THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

Preserving American Jewish History

MS-603: Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum Collection, 1945-1992.

Series C: Interreligious Activities. 1952-1992

Box 49, Folder 2, Vatican Council II, 1962-1964.

3101 Clifton Ave, Cincinnati, Ohio 45220
(513) 221-1875 phone, (513) 221-7812 fax
americanjewisharchives.org

COPY

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
Institute of Human Relations
165 EAST 56TH STREET NEW YORK 22, N.Y.

PARIS OFFICE
30, rue la Boëtie
Paris VIII

October 18, 1962

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. John Slawson

From: Zachariah Shuster

Subj: Ecumenical Council

I am writing this in Rome, a few days after the opening of the Ecumenical Council, which I attended as a guest.

The inaugural ceremony was most unusual in solemnity, splendor and profound dignity. Tens of thousands of people -- priests, nuns, laymen from all parts of the world and of various races and ethnic groups -- crowded the Basilica and the Square of St. Peter, and were visibly dominated by a sense of awe and the importance of the historic event they were witnessing. In this report I shall dwell on developments during the first week of the Council's proceedings with regard to the subjects which are relevant to matters of our concern.

First, it should be pointed out that Pope John XXIII himself in his inaugural address, expressed the new attitude which is now prevailing among many Catholic clergymen throughout the world. The essential elements of this attitude are a realization of tremendous changes in the world situation; a turning away from the spirit of severity, austerity and condemnation of heresies; and a desire to find a way toward understanding with non-Catholic groups. Some of the striking passages in the Pope's address setting forth these realizations are the following:

> "Divine providence is leading us to a new order of human relations... Everything, even human differences, leads to the greater good of the Church...The spouse of Christ prefers to make use of the medicine of mercy rather than that of severity...Men are ever more deeply convinced of the paramount dignity of the human person and of his perfectioning, as well as the duties that this implies... The Catholic Church, raising the torch of religious truth by means of the Ecumenical Council, desires to show herself the loving mother of all, benign, patient, full of mercy towards the children separated from her..."

The intent of these passages was emphasized in most of the inspired comments which followed the inaugural address. It was succintly summed up by a leading Italian newspaper in these words:

"

> "The great merit of John XXIII is of having noted that anathemas are of little value and that much more productive is the dialogue, comprehension, confrontation of different points of view; and the realization that truth is one but the roads to it are infinite."

It is generally assumed that one of the major reasons for the emergence of the new spirit in Rome is the awareness of the revolutionary changes that have taken place in the demographic, political and social structures of the world since Vatican Council I, 92 years ago.

Official and inspired sources spelled out this point in various ways; but stress was particularly laid on the following facts: out of more than three billion people living on this planet, only less than a billion are Christians, and of these 500 million Catholics, many of them only nominally so, and others living under regimes which are inimical to religion; every year there are born 22 million non-Catholics, only 5 million Catholics; at this rate of development, in the year 2000 the number of Catholics in the world will be only 9 to 10% instead of the present 18%.

A comparison of the composition of the two Vatican Councils accentuates the fundamental changes that have taken place in less than a century. The first Council was dominated by European Bishops and Cardinals who numbered 60% of the Council Fathers. The present Ecumenical Council consists of mostly non-European clergymen, and only 38% of the participants are Europeans, although 47% of the Catholic population of the world resides in Europe. Among the approximately three thousand Cardinals and Bishops taking part in this Council, there are 150 colored Bishops, including 60 Africans and 90 Asiatics. Among the Cardinals there is one Chinese, one Japanese, one Indian, one Philippino and one African. Of the Europeans, the Italians have the largest group, counting 313; and the rest of Europe only 400. Incidentally, the predominance of Italians, who also constitute the overwhelming majority of the Roman Curia -- or the Vatican government -- is one of the reasons for the conflict that came to the fore in the first few days of the Council.

In short, the alert and forward looking elements of the Catholic Church are clearly facing the problems of a world in which Christians are in a minority and in which the prospects for growth and influence are diminishing. It is this basic realization which is at the core of the various reforms projected with regard to internal aspects of the Church as, for example, the desire for a change in liturgy from Latin to the vernacular, authorizing laymen to perform religious functions (this is primarily owing to the fact that the 500 million Catholics are now served by less than 300,000 priests and the growing difficulties of recruiting candidates for

the priesthood), the desire for greater autonomy of the Bishops and lessening the constant control and supervision of Rome. And this is also the practical background for the spirit of rapprochement with Protestants and Jews.

* * *

Official observers invited to the Council consisted primarily of representatives of Protestant denominations, and two of the Greek Orthodox Church. No non-Christian group was invited, and thus the question of Jewish representation was eliminated. The State of Israel, though not accredited to the Vatican, was invited to send representatives to the inaugural session, as were other non-accredited states, including the United States. The representatives of Israel were: Mr. Maurice Fisher, Ambassador of Israel to Italy; Mr. Ben Tour, Ambassador of Israel to Switzerland; and Dr. Shaul Colby, Director of the Ministry of Religious Affairs. Of the Arab States, there were representatives of Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and the United Arab Republic.

