) READINGS IN FAITH AND SCIENCE

"Chesterton has said that the only element of Christian doctrine for which there is empirical evidence is original sin. One can go much beyond this limited empirical view and argue that the totality of human experience, collectively, historically and radically cries out for God. As a Christian, I believe that the Incarnation is God's response to this human cry." *Sociology* by Dr. William Monahan.

"In Darwin's hands scientific laws would become the exhaustive explanation of organic development, so much so that no room was eventually left for religious belief to supply useful information about man and his origins." *A History of Science and Faith* by William A. Wallace, O.P.

"Given science's vast influence, there is little wonder that it profoundly affects the way we think, the range of things we accept without question. . . Faith, on the other hand, seems to deal with untestable feelings and experiences, intuitions rather than facts." *Science and Religion Not on Speaking Terms in Today's World* by Dr. David Byers.

"Many of the issues presently arising out of scientific discovery will introduce significant challenges to both the general society and the church. Perhaps two of the greatest challenges will come from molecular biology and the environmental movement." *Issues of Concern* by Robert Brungs, SJ.

"It is not difficult to understand the intimate need these two disciplines (science and theology) have for one another if we do a reality check. Reality is either limited to what our senses tell us is there or it is broader than the data the senses provide." *What is Science, What is Theology: Limits and Interrelationship, Science/Scientism, Theology/Faith* by S. Carla Mae Streeter, OP, PhD.

"What is the purpose of sexual relations? What does one expect to receive from a relationship? What does one expect to bring to a relationship? How does one talk about these issues?" *Holistic Sexuality - A Proper Focus for the Scientist?* by Hanna Klaus, MD.

THE CHRISTIAN NOTION OF FREEDOM

Most Reverend John Sheets, S.J.

[Bishop John Sheets, S.J. received his Licentiate in Sacred Theology at St. Marys College, St. Marys, Kansas. He received a Doctorate in Sacred Theology at the University of Innsbruck, Austria. He taught graduate and undergraduate theology at Marquette University in Milwaukee and at Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska. Most recently he was Auxiliary Bishop of the Diocese of Fort Wayne, Indiana. This paper was delivered at the ITEST Conference, Fabricated Man IV: Freedom in a Highly Technologized Society, April, 1976. As was the customary usage of the time, language, which is now judged to be sexist, was then standard. We have decided not to change Bishop Sheet's text.]

INTRODUCTION

I wish that someone had not spirited away the comics for tomorrow; it was on the desk, and there was something from "Dennis the Menace", where Margaret was showing Dennis a large huge puzzle that she had put together out of about 500 pieces. It was Gainsborough's "Blue Boy," and Dennis said, "Why would any little boy dress up like that?"

And she said, "But it's a remarkable painting."

And he said, "Yeh, it must have been remarkable for him to paint all those 500 pieces and put it together."

In a way, that's the problem we have when we start talking about freedom. What I would like to do is give, in a sense, a global description of the Christian meaning of freedom. It's a subject, as we know, that has many, many pieces. Yet what I would like to do in some way or other is get beneath the pieces.

Throughout the last 2000 years, or let's say at least up until the last 200 years, the ideas that we have had about freedom in the Western world have been formed from sometimes a paralleling, sometimes an interacting, sometimes a confluence of Greek philosophy and Judaeo-Christian experience.

There's no discipline which doesn't in some way or other have something to say about freedom, whether it's philosophy, psychology, political science, sociology, jurisprudence and so on. Every literary person, of course, is embodying in his own concept of literature his own concept of freedom. So it is a very complex subject.

It poses many difficulties. The first difficulty is this: that our experience of freedom is one that cannot be isolated or objectified in the same sense as other experiences, for example, of heat and cold, which we can measure. Similarly it's complicated by the fact that in our very discussion of freedom, our freedom is involved. In other words, our freedom is conditioning our listening, my presentation, my selection. Let's take one of the models for the Church that was chosen this morning — the bureaucratic model. It's interesting that that one would be chosen over other models like *spouse,* as we also have in Scripture; *mother,* the Church as mother, as *body,* and so on. In other words, even in our discussion of freedom, our freedom is involved, which of course makes it very difficult.

Putting all of this in another way, it's simply saying: in a person's notion of freedom we have brought to a focus the whole philosophy or world-view that a person has. Therefore freedom is not simply an isolated idea within a person's philosophy or world view. Freedom becomes, as it were, the litmus paper for testing a person's full view of reality. What we are talking about is not a will-of-the-wisp, something that we pursue and cannot find, but rather we are pursuing something which is a dimension, not only of what we pursue, but who pursues it, how we pursue it. It is the dimension of our whole existence.

What I would like to do this afternoon is trace the development of the Christian idea of freedom, first in the Scripture, the Old Testament and the New, and then give some of the characteristics of the Christian idea of freedom, and finally take up some of the implications of the Christian notion of freedom for our contemporary world.

1. THE BIBLICAL NOTION OF FREEDOM

So what I would like to do first is take up the Biblical idea of freedom. It's simply an historical fact that the Judaeo-Christian notion of freedom has formed our idea of freedom in the Western world. Throughout the last 2000 years, or let's say at least up until the last 200 years, the ideas that we have had about freedom in the Western world have been formed from sometimes a paralleling, sometimes an interacting,

sometimes a confluence of Greek philosophy and Judaeo-Christian experience.

Perhaps many — not only perhaps, but surely many — don't accept the interpretation that the people of Israel gave to their own experiences. They don't accept the interpretation that Christians give to Christ and their experience of Him. But whether they share that faith experience of Israel or Christianity, as students of history, they simply have to admit that our views of freedom have been formed in large part by the Judaeo-Christian view of man. For the rest of this paper I'm going to be talking out of this basic faith experience; therefore, I'm taking as the coordinates for my description of freedom those that are given in revelation.

Revelation concerns freedom, not in a narrow sense, or merely political sense. Primarily it concerns freedom insofar as man is freed from the self-imposed alienation through sin and the consequences of sin. But he's freed for the freedom that leads to union, a mode of union which is a gift-freedom, a free gift of God. Revelation, therefore, discloses the depth-dynamics at work, dynamics which are gift-dynamics, dynamics that are not simply there as principles immanent in nature. Rather they are the dynamics that come from a special empowering, from God's special gift of the Spirit.

Revelation basically is simply disclosing the dynamics at work that you could not pick up by reason or any other source. At the same time, revelation discloses the anti-dynamics which we could not pick up from reason, the anti-dynamics of the human heart and the whole network of evil that opposes the freeing activity of God.

In Scripture, freedom is not seen as a goal. The human is not freed in order to be free. The human is freed in order to belong. To enter into union with God and with others in what is called the reign of God is, in Biblical terms, the meaning of freedom. The reign of God, on the other hand, is the societal expression of the freedom that God gives.

A. The Old Testament Idea of Freedom

I'd like to comment very briefly, then, on the Old Testament idea of freedom in particular. The word "freedom" is not used in the Old Testament, except in the sense of freedom on a social or economic level. But the experience of freedom is not limited, as we know, to the use of a word. "Freedom," in Israel, is first of all an experience of a liberation from a social enslavement, which they experienced in the Exodus. But this freedom from a social enslavement became the paradigm for a freeing which would take place at a deeper level throughout the whole of their history.

The complex and rich experience of freedom of the people of Israel is described globally as the covenantal experience. They, along with their neighbors in the Near East, before this experience of God, had basically the same myths and basically the same cyclical view of history. But the experience of God freely erupting into their existence broke the illusion of the cyclical idea of history. It is from this experience, which was not limited simply to one peak experience, but continued throughout their history, that they became conscious of the freedom of God. At the same time, it was a revelation of their own freedom, a freedom to respond to God's overtures. They extrapolated backwards this experience of God as the Lord of History to the very beginning, to see Him also as the God who freely created, that is, as the Lord of Nature. But they go from the Lord of History to the Lord of Nature.

