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Among the many joys and blessings of my priesthood has been the opportunity to teach, although "to teach" doesn’t completely describe what my role has been in the classroom. I think "to form" best describes what I, and my brothers in Holy Cross, do with minds and hearts of all ages.

The difference is significant. Presenting facts, concepts and theories and helping others understand them falls into the realm of intellectual instruction. Doing the same through the lens of faith, which includes instilling values consistent with the Gospel and nurturing not just the intellect but the heart as well, I would describe as formation.

It’s this definition, this distinction, that Blessed Basil Moreau gave the Congregation of Holy Cross. It is our charism.

As part of our heritage in education, there is no subject we will not teach that our students need to know. Time, place and circumstances help to define those subjects, which range from basic vocational training in our mission schools to systematic theology in any of our four colleges and universities. A brief sampling of the teaching expertise of members of Holy Cross includes theology, business administration, mathematics, spirituality, history, political science, art, architecture, law and science.

Regardless of the subject, the goal is the same: the formation of hearts and minds, or as Blessed Moreau penned, "While we prepare useful citizens for society, we shall likewise do our utmost to prepare citizens for heaven." (Circular Letter 36, 1846)

The focus of this issue of "Pillars" is the dialogue between faith and science and I’m drawing upon a number of our Holy Cross teaching experts to lend their wisdom and bring clarity to the many voices contributing to the conversation. These men are well versed in the theoretical and practical details of faith and science; I’m confident their essays will be informative. But more than informative, I think you’ll find them formative.

Rev. Thomas Hosinski, C.S.C., introduces the theme by providing an overview of the discussion on science and the Catholic faith. Addressing specific aspects of science and the dilemmas it can produce are Rev. Thomas Gartiepy, C.S.C., and Rev. John Young, C.S.C., each active in the field of medicine and medical research. Rev. Jim Fenstermaker, C.S.C., presents a thoughtful essay on the Catholic Church’s position on end-of-life issues. We also reached out to Dr. John Cavadini, a theologian and faculty member at the University of Notre Dame, who contributed an excellent essay on the "New Atheists."

You’ll also find in this issue a commentary on Pope Francis’ first encyclical, "Lumen Fidei," written by Notre Dame Professor Emeritus Rev. Nicholas Ayo, C.S.C.

The vision and inspiration of Blessed Basil Moreau continue to exist in each member of Holy Cross and we are indeed blessed by the diversity and talents of our members. Equally, we are blessed with the opportunity to share, in the educational tradition of Holy Cross, this depth of wisdom and knowledge with you.

May God bless you and your families and May God bless and guide the Congregation of Holy Cross.
Where Faith and Science Meet
by Rev. Thomas E. Hosinski, C.S.C.

In 1616, the Roman Catholic Church condemned the Copernican astronomical system and in 1633 it subjected Galileo, one of the foremost supporters of that system, to a heresy trial. Because this is widely known, many people assume that the Church and science are opposed to each other and are enemies. But in fact, the Church has no fundamental problem with science itself. To be sure, Galileo’s trial was an unfortunate mistake. The reasons for Galileo’s difficulties with the Church are complex and involved a great deal of ecclesiastical and secular politics. In 1992, after receiving the report of a specially appointed Commission to reexamine the Galileo trial, Pope John Paul II acknowledged that the Galileo heresy trial was a mistake and in 2000 he issued a formal apology for it. The Roman Catholic Church has been involved with and supported the development of science since the 13th century. Roman Catholics were deeply involved in the transition from Aristotelian philosophy to modern empirical science from the 16th century on and Roman Catholics today are making important contributions to the development of contemporary science. The Church has consistently held that so long as it is understood properly, there is no conflict between our religious faith and the scientific theory of evolution. Pope Pius XII, in his encyclical “Humani Generis” (1950), taught that Catholics could accept the theory of evolution as accounting for the origin of the body, but must hold that God infuses the soul into each individual. In 1996, Pope John Paul II, in his “Message to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences concern- ing the Relationship between Revelation and the Theories of Evolution,” reaffirmed that teaching saying: “If the human body takes its origin from pre-existent living matter, the spiritual soul is immediately created by God” (Section 5).

Atheists and scientific naturalists argue that empirical science gives us an exhaustive explanation of reality. They leave no room for religious assertions. But it is fairly easy to show that there are several possible levels of understanding and explanation and that no one way of understanding exhausts all truth. Consider this example: A group of us walk into someone’s kitchen and one of us asks why a kettle of water is boiling on the stove. A scientist among us might point out that the water is changing from a liquid to a gaseous state. Another person might say, “the kettle is boiling because I want a cup of tea.” But another person might say, “the kettle is boiling because I want a cup of tea.”