Mr. Fisher told me that at one of the diplomatic receptions the Pope greeted him very cordially and spent a few minutes in conversation with him. Neither the Jewish Community of Italy nor the Rabbi of Rome received an invitation to the opening session; as no invitations were extended to any private persons or non-Catholic religious group. The Jewish community of Italy, however, through its President, Sergio Piperno, took the initiative to issue a message of greetings to the Ecumenical Council, which was published in the Italian press.

During the entire period of the preparations for the Council, official Vatican sources -- except for Cardinal Bea -- have not referred to Christian/Jewish relations as a subject to be dealt with by the Council. However, immediately before the opening of the Council, references to the Jewish subject were made in some Italian publications, and they were obviously inspired by the Vatican. The gist of these comments were that the age-old accusation of deicide and the responsibility laid upon all Jewish generations for it will be probably taken up by the Council. In the various statements made by the arriving Church dignitaries, there were a great many references to the subject of Christian unity, but nothing about Jews. However, there was a singular exception, and this was the statement made by Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, on his arrival at the Rome airport, where he was received by Vatican representatives, and which was prominently featured in the Italian press. He said:

> "In the United States there is a plurality of Protestant confessions, and all look with interest to this Council. No one expects the unity of the churches on this occasion, but all expect that an atmosphere favorable to reaching this unity will be created. In a more or less near future, there will be one flock, and only one pastor."

"When I speak of a favorable atmosphere" added Cardinal Cushing, "I mean that this is the occasion for Catholics, Protestants and Jews to better know each other. There are many differences, but even more things in common. I have always maintained that all those who have a common faith must form a common front against atheistic Communism. I have always asked Catholics not to close themselves in their community, and have done the same for the Jews and the Protestants. We must stay together in order to mutually love each other and know each other. The union of the Protestant Churches and the Jewish community have sent me their good wishes for our Conciliar work."

While there was little mention in public of the Jewish matter, Cardinal Bea quickly developed a large-scale plan for action on the subject. You know from my previous memorandum of the two papers that had been prepared on this matter: one, a short discussion paper; and another, prepared by Cardinal Bea for presentation to the Council as the declaration to be adopted. This document consists of a comprehensive statement which not only condemns anti-Semitism, but rejects the traditional charges of deicide and states that they are based on misinterpretation of texts in the New Testament. Cardinal Bea, however, was not satisfied with the wording of this paper, and at the last moment introduced changes which made the declaration much stronger and more binding. Another important and favorable change took place immediately before the opening of the Council, when Cardinal Bea made the decision not to present the short discussion paper, but to submit his own paper as the basis for discussion and as the final declaration for adoption.

Cardinal Bea is not only a man of great principles, but a first-rate strategist, and has a refined sense for detailed action. His proposed declaration was circulated by him and his representatives among the entire Vatican hierarchy and among the Bishops and Cardinals who have come to the Council from various parts of the world. Cardinal Bea and his staff, many of whom are young priests of keen intelligence, have analyzed the Council membership in terms of potential sympathizers, potential opponents, and indifferents. Probably most of the Council Fathers belong to the third category. Before the first week of the Council was over, many of the Bishops and Cardinals had received not only Cardinal Bea's proposed declaration, but were approached personally by Bea's representatives. I was present at some of these conversations and was impressed by the persuasive powers of Bea's emissaries.

A most pleasant surprise was the attitude of the American delegation, whose members were -- up to their arrival -- an unknown quantity as far as their attitude on the subject was concerned. Some of them had a vague idea of Cardinal Bea's intentions, without knowing the exact propositions. Cardinal Bea saw to it that they received the text of his declaration immediately, and members of his staff subsequently paid visits to prominent personalities among the almost 300 Bishops and Cardinals from the U.S. It did not take

much time before expressions of full approval of Cardinal Bea's text were given by leading members of the American group. At the caucus meetings of the American Cardinals and Bishops, as well as in private conversations with Cardinal Bea's representatives, they promised to give full support to the plan.

The leader of this movement for unqualified support was Cardinal Cushing, of Boston. I was informed by one of Cardinal Bea's representatives that Cardinal Cushing addressed his colleagues in straight and simple terms, admonishing them to do everything possible to help achieve Cardinal Bea's plan. He even said, "If it is necessary that I go to the Council in a yarmulka" (he actually used this word) "in order to support Bea's plan in favor of the Jews, I shall be glad to do it." Immediately after the other Cardinals fell into line and even Cardinal Spellman, though perhaps not with great enthusiasm, said he would vote for Bea's declaration.

I discussed the attitude of the American delegation at great length with Msgr. George G. Higgins five days after the opening of the Council. He informed me that there ought to be no more concern about the position that will be taken by the American Bishops and Cardinals on Cardinal Bea's declaration with regard to Jews, and that they considered it as the most natural thing for them to do.

At the same time, Msgr. Higgins advised very strongly against doing anything which could be interpreted as pressure on the American clergymen from a Jewish group. It is for this reason that he suggested that I meet some of the American clergymen in a social way, but without trying to enter into the depth of the subject and in order not to give the impression that there is some planned arrangement between Cardinal Bea and Jewish groups.

