

Making Sense of Eighty Years of Theological Ethics

Theological Studies
2019, Vol. 80(1) 148–168
© Theological Studies, Inc. 2019
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/0040563918819819
journals.sagepub.com/home/tsj



James F. Keenan, SJ

Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA, USA

Abstract

This article surveys all the contributions in ethics on these pages over the past eighty years and is divided into four historical parts: the first three years; the years from 1943 to 1964; the years Richard McCormick wrote from 1964 to 1984; and the years beyond McCormick. It surveys a period from neo-Scholastic manualism at the eve of World War II to the contemporary era, where methods for attaining moral objectivity are complex. This survey notes shifts in theological method, the movement of the center from the personal to the social, the transition from an exclusively clerical authorship to a much broader array of authors, and a shift in readership from priest confessors to professional theologians.

Keywords

conscience, John Ford, *Humanae Vitae*, manualism, Richard McCormick, method, neo-Scholasticism, situation ethics, virtue ethics, World War II

Theological ethics has been a mainstay feature of this journal over its past eighty years. Here, I present highlights of not only the “Notes on Moral Theology”¹ that have appeared every Spring, but all the ethics articles, a total of roughly 350 contributions.²

1. This venerable section of the journal was popularly referred to as “Moral Notes,” and was recently renamed “Notes on Theological Ethics,” reflecting a shift in the field over recent years. It has had various other names, including “Note in Moral Theology.” However, readers continue to refer to it simply as “Notes.”
2. Special thanks to my research assistant, Charles E. Power, who helped me considerably in appreciating the broad spectrum of these contributions.

Corresponding author:

James F. Keenan, SJ, Boston College, 246 Beacon Street, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA.

Email: james.keenan.2@bc.edu

Current readers are likely more interested in the earlier years than the more recent ones. I have therefore developed the presentation into four periods: The first three years (1940–42); the subsequent period which, after World War II, focused predominantly on confessional matters related to sex and reproduction (1943–64); the McCormick years (1965–84), which modeled for readers how to arrive at informed moral judgments; and, finally, the development of methods and arguments beyond McCormick, with greater attention to writings before the new millennium than after.

The Start: Defining Itself

When *Theological Studies* first appeared in 1940, the first ethics article was entitled “A Fundamental Notion in the Problem of Sexual Morality.”³ The author, Gerald Kelly, was arguably the father of American Catholic medical ethics.⁴ The article begins, “A certain footnote in Father Cappello’s excellent treatise on Marriage is of special interest and importance to the moral theologian. I refer to the author’s discussion of the definition of venereal pleasure.”⁵ Therein he investigates the moral liceity of the theory of “a two-fold genital pleasure,” and after ten pages rejects the theory, noting that there is confusion in part because “some of this naturally lies in the fact that the literature of the past is couched in a terminology not easily comprehended by the mind of today.”⁶ I will comment later on this remarkable point of departure for the journal.

Besides two other articles relevant to ethics (a strikingly naïve article on the creation of Eve⁷ and the first of two articles on the influence of Romans 13 on early Christian political thought⁸), the only other ethics article from 1940 is an unsigned one that looks to be the first Moral Note.⁹ Its survey is somewhat inspiring and instructive: psychological studies that highlight impediments to human responsibility; the growing problematic claim of social determinism; professional secrets, particularly a physician’s protection of a patient’s syphilis; social attitudes toward prostitution; the February 22, 1940 Declaration by the Holy Office against any direct sterilization; the Voronoff operation which is “the grafting of a part of the testicle of a man or a monkey on the defective testicle of a patient”;¹⁰ statistics on abortion and divorce; when artificial impregnation would be licit; the search for a definition on social justice; family wage; mass stipends; and, lastly, a section on matrimony which discusses prenuptial investigations, marital consent, and rota fees.

-
3. Gerard Kelly, “A Fundamental Notion in the Problem of Sexual Morality,” *TS* 1 (1940): 117–29, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394000100202>.
 4. Gerald Kelly, *Medico-Moral Problems* (St. Louis: Catholic Hospital Association, 1958).
 5. Kelly, “A Fundamental Notion in the Problem of Sexual Morality,” 117.
 6. Kelly, “A Fundamental Notion in the Problem of Sexual Morality,” 128.
 7. Thomas J. Motherway, “The Creation of Eve in Catholic Tradition,” *TS* 1 (1940): 97–116, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394000100201>.
 8. Wilfrid Parsons, “The Influence of Romans XIII on Pre-Augustinian Christian Political Thought,” *TS* 1 (1940): 337–64, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394000100401>.
 9. Anonymous, “Recent Canon Law and Moral Theology: Some Important Items,” *TS* 1 (1940): 412–33, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394000100405>.
 10. Anonymous, “Recent Canon Law,” 425.

At first glance, the second volume might not seem that groundbreaking, though the first two of three ethics articles are foundational: the indissolubility of marriage,¹¹ social action in the early church,¹² and John Ford's "On Cheating in Examinations."¹³

Still, in this volume, theological ethics comes of age in the United States in its first signed moral note, Ford's 1941 fifty-page "Current Moral Theology and Canon Law." Ford begins, "The preparation of these notes has been somewhat hampered by war conditions. Many of the European reviews have not come at all; others have arrived irregularly and late. Surprisingly enough, however, some of the German and Italian publications have appeared with regularity."¹⁴ He turns to a review of the literature, including equiprobabilism, impediments to moral responsibility, sin, population growth, sexual morality, and contraception.

Then the War enters the picture. Here Ford's first concern is about the sacraments and specifically the administration of penance and absolution to soldiers as they enter battle; faculties for chaplains interred in prison camps; the eucharistic fast in time of war; and, administering sacraments to the Orthodox.

Then he turns to morality and war, warning the reader that he can cover "only a few of the endless articles and books that come forth daily on the war, pacifism, conscientious objection, and the use of just means in conducting the war."¹⁵ He starts with an English debate, launched by the Dominican Gerald Vann,¹⁶ who argues that each Christian has to weigh whether a war can be waged justly today. Canon E. J. Mahoney contends against this:¹⁷ individuals "are under no obligation to weigh all the reasons and conditions required for a just war; they may take their part in it with a good conscience relying on the integrity of their rulers, particularly if the government is elected by the people, unless the wickedness of the war is absolutely manifest."¹⁸ Ford eventually pursues a middle point, not about what ethicists say, but rather about those lay people who have formed their consciences on the matter.

But first, Ford refers to an article from Germany (!) by the Jesuit Alfred Delp: "His treatment explicitly prescind[s] from the question of the moral permissibility of any given war, but takes war as it comes, a hard fact, in the midst of which, perhaps against his will, the soldier finds himself. The author feels that in the appeal to the

11. John P. Haran, "The Indissolubility of Christian Marriage," *TS* 2 (1941): 198–220, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394100200203>.

12. Paul Hanly Furfey, "Social Action in the Early Church: 30–180 A.D.," *TS* 2 (1941): 171–97, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394100200202>.

13. John Ford, "On Cheating in Examinations: A Letter to a High School Principal," *TS* 2 (1941): 252–56, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394100200206>.

14. John Ford, "Current Moral Theology and Canon Law," *TS* 2 (1941): 527–76 at 527, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394100200405>.