In God, freedom is the executor of His holiness. His own inner life, His own inner law, is His Holiness, a concept which many of us have leveled, have lost the meaning. But for the Israelite, holiness meant life brought to an intensity of incandescence.

They experienced the free calling of themselves into being as a people. Their identity was not based on an ethnic identity — it was based on vocation, that is, "calling." Having experienced that free calling, which is called election, more and more their consciousness grew of the freedom of God acting in history. Their notion of history was completely changed from a cyclical view to one that saw history as having a beginning, a design, and a goal, all of which were the manifestation of God's freedom.

History, therefore, was seen as a drama or a dialogue, engaging their own freedom as a people and as individuals with the freedom of God. But for the Israelite, freedom was not seen as one attribute of God among many. Rather, freedom was the living and the holy God, the living and holy God who did not act arbitrarily or out of necessity, or from whom the world did not emanate in any necessary way.

In God, freedom is the executor of His holiness. His own inner life, His own inner law, is His Holiness, a concept which many of us have leveled, have lost the meaning. But for the Israelite, holiness meant life brought to an intensity of incandescence. This is the

holiness of God. Therefore, the very inner law, the inner life of God, His identity, was His holiness. But His holiness is manifested in His freedom, which is His freedom to unite, to call into a share of His holiness. God manifested His freedom, therefore, in election, but He chooses only to bless. Blessing, again in the Scriptural sense, means to communicate life. He blesses in order to send. These three notions tie in very intimately with the idea of freedom: election, blessing and mission. All of these show God as the Lord of history.

But the people of Israel were also given the score, or the scenario of their role in this dialogue. This was the Law, but not the Law in a narrow sense, but rather that beautiful description that you have of the Law in Psalm 119, where the law is described in every possible simile and analogy of things that are precious and things that are expansive: "You have opened a wide road for me, you have freed me." It is an amazing thing, and again it is this paradox of freedom that they find they become more free in following the ways of God. We often think of freedom particularly if I have only one way to choose, as narrowing. They find their freedom in the fact that the Way has been revealed, and that is the Law. But the Law is the crystallization, in concrete ways, of the holiness of God. Even though the Law itself later can become formalized, and again leveled, made profane in a way, the basic notion of the Law was: the revelation of the ways of God's holiness.

Similarly, the Christian notion of freedom comes from the experience of an event, and the appropriation of that event, making one's own the meaning of that event, which is, of course, the liberating or redemptive event.

The Old Testament idea of freedom originated therefore, in event, God's entrance into their history. In contrast with an idea of freedom that we would have in Greek philosophy, freedom for the Israelite is not simply something that is there, something to be unfolded through the immanent laws of human nature. Rather, freedom is a gift. It comes from being drawn into the very ways of God Himself in the Covenant. Their experience of freedom is eventful. It originates from events, and it is to manifest itself through the event which is the kingdom of God. It is not, therefore, immanentistic. It simply doesn't unfold as human nature unfolds. It is not, as in the Greek notion, "harmony." In the Stoical view of harmony, the free man is the one who lives in harmony with the laws of his being and the laws of the cosmos. It's interesting that the Hebrews don't even have a word for *cosmos*, the Greek word for *order*. They don't have a word, because they see the order, not as an inbuilt thing, like, if you want, that of a clock. Rather, it is the order that comes from a relationship; it comes from belonging. The supreme order, therefore, is not the harmony of reason to law, but the harmony of the heart to God. Similarly, their idea of freedom is not seen in an individualistic way, or in terms of isolation. It comes from entering into a covenanted community. I think the Hebrew concept of freedom is beautifully expressed, though in terms now of someone in the New Testament, but speaking out of the Old, in the Canticle of Zachary, where he says, "You have *freed* us *from* our enemies *to* worship you without fear all the days of our life."

So freedom is an entirely different view, if you want, than what we ordinarily associate with freedom. It's freedom from their enemies, but not simply from the viewpoint of being liberated from Egypt, or Babylon. Rather it's freedom from all of those powers which would be inimical or hostile or diminishing to worship. Therefore they are freed to worship.

B. The New Testament Idea of Freedom

1. *The Freedom of Christ*

The way that Israel experienced freedom was through, as I said, a religious experience. It didn't come from a philosophy; it didn't come from analyzing human nature, but from a faith-consciousness of a religious experience interpreted through the prophets. Similarly, the Christian notion of freedom comes from the experience of an event, and the appropriation of that event, making one's own the meaning of that event, which is, of course, the liberating or redemptive event.

In Jesus Himself we find the paradigm of what the Christian would describe as freedom. In fact, Jesus describes the very event which liberated the world as coming from His freedom, as we read in John, 10: "The Father loves me, because I lay down my life in order to take it up again. No one takes it from me; I lay it down of my own free will, and as it is in my power to lay it down, so it is in my power to take it up again, and this is the command I have been given by my Father."

Again, you find in John, chapter 5: "As the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so the Son gives life to anyone He chooses."

Or in Matthew, 11: "No one knows the Father except the Son, and those to whom the Son chooses to reveal Him."

What is the nature of the freedom of Christ? We read much these days about the consciousness of Christ, and so on. This is something that often baffles me, as if we could catch the consciousness of Christ in the net of our little minds. If our own consciousness has roots of which we only experience the branches, what about the consciousness of Christ? Our own freedom is lost in mystery. Much more the freedom of Christ!

His freedom is basically an empowering that comes from His communion with the Father, a communion which empowers Him to fulfill the very law of His being. The basis of His freedom, therefore, is union, intimate union with the Father, not as we as creatures are united to God, but in that union which as we read in the prologue of the Gospel of John: "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Therefore an intimacy, an identity, and at the same time, a distinction from the very ground, the very source of all freedom. In turn, His acts of freedom, as they arise from the deepest communion, create communion. This is the essence of the freedom of Christ. His acts arise out of communion in order to create communion. From the first moment of that creation of union, it is the overcoming of disunion.

The freedom of Christ, therefore, is a power arising from a vital union of oneness, the mutuality of life and love with the Father. This mutuality commits Him fully to the very law of His being, which in Scripture is called "mission." The accomplishment of His mission is the communication of His own freedom; the communication of His own freedom is the communication of Himself; and the communication of Himself is the communication of the relationship that He has with the Father. His supreme act of freedom, the paradigm, I say, of all human freedom, is at the same time paradoxically the supreme act of submission to the Father.

The liberating power of Christ is given to the Church through the gift of His Spirit; the very first gift that Christ gives as he breathes on the disciples after the Resurrection is the power to unite. It is the Power to free: "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven; whose sins you shall retain, they are retained."

Therefore in Jesus freedom is not absolute but relative, relative to the Father and to mankind; not closed, but open, open to the Father, open to mankind. At the same time, the freedom of Jesus, as I said about the freedom of Israel, is not a freedom for itself, but a freedom that exists for the liberation of others. The supreme act of freedom is also the supreme act of free-ing.

It's interesting, and I'd like someday to talk to St. Paul and see how he penetrated into the mystery of Christ's freedom and liberation more than any of the disciples, so that it became thematic, as I'm sure you know, in his letters and in his oral teaching. It's an interesting thing.