This advice was also given to me by our friends of Pro Deo and members of Cardinal Bea's staff, with whom I have been in constant touch.

I had a most pleasant conversation with Msgr. Higgins, whom I met for the first time, and who impressed me as a man of very lively intelligence and most sympathetic to our cause. We agreed that he will arrange meetings for me with Cardinal Cushing and others, but purely on a social basis. In the meantime, a meeting has been arranged between Cardinals Bea and Cushing.

It should also be emphasized that while Cardinal Bea was carrying on his campaign to win the sympathy of the arriving clergymen, he kept continuous contact with the Vatican hierarchy and with the Pope himself who, I understand, has again expressed a positive view on the necessity of doing something important with regard to the Jewish subject.

The situation has taken such a favorable turn that, according to reliable sources in Rome, even Cardinal Ottaviani -- who is considered as the pillar of arch-conservatism -- is supposed to have indicated that he will not resist Bea's proposed declaration. The only possible strong opponent will be Msgr. Samore, but if there is no unexpected change, he will probably remain in a minority.

The lineup on this question as of today is more or less the following: the clergymen from Germany, Austria, Holland, France and Switzerland, as well as those from smaller countries in Europe, will be behind Cardinal Bea in this as in all other matters which are within the competence of the Secretariat of Christian Unity. By and large, the clergymen of these countries represent what is known as the progressive wing of the Council on all matters of reform. Surprisingly, the clergymen of Great Britain are counted among the conservatives; and the Irish are as well. Cardinal Bea's representatives have been applying much effort to win them over. The Latin Americans are considered by Cardinal Bea's staff as very uncertain for two reasons: a) because of their abysmal ignorance; b) because of a general opposition to new departures, particularly in view of the struggle with the Protestant Church in Latin American countries.

The 70 clergymen from Arab countries have already made it known that they will vote against Cardinal Bea's declaration. Fortunately, neither Bea himself nor the Secretariat of State of the Vatican consider this a serious obstacle on the ground that this opposition is entirely unreasonable in view of the fact that a matter of relations to another religion has nothing to do with Israel and the Middle East situation.

Much is yet unknown about the attitudes of Bishops from Africa and Asia; but Cardinal Bea's experts believe that after explaining the situation to them they will vote in favor of it for the simple reason that their general spirit is one of goodwill toward minority groups.

How will Cardinal Bea's proposed declaration be presented? About this there is at this moment no certainty; but the most authoritative advice I have obtained is that the proposal will probably come before the Theological Commission, the President of which is Cardinal Ottaviani, and before which there will be six schemata (projects) on the sources of revelation, moral order, the deposit of faith, chastity in the family, the Church, the Mother of God and men. The major subject of this Commission will be to define the sources of revelation and to decide the relative importance of Scripture and tradition. While some theologians of the Catholic Church claim that the fundamental source of revelation are the Scriptures and that the traditions accumulated through centuries are of lesser importance and can easily be changed, others, and this means the conservatives, insist that traditions have the same importance as Scriptures, and no changes can be made in the teachings not only of doctrine but of the interpretation of doctrine as adopted by various bodies of the Church, and which form an integral part of it. For a while it was felt that Cardinal Bea's proposed declaration on Jews, if it were to come before this Theological Commission, under Ottaviani's Chairmanship, might become involved in the problem of the relationship between Scripture and tradition; and that Ottaviani and his followers might claim that any reinterpretation of charges against Jews involves a change of tradition and represents an unorthodox step.

However, on the basis of the best information I obtained, Cardinal Bea developed the following method of approach on this matter. He intends to present this declaration not as any alteration in tradition, but as a re-affirmation of the permanent teachings of the Church which have been misinterpreted by non-authoritative sources. If presented in such a way, this matter would not enter in the problem of Scripture and tradition, for Bea claims that both Scripture and tradition are against the charges against Jews, and all that is required is to re-establish the true meaning of the New Testament and the tradition behind it, as opposed to erroneous interpretations.

If the proposal is presented in this way, Cardinal Bea believes that the opposition will have no basis for counterattack and even Cardinal Ottaviani will have to fall behind it. As a matter of fact, I was informed by highly stationed ecclesiastic personalities in Rome that Ottaviani is not prepared to make any real stand against Cardinal Bea in this respect. At any rate, Cardinal Bea's formula is considered by all as the most expedient in achieving the objectives while avoiding an open clash on theological matters.

The subject of religious liberty, which is also within the competence of the Secretariat of Christian Unity, is of significance to us as well. Cardinal Bea and his followers are committed to the principle that the Catholic Church proclaim the inalienable right of every religious group to adhere to its own beliefs and practices; and that plurality of religions is part of the natural order of society, as established by providence. In practical terms, this principle aims at asserting that the Catholic Church is not out to dominate any country or society by its own creed, and even in such places where Catholics are in a majority, as they are in Latin America. This would eliminate many conflicts between Protestants and Catholics in many parts of the world. At this moment, it is not certain whether this subject will be brought up before the Theological Commission or any of the other ten Commissions which are actually the working groups at the Council.