15. Ford, "Current Moral Theology and Canon Law," 544.

16. Gerald Vann, *Morality and War* (London: Burnes Oates, 1939).

17. E. J. Mahoney, "The Modern Dilemma," *Clergy Review* 20 (January 1941): 50–67 at 65.

18. Ford, "Current Moral Theology and Canon Law," 544.

virtue of pietas there can be found that element of spirituality that will rationalize and Christianize the waging of war.”¹⁹

Ford returns to the question, noting that “the horror of the last war” turned the minds of many “to the problem of pacifism and Christianity.”²⁰ While the threat of fascism is great, the means to stop it are themselves so deeply problematic that many will consider conscientious objection to military service. Between Vann and Mahoney, Ford takes the “middle ground of Catholic opinion which holds that in some circumstances conscientious objection is justifiable, in others not.” An individual Catholic who is “entirely convinced of the injustice of the war in which his country is engaged [is] hence be bound to be a conscientious objector.” He adds: “This can happen either because the war is patently and objectively unjust or because he is subjectively but invincibly persuaded that it is unjust. In such cases a Catholic not only may but must be a conscientious objector.” He offers an Italian or German Catholic seeing the Axis war as unjust as a case in point. He concludes,

When the infallible Church has not spoken and will not speak on the justice of a given war, and when the Catholic Hierarchies of opposing enemy nations do speak on it and give opposite answers, and when moralists and theologians are still in the process of forming their opinions, the very least we can say is that, as far as confessional practice is concerned, the sincere conscientious objector is entitled to the freedom of the conscience.²¹

Ford then turns to the actual means of war: from bombing missions to targeting civilian populations as an act of reprisal, engaging decisively “direct killing (of the innocent, or of captured prisoners, or in sniping or mopping up).”²² He concludes the section,

It will not be long perhaps before all these questions of conscientious objection, of bombing and killing will become more immediately pressing for the American moralist. The impression made upon the present writer by reading the foregoing literature (and much more like it) is that the application of our moral principles to modern war leaves so much to be desired that we are not in a position to impose obligations on the consciences of the individual, whether he be a soldier with bayonet, or a conscientious objector, except in the cases where violation of natural law is clear.²³

Ford’s 1941 note is a powerful one and predates by three years his remarkable “The Morality of Obliteration Bombing,” often ranked as one of the most momentous ethics

19. Ford, “Current Moral Theology and Canon Law,” 546. Ford is referring to the article by Alfred Delp, “Der Krieg als Geistige Leistung,” *Stimmen der Zeit* 137 (April 1940): 207–10. Delp, a member of the Catholic Resistance against Hitler, was executed by the state on February 2, 1945.

20. Ford, “Current Moral Theology and Canon Law,” 547.

21. Ford, “Current Moral Theology and Canon Law,” 551–52.

22. Ford, “Current Moral Theology and Canon Law,” 555.

23. Ford, “Current Moral Theology and Canon Law,” 556. The rest of the note is on canon law, fetting the launch of *The Jurist*, while treating canonical issues on marriage, particularly “moral imbecility.”

essays of the twentieth century. What we are seeing here is how Ford anticipated these issues.²⁴ Still in the entire 1941 issue of the journal, there is no other article on the war. Only later will the journal realize that it needs to devote an entire issue to a singular topic like war and will do so on other issues like abortion, the population explosion, situation ethics, black theology, feminism, and Vatican II.

In the third volume, the lead article is on Albert the Great's *debitum maritalitatis*, happily translated by the author as "conjugal intimacy."²⁵ Then Furfey offers a terrific argument on the singular contribution of Catholic ethics on human dignity.²⁶ We also find Ford's classic, comprehensive essay on the meaning and purposes of marriage.²⁷

In the same volume, John LaFarge reflects on interdenominational cooperation: "The plain fact remains that there can be no adequate defense of our civilization and of Christian institutions without a much greater degree of social unity than we now possess." He adds that "this pursuit will not be easy for Catholics" because it "necessarily entails a risk of misunderstanding, possible scandal and detriment to the Faith on the part of Catholics."²⁸

John Courtney Murray too reflects on the theology of Christian cooperation, with a clear appreciation of a world at war. In the first of three articles on the topic, he notes, "One of the most striking characteristics of the religious scene today is the assertion of a growing will among Christians to work together for a more human and Christian world-order, in the face of concerted, organized, and implacable forces that threaten to destroy the possibility of it."²⁹

Finally, from a canonical viewpoint, T. Lincoln Bouscaren considers cooperation with non-Catholics with the desire to overcome Catholic exclusivism.³⁰ The magnitude of these articles providing leadership to pathways of cooperation for American Catholics with American Protestants cannot be missed.

The third volume closes with John Ford's moral note.³¹ The array of topics is extensive: sin, patriotism, and militant virtues, with only a paragraph on wartime reprisals; then a turn to retributive justice, the fifth commandment, and pregnancies that threaten the lives of women, which leads to a discussion of sterilization and finally sex and morality.

24. John Ford, "The Morality of Obliteration Bombing," *TS* 5 (1944): 261–309, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394400500301>.

25. John Clifford, "The Ethics of Conjugal Intimacy according to St. Albert the Great," *TS* 3 (1942): 1–26, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394200300101>.

26. Furfey, "Social Action in the Early Church, 30–180 A.D., II," *TS* 3 (1942): 89–108, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394200300105>.

27. John Ford, "Marriage: Its Meaning and Purposes," *TS* 3 (1942): 333–74, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394200300302>.

28. John LaFarge, "Some Questions as to Interdenomination Co-operation," *TS* 3 (1942): 315–32, at 332, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394200300301>.

29. John Courtney Murray, "Current Theology: Christian Cooperation," *TS* 33 (1942): 413–433, at 413.

30. T. Lincoln Bouscaren, "Cooperation with Non-Catholics," *TS* 33 (1942): 475–512, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394200300401>.

31. John Ford, "Notes in Moral Theology, 1941," *TS* 3 (1942): 579–608, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394200300404>.

When writing on the fifth commandment, we find an equal regard for men and women as we see, for instance, on ectopic pregnancies, but on the sixth commandment there is often not an equal regard. For instance, regarding onanism,³² Ford argues that when husbands attempt to use condoms, “only the very gravest reasons can ever justify passivity on the part of the woman.”³³

In this same section on sex and morality, Ford turns to the consideration of “Ablution Centers,” set up by military authorities, for use by “soldiers who have had irregular relations with prostitutes.” The singular focus is not on who the “prostitutes” are but on whether the principle of double effect is correctly applied to provide prophylactic rather than contraceptive purpose.³⁴ Again, there seems to be a singular anxiety about whether a man uses a condom, while accommodating the instrumentalization of women.

In the last four pages of the note, we find “conditions of the Eucharistic fast” for those at the war front. In establishing the clarity and sufficiency of the four-hour fast, we find a wartime reflection that reveals an enormous amount of ecclesial gatekeeping anxiety about something that was once for all given to us freely, the body of Christ.

Ford returns to a variety of issues on war with his moral notes of 1943 and 1944 as well as the article on obliteration bombing, but after the war he attends almost exclusively to issues of imputability, reproduction, and papal authority.³⁵

This survey gives us a sense of the early years of crafting ethics in *Theological Studies*. It shows a diversity of topics and an attention to detail, but it also shows how the journal anticipated wars; these writings on war are the most compelling and will perennially appear.³⁶ Similarly the journal anticipated specific issues like saturation

32. Francis J. Connell, CSSR, “How Must the Confessor Deal with an Onanist,” *Ecclesiastical Review* 107 (1942): 55ff.

33. Ford, “Notes,” 596. As someone who has worked on HIV prevention, where in many cultures women cannot persuade men (including their husbands) to use a prophylactic to inhibit the transmission of the virus, I find the imposition of moral responsibility on the woman to keep the man from using them incredibly intrusive and opportunistic. Arguing as they did for wives to be obedient in the home, it is certainly problematic to suggest that in the bedroom they should have the upper hand. In their concern for the man’s spiritual state, there seems only the slightest concern for the well-being of the woman. Special thanks to Sara Bernard-Hoverstad who called this lack of equal regard to my attention in her reading of the manuals of Thomas Slater, Henry Davis, and Heribert Jone.

