

There is a big scene, and they pull him in and ask, "Why can't we sure this man?" And the first thing Jesus does is to look up to heaven and say, "O faithless and unbelieving generation. How long must I put up with you?" That has given me a lot of consolation, and a lot of devotion to the humanity of Christ, who chose to experience the frustration that we all experience every day.

How did he do it? Christ drew his strength from his rich inner life, nourished by prayer. He saw things with a supernatural vision and was spurred on by his mission, to redeem humanity out of love. He embraced every moment as full of meaning and saw it with the perspective of eternity.

Through my friends in Opus Dei, I discovered the joy and the adventure of developing an inner life. I began to dedicate time to prayer and draw strength from the sacraments. I began to see that my desk is my altar, the place I can sacrifice myself for others, the place I can encounter God. On a good day, I accept the double bookings, emergency calls at 5 p.m. on Friday, patients who arrive an hour late, and hours of disability forms as coming from God's hands; on my bad days, my job is a flog and I can get quite "toxic." Every day I start again.

In addition to bringing me closer to God, my work gives me the opportunity to reach out to others. I try to do this more by my example than my words. As most of my patients have cancer, there are many opportunities to affirm their dignity and speak with them about their spiritual concerns. I'm sure you are familiar with the old adage that there are no atheists in foxholes. Well, I can tell you that there are very few atheists among those who are struggling with cancer. As a devout Catholic in an agnostic academic environment, I try to open the minds of my colleagues to the concept of a loving God and the possibility of an inner life. Through my profession as an oncologist and teacher I try to help foster respect for the elderly and the dying. I sometimes find it hard to swim against the tide and have to ask for more courage.

There is a beautiful quote in an article by Cardinal Ratzinger written around the time of the canonization of St. Josemaria, in which he describes this sense of divine filiation, and the effects that it can have for the individual person and for the world. He says, "Those who have this link with God, those who have this uninterrupted conversation with him, can dare to respond to challenges and are no longer afraid because those who are in God's hands always fall into God's hands. This is how fear disappears and courage is born to respond to the contemporary world."

I'm eternally grateful to St. Josemaria for helping me to realize that I didn't need to go to the top of the mountain in order to find God, and that I could find Him in the center of my soul. I would like to end with these words of his: "My children, heaven and earth seem to merge on the horizon. But where they really meet is in your heart."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> St. Josemaria Escrivá, "Passionately Loving the World," paragraph 16.

CLIFFORD ORWIN

## RESPONSE TO THE PAPERS OF JENNY DRIVER AND CARLOS CAVALLÉ, WITH REPLIES BY DRIVER AND CAVALLÉ

I am certainly the odd man out at this panel, being neither a devotee of St. Josemaria, nor a Catholic, nor even a Christian. I view only from the outside the life and example of the remarkable man whom you are able to view as your own. Of course that's why I was invited: I am to provide an outside perspective, and in that respect at least I can't possibly fail.

In fact, in my role of designated outsider I am going to give you double your money's worth. In commenting on these two powerful papers I will adopt perspectives external not just to those of the authors but to my own. In my remarks on Dr. Driver's paper, for instance, you will hear from Orwin the Conventional Liberal (even though the actual Orwin is at most an Unconventional Liberal.) I will play this role for fear that no one else at this gathering will do so, and because I'm eager to hear Dr. Driver's response to an objection couched in these terms. That may help me learn how to respond to it; Lord knows I've heard it often enough from critics of Opus Dei.

All right, then. As a liberal, I declaim as follows. The nerve of Dr. Driver in introducing Christianity into her medical practice. Doesn't she see that the same liberal tolerance that smiles on her practicing her religion in its proper place frowns on her introducing it into the workplace? For our liberal way of life excludes religion from the public sphere, and the workplace is increasingly (and properly) conceived as pertaining to the public sphere. That's why we must maintain it quite strictly as everything neutral. You know what I mean: race neutral, gender neutral, culture neutral, sexual preference neutral. All right, not smoking neutral, I'll grant you that, but certainly faith neutral. The workplace must be perfectly, indiscriminately inclusive, and so while adherents of all religions are welcome, they must park those religions at the door. This is why we liberals distrust you in Opus Dei; you may call yourselves God's Work, but God's Work has no place in the workplace. Certainly not in Dr. Driver's workplace, dedicated as it is to the Baconian project of the relief of man's estate.