In some of my previous reports, I posed the question as to whether the Jewish matter will come up in the first session. The general expectation is that it will, and this is to be hoped for, for it is still uncertain whether there will be a second session. I had the impression that most of the participants at the Council would like to be through at the end of the year, and not have to return in the spring. However, in view of the slowness with which the Council has started its work, and the many issues that have to be discussed, it is possible that another session will be necessary. At any rate, there is no certainty as to the date when our subject will be brought before the Theological Commission.

The form in which the declaration will be presented and adopted, will be a "constitution" of the Ecumenical Council. In Vatican terms a constitution means a decreee or a solemn ordinance, which becomes binding for all those who belong to the Church. The usual term used in Rome for it is "decree."

Notwithstanding the favorable outlook of the situation as it presents itself today, a word of caution against undue optimism is necessary. One cannot exclude the possibility that by some parliamentary maneuver, the proposed declaration about Jews might be relegated by the Ecumenical Council to one of the bodies that ~~that~~ will be established by it, and which will deal with implementation. It is also possible that at the last moment some unforeseen alterations in the text might be introduced which would whittle down a great deal of the Bea statement as it stands today. There is such a variety of tendencies, groups, interests and orders of priority, that it would be rash at this moment to claim with certainty a definite outcome on any of the major issues before the Council. As a matter of fact, one of the serious apprehensions in Rome is that the final results of the Council might be a great distance away from the expectations. However, these are factors which are rather independent of us and even of those within the Vatican who have been promoting the objectives we stand for.

In conclusion, I should like to point out the excellent and most friendly contacts we have in Rome with various ecclesiastic personalities, and particularly with our friends of Pro Deo, and with members of Cardinal Bea's staff, who have displayed a spirit of broadmindedness and liberalism as one perhaps has never seen in Rome before.

* * *

cc: Mr. Danzig
Dr. Segal
Rabbi Tanenbaum
Mr. Friedman

CONCILIO ECUMENICO VATICANO II

UFFICIO STAMPA

September 24, 1964

Session No. 3

NEWS BULLETIN NO. 8

GENERAL CONGREGATION NO. 87

The 87th General Congregation of the II Ecumenical Vatican Council opened on Thursday morning, September 24, 1964 with the Votive Mass of the Holy Spirit celebrated by the Most Rev. Joseph Cordeiro, Archbishop of Karachi, Pakistan. Bishop Joannes Maria Holterman, O.P., Bishop of Willenstad, Island of Curacao, enthroned the Gospel Book. During the Mass, special selections in Gregorian Chant were sung by a group of choir boys from Bresseto(Parma). The Moderator for the session was Cardinal Leo Jozef Suenens, Archbishop of Malines-Bruxelles, Belgium.

The General Secretary announced that the deadline fixed for the presentation of summaries by those who wish to speak on the schema on Divine Revelation for Sept. 25 is to be understood as referring only to the first part of the discussion, namely to the introduction and chapters 1 and 2. The deadline for the second part, which will take up Chapter 3 on the inspiration and interpretation of Sacred Scripture will be Sept. 28, while Sept. 30 will be the final day for presenting summaries dealing with chapters 4-6, on the Old and the New Testaments and on Scripture in the life of the Church.

During the continued discussion of the declaration on religious liberty, the Council Fathers completed the six votes scheduled for today's Congregation:

Vote 19. Individual Bishops exercise their power over the portion of the people of God assigned to them but as members of the Episcopal College they are under obligation to be also interested in the universal Church. This is not an expression of jurisdiction but something which promotes the unity of Christ's mission for the Church. Votes cast: 2,226; Placet, 2,162; Non placet, 64.

Vote 20. The text states the obligation of individual Bishops to be missionary-minded in helping to supply men and money for needy churches - Votes cast, 2,228; Placet, 2,205; Non placet, 23.

Vote 21. The text approves and encourages the formation of Episcopal conferences. Votes cast, 2,226; Placet, 2,147; Non placet, 77; Null, 2.

Vote 22. Insists on the element of service in the discharge of the mission of teaching and preaching. Votes cast, 2,225; Placet, 2,189; Non placet, 35; Null, 1.

Vote 23. Bishops can be canonically established in conformity with customs approved by the Holy See, by local laws, or by the Roman Pontiff, but if in any case, the Pope refuses Apostolic Communion, the Bishop in question cannot be regarded as a valid member of the Episcopal body. Votes cast, 2,221; Placet, 2,177; Non placet, 43; Null, 1.

Vote 24. The principal duty of Bishops is to preach the Gospel. Votes cast, 2,203; Placet, 2,152; Non placet, 51.

The following speakers continued the Council discussion on the text of the Declaration on Religious Liberty:

segue...