34. Ford, “Notes,” 597.

35. In 1958, Ford and Kelly, having authored the notes from 1941 to 1954, team up for a two-volume work called *Contemporary Moral Theology* (New York: The Newman, 1958). The first volume focuses on magisterial teaching and imputability; the second, on marriage. Together they represent the heart of their concerns.

36. War brings out the best of *TS*, see, for instance, John Courtney Murray, “Remarks on the Moral Problem of War,” 20 (1959): 40–61, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056395902000102>; John Connery, “Current Theology: War, Conscience, and the Law: The State of the Question,” 31 (1970): 288–300, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397003100204>; Connery, “Morality of Consequences: A Critical Appraisal,” 34 (1973): 396–414, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397303400303>.

bombing, conscientious objection, and the need for cooperation, therein setting agendas for further discussion. This remarkable foresight was practiced routinely, for instance, when McCormick wrote on bioethical issues but also when he reflected on ecology in 1971³⁷ or when Norbert Rigali wrote on pedophilia in 1994.³⁸ The noteworthy exception is the failure to reflect on the civil rights movement, an omission the journal has tried and continues to try to rectify.³⁹

After the Beginning: 1943–63

One of my first articles for *Theological Studies* was on the human body, where I argued that the teaching of the church on the topic was fairly positive.⁴⁰ Readers

.org/10.1177/004056397303400302, which is preeminently about the war in Vietnam; James F. Childress, “Just War Theories: The Bases, Interrelations, Priorities, and Functions of Their Criteria,” *TS* 39 (1978): 427–45, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397803900302>; David Hollenbach, “Nuclear Weapons and Nuclear War: The Shape of the Catholic Debate,” 43 (1982): 577–605, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398204300401>; William O’Brien, “Just-War Doctrine in a Nuclear Context,” 44 (1983): 191–220, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398304400201>; John P. Langan, “Pastoral on War and Peace: Reactions and New Directions,” 46 (1985): 80–101, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398504600106>; David Hollenbach, “War and Peace in Catholic Thought: A Heritage Abandoned?” 48 (1987): 711–26, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398704800405>; O’Brien, “Counterterrorism Deterrence/Defense and Just-War Doctrine,” 48 (1987): 647–75, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398704800403>; John P. Langan, “The Just War Theory after the Gulf War,” 52 (1992): 95–112, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399205300106>; Kenneth Himes, “Intervention, Just War, and U.S. National Security,” 65 (2004): 141–57, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390406500104>; Patrick T. McCormick, “Violence: Religion, Terror, War,” 67 (2006): 143–62, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390606700106>; David E. DeCosse “Authority, Lies, and War: Democracy and the Just War Theory,” 67 (2006): 378–94, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390606700206>. Similarly, see Lisa Sowle Cahill’s note in this issue.

37. Richard A. McCormick, “Current Theology: Notes on Moral Theology,” *TS* 32 (1970): 66–122, at 97–107, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397103200104>.
38. Norbert Rigali, “Church Responses to Pedophilia,” *TS* 55 (1994): 124–39, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399405500108>.
39. In its apology, *TS* dedicated the entire issue of Winter 2000 to black theology with articles by James Cone, M. Shawn Copeland, Cyprian Davis, Diana L. Hayes, Jamie T. Phelps, and Bryan N. Massingale; in particular, Massingale, “James Cone and Recent Catholic Episcopal Teaching on Racism,” *TS* 61 (2000): 700–30, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390006100405>; more recently see Massingale, “Has the Silence Been Broken? Catholic Theological Ethics and Racial Justice,” 75 (2014): 133–55, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040563913520090>; Keenan, “Prophetic Pragmatism and Descending to Matters of Detail,” *TS* 79 (2018): 128–45, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040563917744654>; Jeannine Hill Fletcher, “The Grace of Reparation in the Trauma of White Supremacy,” forthcoming.
40. James F. Keenan, “Christian Perspectives on the Human Body,” *TS* 55 (1994): 330–46, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399405500208>.

responded, asking that if this were so, why was church teaching on sex, in a word, so awful. I responded saying I thought that much of the teaching on the human body did not reflect on human sexuality and, that while the teachings on the body were very much about being the condition for relationality, the teachings on sex did not explore that.

For instance, the journal's first article by Kelly from 1940 is virtually impenetrable. I have read it several times and still cannot understand what was the twofold pleasure. I recall Mark Jordan's comments that in these discussions sexual terms lose any semblance of intelligibility⁴¹ and James Brundage's observation that "the Christian horror of sex has for centuries placed enormous strain on individual consciences and self-esteem in the Western world."⁴² To his credit, as we saw, Kelly too remarked on the claims of Father Cappello as being in part unintelligible.

John Clifford, who often sought moral grounds to positively guide confessors advising married penitents, does not develop his concerns into an embodied relational framework. For instance, his first article, on conjugal intimacy, is really about "vindicating marital congress from the imputation of sin."⁴³ Reading his other three articles, one realizes again that they mostly focus on moral issues concerning men,⁴⁴ as do most of the others during this period.⁴⁵

As priest theologians writing for fellow priest confessors, they aim for pastorally sensitive solutions, though they still treat sexuality in isolation from relationality. So, the first time that homosexuality appears is, impressively, in 1955, but its author writes about his conversations with fellow priests, some of whom "betrayed an emotional revulsion even to a pastoral discussion of inversion," while others had few resources. In this context, he offers his essay "with the hope that they will be of help to some of his fellow priests confronted with a similar situation."⁴⁶ In these years, sex was *always* presented as problematic and always about a third party or, worse, "a situation."

41. See Mark Jordan's *The Invention of Sodomy in Christian Theology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).

42. James A. Brundage, *Law, Sex, and Christian Society in Medieval Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 9.

43. Clifford, "The Ethics of Conjugal Intimacy," 1.

44. John J. Clifford, "The Marital Rights of the Sinfully Sterilized," *TS* 5 (1944): 141–58, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394400500202>; "The Morality of Castration for Carcinoma of the Prostate," *TS* 5 (1944): 439–52, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394400500402>; "Reoperation after Double Vasectomy," *TS* 7 (1946): 453–63, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394600700304>.

45. Edward Nowlan, "Double Vasectomy and Marital Impotence," *TS* 6 (1945): 392–427, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394500600304>; John Ford, "Double Vasectomy and the Impediment of Impotence," *TS* 16 (1955): 533–57, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056395501600402>. As Charles Power rightly noted, the first one on women appears in the twenty-second volume: Thomas O'Donnell, "Definitive Pelvic Surgery: A Moral Evaluation," *TS* 22 (1961): 652–60, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396102200405>.

46. John F. Harvey, "Homosexuality as a Pastoral Problem," *TS* 16 (1955): 86–108, at 86, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056395501600104>.