What we've been saying about the freedom of Christ might sound very abstract, and yet it's most real. However, it might help if we, in a concrete way, show how this freedom manifested itself. It's a freedom which overspilled the social, religious and political categories of His time. One thing we could not do is categorize Jesus. We think we knew who He was, and suddenly He appears as another, in that sense kind of a protean being. When He asked who did people think that He was, they came up with all of these ideas, John the Baptist, Elijah, and so on. How could we be so mixed up about one individual? The point is: he defied and broke all categories.

For example, to point out things we are aware of, it was contrary to the custom for any teacher to choose His own disciples. Gamaliel didn't go around picking students; students came to Gamaliel. Jesus, on the other hand, went around and picked His disciples. Not a very good pick, we might say. It was like Charlie Brown's baseball team. He limited their number to a number symbolic of the twelve tribes of Israel.

His resurrection from the dead and His ascension to the right hand of the Father are not some kind of a Gnostic space trip. Rather His resurrection and exaltation mean that the whole Being of Christ becomes the embodiment of the very freedom of God, and the sacrament of liberation for man.

His freedom is shown in the way that He treated women, not again in a way that this theme is often trivialized in extreme advocates of Women's Liberation. It's something that gets deeper than mere convention. Again we find the mystery of the freedom of Christ. We find it in His attitude towards the inveterate enemies of the Jews, the Samaritans. Again, we find it in His being at home with sinners, while at the same time speaking strongly against sin. Most unusually, he wasn't caught up with the *Weltgeist*, or whatever the Hebrew word for that would be, of the nationalistic and political movements of His day, which anyone interested in liberation would certainly take up. We'd be Zealots!

We find His relativizing of what to many had been turned into absolutes: the law of the Sabbath, for example, the dietary laws, the place of the Temple. All of these actions point to a source of freedom lying deep beneath custom, temperament, likes and dislikes, to a source from which it derives a freshness, spontaneity, and originality, a kind of a manifestation of a hidden music, which is His union with the Father.

His own work was a work of demythologizing. He had to destroy and demythologize even their notion of the Messiah, their notion of the Kingdom of God, their notion as a people which was exclusive. He had to destroy their dreams in order to fulfill their hopes. As He said to the disciples on the way to Emmaus after the Resurrection, "Ought not the Christ to have suffered, and so to have entered into His Glory?" He destroyed their dreams, but He fulfilled their hopes.

His resurrection from the dead and His ascension to the right hand of the Father are not some kind of a Gnostic space trip. Rather His resurrection and exaltation mean that the whole Being of Christ becomes the embodiment of the very freedom of God, and the sacrament of liberation for man. In His resurrection and exaltation His freedom takes on that limitlessness of God's own freedom, not in the sense of infinity, but in the sense of the limitlessness of God's power to communicate His Being. Therefore His whole being is turned to the world, in a sense nothing reserved for Himself. That is perfect freedom, when he can put his whole being into his gift.

The author of the letter to the Hebrews expresses this very well when he sees Christ's whole being simply as a being forever, but a being forever to intercede for us. As we read in Hebrews, chapter 7, "it follows then, that as his power to save is utterly certain, since he is living forever to intercede for all who come to God through him." In other words, the limited nature of our freedom comes from many aspects: we can't attend to things as we ought; we might be driving and fall asleep. We can't attend the ones we love, even though our intention is to love; we can't attend very often, completely. But the author of the letter to the Hebrews says Christ attends completely. Now this is His freedom.

The liberating power of Christ is given to the Church through the gift of His Spirit; the very first gift that Christ gives as he breathes on the disciples after the Resurrection is the power to unite. It is the Power to free: "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven; whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." Therefore the Church carries out the work of liberation throughout history, not by teaching a set of principles, like Buddha or Confucius, but by drawing men into the relationship that Christ has with the Father.

Those are a few brief remarks, then, about the freedom of Christ.

2. *The Freedom of the Christian*

I'd like to speak briefly about the freedom of the Christian, particularly as we have it described in John and in Paul. In the Gospel of John, we read in chapter 8: "To the Jews who believed in him Jesus said: 'If you make my word your home, you will indeed be my disciples; you will learn the truth, and the truth will make you free.' They answered, 'We are descended from Abraham and we have never been the slaves of anyone; what do you mean, 'You will be made free'? Jesus replied: 'I tell you most solemnly, everyone who commits sin is a slave of sin. Now the slave's place in the house is not assured, but the son's place is assured. So if the Son makes you free, you will be free indeed.'"

More than any other New Testament author, Paul expresses the Christian message in terms of freedom. This didn't come about because he was interested in freedom, as a philosopher, but rather he stressed freedom because he knew what slavery meant.

Therefore freedom means being perfectly at home. In a more sophisticated way it is what the philosophers speak of as self-possession, or as being present to oneself. But in a Scriptural sense, it is relational. It is to be at home, in the relationship for which we are made. Outside of this relationship the human is in Hell. Christ says we are perfectly free when we share His own at-homeness with the Father. This takes place when we allow His word, which is the extension of Himself, to make its home in us. If He is at home in us through faith, we are in turn at home in Him, in perfect freedom. What he says, then, is that when one opens his heart to the Word, a liberation takes place, a liberation which is the experience of going from darkness to light, from death to life. When I was thinking about this, the example of the life of Helen Keller came to mind. You remember she was blind, deaf, mute; there was no way of communicating except through the sense of touch. And then her teacher took water, one day, and wrote on Helen's hand the word "water." Suddenly the whole world opened up, because of a word.

In a sense, I say, you have an analogy, that when one opens oneself to the Word of God, it has opened a whole world. It's drawn a person into a relationship

that is a gift relationship, the relationship that Christ has with the Father, and to the world.

More than any other New Testament author, Paul expresses the Christian message in terms of freedom. This didn't come about because he was interested in freedom, as a philosopher, but rather he stressed freedom because he knew what slavery meant. Most of us don't know what health is, unless we've been sick. We don't know what it means to have money unless we've been poor. We don't know what Christianity means unless we know what it means to be saved.

For Paul, then, freedom is a process of transpersonalization, where our human personality takes on the very being of Christ's person. "I live now not I but Christ lives in me" (Gal 2. 20).

The people of Israel, who had experienced slavery, knew what freedom meant. Paul, as Saul, thought he had been free, as a Pharisee, a member of the tribe of Benjamin, a student of Gamaliel — and he found out he was a slave. He knew what freedom meant because he experienced a transition. He experienced a metamorphosis from slavery to freedom. This is why freedom is thematic in Paul. Just as Israel experienced a transition, Paul experienced a transition in his own life. This is why he speaks so strongly: as the prophets spoke about Israel returning to the slavery of the Baals, the fertility gods, and so on, so Paul speaks of returning to anything that is pre-Christ, that is before Christ, because that is return to slavery. Paul knew that no one rules himself, as if we were completely autonomous; rather, a person's dignity or loss of dignity depends on what we allow to rule us. Paul is saying that, if a person is ruled by anything or anyone less than Christ and His Word, he is a slave. Hence, to be ruled by the Torah, which has been superseded, is to be a slave. To be ruled by the powers of evil, human powers of evil or superhuman, is to be a slave. To be ruled by the consequences of evil; namely, death, that is slavery.

Paul preached so much about freedom that, as usually happens with our human nature, his listeners would take it as an excuse for false liberty. He was forced to remind them that genuine liberty was not license. As he told the Galatians, "Brothers, you have been summoned to liberty; only do not turn that freedom into license for the flesh."

The basis for Paul's teaching of freedom is not found in a philosophy or a concept of man or a concept of will, but it is from the experience that Christian existence is a new mode of being, a new mode of being related, from which follows a new pattern of life. As he says, the Christian is a new creation, literally, just as the first person who came from God. "If then any man is in Christ, he is new, completely new. Wonderful to tell, he has been made over absolutely new," as he says in 2nd Corinthians, chapter 5, or Romans, 6, putting it very strongly — he couldn't put it more strongly — "Consider yourselves dead men brought back to life."