But it is fairly easy to show that there are several possible levels of understanding and explanation and that no one way of understanding exhausts all truth. Consider this example: A group of us walk into someone’s kitchen and one of us asks why a kettle of water is boiling on the stove. A scientist among us might point out that the water is changing from a liquid to a gaseous state. Another person might say, “the kettle is boiling because I want a cup of tea.” But another person might say, “the kettle is boiling because I want a cup of tea.”
on the stove in the first place. Each explanation is independent of the other and we might be satisfied with either at a given time. But we should notice that neither explanation can substitute for the other. If we accept both explanations, however, we achieve a more complete understanding of why the kettle is boiling.

Another example shows that there are many possible levels of analysis, understanding and explanation. Consider a printed page in a book. If we are asked to explain the page completely, we soon see how many different sorts of analysis and explanation are necessarily involved. First there is physics, chemistry and technology involved in the production of the paper and ink and the understanding of how ink bonds with paper. But from this level of analysis and explanation we cannot understand or predict what kinds of marks are made on the page or what the page means. On another level of analysis and explanation, we must recognize a particular written alphabetical system associated with a particular group of Western languages. But this alone is not enough to decipher the page. We must recognize what specific language is being used, we must recognize specific words and their meaning and we must know the rules of syntax and grammar for this specific language before we can understand the meaning of the sentences on the page. None of this can be predicted from knowledge of the alphabet alone and certainly not from the laws of physics and chemistry that tell us how ink bonds to paper. Nor can knowledge of the rules of grammar tell us what we will find on the page. Grammar cannot predict what unique sentences might be constructed by the author. So we must examine each sentence in relation to the sentences that come before and after the one we are examining and that is yet another level of analysis and understanding. Eventually we must analyze the entire book to understand why the author wrote it and what meaning it has and none of this can be understood by restricting ourselves to the lowest levels of analysis.

In a similar way, all our ways of knowing are limited, partial and attend to only some aspects of reality, ignoring others. This means that both science and religion – as well as poetry, art, literature and other modes of human reflection – can be pointing us to truth by examining our experience of reality at different levels, focusing on different aspects of reality and ignoring others. But we must not forget that both science and religion are limited; neither can give us an exhaustive understanding of all reality. To think that science alone tells us what is true and gives us a complete understanding of all things is simply mistaken.

Science explains how things happen and how this wondrous universe works. Religion tries to help us grasp the meaning and purpose of our existence and of the whole of creation. Neither can substitute for the other, but neither are they in competition with each other. They occupy different explanatory niches or seek to explain at different levels. They tend to come into contact over questions of origins of the beginning of the universe or the origin of life or the origin of humans. If people forget that religion and science are explaining at different levels, they fall into the trap of thinking that only one can be correct. But if we approach our search for understanding and truth with intellectual humility – recognizing that all ways of knowing are limited – then by accepting both what science and what our faith teach us, we can gain a deeper and richer understanding of our lives and this amazing universe that is our home.

There is a very interesting dialogue between religion and science going on today, unlike any previous discussions since the 17th century. There are several centers throughout the world devoted to studying the relation between science and religion. There is a new openness to religion on the part of some scientists and many scientists, theologians, philosophers and other scholars in the humanities meet in professional conferences to advance the dialogue. We are living in a time when there is much promise of future cooperation between science and religion in contributing to a deeper and more nuanced vision of reality.

But part of the current dialogue – usually the part reported on in the popular news media – involves a dispute between those who advocate for a position called intelligent design and those who oppose it. The intelligent design movement is not merely a new version of the old creationist movement, which is based in religious commitment to biblical literalism (a literal interpretation of the Bible, especially the first several chapters of Genesis). The ID movement, which takes a slightly different form in each of its proponents, is much more sophisticated than creationism and argues that standard Darwinian Theory cannot account for the origin or the complexity of life. It argues that this complexity resembles very strongly an intelligent design of mechanisms, except that it is much more complex than anything ever designed by humans. This, ID holds, implies that there must be a designer.