This critique seems to me to pose a greater practical obstacle to Dr. Driver's Christian aspirations than she acknowledges in her statement. She does acknowledge it as a significant one. "As a devout Catholic in an agnostic academic environment, I try to open the minds of my colleagues to the concept of a loving God and the possibility of an inner life. ... I sometimes find it hard to swim against the tide and have to ask for more courage." What Dr. Driver

doesn't say is whether working in an agnostic academic environment, she experiences conflict between the demands she places on herself as a Christian and the demands of that environment.

I hope that I won't embarrass Dr. Driver if I compare her situation with that of the venerable religious who will soon join Father Escriva among the saints of the Church, Mother Teresa of Calcutta. I turn to Mother Teresa *faute de mieux*, because I don't know much about recent paragons of Catholicism but I do know something about her. I'm writing a book on the role of compassion in modern society, and I felt that to this end there was nothing more important for me to grasp than the distinction between true Christian charity and this its ersatz modern successor. In the book I adopt Princess Diana as my icon of secular compassion, and Mother Teresa as my model of Christian charity.

One of the writers on Mother Teresa I found most useful for clarifying her greatness was the most virulent of her detractors, the British journalist Christopher Hitchens. Aggressively secular, antireligious in general and anti-Catholic in particular, Hitchens hated Mother Teresa for the best of reasons: because she was so deeply devout. And since she and her order provided medical treatment, Hitchens's critique of her may apply to Dr. Driver as well.

Hitchens is indignant that despite Teresa's great reputation among the fashionably philanthropic of the world, she was not in fact a humanitarian. For had she been one, she would have been a modern, pain-relieving, oblivion dispensing medical practitioner, and would have trained her Sisters of Charity to be likewise, but she wasn't and she didn't.

Hitchens is of course correct; a modern medical practitioner Mother Teresa never claimed to be. I quote her: "We are first of all religious. We are not social workers, not teachers, not nurses or doctors. We are religious sisters. We serve Jesus in the poor. We nurse him, feed him, clothe him, visit him, comfort him in the poor, the abandoned, the sick, the orphans, the dying. Our lives are very much woven with the Eucharist. We have a deep faith in Jesus' Blessed Sacrament. Because of this faith, it is not so difficult to see Christ and touch him in the distressing disguise of the poor."

Now this is very powerful and wholly alien to the conception of medicine that prevails in the contemporary "agnostic academic workplace." It stands to it in the relation of charity to mere humanitarianism, but it must be recognized that the latter arose in opposition to the former with the intention of subverting and supplanting it. Compassion, like most social phenomena, is as important for what it isn't as for what it is. The crucial thing it isn't—what those great geniuses who launched it into the world in the 18th Century specifically designed it not to be—is Christian charity. Dr. Driver grasps this clearly; it's why she speaks of having to swim upstream in her agnostic academic workplace.

But if Mother Teresa remains our example—and again I apologize to Dr. Driver if she finds the comparison embarrassing—what she provided was not only more than a secular physician would—in addition to it but compatible with it—but irreconcilably different from it. Her approach to her patients was

not primarily a clinical one, directed to healing their bodies or, that failing, to minimize their pain. As a practitioner of charity, she addressed the problem of suffering differently than if she were acting from compassion.

Indeed, even to recognize suffering as a problem (as opposed to merely an evil) is to step outside the bounds of the modern therapeutic mentality. Dr. Driver recounts of her early years as a physician that "each one of us ultimately faced the questions, 'Why am I doing this? What is the meaning of my patient's suffering? What is the value of my work?'" I wonder, however, how many of Dr. Driver's colleagues joined her in raising the question of the meaning of suffering. For the modern humanitarian, suffering exists to be abolished, and for no other reason. Like death itself, it is a natural defect, an objection to life. Only for the believer is suffering a problem, which is to say a riddle and an opportunity. As Teresa put it, "Suffering in itself is nothing, but suffering shared with Christ's passion is a wonderful gift to human life. Suffering is a sign of love because this is how God the Father proved that he loved the world — by giving his Son to die for us and expiate our sin. Suffering in itself does not bring joy, but Christ as seen in suffering does."