The new mode of being related is described as adoptive sonship, so that we can boldly say, "Abba." And this takes place through the Spirit who is poured in our hearts (Rm 8.11, 14). All of this involves a whole new pattern of life as we read in Romans, 12: "Do not model yourselves on the behavior of the world around you, but let your behavior change, modelled by your new mind" (Rm 12.2). For Paul, then, freedom is a process of transpersonalization, where our human personality takes on the very being of Christ's person. "I live now not I but Christ lives in me" (Gal 2. 20).

Let us sum up, then, the biblical notion of freedom. It is an experience which originates in event; it does not come from philosophy or introspection. The event in which it originates is God's entrance into history, in a preliminary way in the Old Testament and then in an inconceivable way in the enfleshment of the Son of God in the New Testament. The experience has many aspects: first, the experience of God's own gracious freedom in His election, fidelity and blessing; second, it is the experience of our own slippery hold on this freedom, our fragility, our tendency to fall back into slavery. St. Paul was conscious of this when he said, "Pray for me, lest after having preached to others I become a castaway." There is the consciousness that we do not have a hold on this in the sense that it's simply all settled. We are in constant need of the attitude so beautifully expressed in the prayer of Kierkegaard where he said in speaking about God's having loved us first — I'm paraphrasing: "We often think. that as God having loved us first once and for all . But God loves us first at every moment. When we get up in the morning God has loved us first. When we turn to God in prayer He has first loved us". Therefore, the firstness of God's love is always anticipating.

Thirdly, freedom comes from a commitment, a commitment to open ourselves to God's will, a decision to follow His ways. In the New Testament, freedom is seen first of all in Christ, in His identity with the Father and His existence for man. His existence with the Father gives Him the power to direct His whole being to bring about the return of all things to the Father in His redemptive act. The Christian is free to the extent that he becomes someone new. In the New

Testament this image of newness is contrasted with that of the "old man". To the extent that someone becomes completely new and his actions flow from this newness which comes from his incorporation into Christ, to that extent he is free. It is evident how far the Christian notion of freedom is from that of any other religion or philosophy. Time, however, does not let us make this type of comparison and contrast.

II. SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE MEANING OF CHRISTIAN FREEDOM

From our reflections on the biblical notion of freedom, I would like to draw some theological and philosophical implications. There are ten characteristics I would like to single out.

1. In the first place, it is important to note that freedom brings the whole person into play; his past, future and present in all the complexity of his relationship to God, the world and himself. Freedom cannot be atomized and spoken of only in terms of isolated acts. Freedom is in the first place a *mode of being*. This is an insight expressed first in St. Paul and later in writers like Augustine, Kierkegaard, Buber and Heschel. Freedom is that mode of being that characterizes a person. Particular acts of freedom give an existential shape to the whole being, for good or for evil.

2. The mystery of freedom is, therefore, the mystery of *personhood*. Man is in a limited way what God is in an unlimited way. In scriptural terms the human is the *imago Dei*. But what does this mean? We obviously do not mean image in terms of a little cameo representing God. Rather image is a dynamic idea. This is a mystery of the power to bring about union and to enter into union in a way that resembles God's own creative activity. In the Old Testament the idea of the image of God is that the human becomes God's vicegerent on earth. To kill a person is to kill God's vicegerent on earth. That's why the blood of Abel cried out, because it is as if Cain had killed God. The blood cries out to heaven. In the New Testament, the human is the *imago Christi*, i.e., one putting on the mind of Christ. It is the power to be on earth what Christ is in heaven, the power to liberate by uniting. On the purely human level — I'm not implying that anything ever happens on the purely human level — this creativity is the source of the various levels of union, those of culture, of technology, of society. On the level of grace (union), it is the source of the continued freshness of God in the world. It is like spring which constantly reasserts itself within the entropy of our world.

3. Man's freedom has, as it were, *three moments or stages*. First, there is what is called transcendental freedom, i.e., the very basis of freedom is located in God Himself, the ultimate ground of freedom. The second aspect of freedom is transcendent freedom which is the power to distance oneself from individual objects that are presented for choice, a certain equipoise that comes from the fact that the human by his spiritual nature shares in some way in God's own transcendence; thirdly, the power to choose or not to choose, or to choose among alternatives. The debates concerning determinism or indeterminism are sometimes based on a false notion of motivation. Surely we are motivated in our choices. The mystery of freedom lies in the fact that we allow ourselves to be motivated by one alternative rather than another. As St. Augustine said: "Each one is moved by his own pleasure. Show me your pleasure, and I shall show you what moves you." This is not only being attracted in the sense of final causality. Freedom is that mystery of our power to tip the balance to one attraction or another. It is the mysterious power of decision, a mysterious power to create or destroy. There is no neutral act of freedom. It brings about unity or disunity.

It originates in a person situated at a particular point in the continuum of history, and comes to fruition by reaching out into that continuum of history.

---

4. Man's freedom is both *unconditioned* and *conditioned*. A strict determinism sees freedom as caught within the vectors of existence, and in some way as simply a resultant of those vectors. If we could sort out the vectors we could explain a person's choice. In the Christian sense, on the other hand, our freedom has its base in our spiritual being and in this sense is unconditioned. In the concrete, however, our freedom is conditioned by many factors of temperament, circumstances, habits. There is also the limitation that comes from personal and original sin, which create a certain spiritual inertia disposing a person to being at home with choices that fit this inertia.

5. Man's freedom, therefore, needs to be *healed* from the inside-out through God's grace in order that his choices develop the sureness, spontaneity and consistency of a freedom that is healthy. No culture, no civilization, nothing from merely outside can heal that which has to be healed from the very roots up through the trunk and the branches. This healing takes place both immediately through God's grace as well as mediately through the sacraments. It is the primary object of the prayer of petition: "A clean heart create in me, Lord." This is a prayer for free-

dom. Christianity rejects the extremes of Pelagianism which extols the healthiness of man's will, or a Stoic type of character, as well as the extremes of a theology which diminishes freedom to the point where there is no genuine freedom. It is important to realize that in spite of our talk about freedom, there is a deep-rooted fear of genuine freedom, because freedom is honesty, authenticity, responsibility. "We love the truth when it illumines itself; we hate it when it illumines us," as Augustine says. There is a deep-seated collusion with any theory which diminishes our responsibility, like the masks that people hide behind during the Mardi Gras. We prefer illusion if it flatters rather than truth if it hurts. The first act of freedom, therefore, is to say, "I have sinned." Note that in the Watergate affair no one did anything wrong, but many made mistakes in judgment. But that's not peculiar only to Watergate. We all do it. Look at Adam's statement, "The woman you gave me gave me to eat." In other words, it was God's responsibility: you gave me the woman and she gave me to eat. Then the woman says: "The serpent deceived me" and you created the serpent. So it's God's fault anyway. I say there's nothing we fear like freedom though we talk so much about it. Ultimately freedom is responsibility.

. . . the final goal of freedom, as well as its source, is communion that completely fulfill the human heart. In theology, it is called the beatific vision, that is a union where one sees completely because one loves completely.

---

6. The Christian idea of freedom can be called *three-dimensional*. It is related, as was said, *to God* as the ground of freedom. It finds its relations to God, however, in and through relationship to an *event* which is both historical and transhistorical, the redemptive event of Christ, which both liberates us from unfreedom and unites us to Christ. It is *societal*. It originates in a person situated at a particular point in the continuum of history, and comes to fruition by reaching out into that continuum of history. In the terminology of Teilhard de Chardin, there is a *radial* aspect (interiority, or consciousness), and a *tangential* aspect (complexification, the unification brought about among things and peoples through our freedom). The radial and tangential in Teilhard are reciprocal; they grow in unison. As we deepen the tangential (our freedom entering into history) there is also a process of greater interiorization.