Some Catholics have been drawn to the intelligent design movement because it seems to support religious belief by implying that the world cannot be explained without reference to God. But the ID argument insists that it is a scientific hypothesis or theory. Instead of recognizing that there are different explanatory levels focusing on different aspects of reality, it seems to assume that there is only one explanatory level and that it must compete with standard science for that level. The ID movement should not be identified as consonant with the Catholic position on evolution. The Church’s interest is not in attacking standard science as mistaken. Rather, the Church’s interest is in affirming the truth of divine causation. The doctrines of monotheism and creation express this truth: All things come from the generosity of the Divine love.
**Seeking Ethical and Effective Research**

_by Rev. Thomas P. Gariepy, C.S.C._

You’ve probably heard the news reports about medical breakthroughs based on stem cell research; they’re hard to miss. A scientist in Great Britain, for example, announced in July 2013 that he had cultured photoreceptor cells from mouse embryonic stem cells. When these photoreceptor cells were inserted into the eyes of blind adult mice, they formed functioning connections with the correct nerve cells. It will be years before this procedure could be done on humans with cells made from human stem cells, but if it is successful, sight could be restored, for example, to diabetics or to those with macular degeneration. It appears as a sign of a medical messianic age when the blind will see.

Many of the news stories announcing such breakthroughs in stem cell research often note the Catholic Church’s disapproval of this work. This opposition leaves even many of the faithful wondering why the Church seemingly stands in the way of such promising and good work. Neither the research and its promises, nor the Church’s position, are as simple as often portrayed.

**Stem Cell Origins**

For the sake of simplicity, assume that only two types of cells comprise our bodies. Non-stem cells, or differentiated cells, which are found in tissues or organs, carry out specific vital functions; examples are heart cells, liver cells or nerve cells. Whenever these cells undergo cell division, each daughter cell has the same function as the parent cell.

These cells with their distinct functions arise from stem cells. These cells are undifferentiated in that they have no specific function as do the cells mentioned above. When stem cells divide, one daughter cell remains a stem cell. Depending on the cell’s environment, the other daughter cell becomes a specific differentiated cell, as will all of its daughter cells after cell division. Each time a stem cell divides, this pattern occurs. One cell remains a stem cell. The other cell becomes a differentiated cell and eventually all of the cells needed for the organism to live are formed.

In the embryo, stem cells whose daughter cells can possibly become any differentiated cell are found only in the earliest developmental stages – usually around the first 14 days after conception. If these cells are removed from an embryo and sustained by artificial means (in vitro culture), they will divide indefinitely. Each cell will produce one stem cell and one undifferentiated cell that can be manipulated to become almost any desired cell.

Stem cells generated from an embryo are called “embryonic stem cells.” The embryos are obtained from in vitro fertilization clinics, where several eggs are harvested for fertilization, but not all are used. IVF clinics, however, are not the only resource for obtaining cultures for the generation of stem cells. Stem cells also can be cultivated from blood in the umbilical cord or from bone marrow.

The re-sulting cells are popularly called “adult stem cells.” Adult stem cells may not always be as able to generate the variety of differentiated cells as embryonic stem cells, but in the past few years, scientists have been able to generate a variety of tissues from them. The Church objects to in vitro fertilization because it considers the result of the union of any egg and sperm that forms a conceptus – no matter the sources – to form a human individual worthy of protection. Furthermore, because the creation of embryonic stem cells necessitates the destruction of an embryo, the Church will not accept this research or the results that flow from it.

The ability of embryonic or adult stem cells grown in vitro continuously to replenish their own supply and to produce differentiated cells makes them popular with developmental biologists who use them to study the myriad steps in embryonic and fetal development. These two properties make them popular, too, with scientists who want to apply these properties to solving medical issues.

**Medical aspirations**

All of us seek to avoid the disabilities that follow from chronic illnesses or to prolong our lives in good health. These aspirations drive the technological and regenerative medical research based on stem cell research. Can stem cells provide enough healthy cells to replace damaged or absent cells and thereby restore tissue function and health? In theory, yes; in practice, maybe not, or not as easily as the theory promises.

If adult stem cells or cells derived from them are somehow delivered to the tissues needing repair or replacement, the hope is that the host organism will accept them and the damaged tissues will be repaired or missing ones replaced. Experimental evidence using mostly mouse stem cells suggests that this approach could work, but there are severe obstacles between what is done with mice and the creation of therapeutic devices or medicines for humans. The experiments require strict protocols and they are sometimes hard to repeat. Stem cells in host animals occasionally cause cancers or tumors. If these stem cells are adult stem cells, the Church has no moral objection to this research. In fact, the Church has financially supported organizations that promote adult stem cell research. The biggest hurdle to applying this research to humans is ethical and governed by the Food and Drug Administration. The FDA must determine if the proposed stem cell-based therapy is better than current treatments. In some cases, such as with Parkinson’s Disease, they do not seem to be. The FDA must also weigh the risks of a procedure against its possible gains; so far, risks far outweigh gains.