Still, the first time sex is spoken about in terms of relationality, it is treated as occasioning sin. John Connery writes about steady dating, noting “it may not be out of place to discuss the morality of frequenting occasions of sin with a view to an ultimate statement on the morality of these so-called juvenile courtships.”⁴⁷

Anyone familiar with Catholic history knows that the moral theologians were not the ones driving this issue. In 1962, John Lynch’s Note begins on the *Monitum* released on July 5, 1961 by the Vatican Congregation of the Holy Office pursuing the opinions of theologians who raise questions about imputability affecting the grave sins against the sixth commandment.⁴⁸ In the parameters in which they could function, the writers for the most part try to find positive pastoral solutions for the perceived problems about sex regarding third parties. In the same way, birth control enters as a third-party problem and is discussed continuously as such from the very second volume.

What is curious during this time are those places in the Notes where the theologian tells the confessor to heed the penitent’s conscientious judgment. Ford and Kelly put forth a full 35-page essay singularly devoted to the pastoral legitimacy of rhythm and conclude noting that the married couple “are almost always the best judges of the reasons they may have for spacing their children or limiting their family by these means.”⁴⁹ As in the case of the conscientious objector, Ford warmly advocates for the consciences of the laity when the topic is “safe,” that is, not yet defined by the Magisterium. For Ford, with the exception of rhythm, matters on sex and reproduction were already defined and therefore the individual’s conscience received no hearing. As Eric Genilo argues in his work on Ford, Ford advocated for conscience whenever the church had not yet defined; if the church did, conscience had no rights.⁵⁰

Matters on sex, moral judgment, conscience, and method change radically as Richard McCormick enters the history of *Theological Studies* and moderates the debates for nearly 20 years. This is not to suggest that there were not divergent opinions before McCormick. For instance, Bernard Lonergan’s “Love, Finality and Marriage” purportedly complemented John Ford’s positions on marriage, but actually raised questions about the nature of human action, love, and sexuality that were completely embodied and never found anywhere in Ford’s writings.⁵¹ There was also Felix

47. John Connery, “Steady Dating among Adolescents,” *TS* 19 (1958): 73–80, at 73, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056395801900104>.

48. John Lynch, “Current Theology: Notes on Moral Theology,” *TS* 23 (1962): 233–65, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396202300203>; see also Joseph Farraher’s further comments on the *Monitum*, “Notes on Moral Theology: Imputability,” *TS* 24 (1963): 53–105, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396302400102>.

49. John Ford and Gerald Kelly, “Current Theology: Periodic Continence,” *TS* 23 (1962): 590–624, at 624, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396202300403>.

50. Eric Genilo, *John Cuthbert Ford, SJ: Moral Theologian at the End of the Manualist Era* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2007).

51. Bernard Lonergan, “Love, Finality, and Marriage,” *TS* 4 (1943): 477–510, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394300400401>.

Cardegna's argument in favor of the pill before the teaching was declared, an argument frequently discussed, but never validated.⁵²

The McCormick Years: 1965–84

In his tribute to Richard McCormick, Charles Curran remarked that McCormick evolved considerably from the time the then-editor of *Theological Studies*, John Courtney Murray, offered him the Notes in 1964.⁵³ Similarly, the readers of *Theological Studies* also evolved as they learned from McCormick how to develop their own positions. McCormick's transparency and hesitancy to reject magisterial teaching made him a very credible role model for the confessor-reader also harboring doubts about church teaching.

In his third Moral Note, in 1967, on the eve of *Humanae Vitae*, McCormick argues that the teaching on contraception was in a "state of practical doubt."⁵⁴ McCormick publicly raised his own inability to see the teachings on contraception as compelling. He was not yet rejecting or dissenting; he was in doubt. A year later in the aftermath of the encyclical's promulgation, McCormick writes a long note, the last forty pages focusing on the magisterium: first he looks at the magisterium but writes extensively on conscience, then turns to the history of church teaching on contraception, and again to practical doubt, by first engaging an article against doubt written by his predecessors, John Ford and John Lynch. It is a thoughtful, transparent engagement about doubt on church teaching. Then, he writes,

The problem after *Humanae Vitae* is the extent to which this document, obviously a teaching statement, has truly solved the doubts. Perhaps it were better to say that this is one of the problems occasioned by the Encyclical; for if anything is clear, it is that *Humanae Vitae* is inseparable from questions far more basic than the issue which occasioned it.⁵⁵

While his predecessors at the journal accepted the teaching and in fact invested it with greater authority than it claimed,⁵⁶ McCormick not only raised critical questions about the teaching but also about its authority and the methods that were used to promote and defend the teaching. But these were still questions, and concerns until for a third time, a year later, he returned to the teaching. The son of a well-known physician,

52. Felix Cardegna, "Contraception, the Pill, and Responsible Parenthood," *TS* 25 (1964): 611–36, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396402500403>.

53. Charles E. Curran, "Notes on Richard A. McCormick," *TS* 61 (2000): 533–42, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390006100306>.

54. McCormick, *TS* 28 (1967): 749–800, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396702800405>.

55. McCormick, "Notes 1968," *TS* 29 (1968): 679–741, at 725, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396802900404>.

56. John C. Ford and Germain Grisez, "Contraception and the Infallibility of the Ordinary Magisterium," *TS* 39 (1978): 258–312, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397803900202>. See Ford's subsequent article, "Infallibility: A Review of Recent Studies," *TS* 40 (1979): 273–305, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397904000203>.

McCormick, slow to judge, giving a thorough, transparent, investigative parsing of all the claims, revealed his conscientious thought in action. Readers learned through his public reasoning what a conscience needed to do to attain a right judgment. In his “round-up of reactions,” McCormick gave us a sense that the study was thorough and the doubt more than reasonable and whether he thought it right or wrong, he taught readers how to arrive at their own judgment.⁵⁷

Subsequently McCormick helped us to appreciate the need for a method for making moral judgment.⁵⁸ This moral judgment, for McCormick was almost always, as it was for his contemporaries, about resolving *conflict*. A method like virtue ethics that seeks to serve the whole spectrum of life’s tasks was not sought; rather, for these 20 years the search was for a method that could both achieve moral objectivity about neuralgic issues and counter the neo-Scholastic, manualistic arguments that prohibited actions defined juridically and metaphysically as “intrinsically evil.”⁵⁹

In 1978, McCormick returned to the encyclical but now his main preoccupation was with conscience vis-à-vis all sorts of conflicts.⁶⁰ In the interim, McCormick pursued two basic tracks, first contemporary issues like genetics, abortion and the decision of *Roe v. Wade* (1973), sterilization, the care for the dying, the “Declaration on Certain Questions concerning Sexual Ethics” (*Persona Humana*),⁶¹ and the reply of the CTSA Committee Report on Sexuality.⁶²

Second, he reported on emerging methodological proposals for conscientious norm-making, particularly in the face of these conflicts: consequentialism, deontology, and teleology. Principles like double effect, cooperation, and toleration that were created precisely in order to deal with or circumvent “intrinsic evil” were routinely

57. McCormick, “Notes in Moral Theology: 1969,” *TS* 30 (1969): 635–92, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396903000404>.