This means, when I speak of a three-dimensional aspect of freedom (to God, to event and to society), that freedom is summed up by the term "self-commitment." In a sense, this is paradoxical. It's like Kierkegaard's three stages of freedom, of which you are aware: the esthetic, the ethical and the religious. Within the religious we look particularly to the Christian aspect. Let us look first at the esthetic stage where we seem to be so free. We can go anyplace and do anything we want. We're the dilettante, the esthete, i.e., we have no commitment. Kierkegaard maintains that that is not genuine freedom because there is no commitment. He then moves on to a stage of commitment, but it's a commitment to law. Kierkegaard here uses the image of marriage. That seems to be limiting, but it's really a stage of freeing because it's a commitment. He moves finally to the stage of religion, where he finds the greatest freedom in a commitment to Christ. Therefore, paradoxically, what seems to limit most becomes the most freeing.

7. In the seventh place, the more and the less of freedom should not be confused with the quantity of the objects to be chosen, the more or less of the number of things I have to choose from. As a matter of fact, our freedom does not depend on the quantity of objects but on the quality of the object. My freedom is not, for example, expressed by the fact that I have a hundred books in my library compared to your having one. This is especially true if the one you have is more liberating than my one hundred. Therefore, the degree of freedom among objects, the freedom that an object has to liberate, depends on its power to mediate either the spirit of man or the spirit of God. A great classic could liberate me, whereas a hundred trivial paperbacks could enslave me. In fact there is usually an inverse relationship between freedom and the quantity of objects. This is why Scripture speaks so often about money enslaving; not because money in itself is evil, but because money multiples our alternatives without giving us any depth. Objects are free to the extent that they mediate freedom. Therefore, the word of God is the most mediating.

8. In the eighth place, the final goal of freedom, as well as its source, is *communion* that completely fulfill the human heart. In theology, it is called the beatific vision, that is a union where one sees completely because one loves completely. Freedom in this life is the fragile, tentative, seeking, failing power to enter into that communion and to make it one's own but in a way that is conditioned by the uncertainties of time and our own frailties.

9. Freedom radically is the power to *relocate my whole center of gravity* by putting myself within the orbit of God's love. It is allowing oneself to be loved as the Father loves the Son, and responding as the Son does to the Father with complete trust. Hence, Christian freedom is related to hope and trust. It is not the

freedom to move mountains, but that mysterious power to move my whole world, in order to set it in tune with the will of the Father. Though we may not all be priests, in this sense we all have the power of transubstantiation, to move our being into the being of God. This is, of course, what the Eucharist symbolizes and effects.

10. Finally, how could we describe Christian freedom? It is the capacity of the human to respond through self-determination to that which fulfill him as a person. Revelation unfolds the nature of that self-determination, as well as the trajectory of that path which fulfill the human as a person. Put very simply the source, model, goal, inner law is Christ: "I am the way, the truth and life. No one comes to the Father except through me" (Jn 14. 6). Romano Guardini put this very well: "Because Christ enters into me, lives in me, I am finally able to be myself, the self which God has in mind when He created me and there awoke in me my power of initiative, decision and self-development" (*Grace, Freedom, Destiny*, p. 73). The mystery of freedom as self-realization drops even deeper into mystery when the self-realization is the acceptance of what seems to be a self-diminishment through humiliation, suffering and death. In other words, it is the mystery of how the deepest communion with God can convert even self-diminishment into freedom and liberation. What appears to be diminishment, Teilhard de Chardin in *The Divine Milieu* speaks of as the divinization of our passivities. How is this possible: to become greater by becoming less? We have a law of our being that comes to fulfillment when we're touched by grace.

III. SOME IMPLICATIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN NOTION OF FREEDOM IN RELATIONSHIP TO OUR CONTEMPORARY CULTURE

In this last section I'd like to talk about some of the implications of the Christian notion of freedom, and, perhaps try to tie in with some of the things we talked about last evening and this morning.

The rapid journey we have just made through the biblical and theological notion of Christian freedom will strike people differently depending on their own world views. For some it might sound like a trip with Alice through an imaginative wonderland. Others might find it "mystical," but hardly relevant to our modern world. Still others, like the pagan Celsus in the second century, will accuse Christians of unbounded arrogance for making such claims, when they are in fact (in his language) like maggots on a dunghill. Here we're talking about freedom and about sharing the freedom of Christ and yet we realize in our lives what a wounded, fragile, inconsistent freedom this is. It's because of this that the Church exists for sinners.

I would like to propose the thesis that the particular mission of the Church today and for the unforeseeable future is to provide the light and leaven of freedom for the world. At first sight, this may sound obvious or trite. But perhaps if we reflect, we shall find that it is neither trite nor obvious, nor in a liberation theology narrowly conceived.

We are living in what many call a post-Christian world. As Gilson said, however, what is post-Christian is really pre-Christian. Under different names we find ourselves back in the philosophies of fatalism skepticism, gnosticism, and of moral decadence. We have witnessed the secularization of the Christian notion of freedom. We have taken the fruit and cut down the tree.

Historically, the Christian notion of freedom entered into the world like a tiny seed blown up to a rocky ledge that found its way into a crevice in the rock. Humanly speaking it could not survive against the hostile elements. It was surrounded by fatalistic philosophies, skepticism, mystery religions, incipient gnosticism glorifying the divine spark in man, and a situation of moral decadence. But the tiny seed took root, grew, and eventually split the mountain into rocks that became the fertile soil in which our concept of freedom grew.

In many respects we find ourselves today in the same situation as Christianity in its beginnings. It is true, of course, that our consciousness of man's dignity, of justice, human rights, etc., has been raised over the past 1900 years. On the other hand, there has been a regression to positions which existed when Christianity first came on the scene. We are living in what many call a post-Christian world. As Gilson said, however, what is post-Christian is really pre-Christian. Under different names we find ourselves back in the philosophies of fatalism skepticism, gnosticism, and of moral decadence. We have witnessed the secularization of the Christian notion of freedom. We have taken the fruit and cut down the tree. As I see it, this is the greatest diabolical *tour de force* that has been witnessed in history.

There are differences, of course, between our present situation in the 20th century and that of the 19th. The complexities of the interlinking of the various factors that govern our existence have grown enormously. As Teilhard de Chardin described it: we are the cards,

the stakes, and the players. One factor however which is significantly present in the modern world is the Promethean instinct that has stolen, not fire from the gods, but *techne*, skill, the source of technology, and given man a great sense of power. That was not present in the Roman or Greek world into which Christianity came. Rather, there was a sense of despair, of powerlessness. Christianity could respond to this powerlessness, but today we have a substitute sense of power, even though this also has been shaken very much in the past five or six years. Even though a person may not have a philosophy of determinism, nonetheless, in our lives, there is an operational deterministic attitude. Someone this morning adverted to Goethe's poem, *The Sorcerer's Apprentice*: we have awakened what was supposed to be our servant, and it has become our master. We have become reabsorbed into the rhythms of nature. In the experience of Israel, there was, first of all, an experience of distinction. The God of Israel was not a nature god. The people of Israel were not simply bound into the rhythms of nature. We have once again become reabsorbed into the rhythms of nature, which is something Nietzsche went back to deliberately in his philosophy, i.e., to the cyclic notion of history. Strangely enough, even with the sense of power, there is a prevailing sense of determinism among many scientists. Even though this prevailing tone has been challenged by such men as Rollo May and Victor Frankl the attitude still prevails.