**Issues of justice**

As we have seen, the Church does not forbid all research on or application of stem cell research and the Church is not the only agency raising ethical concerns. Regenerative medicine, however, raises other issues. The development, testing, regulatory oversight and marketing of these potential therapies will be expensive. The number of patients who could benefit is small compared to patients with other diseases. In this the best way to spend what will be a massive investment of public funds? Should monies, for example, be invested in water sanitation programs that could drastically reduce child mortality in low- and middle-income countries – and for a much lower cost than stem cell therapy? The medical breakthroughs reported so often in the press are years—possibly decades—away from realization. So great are the insights into development and growth that basic stem cell research now gives to scientists, it will continue to enjoy private and public support. While the Church protects life from its very beginning and refuses to countenance embryonic stem cell research, it stands as a partner with those who would further adult stem cell research.

Rev. Thomas P. Gariepy, C.S.C., Ph.D., was ordained on April 20, 1974. Fr. Gariepy is a professor and chair of the Department of Healthcare Administration at Stonehill College in Easton, Mass. His current research focuses on the role Dr. John Fulton’s laboratory played in the development of the frontal lobotomy and the current mythology that arrow around that event. He also has an interest in the history of epidemiology.
Bioethics in medicine...

Who Should Be Making Decisions?

by Rev. John L. Young, C.S.C.

O

ver the last generation or so, the term bioethics has taken over for what had been called medical ethics, reflecting the fact that the field can no longer belong only to members of the medical profession. This reality became apparent to me during my pediatrics clerkship as a medical student. One of the requirements was to give a brief presentation on any aspect of the clinical experiences we were being exposed to. My turn came during the neonatal ICU rotation, just when a film from The Johns Hopkins University Medical School was being widely shown, portraying a young couple whose newborn had trisomy 21 (“Down’s Syndrome”) and duodenal atresia (an intestinal blockage near the stomach). Without a low-risk surgical procedure, the child would soon die of malnutrition or it could be treated and face a life with some significant challenges (much greater ones than is the case today). The film portrayed the parents as making the decision, yet it appeared to me that somehow their ultimate choice—against the surgery—was, in fact, coming from the physicians. Although I disagreed with the decision, I remember feeling with some ambivalence that the situation called for the doctors first to provide the parents with ample discussion and then either accept their decision or be explicit about taking upon themselves the ultimate responsibility for deciding.

As I read current medical and ethics journal articles to prepare my presentation, I was quickly caught up in the same impression: that the physicians remained in control of decisions in difficult cases, while pretending otherwise. Yet further careful reading left me with the same impression, that the physicians in knowing more about bioethics. First is the well-known pamphlet, “Ethical and Religious Directives for Catholic Health Care Services,” published by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and now in its fifth edition, 2009. It is noteworthy that the title claims a connection between ethics and religion. Also available from the USCCB are pamphlets on such topics as embryonic stem cell research, euthanasia and nutrition and hydration. There is also a helpful Apostolic Letter of John Paul II, On the Meaning of Human Suffering (Suffricti Doloris), 1984.


Finally, professional meetings provide invaluable opportunities for learning about bioethics. The University of Notre Dame conducts a wide-ranging ethics conference each autumn and in the spring a case-based bioethics meeting aimed primarily at practicing physicians. Georgetown University sponsors a short, intensive summer course. Some individuals should consider the Clinical Pastoral Education experience, a widely available training program that requires a full-time 12-week commitment.

If young adults are currently experiencing an increasing interest in bioethics, this is a trend that deserves every encouragement. It should be obvious that the issues at stake are too important to be left to the experts or physicians alone. Hospitals, whether Catholic or not, need community members to serve on their ethics committees. Educated non-specialists should continue learning the public conversation.
End-of-life decisions ...

Prolonging Life at Any Expense?
by Rev. James E. Fenstermaker, C.S.C.

Does the Catholic Church believe that human life must be prolonged as long as possible, regardless of the circumstances? Many people believe so, but this is not, in fact, the case. "The Catholic Church has a very clear position that death doesn’t have to be prolonged. It’s a myth that the Catholic Church wants people to be in pain," states Rev. Richard Benson, chair of moral theology and academic dean at St. John’s Seminary in Camarillo, Calif.