1. Cardinal Franziskus Koenig, Archbishop of Vienna;
2. Cardinal Michael Browne of the Council Theological Commission;
3. Archbishop Pietro Parente, Assessor of the S.C. of the Holy Office;
4. Archbishop Pedro Cantero Cuadrado, Archbishop of Zaragoza, Spain;
5. Bishop John Abasolo, Bishop of Vijayapuram, India;
6. Archbishop Enrico Nicodemo, of Bari, Italy;
7. Bishop Jose Lopez Ortiz, of Tuy-Vigo, Spain;
8. Bishop Antonio De Castro Meyer, of Campos, Brazil;
9. Bishop Giovanni Canestri, Auxiliary of the Cardinal Vicar of Rome;
10. Bishop Johannes Pohlschneider, of Aachen, Germany;
11. Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, Superior General of the Congregation of the Holy Spirit;
12. The Very Reverend Joseph Buckley, Superior General of the Society of Marists;
13. Bishop Ernest Primo, of Manchester, New Hampshire;
14. Bishop Peter Nierman, Bishop of Groningen, Holland;
15. Bishop Angel Temino Saiz, of Orense, Spain;
16. Bishop Michal Klepacz of Lodz, Poland;
17. Archbishop Marcel Dubois, of Besancon, France;
18. Bishop Anastasio Granados, Auxiliary of Toledo, Spain;

The remarks of these Council Fathers can be summed up in the following paragraphs;

1. Although the declaration is altogether acceptable as it stands, still it should not keep silence regarding the tragic fact that there are nations who enjoy no religious freedom. Some governments today are militantly atheistic, while others grant religious freedom only when this can be distorted so as to mean the suppression of all religion. In these countries Catholic education is barred from using any of the public media of communication and is even punished as a crime. This is against the 1948 declaration of the United Nations. It is likewise against the idea of sincere tolerance as expressed by the Council in keeping w ith the needs of our pluralistic society today. This attitude is likewise against scientific principles because nothing is more anti-scientific than to suppress the opinions of others. Those who act in this way set themselves up as infallible and proclaim an atheistic intolerance which is far worse than any conceivable religious intolerance. This is a direct offense the dignity of man. The fostering of religious prevents totalitarian domination by any government while the denial of religious liberty is in contradiction with social progress and human dignity. The Council should find a way to speak out in the name of all men in order to arouse the conscience of the world and to prevent those deplorable situations where atheism has all the privileges and religion has no rights. Government can be separated from atheism

2. The declaration cannot be approved in its present form, a form which is not even necessary for the peace and unity for the peoples of the world today. It puts the foundation of religious liberty in the rights of the human conscience. But it is evident that social rights based on an individual conscience which is erroneous cannot be equated with rights flowing from an individual conscience which is right. John XXIII did not speak of the dictates of any conscience as being a norm, but only of the dictates of a right conscience. The norm of a right conscience is the Divine Law. In his allocution to the Roman prelates in 1946, Pius XII set forth an altogether different foundation for religious liberty, basing this liberty not on the rights of the indivual conscience but rather on the demands of the common good.

segue...

3. The text cannot be approved as it stands. To the rights of God it prefers the rights of man and his liberty and the rights of his conscience. There is no clear distinction between the objective and subjective aspects of truth and error, nor is there a forthright admission of the mission of the Church. Much in the text is open to equivocation. We should be concerned about the probable reactions among various governments and learned circles. Our declaration speaks of protecting the followers of every religion in the name of liberty of conscience. It seems to forget the duty of the Church to preach the truth with prudence and charity. It is an unfortunate suggestion which would have the Church make use of her extraordinary magisterium to proclaim absolute religious liberty. The text should be amended in such a way as to safeguard basic principles. It contains much truth but it should avoid even any semblance of argumentation and set forth only what is absolutely true and uncontested in keeping with the observations made yesterday by Cardinal Ritter.

4. The text is acceptable in general and must be regarded as necessary for any ecumenical dialogue. As regards its internal structure, this should correspond to the pastoral and ecumenical aims of the Council. The treatment should remain on the juridical, not the practical plane. It must not be forgotten that there can be no freedom of religion before God since man has no right of choice in the Presence of God when God has made known His Will. When we consider the social nature of religious liberty, we should carefully avoid equivocal concepts, in order, as the text does not do, to distinguish clearly between religious liberty and liberty of conscience. They differ in their subject, because religious liberty deals with the individual and society whereas liberty of conscience concerns the individual alone. Religious liberty concerns only religious acts and liberty of conscience has a wider scope, and thus these two forms of liberty difference in their objects. They likewise differ in their scope. Liberty of conscience means immunity from external coercion. It is a moral faculty which does not always need to be accompanied with external rights. The exercise of religious liberty is not absolute but must be conditioned by many circumstances because it must be reconciled with the rights of others.

5. When speaking of religion we should put more emphasis on the concept of beauty than on that of right. Man's rights in matters of religion, such as freedom of worship, arise basically from man's duties towards God. It must not be forgotten that not all consciences have the same rights. The rights of a conscience which is correct are on a higher plane than those of a conscience which is invincibly erroneous. Only what is true and right can be a source of inviolable rights. Consequently the title of the declaration should be made to read "The Duties and Rights of Individuals and Communities in Matters Religious." A man's subjective obligation in matters religious comes from his conscience, while the objective obligation stems from the Divine Law. Those who profess the truth have absolute and inviolable rights both before their conscience and before society. Those who are in error will not necessarily have the same rights as far as society is concerned. There can be no right to persuade men to error because this would be sowing cockle in the field of the Lord. Christ proclaimed that we are to observe everything that He has commanded us and reminded all men that he who is not with Him is against Him.