The Gospels were written to create the difference between the apocryphal or mythical gospels and the Christ of the Christian experience. How could they explain the God of Christianity in a polytheistic world? They chose again myth. They preached a God of being, not the mythical gods.

One of the most obvious examples of the secularization of the Christian notion of freedom is seen in the field of jurisprudence in this country. It is ironical that we are celebrating the bicentennial of what no longer exists. Only the initiates realize that the concept of freedom upon which the country was founded is no longer accepted by the experts. The philosophy of John Locke upon which Jefferson drew for the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution founded the freedom on the law of God as it is in the natural law. This is a concept which most authorities of jurisprudence would no longer accept. It is a "religious" concept, and law is based on what is rationally acceptable to the greatest number. Therefore, when we speak about freedom as the power of self-determination and self-commitment to that which fulfill the inner law of our being, we are asked what that law is. Is there such a law? If so, what is it?

Let me mention myth here. Christianity is basically anti-mythical. By myth I mean an imaginative construct which can be expressed on four levels. First, it can be an imaginative construct expressed as a search for meaning. Thus Eliade speaks of myth as the philosophy of the primitive. It involves such questions as: how did death come into the world? What's the origin of the world? That kind of myth is the product of the search for meaning. Another type of myth is the product of fantasy and exists for entertainment. A third type is an expression of the beautiful in poetry. The fourth type is a product of our fear of freedom. That type of myth is illusion which serves as a buffer between us and reality.

When Christianity entered into the world it was anti-mythical. When Paul preached to the Athenians, they listened to him attentively until he came to the resurrection. Had he spoken about the mythical idea of resurrection, there would have been no problem because that notion belonged to their mystery religion. But he spoke about an historical person, existing at an historical time, who died and who has been brought back to life and who will judge the living and the dead. That is anti-mythical.

The Gospels were written to create the difference between the apocryphal or mythical gospels and the Christ of the Christian experience. How could they explain the God of Christianity in a polytheistic world? They chose again myth. They preached a God of being, not the mythical gods. Tertullian said that Christ declared Himself to be truth, not custom. This morning the question of truth arose. So often we're afraid of truth because were afraid of freedom. The words "freedom" and "truth" are abused in terms of tolerance. That is why one is content to speak out of his tradition and another out of another. I'd much rather have someone tell me: "I disagree with you. I think you're wrong." I have a great respect for Anthony Blum, the Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church in exile in London. There was a question whether Roman Catholics in the Ukraine and elsewhere could receive communion from Russian Orthodox priests. In a sermon he allowed the practice but went on to say that the Russian Orthodox Church is the only true Church of Christ and that the Roman Catholic Church is in error. I would personally rather hear that than "I will speak out of my tradition and you speak out of yours," if the speaker is truly convinced that there is a truth that has to be manifested.

In the history of Christianity, the Christian community has often come to forks in the road. The choice has

been between alternatives which were irreconcilable, whether, for example, Jesus was God and man, or merely a creature. These alternatives were not between irreconcilable myths, but between irreconcilable judgments. Such doctrinal declarations characterized all of the ecumenical councils of the Church. At those forks in the rood — Christianity throughout history has come to them — which do you choose? This is the question of authority to declare the inner law of our being. As a Roman Catholic, in my own act of faith, I feel that that power has been sacramentalized in the Church, particularly in those who succeed the Apostles, especially in the successor to Peter. Not only has word and redemptive event been sacramentalized, but also the prophetic power of Christ has been sacramentalized. Had we no way to tell which fork in the road to take, we would be in worse condition than in Old Testament times. I see this prophetic power of Christ in the Church.

In the past these forks in the road were doctrinal: whether Christ is God, or simply human, and so forth. The forks in the road now are moral. We have to do now with the development of what it means to be a human person. Or, if you wish, we are facing the distortion of what it means to be human. Who will tell us what fork to take? The sociologist? The Psychologist? The political scientist? The lawyer? The theologian? For me, I know that we are not left orphans. Someday, perhaps, the seeds of Christian freedom will again split the rock, although the odds against it today are as heavy as they were two thousand years ago. Yet I believe with all my heart that the words of the Lord Jesus, "I shall be with you until the end of history" are simply another way of saying that His power to liberate will be here until He comes again.

CONSUMPTION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Dr. Gregory W. Pouch

[*Doctor Gregory Pouch is a geologist currently residing in Normal, Illinois. Before his present job he was employed by the Kansas Geological Survey. His special interests include evolution, resources and geologically based research and development.*]

Concern over "consumption" and eventual exhaustion of non-renewable "natural resources" has become accepted dogma in much of Western culture, justifying opposition to development, calls for a return to a "simple" life, and an imperative for "sustainable" development. The argument is that 1) we are consuming this material (iron, copper, coal, water, oil...) at some rate (usually with potentially-infinite exponential growth thrown into the argument); 2) the supply of this material is finite and is the present reserve; 3) we will therefore run out of this material in the year (Today's date + 15 to 30 years, depending on the material in question, and occasionally much more). This argument was put forth as an economic argument by Malthus in 1798 (concerning crops) and is widely embraced today. It was wrong in 1798 and continues — despite its popularity and apparently self-evident nature — to be wrong. The classic Malthusian viewpoint is that there is a fixed supply of material being consumed and that this amount imposes an absolute limit to growth.

This belief is underpinned by several misconceptions about natural resources and reserves. Much of the problem stems from confusing the terms *resource, reserve* and *supply*. *Supply* of a material is the amount on/in the Earth. *Reserves* refers to the amount producible under present economic condition in current facilities. *Resources* is the amount that has been concentrated enough to attract attention and includes not only reserves but also more speculative categories. *Supply estimation* is based on the composition of meteorites or average concentration in various types of rocks. *Resource estimation* is a remarkably speculative but enjoyable endeavor, based on knowledge of the overall distribution of geological provinces and current understanding of what kinds and amounts of deposits they are likely to contain. *Reserve estimates* are based on economic analyses of particular mines or well-fields and include only that material which can be extracted at a profit under present economic conditions (ore). Reserves can be estimated quite accurately, supply and resource are much more speculative.

As an example of the above definitions, consider iron. The supply of iron includes iron in iron ores, iron mineralization (unusually high or convenient concentrations of iron), and iron disseminated in "ordinary" rocks, such as the iron oxides coating sand grains. Iron *resources* includes iron mineralization and iron

ore: rocks chemically indistinguishable from ore that are unprofitable to mine are in this category — including rock that would be mineable were the price higher, rock that would be mineable if there were better transportation available, and rock that could be mined if labor, equipment, or fuel costs were lower or zoning or tax laws were different — as well as rocks that have lower concentrations of iron or are more difficult to extract. *Reserves* includes only rock in operating mines that can be mined at a profit today: a rock that is a reserve one day can become a resource the next and vice versa. Iron mines do not close because there is no ferruginous (iron-bearing) rock left; they close because the owners would (or did) lose money extracting it.

A financial analogy would be that reserves are cash on hand; resources are cash, bank accounts, and accounts receivable; supply is total potential income. Budgeting that limits all future purchases to those that can be met with cash on hand is foolish; social planning that limits development to that which can be accomplished with reserves on hand is foolish as well.