Back in November, Holy Cross Parish hosted a presentation on “The Catholic Perspective on End-of-Life Issues” by Dr. Mary Pat Tranter, Ph.D., who received her doctorate in medical science from Harvard Medical School. President of Coyle and Cassidy High School in Taunton, Mass., she currently serves as co-chair of the ethics committee and on the board of directors at Good Samaritan Medical Center in Brockton, Mass.

Dr. Tranter explained that there are three tenets to the Catholic response to end-of-life issues. First, as created in the image of God, all life is sacred from conception to natural death. Second, one can never do evil so that good can come of it. The act, intention and circumstances must all be good. Third, any act or omission with intention and circumstances must all introduce them into a body that will not benefit from them, nor would it be appropriate to do so for a body that cannot absorb them. Likewise, if death is imminent and a person has stopped eating or drinking, it is not necessary to insert a feeding tube. A distinction can be made between what is morally obligatory and what is morally optional.

While the Christian faith values the sanctity of human life as created in the image and likeness of God, it also professes that this temporary earthly life leads to a new and eternal life. We value, respect and protect human life, but also acknowledge that it is not the ultimate purpose or end of human existence. A greater life awaits us on the other side of this life.

The question will then often arise, “When is it OK to say enough is enough?” The Catholic answer is that we can withhold treatment when a natural death is inevitable. The Catholic Church does not believe in prolonging life as long as possible. Natural death is OK. It is the ultimate reality of life.

The fear that many of us have in a prolonged state of dying is the suffering caused by severe pain. Modern medicine, however, allows pain to be effectively managed. Death should not be uncomfortable if the person is receiving proper care. It is also a sacred event in which we move from this life to the next life. Palliative care is designed to make the person as comfortable as possible in order to make the transition from this life to the next life as easy as possible.

The question of what constitutes ordinary and extraordinary measures can often be confusing. I read in my research for this column that the term “extraordinary measures” was developed by Catholic theologians in the 16th century in an attempt to grapple with the bioethical implications of prolonging human life. Every treatment must be understood and evaluated within this context. For example, a simple treatment of antibiotics that would ordinarily cure an illness could be considered extraordinary and morally optional if death is imminent. On the other hand, a costly and difficult treatment would be morally obligatory if the benefits outweigh the burdens. But if the burdens of the treatment are disproportionate to the benefits, or the treatment has no reasonable chance of reversing the illness or keeping the person alive, it would be considered extraordinary.

The issue of nutrition and hydration often arises in cases of severe illness. Catholic moral teaching presumes that nutrition and hydration will be offered, whether orally or by a feeding tube, to a person whose body can absorb and process these basic necessities of life. At the same time, it would not be necessary to artificially introduce them into a body that will not benefit from them, nor would it be appropriate to do so for a body that cannot absorb them. Likewise, if death is imminent and a person has stopped eating or drinking, it is not necessary to insert a feeding tube. A distinction can be made between what is morally obligatory and what is morally optional.

Today, unlike in past years, 90 percent of us will not die a sudden death, but rather a protracted one. For many of us, Dr. Tranter explained, treatment will move from curative to palliative, aimed at keeping the person comfortable. The question will then often arise, “When is it OK to say enough is enough?” The Catholic answer is that we can withhold treatment when a natural death is inevitable. The Catholic Church does not
Where’s the Wonder?
by John C. Cavadini, Ph.D.

The New Atheism has acquired a substantial portfolio of distinguished and compelling refutations. Religious intellectuals, and, ironically, even atheist intellectuals, have conclusively demonstrated the movement’s lack of intellectual credibility. Yet their appeal remains untouched. It is almost as though the new atheism were itself a religion, impervious to reason. It has no God, but many fundamental dogmas. First, there is no God. Second, all reality is material. Third, all events in the universe are predetermined consequences of unvarying physical laws. A corollary: universe and interact with the other objects in it, scientific determinism must hold for people,” they claim. “Free will is just an illusion.” This is an a priori claim based on the assumption that people are just “objects”, presented as a scientific result.

If philosophy were not dead, perhaps it could threaten this claim. Plato, scolded and caricatured in “The Grand Design,” provides help. At “Phaedo” 96e-96g, we find Socrates, awaiting his execution, asking his young friends, why he, Socrates, is sitting there. To those offering an exclusively physical account of his (and all) action, he reminds them of the real reason or cause he is sitting there “Since Athens has thought it better to condemn me, I have thought it more right to stay and submit to whatever penalty she orders.” In other words, the cause that is he thought it right to stay.