Hitchens's *Kulturkampf* against Mother Teresa dramatizes the clash between the Christian notion of salvation through suffering and the post-Christian project of the abolition of earthly suffering. So my question to Dr. Driver is simply this. Does this clash haunt her efforts to negotiate her agnostic academic workplace in the footsteps of St. Josemaria? Does she understand the Christian component of her medical practice as in addition to what her colleagues provide, or as in tension with it? Does her deep Christian faith, in sanctifying her working life, also greatly complicate it?

I turn now to the remarks of Carlos Cavallé. While so different from Dr. Driver's personal confession, his talk too evoked my admiration. What an idea not only to set out to ennoble the world of business through the example of St. Josemaria but to conduct empirical research into the feasibility of this project. (I should add that I was privileged to enjoy a delightful conversation with Professor Cavallé yesterday afternoon in which he further expounded his project to me.) Where there's a will there's a way, much of the time, at least, and Professor Cavallé's will seems indomitable.

From one workplace to another, from the world of modern medicine to that of the modern commercial enterprise. Here too, we confront an audacious attempt to Christianize the designedly un-Christian. For as modern humanitarianism was the project of defectors from Christianity who had learned from it the better to supplant it, so modern economics was the creature of other thinkers (or even of the same ones) who conceived of it as furthering this same project. When we read Locke or Montesquieu, or Adam Smith — to cite just the three greatest theoretical proponents of a new world of commerce — we find a radical critique of Christian charity as having issued inevitably in economic stagnation. All three thinkers promoted the "invisible hand" of human self-interest — Smith's famous term — as superior to Christian principles in its effectiveness as a motivator and therefore in its tendency to promote the gen-

eral welfare. They deemed greed to be good, not because they were lacking in philanthropic concern, but because they were guided by it. If there was to be boundless increase in the stock of goods available to sustain the human race, there must be boundless incentive to strive for it, and for this the only reliable motive was personal profit, liberated from the constraining shackles of Christian doctrine.

Well, it worked, productivity having soared to levels of which Locke and Smith could only have dreamed. Professor Cavallé welcomes this outcome: he is not anti-growth but pro-development. Nor is he simply hostile to the acquisitive passions. He does not malign ambition for oneself or on behalf of one's shareholders. He insists that the teachings of St. Josemaria do not override but even re-enforce "legitimate motives" of this sort. He is aware, however, that once liberated from the salutary restraints of the Christian faith, these motives tend to excess. As he himself puts it, we live today with "the imbalances that result from a materialistic approach to business and from personal and institutional greed."

Viewed from the perspective of the fathers of the modern economic enterprise, Dr. Cavallé seeks to reconfine this enterprise within that strait jacket of Christian doctrine its escape from which first defined it as modern and economic. Why do I state the matter in these loaded terms? Not because I am adverse to Professor Cavallé's project, any more than I am to Dr. Driver's, on the contrary, I wish him all success. But I want to raise the question of whether the synthesis for which he hopes—in which charity and acquisitiveness walk hand and hand—is as feasible as it would be desirable.

In conclusion, then, let me summarize my doubts about both these worthy projects, that of Dr. Driver and that of Professor Cavallé. As a student of the history of political thought, I'm convinced that modernity arose in the world in repudiation of Christianity, and that this repudiation was of its essence. Its founders aspired to a non-Christian future much brighter than the Christian past. Such was the ethos of their project and such has its ethos remained. From the point of view of Christianity, modernity is a runaway train. As for the workplace, it is the forge of modernity. There the systematic remaking of God's former world is incessantly advanced and consolidated. St Josemaria's "sanctification of work" is thus a project of breathtaking boldness. It would refound the modern edifice on the basis of the stone that the builders rejected.

#### Jenny Driver's Reply

I promise I'll be very brief. First, I want to ask for a copy of your remarks, so I can work on my homework after I get home.

I was extremely anxious when I was accepted to the program at Harvard because I thought that perhaps my devout Christian beliefs would be in terrible conflict with my academic community and then I really wouldn't make it. I'm certain that if I had been more up front about my beliefs regarding medical ethics I would not have been accepted. But I wasn't asked about them so I didn't talk about them.