58. On the fiftieth anniversary of the encyclical, see Curran, “*Humanae Vitae*: Fifty Years Later,” *TS* 79 (2018): 520–42. Noteworthy is Mark Massa’s *The Structure of Theological Revolutions: How the Fight Over Birth Control Transformed American Catholicism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018). Massa places Curran, who wrote elsewhere, at the center of the transforming change. Massa also describes how others subsequently developed their own “paradigms” for ascertaining the morally objective judgment. Two other “anniversary” works deserve mention: Konrad Hilpert and Sigrid Müller, eds., *Humanae vitae- die anstößige Enzyklika: Eine kritische Würdigung* (Freiburg: Herder, 2018); Javier de la Torre, *Humanae vitae 14: Una propuesta desde Amoris laetitia* (Maliaño, Spain: Sal Terrae, 2018).

59. Philip Keane, “The Objective Moral Order: Reflections on Moral Research,” *TS* 43 (1982): 260–78, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398204300203>.

60. McCormick, “Notes in Moral Theology: 1978,” 40 (1979): 59–112, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397904000104>.

61. He called the Declaration “a missed opportunity.” “Notes on Moral Theology: 1976,” *TS* 38 (1977): 57–114, at 112, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397703800103>.

62. Of the report McCormick wrote, “we have not learned the gentle and patient art of allowing a problem to mature.” “Notes on Moral Theology, 1977: The Church in Dispute,” *TS* 39 (1978): 76–138, at 138, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397803900104>.

invoked, and from one of them, double-effect, an entire moral system evolved known as “proportionalism.”⁶³ McCormick became a strong advocate of proportionalism which was a transitional neo-Scholastic method of proportionately weighing values while attending to intentionality and circumstances but refusing to recognize the claims of intrinsic evil.⁶⁴

Two other significant changes occur at this time, one concerning the readers and the other, the authors; both pertain to Curran’s claim that one of the major reasons for McCormick’s success was “the growing academic nature of moral theology and the importance of *Theological Studies*.”⁶⁵

Starting in the late 1960s, a growing group of readers emerges who were religious and lay Catholics trained in theology. This audience was less familiar with clericalism and the confessional and more acquainted with academic freedom.

At the same time authors developed a renewed openness to European theologians, a reversal of earlier policies. At the beginning of this article, we saw that Ford invoked a variety of European writers and engaged them positively, but after the war, Ford, Kelly, Lynch, and Farraher became less inclined to listen to their European colleagues who were clearly looking to reform moral theology. For instance, the Notes of 1952 and 1953 each saluted the Jesuit Gerard Gilleman for his work on the primacy of charity, but then ridiculed it for its attempt to propose a new methodology that would integrate the ascetical and the ethical.⁶⁶

More remarkable is the derision Farraher accords Bernard Häring for *Das Gesetz Christi*.⁶⁷ Farraher mocks Häring’s landmark contribution and adds, “In much of his complaining, Häring, like many who make similar complaints, seems to confuse moral theology with ascetical and pastoral theology.”⁶⁸ He concludes, “How can a science of right and wrong with respect to the sacraments overlook the positive institution of Christ and the admitted authority of the Church to define what is of obligation in their regard?”⁶⁹

63. Bernard Hoose, *Proportionalism: The American Debate and its European Roots* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1987).

64. James F. Keenan, “New Foundations for Moral Reasoning, 1970–1989,” *A History of Catholic Moral Theology in the Twentieth Century: From Confessing Sins to Liberating Consciences* (New York: Continuum, 2010), 141–72.

65. Curran, “Notes on Richard A. McCormick,” 534.

66. “But we still await the mystico-ascetico-theologico-confessorial genius who will adapt Fr. Gilleman’s theories to the realities of the classroom and confessional, and who will present it all in a text-book that will satisfy critics and professors alike. Meantime the spiritual attitude of the teacher himself and his viva voce communication of it to the future confessors in his charge will have to serve as a substitute.” John Ford and Gerald Kelly, “Notes in Moral Theology, 1953,” *TS* 15 (1954): 52–102, at 53, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056395401500103>; see also Gerald Kelly, “Notes in Moral Theology, 1952,” *TS* 14 (1953): 31–72, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056395301400102>.

67. Bernard Häring, *Das Gesetz Christi* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Erich Wewel, 1954); ET: *The Law of Christ*, 3 vols., trans. Edwin Kaiser (Westminster: Newman, 1961).

68. John Farraher, “Notes on Moral Theology,” *TS* 21 (1960): 581–625, at 581, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396002100403>.

69. Farraher, “Notes on Moral Theology,” 582.

The divide becomes more frequent and regular when Europeans entertain the legitimacy of oral contraceptives. John Lynch effectively develops an entire note to refute the now famous groundbreaking articles by W. Van der Marck and Louis Janssens.⁷⁰

McCormick's favorable read of Europeans was extraordinarily refreshing: while the names of Häring and Josef Fuchs were known favorably by some American Catholics who read other periodicals, McCormick introduced the journal's readers to Peter Knauer, Enrico Chiavacci, Bruno Schüller, Alfons Auer, Franz Böckle, Antonio Autiero, Dietmar Mieth, and a host of others. Not surprisingly, Häring himself contributed in 1976 to the journal, writing on responsible parenthood.⁷¹

American parochialism and its long-standing need to be more Roman than the Romans found little footing in McCormick's later notes, nor in the rest of the journal's editorial policy. But McCormick's own reviews become themselves the staple not only of Americans, but even of the Europeans. I remember in 1982 in my first course with Josef Fuchs at the Gregorian, Fuchs carrying the two volumes of McCormick's notes and urging us to buy them because we could not understand the moral theology of the last twenty years without them. And, he added, no other journal so pursued the discussions as *TS* had. As Curran noted, the journal gained international recognition and respect.⁷²

Beyond McCormick

By 1979, when McCormick revisited *Humanae Vitae*, the theological ethics of the journal was already undertaking three more significant shifts. First, ethicists begin looking for methods that are no longer solely designed for conflict cases and these writers are no longer solely American clerics, but lay men and women, and religious women, and noted Protestant ethicists. Second, these new voices incorporate the social into their ethical investigations and claims; the foundations of moral theology are less often primarily personal, but rather irrevocably social. Third, by the new millennium, ethicists are no longer writing with a Euro or American-centric mentality; ethicists connect and they and their bibliographies go global.

70. W. van der Marck, "Vruchtbaarheidsregeling: poging tot antwoord op een nog open vraag," *Tijdschrift voor theologie* 3 (1963): 378–413; L. Janssens, "Morale conjugale et progestogènes," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 39 (Oct.–Dec. 1963): 787–826. About the groundbreaking articles, Lynch concludes, "It would appear most likely that judgment by moral theologians will be generally adverse." "Notes in Moral Theology," *TS* 25 (1964): 232–53, at 246, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396402500204>. For a very different appraisal of these articles see Ambrogio Valsecchi, *Controversy: The Birth Control Debate 1958–1968* (Washington, D.C.: Corpus, 1968).

71. Bernard Häring, "New Dimensions of Responsible Parenthood," *TS* 37 (1976): 120–32, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397603700105>.

72. Richard A. McCormick, *Notes on Moral Theology: 1965 through 1980* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1981); *Notes on Moral Theology: 1981 through 1984* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1984).