He then adds, in words that could be equally well addressed to Hawking, “Fancy being unable to distinguish between the cause of a thing, and the condition without which it could not be a cause!” (“Phaedo,” 96e-96g) Such a simple distinction! Socrates implies that those who would reduce the cause (his free judgment) to the (physical) conditions, necessarily can make no distinction between his act of loving courage and the act of a coward who could easily have bribed the jailor and run off.

The true believers in Scientific Fundamentalism do not, it seems, feel the need to read any such text, though available on many undergraduate syllabi. And, by declaring that philosophy is dead, and disguising philosophical assumptions as scientific results, they prevent anyone who might be moved by such a text from taking it seriously. The second “fundamental,” Scientific Determinism, remains unchallenged.

Fundamentalist religions, however, do not hang together simply because of their beliefs. There is always something that convinces people to allow reason to be occluded, something that makes it worth the sacrifice of their own minds, some emotional or “spiritual” dividend. The key here is in what Scientific Fundamentalism does to someone like Socrates. He may seem wonderful, but there is nothing really to wonder at in his heroism, because his free will, indeed his personhood, is only an illusion. The “wonder” is a function of the illusion.

The same is true for the rest of nature. Scientific Fundamentalism deflates nature of wonder. “In the same way that the environmental coincidences of our solar system were rendered unremarkable by the realization that billions of such systems exist, the fine-tunings in the laws of nature can be explained by the existence of multitudes universes.” (“Grand Design,” 165) “Unremarkable” means “not wonderful.” Our whole universe, with all its apparently “miraculous” fine-tuning that permits life to exist, is, we discover, “nothing special.” (“Grand Design,” 21)

But then where does all the wonder go? Once the universe has been disenchanted of illusions, the only thing left to wonder at is the theory that explained them all away. Perhaps the true miracle,” Hawking drily comments, “is that abstract considerations of logic lead to a unique theory that predicts and describes a vast universe full of the amazing variety that we see.” (“Grand Design,” 181) True wonder has been transferred from the amazing universe in all its finely tuned diversity to the “unique theory” of the scientists, which rendered it all so “unremarkable.” In other words, the wonder is transferred, as prestige, to the scientists as a cultural elite who can explain everything without ever looking beyond the doors of the College of Science.

Here is the “spiritual” benefit of Scientific Fundamentalism. Believers get to enjoy, by participation or proxy, the prestige of this cultural elite and the security that everything can be explained, that there is no mystery left in the universe at all. This suggests that to mount an effective response, the new atheism must be treated as any religious fundamentalism. Though arguments are necessary, relying on them does not take away the “spiritual” benefit of a closed system that explains everything. Formulative fundamentalism thrives in one-dimensional cultures that have lost their ear for mystery. But the Catholic faith is a dense culture of many layered mystery—that God is love. The word became flesh, that he loved us to the end and left us the Eucharist as the Sacrament of love, to name a few. The more we train our children, students and parishioners in an affection for the Eucharist, a love of the saints who are perfected in God’s love, a sensibility for the beauty of all the mysteries of God’s love and the solidarity with the “little-ones” of the world that they entail, the less appeal will any one-dimensional fundamentalism, of either the theist or the atheist variety, have on them, no matter how prestigious. For they will have been trained to see in the “littlest,” in the least prestigious face, a mystery of infinitely greater worth and wonder than 10,000 galaxies of brilliantly burning suns.
Sept. 10 marked the 50th Anniversary of the arrival of the Congregation of Holy Cross in Perú. We came to the sugar hacienda coastal town of Cartavio in 1963 to provide pastoral care for the field hands and factory workers. Our service has grown to include social service ministries and a school for children with special needs. Our parish in Lima, Lord of Hope Parish, is larger than most U.S. dioceses, serving more than 200,000 people, many of whom live in extreme urban poverty. But in the face of all this adversity, we know we are building up the Kingdom, a community built around faith and service to the Lord and each other. The weeklong 50th Anniversary celebrations included a luncheon, a Taize-style evening vigil, parades and processions of Our Lady of Sorrows, Eucharistic Adoration and Masses.

"Yet the Lord doesn’t expect perfection from us, rather He hopes for commitment, and Holy Cross in Perú for the last 50 years has demonstrated a superabundance of it: to the Gospel, to the Kingdom of God, to seeing Christ in the poor. Five decades now demonstrate maturity in the commitment and in the way of doing the mission. When you see the impressive network of spiritual, educational and social works of the District, you wonder how so few could have done so much." — Fr. Jim Phalan, C.S.C.