6. To avoid perplexity and confusion of ideas, certain principles should be clearly stated. Although we distinguish error from the erring, we must not forget that error as such can have no rights. Religious liberty is not based on any objective right inherent in error but on the subjective right of the human person to follow the dictates of his conscience. An erroneous conscience cannot act against the natural law and it is here that public authority can intervene. Religious liberty can never mean that an individual has the right to judge the religious society to which he belongs.

segue...

7. Because of its false and harmful consequences, the passage declaring the incompetence of the state to judge of truth regarding religion, should be deleted from the text. Although brief, the passage is very dangerous. It insinuates that no Government can declare itself Catholic if it so wishes. When a Government makes such a declaration, it is not passing judgment on truth concerning religion but only solemnly manifests its obedience to the Divine Law. If Governments had no right to judge on any religious matter, then they would have to be agnostic, which is inadmissible. When the citizens of a nation, with practical unanimity profess the true religion, then the state should act accordingly.

8. The declaration needs to be completely recast. It states the equality of rights for all religions, true and false, whereas the public profession of religion is to be allowed only to the one true Faith. Human nature is perfected only in adherence to the good and the true. Therefore human nature can derive no dignity from error even when it is error in good faith. Mutual relationships in society must be based on the natural law and the positive law of God. This law of God commands that all men accept the true faith. No man will ever be damned except through his own fault, but all men are under obligation to embrace the faith revealed by God.

9. Religious liberty does not always come from conscience as its foundation. We must beware lest the practice in the doctrine of the Church be changed in some of its substantial elements. It is false to declare that all proselytism is bad. Proselytism is to be condemned only when it uses dishonest means. It is wrong to proclaim the neutrality of the State. Leo XII declared that, notwithstanding certain advantages it might have, this neturality is not always the best solution of the problem.

10. This declaration is a truly historical document which will serve the good cause of peace on earth. It needs to be supplemented, however, by a reference to freedom of education. This point might be regarded as being more appropriate in the schema on Catholic schools, but it really has its place here also, at least in brief mention. Our affirmation of liberty of education should be directed not merely to atheistic governments but to the governments of all nations. The complete freedom demanded by human dignity is not only freedom of conscience and freedom of worship but it also extends to that duty which is the gravest of all for parents and which consists in the right to educate their children. This basic right should never be interfered with by any state monopoly. It is the duty of the state to enable parents to make a free choice of schools, without this choice resulting in additional burdens for the family. These rights are in some degree violated everywhere in the world today. Because these facts are not commonly known, it belongs to the Council to bring them out in the open with a firm demand for tolerance toward schools and the education of youth.

11. Unless revised on a broad scale, the present declaration can involve great dangers. The text should distinguish the internal acts of conscience from external acts. They are not in the same category because external acts always entail the dangers of scandal because of our human associations. The exercise of liberty in external acts involves public authority. It would be impossible to affirm full religious liberty for all groups without thereby in some cases condoning immorality because of the close connection of religion and morality some groups make immoral acts part of their religion. It is likewise a mistake to formulate a doctrine in view of only one particular set of circumstances, such as might prevail in one particular country. Unless corrected, the declaration could be quite harmful.

12. There is an urgent need to affirm the sacred right of religious liberty. One correction is needed in the text which often

segue...

often refers to religious liberty as flowing from man's response to his "divine vocation." According to this, any sincere conscience, even when erroneous, is the echo of a divine vocation. As a matter of fact, we know that it is impossible for a man to know always, in the concrete, exactly what God demands of him in a pa rticular situation. There would be a danger of pseudo-mysticism if the expressions of the text were pushed too far. The affirmation that an erroneous conscience can represent a divine vocation is the culminating point reached by unhappy concept of divine vocation as here set forth. Consequently, this expression must be avoided. The basis of religious liberty should be made to consist in the obligation flowing from conscience under God, i.e., the categorical imperative of conscience. There is no right not founded on a prior obligation. Man has the right to worship God according to his conscience because he has the obligation to do so. We should not forget that at times the rights of one individual can be restricted because they are in conflict with the rights of others. We should adopt the text with necessary corrections lest we disappoint the world.

13. We should distinguish between religious liberty which is internal and personal and religious liberty which is external and social. In present day parlance the first is called liberty of conscience, while the second is known as freedom of worship. There is a commonly accepted bond between the two. We must beware of that false concept of man which would make him first an individual and then social. Man is essentially social. We should not allow any dychotomy in human personality. Because of this, it is unlawful to recognize a man's right to freedom of conscience while restricting him in his freedom of worship. Both freedoms are equally essential and pertain to the integrity and dignity of the human pe rson. Freedom of worship is not only a logical deduction from freedom of conscience. Religious freedom must be regarded as a true and strict right. In this light, it constitutes a guarantee of immunity from coercion.

14. The declaration has great value as regards its description of the nat ure of religious liberty and its practical implications for the life of the Church. The pr inciples laid down on religious freedom may at times be invoked to just ify the restriction of freedom of worship by particular religious groups.