A key to appreciating how ethicists were trying to construct a new method for moral judgment can be found by looking at another ethicist writing for the journal as McCormick is starting. In 1965, John Giles Milhaven writes an enthusiastic article on the work of a new lay contributor to the field, Germain Grisez,⁷³ and follows with another article admonishing his colleagues, McCormick and Kelly, for not substantiating the premises they hold, arguing for the need for a new epistemology of ethics.⁷⁴

The spring issue of 1967 is dedicated to the “new morality,” and Milhaven and David Casey report on the theological background of situation ethics that urges us to realize the love command in the immediacy of life.⁷⁵ Louis Dupré investigates situation ethics and the issue of moral objectivity, while Peter Chirico proposes his tension morality in the context of the (conflict) situation.⁷⁶ Robert Springer, a frequent writer for the Notes, illustrates how the new morality is being received worldwide, starting with reports from India. He claims the movement has three elements: a broader base for the data of moral reflection; a reevaluation of the teaching of the Magisterium; and a wider role for the empirical sciences in theological ethics.⁷⁷ These three elements become central in the writings of subsequent ethicists.

In 1970, Milhaven turns his epistemological concerns on abortion and presciently writes, “Irrespective of the intrinsic merits or demerits of any position, the abortion debate going on in the United States is a disaster.”⁷⁸ Then he proposes his own new method, a love ethics or a love epistemology in a consequentialist ethics.⁷⁹

McCormick certainly developed the attention to method, but as we see here, even before he did others were in search of it. Moreover, it was not simply the proportionalist versus deontological debate as McCormick too facilely and reductively described the extensive discussions regarding methodology. Europeans, for instance, were astonished to find themselves identified by him as proportionalists when they described themselves as belonging to either a faith-context ethics or an autonomous ethics in a

73. John Giles Milhaven, “Contraception and the Natural Law: A Recent Study,” *TS* 26 (1965): 421–27, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396502600305>.

74. John Giles Milhaven, “Toward an Epistemology of Ethics,” *TS* 27 (1966): 228–41, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396602700203>.

75. Milhaven and David Casey, “Introduction to the Theological Background of the New Morality,” *TS* 28 (1967): 213–44, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396702800201>.

76. Louis Dupré, “Situation Ethics and Objective Morality,” *TS* 28 (1967): 245–57, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396702800202>; and Peter Chirico, “Tension, Morality, and Birth Control,” *TS* 28 (1967): 258–85, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396702800203>. Later Nicholas Crotty developed further this idea of tension in “Conscience and Conflict,” *TS* 32 (1971): 208–32, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397103200202>.

77. Robert Springer, “Notes in Moral Theology: July–December 1966,” *TS* 28 (1967): 308–35, at 308, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396702800205>.

78. Milhaven, “The Abortion Debate: An Epistemological Interpretation,” 31 (1970): 106–34, at 106, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397003100104>.

79. Milhaven, “Objective Moral Evaluation of Consequences,” 32 (1971): 407–30, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397103200302>.

relational context.⁸⁰ Like situation ethics, both European methods were different from proportionalism.

Methods were generated and many were hardly mutual exclusive. In fact, some ethicists developed complex methods. Charles Curran, the premier moral theologian in the United States, was described by McCormick as a proportionalist, but Curran, trained by Häring, embodies, I think, a robust relational-responsibility ethics.⁸¹ Like Curran, Stephen Pope is interested in the comprehensiveness of his approach, which is a responsibility-virtue ethics based on love, informed by sociobiology, and driven by equity and the option for the poor.⁸² This very inclusive responsibility ethics resonates well with Protestant ethicists who often find in responsibility something more social about the foundations of ethics. An excellent example is Paul Ramsey's report in this journal on the Second Vatican Council's teachings on war.⁸³ As Roman Catholics were seeking new frameworks, Protestant ethicists were observing and engaging their Catholic colleagues.⁸⁴

Natural law is a recognizably Catholic method, and Germain Grisez, whose first recognition in the journal came from two very different sources, John Ford and John Giles Milhaven, developed a new natural law ethics that merited the attention of both John Connery⁸⁵ and Jean Porter.⁸⁶

Porter developed her distinctive claims on virtue and natural law that would bridge historical and contemporary claims, in particular Aquinas's (with a nod to Alasdair MacIntyre).⁸⁷ She investigated the possibility of a global ethic and acknowledged that

80. James Keenan and Thomas Kopfensteiner, "Moral Theology out of Western Europe," *TS* 59 (1998): 107–35, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399805900106>.

81. James Keenan, "The Moral Agent: Actions and Normative Decision Making," James J. Walter, Timothy O'Connell, and Thomas Shannon, eds., *A Call to Fidelity: On the Moral Theology of Charles E. Curran* (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2002): 37–54.

82. Stephen Pope, "The Order of Love and Recent Catholic Ethics: A Constructive Proposal," *TS* 52 (1991): 255–88, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399105200204>; "Proper and Improper Partiality and the Preferential Option for the Poor," *TS* 54 (1993): 242–71, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399305400203>; "The Convergence of Forgiveness and Justice: Lessons from El Salvador," 64 (2003): 812–35, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390306400407>.

83. See Paul Ramsey, "The Vatican Council on War," *TS* 27 (1966): 179–203, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056396602700201>.

84. Richard McCormick reports on one such engagement involving James Gustafson (who trained many contemporary Catholic theological ethicists) in "Exchanges on Fundamental Moral Theology," *TS* 47 (1986): 69–88, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398604700104>. Gustafson himself shared his observations in "Roman Catholic and Protestant Interaction Ethics: An Interpretation," *TS* 50 (1989): 44–69, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398905000103>.

85. John Connery, "Grisez on Abortion," *TS* 31 (1970): 170–78, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397003100107>.

86. Jean Porter, "'Direct' and 'Indirect' in Grisez's Moral Theory," *TS* 57 (1996): 611–32, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399605700402>.

87. Jean Porter, "Desire for God: Ground of the Moral Life in Aquinas," *TS* 47 (1986): 48–68, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398604700103>.

the belief that there are certain characteristically human needs and inclinations is consistent with the acknowledgment of deep, possibly even intractable disagreements among different moral traditions, since on this view, human nature, while real and morally significant, nonetheless under-determines morality. She concluded, “The claim that all moral traditions share a fundamental core, which amounts to a universally valid morality, appears to me to be defensible only if the core in question is described at such a high level of generality as to be virtually empty.”⁸⁸

Porter raised this question in the face of growing interest in the language of human rights, a position and a method that had greater and greater claims in this journal. Human rights received a resounding endorsement in the Spring issue of 1974, completely dedicated to the population explosion. The Yale Task Force on Population Ethics (identified as Drew Christiansen, Ronald Garet, David Hollenbach, and Charles Powers, with the cooperation of Margaret Farley) presented a compelling need for the discourse on human rights in the face of the population crisis.⁸⁹

Starting in 1976 Hollenbach brings human rights to the fore in the journal especially as he looks at our civic lives, and the abiding connection between human dignity and human rights.⁹⁰ Later, he considers them as the condition for participation in public society,⁹¹ but his most compelling contribution is where he reinterprets “the common-good tradition in a way that enables it to contribute to a nonindividualistic understanding of human rights.”⁹²

If Hollenbach gives us the foundations of human rights discourse as a vehicle to mediate contemporary social issues, then Kenneth Himes is the one who takes it out on the road. His article on humanitarian intervention is a foundational work for connecting human rights to matters of immediacy and urgency in our contemporary global era.⁹³ In a similar vein, in his assessment of contemporary globalization he notes the need for the Catholic social tradition to continue to deepen its appropriations of human rights.⁹⁴ More recently, Himes has used that vehicle to examine our

88. Jean Porter, “The Search for a Global Ethic,” *TS* 62 (2001): 105–21, at 121, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390106200106>.

89. The Yale Task Force on Population Ethics, “Moral Claims, Human Rights, and Population Policies,” *TS* 35: (1974): 83–113, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397403500105>.