“What I felt in that packed church, the gifts, the toast, the fireworks and the singing and dancing was a great sense of love that the people have for Holy Cross for all that has been accomplished in the 50 years to this point and all the amazing work that is still being done. Our men here, led by District Superior Anibal Nino, are few in number, yet their work is far reaching.” — Fr. Thomas O’Hara, C.S.C.

“So, we’ve looked back for a moment — but only for a moment — to reverence the past with gratitude and to look forward to the future with hope. We’ve paused only briefly because we’re a restless bunch and because we know from insight and experience that all of the hard lessons learned and the wonderful things that have happened over the years, are just a prelude to what the Lord wants to do for us, in us and with us on the road ahead.” — Fr. Don Fetters, C.S.C.
Holy Cross religious and staff from the U.S. Province were recognized at the 2013 Catholic Press Awards this summer:

- Development and Communications lay staffs won second place for Pillars (Winter 2012 issue).
- The America’s Pillars of Knowledge Awards were also presented this year. The acceptances lay staffs won second place for an essay, “The Blessings of Celibacy.”
- Rev. Christopher Cox, C.S.C., spoke on “Building Community, Building a People of God” at St. Adalbert Heritage Center in July. The presentation included a video, photographs and informative stories of Fr. Cox’s life and work at Parroquia Nuestra Señora de Andacollo in Chile, where he has been pastor since 2010. Fr. Cox served at St. Adalbert from 2003 to 2010.
- Christ the King Catholic Church, South Bend, Rev. Bob Loughery, C.S.C., assistant director of the Holy Cross Mission Center, spoke about the Holy Cross charism of mission during Mission Sunday weekend, in June, at Christ the King. The parish donated almost $4,200 toward the mission appeal.

HOOLY CROSS MISSION CENTER Five recent graduates of the University of Notre Dame and the University of Portland are in Chile and Uganda as part of the Holy Cross Mission Center’s Overseas Lay Ministry program. During the 17-month program, recent college graduates work at Holy Cross schools, parishes, health care or other social service ministries. Applications for the 2014 program will be accepted beginning Nov. 11, 2013. Those interested can visit holycrossmissions.org.

REGION OF MÉXICO In July, the seminarians in México participated in the summer mission to the Holy Cross Parish in Tamán, San Luis Potosí – a parish that includes 54 mountain villages. The mission took place in three of those villages. The mission teams went door-to-door personally inviting the villagers to the presentations and learning activities; and each day a priest visited and anointed the sick, heard confessions and celebrated the Mass.

STAY CONNECTED! Follow the latest Church and Province news as it happens ...
- Like us on Facebook at facebook.com/holycrossus
- Follow us on Twitter at @HolyCrossUS
- Check out our boards on Pinterest at pinterest.com/holycrossusa
- Sign up for our e-newsletter by visiting subscribe.holycrossusa.org

www.holycrossusa.org
We walk now in the light of Jesus said:

Lost in the woods at night, one is likely one and all to come closer to where their "light of faith" enables human beings "Lumen Fidei" (“The Light of Faith”) was released. It completes a papal encyclical letter, “Lumen Fidei” (“The Light of Faith”). Pope Francis’ first encyclical letter, “Lumen Fidei” – The Light of Faith

We walk not in darkness or in endless round on earth, birth and death, war and peace, round and round we go, getting nowhere but spinning our wheels. It is only if we find the history of the world and the more recent human history to have a beginning and ending there is a journey and purpose to life itself. If we began in God’s creative love and we are to end in God’s loving eternity, that would make all the difference in how we would see events, one another and both life and death on Earth.

We walk not in darkness or in endless circles we walk in the light of faith and we walk in the presence of God, who made us, loves us and will preserve us forever. Human history will not prove to be a tragedy, but rather a “divine comedy” with a happy ending, even if the love story is complicated with many setbacks along the way. The ultimate guarantee of our faith is the knowledge that God is with us in Jesus Christ, our Lord and our God, who walked among us and will be with us till the end of time. In giving us His Son, God has given us everything. How that story with its divine beginning and divine ending is played out is our story and the heart of this encyclical. In the creation account God said “Let there be light.” Jesus said: “I am the light of the world.” We walk now in the light of “the morning star that never sets.” The best is yet to come. “Now we see in a mirror darkly, but then face to face” (1 Corinthians 13:12). All is not darkness and random chance events without meaning or purpose. From our beginning to our ending, we have been loved by God, revealed to us in the life and death of Jesus Christ, our Lord, about whose death it may be said in truth “There is no greater love than to lay down your life for your friends” (John 15:13). The second chapter of the Encyclical is titled: “Unless you believe, you will not understand.” One may go further and claim that unless you love, you will not believe. “Love and truth are inseparable.” If love needs truth, the truth also needs love. “To touch Him (Jesus) with our hearts is what that it means to believe.” Only a vibrant faith in Christ can hope “to hold together time and ages, and to gather into one the scattered strands of our lives.”