15. Man's first obligation is to heed God when He has spoken clearly. It would be a bad thing to publicly and socially subject God to individual reason and to equate those who heed God with other men. The declaration is based on the equality of all religions in society and for this reason it must be revised drastically. At times it may be in the interest of the Church to permit broader religious liberty and we should base our proclmation of religious liberty on this fact, not of false principles smacking of humanism -- which would consider man as the supreme norm and the source of all rights giving worship to God.

16. The declaration omits an important point, namely the discussion of the relationships of the society, the state, the nation, and thehuman race to the individual and t he individual's relationship in turn to the community. Important considerations are contained in any reflection on the mutual obligations of t he individual and society, especially in the light of justice.

17. The text is too philosophical and t oo juridical. It should be given a tone more in keeping with the spirit of Sacred Scripture and Tradition. Every man must be regarded as a man, as a member of human society and as an object of the love of Christ. It was for these reasons that St. Augustine addressed a heretical Bishop as "honorable brother," as he explained in the letter addressed to this individual. Our Lord, Himself commended religious liberty as can be seen in the passages comparing the Apostles to light and salt, comparisons which exclude

coercion. Many other texts of Sacred Scripture could be used appropriately.

18. In this declaration there is both a doctrinal and a practical aspect. It is better for us here to refrain from passing judgment in the practical order. As regards the doctrinal aspect, the principle which enunciates the strict right of all religious groups to profess their own doctrines, true or false, the following observations are in order. 1) This doctrine is new in the Church. Our traditional doctrine has always been only truth has rights while error is treated with tolerance if this is demanded by the common good. 2) This doctrine is opposed to the mind of Pius XII as expressed in his allocution "Ci riesce". 3) The declaration makes an unlawful tradition from the subjective to the objective order. 5) This principle cannot be reconciled with the concept of religious liberty as set forth in the doctrine itself.

The Congregation adjourned at 12:35.

* * *

PLEASE NOTE:

1. Until further notice the daily briefing of the English language journalists will take place at Via della Conciliazione, 51, in a hall which opens to the left off the cloister at the entrance.

2. The information given yesterday on the appointment of new Men Auditors and Women Auditors erroneously listed Mother Mary Luke as Superior General of the Convent of St. Joseph of Mt. Carmel of Dubuque, Iowa. Mother Luke is Superior General of the Sisters of Our Lady of Loreto at Nerinx, Kentucky.

FINE

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

CONCILIO ECUMENICO VATICANO II

UFFICIO STAMPA

September 25, 1964

Session No. 3

NEWS BULLETIN NO. 9

GENERAL CONGREGATION NO. 87

The 88th General Congregation of the II Ecumenical Vatican Council opened on Friday morning September 25, 1964 with Holy Mass celebrated in the Syro-Antiochene rite by the Most Rev. Mar Cyrille Emmanuel Benni, Archbishop of Mossul, Iraq. This liturgy is celebrated in Aramaic, the language of Our Lord, with the vernacular being used in some parts according to the locality where the liturgy is celebrated. The Most Rev. Jean Karroum, Bishop of Hassake, Syria enthroned the Gospel Book after Mass. The liturgical singing for the ceremony was provided by a group of seminarians of the rite from the Colloege of Propaganda Fide. The Moderator for the session was Cardinal Leo Jozef Suenens, Archbishop of Malines-Bruxelles, Belgium.

The Secretary General announced that the Fathers would receive during the morning session the Relatio on the declaration concerning Jews and Non-Christians. Archbishop Felice also made known that the Holy Father has granted to all the Council Fathers who are not Bishops the same powers for hearing confessions in Rome as were granted to Bishops in the special Apostolic Constitution issued last December.

The Fathers were reminded that the deadline for submitting summaries on the schema dealing with Divine Revelation is Sept. 30. The last day for presenting summaries on The Apostolate of the Laity is Oct. 2. After the discussion of the schema on the Apostolate of the Laity, the Council will pass to schema No. 13 on The Presence of the Church in the World Today. The deadline for summaries on this schema is Oct. 2.

The Secretary announced the deadlines for the following schemas: On Oriental Churches, Oct. 10; The Missionary Activity of the Church, Oct. 11; On Priests, Oct. 12; On Religious, Oct. 13; The Sacrament of Matrimony, Oct. 14; Priestly Training, Oct. 15; Catholic Schools, Oct.16.

After the discussion of the schema on The Presence of the Church in the World Today, the Council will take up those schemas which were reduced to propositions and were to have been submitted only to the vote of the Council Fathers without previous discussion on the floor. Because of requests made by many Council Fathers, the Moderators have decided to permit a brief discussion in the Council Hall on each of these schemas before a vote is taken. This would not be in view of revision of the text by the appropriate commission before the final vote, but rather to enable the Council Fathers to benefit not only by the observations of the Relator, but also by the remarks of other Fathers. Consideration of these observations will be assured through the right to vote "Placet juxtum modum". Even though a set of propositions may have been approved by a substantial majority, modi presented by a significant number of Council Fathers will be given every consideration in the final draft of the text.