90. David Hollenbach, “Public Theology in America: Some Questions for Catholicism after John Courtney Murray,” *TS* 37 (1976): 290–303, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397603700204>; “Religion and Political Life,” *TS* 52 (1991): 87–106; “War and Peace in American Catholic Thought.”

91. David Hollenbach, “The Bishops and the U.S. Economy,” 46 (1985): 101–14, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398504600107>.

92. David Hollenbach, “The Common Good Revisited,” *TS* 50 (1989): 70–94, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398905000104>.

93. Kenneth Himes, “The Morality of Humanitarian Intervention,” *TS* 55 (1994): 82–105, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399405500106>; “Intervention, Just War, and U.S. National Security.”

94. Kenneth Himes, “Globalization with a Human Face: Catholic Social Teaching and Globalization,” *TS* 69 (2008): 269–89, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390806900202>.

lives in the United States, writing remarkably telling and troubling articles about our social fabric: on consumerism, our war effort, the rise of economic inequality, and the election of Donald Trump.⁹⁵

In 1985, McCormick shared the Notes with David Hollenbach, Lisa Cahill, and John Langan. In 1986, the Spring issue has a surplus of writers: McCormick, Cahill, Hollenbach, Grisez, and Porter, as well as John Donahue and William Spohn, who each wrote about Scripture and ethics, with Spohn proposing virtue ethics as a worthy mediator.⁹⁶ As Lúcas Chan noted thirty years later, these two become effectively the pioneers of a biblical ethics that heeds the double competencies of exegesis and ethics, using virtue ethics invariably in its application.⁹⁷ At the end of the year, Fuchs and Langan wrote again. The new diversity of the writers is a credit to the McCormick legacy.

Between 1987 and 1990 until 2003, Langan effectively succeeded McCormick and oversaw the management of the Moral Notes. He would bring foundational philosophical concerns of a social nature to the notes, among those, human rights;⁹⁸ and besides his writings on war,⁹⁹ he frequently bridged social ethics and human rights together in addressing the US bishops' pastoral letters, "The Challenge of Peace" and "Economic Justice for All," as well as their "Statement on Capital Punishment."¹⁰⁰

This engagement of Catholic social ethics with human rights gets fortified in subsequent years.¹⁰¹ Bringing these insights to immigration, Spohn and William

-
95. Kenneth Himes, "Consumerism and Christian Ethics," *TS* 68 (2007): 132–54, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390706800107>; "The United States at War: Taking Stock," 71 (2010): 190–209, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056391007100111>; with Kate Ward, "Growing Apart': The Rise of Inequality," *TS* 75 (2014): 118–32, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040563913519045>; "The State of Our Union," *TS* 78 (2017): 147–70, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040563916682469>.
96. John Donahue, "The 'Parable' of the Sheep and the Goats: A Challenge to Christian Ethics," *TS* 47 (1986): 3–31, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398604700101>; William Spohn, "The Use of Scripture in Moral Theology," *TS* 47 (1986): 88–102, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398604700105>.
97. Lúcas Chan, "Biblical Ethics: 3D," *TS* 76 (2015): 112–28, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040563914565290>.
98. John Langan, "Rawls, Nozick, and the Search for Social Justice," *TS* 38 (1977): 346–58, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397703800206>; "Recent Philosophical Work in Moral Theory," *TS* 41 (1980): 549–67, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398004100304>; "Catholic Moral Rationalism and the Philosophical Bases of Moral Theology," *TS* 50 (1989): 25–43, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398905000102>.
99. See note 34 above.
100. John Langan, "Violence and Injustice in Society: Recent Catholic Teaching," *TS* 46 (1985): 685–99, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398504600405>; "The Pastoral on the Economy: From Drafts to Policy," *TS* 48 (1987): 135–56, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398704800108>; "The Christian Difference in Ethics," 49 (1988): 131–50, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398804900107>; "Capital Punishment," *TS* 54 (1993): 111–24.
101. William Byron, "Protection and Promotion of the Right to Food: An Ethical Reflection," *TS* 49 (1988): 319–34, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398804900205>; John Haughey, "Responsibility for Human Rights: Contributions from Bernard Lonergan," *TS* 63 (2002): 764–85, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390206300405>.

O’Neill write first on the topic;¹⁰² Kristin Heyer brings social sin into her lens on immigration and human rights,¹⁰³ then looks at displacement using transnational human rights and the scriptural virtue of hospitality,¹⁰⁴ and, finally, in the era of Trump, looks at human rights, structures of social justice and the virtue of civic friendship.¹⁰⁵

In a formidable article that captures how contemporary virtue ethics constantly proposes itself for the social collective, Cathleen Kaveny imaginatively engages both virtue theory and human rights.¹⁰⁶ Similarly, Kaveny¹⁰⁷ and Maura Ryan¹⁰⁸ each develop significantly the social ambit and structural concourse of bioethics, and later Andrea Vicini turns to a global view of bioethics in his writings for the journal.¹⁰⁹

In these writers, we see the influence of the social that feminism brings to ethics. In 1972 Rosemary Radford Ruether writes on the paradox of hope and becomes the first woman to write for the journal,¹¹⁰ and later Anne Carr wonders whether a Christian feminist theology is possible.¹¹¹ In 1975, an entire issue is dedicated to feminism, and Margaret Farley makes a major contribution suggesting relationships as opposed to acts as the point of departure for the moral understanding of sexuality; moreover, she

-
102. William O’Neill and William Spohn, “Rights of Passage: The Ethics of Immigration and Refugee Policy,” *TS* 59 (1998): 84–106, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399805900105>.
 103. Kristin Heyer, “Social Sin and Immigration: Good Fences Make Bad Neighbors,” *TS* 71 (2010): 410–36, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056391007100207>.
 104. Kristin Heyer, “Reframing Displacement and Membership: Ethics of Migration,” *TS* 73 (2012): 188–206, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056391207300109>.
 105. Kristin Heyer, “Internalized Borders: Immigration Ethics in the Age of Trump,” *TS* 79 (2018): 146–64, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040563917744396>.
 106. Cathleen Kaveny, “Imagination, Virtue, and Human Rights: Lessons from Australian and U.S. Law,” *TS* 70 (2009): 109–39, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390907000105>.
 107. Cathleen Kaveny (with Keenan), “Ethical Issues in Health-Care Restructuring,” *TS* 56 (1995): 136–50; “Assisted Suicide, Euthanasia, and The Law,” *TS* 58 (1997) 124–48, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399705800108>; “Notes on Moral Theology: Ethical, Theological, and Legal Issues in Genetics,” *TS* 60 (1999): 109–47, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399906000106>. Kaveny continues to do this pioneering work, as can be seen in her note on Pope Francis in this issue.
 108. Maura Ryan, “Beyond a Western Bioethics?” 65 (2004): 158–77, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390406500105>; “Health and Human Rights,” *TS* 69 (2008): 144–63, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390806900108>.
 109. Andrea Vicini, “Bioethics: Basic Questions and Extraordinary Developments,” *TS* 73 (2012): 169–87, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056391207300108>; with Agnes Brazal, “Longing for Transcendence: Cyborgs and Trans- and Posthumans,” *TS* 76 (2015): 148–65, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040563914565308>.
 110. Rosemary Radford Ruether, “Paradoxes of Human Hope: The Messianic Horizon of Church and Society,” *TS* 33 (1972): 235–52, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397203300202>.
 111. Anne Carr, “Is a Christian Feminist Theology Possible?” *TS* 43 (1982): 279–97, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398204300204>.

proposes that these relationships need to be understood not in the neo-Scholastic framework of women's subservience, but rather in a newly constructed way that highlights equity, equal regard, self-sacrifice, active receptivity, and mutuality.¹¹² As she concludes the article, she turns to matters of justice and the common good and bridges significantly the fields of sexual ethics and social ethics for the first time in the pages of this journal.