There are several other points to be made on the issue of *consumption* of *natural* resources. First, "natural resources" are produced by humans to fulfill the needs and wants of other humans at a profit. We do not get iron from some pile of iron ingots or rolls, but rather from finding, digging, crushing and chemically-treating rocks. Natural resources are not natural: they involve much human effort, by geologists, miners, mine engineers and others. Natural resources are resources only because of the demand and because they can be produced at a profit. Second, most materials are not consumed but transformed. To use the iron example, iron ore is converted from an oxidized to a metallic state in blast furnaces. At the end of the day, there is still as much iron and oxygen as there was at the beginning, but there is some in different forms. Only the fuels can properly be said to be consumed, other materials can be recycled, now or later, when conditions warrant it. When the economic conditions are right for a junk car to be melted to produce iron, it will probably be recycled. This is why gold and silver have been recycled for thousands of years, but wood generally has not been recycled.

The "time to exhaustion" computed using the above line of reasoning tends to produce remarkably stable numbers. For most of this century, we have been "about to run out of oil" in about 15 years. For copper, this number has usually been 20 or 30 years. The cause is, as you probably suspect by now, economic. Exploring for a material costs money today. Due to the time required to develop a mine or an oil field, the profits will not be available until some time in the future, if the enterprise is ever profitable. Mineral exploration will be funded only if the expected return is as high or higher than competing investment opportunities (except for subsidized projects undertaken for security reasons). As the reserves and near-reserves of a material become larger, further exploration for the material becomes less attractive economically.

We have always been using materials (consuming natural resources?) to make our lives better and will until the end of time. This has been true since the Paleolithic Age, when there was not an inexhaustible reserve of flint (i.e., continued expansion of tool making would exhaust the available supply of flint), to today, when there are not inexhaustible reserves of metals, water, land or energy. If you are still not convinced that Malthus was wrong, ask yourself, what have we actually run out of.

There are physical limits to our growth, but those involve the mass of the earth and stars. The limits to worry about, because they are near and we can and must do something about them, are ourselves, our imagination, and our choices.

It is impossible to avoid using materials: the question is how and for what purposes. Will we use them wisely, or will we turn our backs on them and, in doing so, turn our backs on future generations? Should we consign people to a poverty they wish to avoid in order to preserve materials? People first, or planets first? Should we avoid using earth resources for the sake of the earth, or should we make these decisions based on the effect on humans?

KYOTO AND POPULATION CONTROL

Robert Brungs, S.J.

In the 1995 Proceedings on *Population Issues: Cairo, Copenhagen, Beijing*, Dr. Alene Gelbard, one of the essayists for this meeting, made the following remarks (page 104):

> The biggest diversity within the population com-

> munity is between the population control people and those who have done a lot of development assistance. Many here seem to think that everyone in the population community shares the opinion that we have to *control* population growth and to constantly keep in mind the numbers of people on a macro level — on both the international and national levels. People seem to think that all of us want to put resources into programs that will bring down that growth in women's fertility. . . .
>
> Population stabilization, development and quality of life together are the goal of everyone in the population community. We did agree among ourselves on the means of achieving that goal. . . . The current administration (Clinton administration) said it was very concerned about this issue, largely because of its concern about the environment, about the relation between population and environment. . . .

I personally think that the situation may not be quite so equitable and even-handed as Dr. Gelbard suggested. While not disputing what Dr. Gelbard said about the population community, it seems that in the last year or so the population *control* wing has made significant inroads. The population *control* people have harnessed their wagon to the ongoing campaign against global warming. No matter what we think about global warming — whether or not it is occurring or whether or not it is or will be as bad as forecast — we must be cognizant of some things.

First, the opponents of the Kyoto treaty have predicted steeply rising costs both for energy and the products produced by manufacturing. Allowing for exaggeration and admitting that we may have to "force" energy saving manufacturing, it can be said that energy will cost more and so too with will the products manufactured for consumption. As always, the large corporations will not suffer. They will simply raise their prices. The people who rely on their products will pay the freight or do without. The small manufacturers may be put out of business. Anyway, the poor will suffer, the rich may hardly even notice the increase in prices and inflation.

But that is not the only result of the Kyoto treaty — maybe not even the greatest one. Certainly, Vice President Gore speaks for the administration on matters of environment and population. What is he saying these days?

At Kyoto, Vice President Gore urged more flexibility from the U.S. delegation on the "global climate treaty." In an article in *Insight* (December 29, 1997), Donald Hodel, former Secretary of Energy and of the Interior under Reagan, remarks that the global climate treaty is better viewed as an energy-suppression treaty. I don't intend to develop the debate on whether we have a global-warming situation or we do not. This is not particularly the forum for such a debate.

In *The Population Explosion* (1990) Paul Ehrlich redeveloped the arguments in his 1968 book, *The Population Bomb*. His solutions to the problem are many: among them are such proposals as making government larger, expanding regulations, increasing foreign aid, encouraging abortion, restricting family choice, doubling the price of gasoline, and so on. Obviously population *control* is a paramount objective for the Ehrlichs. The quotation most often associated with "the Ehrlich crowd" is: "The cancer of population growth must be cut out or we will breed ourselves into oblivion."

Vice President Gore wrote for a book-jacket blurb for *The Population Explosion*: "The time for action is due, and past due. The Ehrlichs have written the prescription. . . ." It might be well to read the prescriptions that the Ehrlichs suggest (those listed above and others).

Hodel writes:

> At a White House briefing for television weather forecasters Gore, asserting that climate change was a sympton of population growth, suggested that people in poor nations could reduce emission by having fewer children. He cavalierly proposed reducing world population growth by 2 billion to 5 billion human beings during the next two decades. And calling for "the empowerment of women to participate in decisions about childbearing," he implied that more abortions would help save the Earth.
>
> The administration has yet to explain how its proposed program of tradable emissions permits would work, but Gore's "family-planning" approach to emissions control suggests interesting possibilities. Since each person, through consumptive activities, generates a certain tonnage of carbon dioxide each year, the United Nations could establish equivalency ratios for all "emissions sources," including individual human beings. Many critics of the climate treaty complain that it leaves China and other developing countries off the hook. But by Gore's logic, might not China already be in compliance? Hasn't China amassed vast stores of emissions credits through forced sterilization, coerced

> abortions and the liquidation of millions of "class enemies?" Gore's gaffe at the weather briefing — his careless admission that the climate treaty and population control are two sides of the same agenda — exposes the hopelessly Malthusean mind-set of modern liberalism.

The only point I want to make here is the caution that there is a "natural" connection that could be made between lessening the green-house gases and population control. It's something that we have to keep in mind. It would seem that Dr. Gelbard's statement could lead to an overly-sanguine feeling about population.

Certainly, the Kyoto treaty can be seen as an energy-suppression treaty. Growth and development practices have relied on an increasing availability of reasonably cheap energy. That could all be changed now.

The Jewish and Christian God is not a "nature god" and our faith is not subject merely to the rhythms of natural forces. It seems to me that we are both transcendent and immanent. In some ways we can affect the course of nature and our ability to do so is seemingly increasing. We are not merely subject to planetary forces. We must live within them; we cannot annul them; we can indeed also affect them. We are creatures who have come to serve God in freedom and it really does us no good to resubmit ourselves to slavery to "the gods of the air," as St. Paul says. Nor should we submit ourselves to the doomsayers who promote population control in the guise of ecological concern. They may be deeply concerned by such things as global warming (if it exists), the ozone hole (if it is not natural), resource exhaustion and so on. The answer to those concerns is not killing people, within or without the womb.

I remain an optimist. God cannot be so parsimonious that he does not provide each and everyone of us with the things we need to come to him. We humans can mess up the distribution part, we cannot alter the fact of his generous love.