The light of faith gives us a story that we must share with others, but the love of God, given and received, is their story too. whether they know that consciously or not. Believers do not possess the truth, but it is the truth that possesses and embraces the believer. Faith does not make one baptizes himself, just as no one comes into the world by himself. Baptism is something we receive. Parents bring chil- dren into this world and then to be born children of God and receive the gift of faith. “Faith teaches us to see that every man and woman represents a blessing for me, that the light of God’s face shines on me through the faces of my brothers and sisters.” “The light of faith is what allows us to discern “what makes human life precious and unique.”

The encyclical pays tribute to Mary, the Mother of God and the Mother of the Church, who believed first in her heart and then conceived in her womb, brought forth the Savior and nourished him with her love. “Blessed is she who believed” (Lk 1:45). And so may it be with us, one and all.

rather “the security of faith sets us on a journey (and) enables witness and dialogue with all.”

Conversion is a new set of eyes, the eyes of faith, seeing with the light of faith. If you ever tried dieting, you know that all diets lead to weight loss if you follow them, but most of the time we go back to old patterns of eating and regain the weight. Only if one sees food differently, only if one no longer sees food as connected with other problems (emotional and spiritual) in our lives, is a real conversion possible. Then one no longer needs a diet, one sees food differently. There are many problems food cannot solve, many needs it cannot satisfy. So with faith, for once, we see life as God sees it; we no longer want to sin. We see ourselves and our way of living in the light of faith and it can change our lives profoundly, illuminating our minds, giving us hope and enkindling our hearts.

The third chapter speaks of the role of the Church, “a mother which teaches us to speak the language of faith.” The Magis- terium, speaking for “an unbroken chain of witnesses,” functions as the memory of the Church. In the “Communion of Saints,” we are always in it together. “No one baptizes himself, just as no one comes

Editor’s note: On July 5, Pope Francis’ first encyclical letter, “Lumen Fidei” (“The Light of Faith”) was released. It completes a papal trilogy on the three “theological virtues,” following Pope Benedict XVI’s encyclical “Deus Caritas Est” (2005) on charity and “Spe Salvi” (2007) on hope. Pope Benedict had almost completed a first draft of the encyclical before his retirement in February 2013. Pope Francis finished it and added his own contri- butions. The entire encyclical is available on the Vatican’s website at vatican.va.

“Lumen Fidei” explores the many ways the “light of faith” enables human beings one and all to come closer to where their origins begin and where their destinies end. Lost in the woods at night, one is likely to walk around in circles and get nowhere.
Rev. John Denning, C.S.C. was inaugurated as president of Stonehill College on Sept. 20. At Fr. Denning’s installation, Thomas May (’69), chairman of the Board of Trustees, presented Fr. Denning with Stonehill’s official charter from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in 1948.

In his inaugural address, Fr. Denning referenced one of the four principles of Catholic social teaching, solidarity, which professes that we are responsible for and to one another. “This is an important aspect of the type of Catholic liberal arts education we provide our students at Stonehill,” he said, “that is, to see the real and true needs of our world and to find the courage, strength, grace and wisdom to work with other men and women of good will to address them while living in a spirit of solidarity with our neighbors.”

Fr. Denning’s inauguration ceremony and Mass culminated a week-long list of activities that included a campus carnival and an ice cream social. During Fr. Denning even tried out the bungee cord bouncy house and served up scoops to students, faculty, staff and alumni.

During our fiscal year, ending June 30, 2013, the Congregation of Holy Cross was blessed by the stewardship of more than 2,600 individuals, families, corporations, foundations and organizations who have graciously supported our men and ministries.

Through your generous financial support, the U.S. Province and Holy Cross Mission Center (International Missions) continue to work in proclaiming the Kingdom of God through our education, parish and mission ministries.

As we continue in our mission, we do so inspired by your partnership of prayer and financial support.
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