But afterwards it was very interesting. I work in a Jewish hospital, the Beth Israel Hospital, for which I'm very, very grateful for many reasons. When it became obvious that I did have beliefs about health care ethics that were different from the "party line" that some people hold in the academic community at Harvard, there was support for me because of the history of the hospital. It was founded by people with strong religious beliefs who wanted to be cared for in a way that was in keeping with those beliefs, in a society that was in conflict with some of them. So I was respected and was even asked to become the chief resident, even though throughout my career there I did not prescribe contraception and I did not refer patients for abortion. Working that out within that system was really kind of an act of God. So, in fact it wasn't as much of a conflict as I thought it would be.

To the question whether Christianity really fits into the working environment there, I would say, yes, it fits in because that's what's missing. And in my experience of talking to colleagues who are agnostic, they actually admire what a person who does have religious beliefs brings to the profession, because I can tell you that when someone is dying in a hospital room, the more common approach is for physicians and health staff to walk by the room and not feel comfortable going in. My faith allows me to want to go in—that's the first place I want to go. That's the kind of thing that's missing, and so I would say that it's been embraced by my colleagues rather than rejected.

#### Carlos Cavallé's Reply

Thank you very much for your comments. In a recent book, one of the most distinguished philosophers alive makes the point that the contemporary world lacks a deep study of what a human person is. He says we are a hundred years behind in research on the nature of the human person. Research of this kind could help resolve the problem you raise.

I had the opportunity of living with this philosopher for a number of years and one day I told him, "Look, I have discussed current economic approaches with my colleagues around the world. If I go, for example, to the Harvard Business School, which is the epitome of liberal capitalism, and discuss these approaches with the Dean, we end up with the concept of the human person." So I asked my philosopher friend, "Can you give me a very simple way of explaining to other people who are not philosophers what a human person is?" A couple of months later he said, "I've got it!" Well, I can tell you what he said, but I cannot explain it in detail here and now. It would take much longer. But he said, "We know from experience and from revelation that the human person is a free and rational being created to the image and likeness of God. We know it." But then he added, "With an immortal soul that is longing for God." That is to say, we have a built-in capacity that makes our immortal soul long for God. It is not something that has been added to us. Any person in the world, in any corner of the world, has this built-in capacity. You cannot keep God away from business because then you keep a very important part of the individual person away from business, and then the person cannot fully realize himself in business.



The philosopher continued, "The human person is a rational and free individual, created in the image and likeness of God; and God has left His imprint so to speak in the human creature, giving the creature a built-in capacity which is a longing for God—and a built-in capacity to love others for themselves and not for selfish reasons." Now for a number of years, Adam Smith and your friends (and my friends) have been treating the human person in organizations as a resource, a *resource*, and even sometimes as a less important resource than coal, petrol, energy and other similar things. Well, they never got rid of material energy but they could get rid of people when they were not useful to them.

All this is changing because, even though we lack that hundred years of research on what the human person is, the world is beginning to realize that the materialistic approach to business that you described, which discards religion, is the wrong one. As you were telling me the other day, your father in his business used to act as a Jew. Modern economic theory is beginning to recognize the importance of the human person. An understanding of the human person is needed in order to make the human person the center of economic activity and not simply a natural resource or simply the market, the abstract market in general, as in the past. This is what is really needed, and I believe that the contribution of St. Josemaria in this respect is very important, because for him, there is nothing more important, after God, than the human person.

CECILIA A. ROYALS

## LET THEM VIGOROUSLY CONTRIBUTE THEIR EFFORT:<sup>1</sup> *OPUS DEI* AND THE NEW EVANGELIZATION

### Introduction

The National Institute of Womanhood is a non-partisan, non-sectarian, civil-society organization that works to meet social challenges by promoting con-



Graeme Hunter, John Hartley, John Murphy, and Cecilia Royals at St. Michael's College, University of Toronto, January 10, 2003.

structive dialogue on issues pertaining to the development of the person, the family, and society through public opinion, policy analysis, and leadership development. It is incorporated in the State of Maryland, is governed by a constitution and a board of directors. It is a free and autonomous social entity.

Neither the Catholic Church nor *Opus Dei* directs the activities of NIW. Any suggestion of such a link would be a throw-back to a distorted understanding of the laity, when the laity were limited to participating in the apostolic activities of the hierarchy. The autonomy and freedom of NIW to function in the world as it sees fit, not linked to *Opus Dei* or the Church, are precisely what demonstrate a very important element of *Opus Dei* and the dynamism of the new evangelization.

<sup>1</sup> Second Vatican council, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*, 36.