NORRIS AWARD FOR THE TEACHING OF CHEMISTRY

Sister Mary Virginia Orna, OSU, professor of chemistry at the College of New Rochelle, received the 1996 James Flack Norris Award for Outstanding Achievement in the Teaching of Chemistry. The award honors one of the nation's leading chemical educators. It was bestowed on Sister Mary Virginia Orna on 14 November 1996 at Merrimack College, North Andover, Mass. Sister Mary Virginia's contributions to education include teaching, lecturing, writing and editing. Her research on archaeological chemistry and color, in chemistry has won her a Fulbright lectureship in Israel; she has published six books and over six dozen articles in such journals as *Analytical Chemistry, the Journal of Chemical Education, Studies in Conservation,* and the *Journal of Biological Chemistry.* She is active in the American Chemical Society, holding a variety of offices and committee positions. At the awards ceremony she presented an address, "Doing Chemistry at the Art-Archaeology Interface." In the picture, Sr. Mary Virginia Orna, OSU (left) and Sr. Angelice Seibert, OSU make a presentation at the ITEST 1989 Workshop on *Science and Technology Education in Church-Related Colleges and Universities.*

In the Summer, 1997 issue of *Chemical Heritage* there is an excerpt from the talk given by Mrs. Marie Sherman on the occasion of her accepting the Chemical Manufacturers Association Responsible Care Catalyst Award, 1996 entitled "Thrity Years of Teaching High School Chemistry to Young Women." We congratulate both Sr. Mary Virginia and Marie Sherman.

NEW MEMBERS

BOLAND, Most Rev. J. Kevin; 601 E. Liberty Street, Savannah; Georgia, 31401-5196, U.S.A.; Bishop; Diocese of Savannah; ✆ (912)-238-2320; FAX (912)-238-2335; E-MAIL boland@omet.net.

JESUIT-KRAUSS MCCORMICK MEMORIAL LIB., Serials-C; 1100 East 55th Street, Chicago; Illinois, 60615-5112, U.S.A.; Library; Krauss Memorial Library.

SCHULTE, Most Rev. Francis B.; 7887 Walmsley Avenue, New Orleans; Louisiana, 70125, U.S.A.; Archbishop; Archdiocese of New Orleans; ✆ (504)-861-6205; FAX (504)-866-2906; E-MAIL abpno@archdiocese-no.org.

SEVERINO PETERS, SJ, Theodoro Paulo; Rua Vergueiro, 165, Liberdade, São Paulo; São Paulo, CEP 01504-001, Brazil; Priest; Fundacão de Ciencias Aplicadas; ✆ 055-011-279-1855; FAX 055-011-279-7996.

ZINSMEISTER, Dr. Richard J.; 4015 S.R. 133, Batavia; Ohio, 45103, U.S.A.; Regional Director of Human & Spiritual Development; Mercy Regional Health System; ✆ (513)-724-7553; FAX (513)-732-8537.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

CURRIE, SJ, Fr. Charles L.; 1726 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Washington; D.C., 20009, U.S.A.; Education; Association of Jesuit Colleges & Universities, ACJU; Science/theology, environment; (202)-862-9893; FAX (202)-862-8523; E-MAIL ccurrie@ajcunet.edu.

HAAS, Dr. John M.; 159 Washington Street, Boston; Massachusetts, 02135, U.S.A.; Administrator; Pope John XXIII Medical Ethics Center; (617)-848-6965; E-MAIL jhaas@pjcenter.org.

O'BOYLE, Edward J.; 1217 Dean Chapel Road, West Monroe; Louisiana, 71291, U.S.A.; Economist; Mayo Research Institute; Social economics; (318)-396-5719; E-MAIL Oboyle@linknet.net.

O'DONNELL, CSP, Fr. Robert J.; 86-11 Midland Parkway, Jamaica Estates; New York, 11432-3041, U.S.A.; Priest/Vice Pres.; Paulist Fathers; Cosmology, evolution, mind, technology; (718)-291-5995; FAX (718)-291-6646; E-MAIL rjodcsp@aol.com.

SHARPE, Kevin; 171B Rumford Street, Concord; New Hampshire, 03301, U.S.A.; Editor; Science & Spirit Newsletter; (603)-226-3328; FAX (603)-229-9053; E-MAIL ksharpe@science-spirit.com.

TARLTON LAW LIBRARY-U of Texas, 727 E. Dean Keeton Street, Austin; Texas, 78705, U.S.A.; Jamail Center for Legal Research; (512)-471-7726.

WOLBERT, Jerome J.; 536 S. Forest Avenue, Ann Arbor; Michigan, 48104, U.S.A.; Professor of Mathematics; University of Michigan; Mathematics, philosophy of science, linguistics; E-MAIL wolbert@member.ams.org.

E-MAIL CHANGE, ETC

ABELL, Benjamin	PHONE: (314)-977-3335; FAX: (314)-977-3117.
BECK, Hubert	E-MAIL hujubeck@kdi.com
BLECK, Eugene E.	PHONE: (650)-348-7237
BROGLE, Robert	E-MAIL robert.brogle@aerojet.com
BRUECKEN, Father Albert	E-MAIL albert@msc.net
BUC, Bernard J.	E-MAIL bjas@juno.com
BURKE, Mary V.	E-MAIL mvburke@nsf.gov
BYERS, David	E-MAIL dbyers@nccbuscc.org
CONNELL, CSJ, Rosemary	E-MAIL srccsj@aol.com
DEHNER, OSB, Eugene	E-MAIL eugene@benedictine.edu
DOSER, FSE, Sr. Sarah	E-MAIL fsesilverspring@worldnet.att.net
DUMAINE, Most Rev. Pierre	E-MAIL DuMaine@dsj.org

DURBIN, Jr, William	E-MAIL wdurbin@iupui.edu
DUVEEN, Anneta	E-MAIL duveen@cyburbsn.com
FINUCANE, Daniel	E-MAIL djfinuc@aol.com
FITZGERALD, SJ, Kevin	E-MAIL Kfitzge@luc.edu
HANISKO, John Cyril	PHONE: (248)-354-2910 (w); 357-5786 (h)
HOUCK, Most Rev. William	E-MAIL wrhouck.org@juno.com
JAFFE, Joel David	PHONE: (757)-221-4160
LA VALLEE, Ron	E-MAIL rlavalle@phnx.uswest.net
LAWRENCE, Edwin	E-MAIL elawren@siue.edu
MARTIN PATINO, José M.	E-MAIL jmpatino@fund-encuentro.org
MARTINO, Rocco	PHONE: (610)-687-1933
MC LEOD, SJ, Frederick	E-MAIL mcleodfg@slu.edu
MOONEY, Jr, William	FAX: (310)-324-0635
MURPHY, Michael G.	E-MAIL mgmurf@computype.com
PROVENZANO, Joe	E-MAIL joseph.p.provenzano@jpl.nasa.gov
SHEAHEN, Thomas	E-MAIL Thomas.P.Sheahen@cpmx.saic.com
SMULDERS, CFMM, Anthony	E-MAIL asmulder@popmail.lmu.edu
SOLLEE, Neyle	E-MAIL ansollee@fone.net
SPORMAN, Robert	E-MAIL rsporman@hotmail.com
STREETER, OP, Carla Mae	E-MAIL streeter@slu.edu
WEST, Charles	E-MAIL ccwrcw@Bellatlantic.net
ZETLMEISL, Michael	PHONE: (314)-863-8764; E-MAIL mzetlmeisl@plit.com

IN MEMORIAM

Professor Russell Barta
Sr. Margaret Mary Jarvis, FSM

We also ask your prayers for ITEST members who are ill. May they feel the restoring hand of the Lord.

ITEST
221 North Grand Blvd.
St. Louis, Mo. 63103

Non Profit Org.
U.S.Postage
PAID
St. Louis, Mo
Permit No. 5206