Lisa Sowle Cahill contributes the first of her many articles in this journal entering into the discussion of method offering a non-utilitarian, teleological ethics that mediates justice.¹¹³ Her second article is on "beginning of life" issues where she argues for consistency, moving issues of social justice and poverty to the fore when talking about abortion and reproductive technology.¹¹⁴ Remarkably, in her next article on marriage, she again brings the social into consideration of marriage; the feminist priority for equity is leveraged in Cahill's writings by engaging goods like sexuality, bioethics, and marriage in their social contexts, using the tools from the Catholic social ethics tradition to better understand the moral issues before us.¹¹⁵

Cahill brings feminism irrevocably into theological ethics.¹¹⁶ Her feminism bridges the claims of Catholic social justice into both sexual and bioethics, and as she does this, she begins to look much more globally at issues of justice, equity, and alienation, offering strategies of empowerment and participation.¹¹⁷ Most of all, she continues to construct platforms of equal access, and because of that, she brilliantly responded to Porter's claims on the quest for a global ethics.¹¹⁸ Cahill did not deny the genesis of moral insight in the local but she also recognized as tangible and significant the social claims to guarantee rights beyond the local. Rather than thinking of universal claims as unattainable, Cahill found the quest for them to be a mandate for contemporary Catholic ethics.

-
112. Margaret Farley, "New Patterns of Relationship: Beginnings of a Moral Revolution," *TS* 36 (1975): 627–46, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397503600403>.
113. Lisa Sowle Cahill, "Teleology, Utilitarianism, and Christian Ethics," *TS* 42 (1981): 601–29, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398104200404>.
114. Lisa Sowle Cahill, "The 'Seamless Garment': Life in Its Beginnings," *TS* 46 (1985): 64–80, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398504600105>; "Sanctity of Life, Quality of Life, and Social Justice," *TS* 48 (1987): 105–23, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398704800106>.
115. Lisa Sowle Cahill, "Sexual Ethics, Marriage, and Divorce," *TS* 47 (1986): 102–17, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398604700106>; "Catholic Sexual Ethics and the Dignity of the Person: A Double Message," *TS* 50 (1989): 120–50, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398905000106>.
116. Lisa Sowle Cahill, "Feminist Ethics," *TS* 51 (1990): 49–64, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399005100104>.
117. Lisa Sowle Cahill, "Bioethics," *TS* 67 (2006): 120–42, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390606700105>.
118. Lisa Sowle Cahill, "Toward Global Ethics," *TS* 63 (2002): 324–44, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390206300205>.

Cahill has bridged both sexual and bioethics with social ethics and at the same time moved the center of fundamental ethics from the personal to the social. In this way, feminists such as Susan Ross and Christine Firer Hinze remind us frequently of social location and equity.¹¹⁹

Looking for the impact of the social on theological ethics, the most remarkable development in a method is how virtue ethics shifts its center from the personal to the social as well. Stanley Hauerwas brings the contemporary retrieval of virtue to the journal,¹²⁰ though Spohn introduces the reader to the contemporary work on virtue ethics.¹²¹ Like Pope, Spohn takes virtue ethics into the realm of the social and especially when he, like Chan after him, wrote on biblical ethics.¹²² Christopher Vogt would bring these accomplishments to the fore when he specifically looked at this transition.¹²³

Virtue ethics brings the methodological capacity for comparison. For instance, biblical ethicists can compare with today what vigilance or mercy in a biblical text meant at the time of the composition of the Scripture. Just as this method provides bridges across history, it does the same geographically: cultures in New York, Nairobi, and Manila can talk about hospitality each in their own cultures, appreciating the differences and similarities.

Making possible that type of communication is what I have tried to do as editor of these Notes, since 2003. Over these fifteen years I have been interested in bridging

-
119. Susan Ross, "Feminist Theology: A Review of the Literature," *TS* 56 (1995): 327–41, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399505600206>. See also, Christine Firer Hinze, "Social and Economic Ethics," *TS* 70 (2009): 159–76, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390907000107>; "U.S. Catholic Social Thought, Gender, and Economic Livelihood," *TS* 66 (2005): 568–91, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390506600303>.
120. Stanley Hauerwas, "Toward an Ethics of Character," *TS* 33 (1972): 698–715, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056397203300404>.
121. Spohn, "Virtue and American Character," *TS* 48 (1987): 123–35, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398704800107>; "Passions and Principles," *TS* 52 (1991): 69–87, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399105200105>; "The Return of Virtue Ethics," *TS* 53 (1992): 60–75, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399205300104>; "Spirituality and Ethics: Exploring the Connections," *TS* 58 (1997): 109–23, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399705800107>.
122. Spohn, "Parable and Narrative in Christian Ethics," *TS* 51 (1990): 100–14, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399005100107>; "Jesus and Christian Ethics," *TS* 56 (1995): 92–107, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399505600105>.
123. Christopher Vogt, "Fostering a Catholic Commitment to the Common Good: An Approach Rooted in Virtue Ethics," *TS* 68 (2007): 394–417, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390706800208>.

history¹²⁴ and geography¹²⁵ through a variety of approaches. While my own work lies in virtue ethics, my interest, in keeping with the later practices of *Theological Studies*, is in giving platforms to newer voices, now including global ones,¹²⁶ like Peter Black, Agnes Brazal, Clement Campos, Lúcas Chan, John D'Arcy May, Marianne Heimbach-Steins, Linda Hogan, Rafael Luciani, Michael Northcott, Agbonkhanmeghe Orobator, Juan Carlos Scannone, and Andrea Vicini, all whose articles help readers understand and appreciate this journal's global reach and responsibility. Therein lies our future.

Author Biography

James F. Keenan, SJ, is Canisius Professor at Boston College and Founder of Catholic Theological Ethics in the World Church. He is presently writing a book, *A Brief History of Catholic Theological Ethics* (Paulist).

124. For instance, James Keenan, "Applying the Seventeenth-Century Casuistry of Accommodation to HIV Prevention," *TS* 60 (1999): 492–512, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399906000305>; "Moral Theology and History," *TS* 62 (2001): 86–104, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390106200105>; "Fundamental Moral Theology at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century," *TS* 67 (2006): 99–119, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390606700104>; "Fundamental Moral Theology: Tradition," *TS* 70 (2009): 140–58, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390907000106>. Also see, Lisa Fullam, "Toward a Virtue Ethics of Marriage: Augustine and Aquinas on Friendship in Marriage," *TS* 73 (2012): 663–92, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056391207300309>; Michael G. Lawler and Todd A. Salzman, "Virtue Ethics: Natural and Christian," *TS* 74 (2013): 442–73, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056391307400209>.

125. James Keenan, "Proposing Cardinal Virtues," *TS* 56 (1995): 709–29, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399505600405>; "Contemporary Contributions to Sexual Ethics," *TS* 71 (2010): 148–67, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056391007100109>.

126. James Keenan, "What Happened at Trento 2010?" *TS* 72 (2011): 131–49, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056391107200107>.