The following speakers continued the debate on religious liberty:

1. Cardinal Francesco Roberti, President of the Commission for the Reform of the Roman Curia;
2. Archbishop Denis Hurley, of Durban, South Africa;
3. Bishop Ubaldo Cibrian Fernandez, Prelate of Corocora, Bolivia;
4. Bishop Frederick Melendro of Anking, China;
5. Archbishop Karol Wojtyla, of Cracow, Poland;
6. Archbishop Gabriel Garrone, of Toulouse, France;

segue...

7. Bishop Simon Hoa Nguyen-Van Hien, of Dalat, Vietnam;
8. Archbishop Karl Alter, of Cincinnati, Ohio; in the name of several Bishops of the United States;
9. The Very Rev. Aniceto Fernandez, Master General of the Dominican Order;

10. Bishop Cornelius Lucey, of Cork, Ireland;
11. Bishop Carlo Colombo, Titular Bishop of Victoriana.

The summaries of the didcourses pronounced by the preceding Fathers is as follows:

1. A clear distinction must be made between freedom of conscience and freedom of sonsciences. This distinction was dear to Pius XII. The Church cannot admit freedom of conscience in its present day meaning because the Church would bhereby be in contradiction with Herself. Freedom of conscience is too often unde rstood as conferring on an individual the right of free, personal choice even when confronted with the law of God. But the Church can admit freedom of consciences, because this implies freedom from all external coercion in the belief and exercise of religion.

2. It is completely unlawful to impose on anyone the accusation or the rejection of any religious belief as a condition for sharing in the benefits of civic life. No religious group can be subordinated to the political ends of t he State. Nevertheless, since the classical argument of the union of Church and State proclaims the obligation of the State to make a social profession of re ligion, this argument could influence many individuals in a direction contrary to the intent of the present declaration. This classical argument however, has a basic weakness in that it ascribes to the State the obligation to provide for social worship, whereas this obligation pertains only to the Church. The Church will be more effective in the discharge of its mission when it works with its own resources and does not have to depend on the support of the State.

3. The declaration is unacceptable because it is not based on adequate doctrinal principles. Its foundation should be in God and the nature of the truth. In addition, it confuses the absolute truth of moral principles with their practical application. The text should be reworked so as to bring it into harmony with the principles of the Ecclesiastical Magisterium. A Council declaration cannot be in conflict with this Magisterium. Basically, we should declare simply that religious liberty must be implemented in practice, and with all due respect to the rights of others.

4. The text needs to be reorganized. It would be even better if the whole question of religious liberty were allowed to mature and the discussion postponed to a future date. Religious liberty does not help contacts between Christians in view of genuine unity. In the Declaration the objective and constitutive order is subordinated to a subjective norm, i.e., the dictates of conscience. It is not sufficient to say that men are invited to embrace the true faith. They are bound to do so by divine law. The Church should not proclaim anything which is contrary to her previous declarations.

5. The declaration should provide a fuller explanation of the notion of liberty and its connection with truth. It is not sufficient to set up the simple principle of tolerance, which principle emphasizes rather the quasi-negative aspect of liberty. The text should present a human person in his full stature and not as a mere instrument of human economy. All of us should make ceaseless efforts to secure full liberty from the State, because no State has the power to dominate religion. A declaration of this kind is expected from the Council by

segue...

people of all faiths. It is a necessary condition of all truthful dialogue.

6. There is an apparent contradiction between the Doctrine of the Declaration and the actual practice of the Church both today and in the past. However, there is no real contradiction because we are not dealing with the same reality under the same respect. Such great world realities as the State, the common good -- which must now be evaluated on a world-wide basis -- and others have undergone profound changes in the last century. At that time the Church emphasized the objective aspects of the liberalism with which it was threatened. Today, on the contrary, she stresses the rights of man existing in the concrete. The same principles are applied to different aspects of reality and this application gives rise to a new doctrinal synthesis. There have been regrettable incidents in the past and for these the Church is humbly penitent. The doctrine should point out explicitly the fact that no real contradiction exists.

7. This declaration is of immense importance both for dialogue with Christians and for eras where Christians are a vast minority. Religious liberty can be understood in different senses. We should clarify its meaning in our context. It is not affirmed in the relations between man and God or in his relation to a higher moral order. It is applicable only to his relationships with fellow citizens in the social order. The title of the declaration should be "The Basic Principles of Religious Liberty." The State is obliged not only not to impede the practice of religion but to provide positive help. A new paragraph could treat of man's objective vocation from God, and of the mission and function of the Church in relation to civil society. It should be insisted that the principle of religious liberty excludes any and all force or violence. The Church shall also aim to avoid carefully anything which might be construed as mutilation of national patrimony, since, like Christ, her duty is not to destroy but to fulfill. Always and everywhere there should be complete abstraction from politics.

8. We are not speaking in the declaration of religious freedom in all its possible senses, but only to the right of every human being to be free of outside force in his worship of God. We do not affirm the personal right of any individual to teach error or to doeharm. He has no such rights before God. We are claiming for him only freedom from social coercion. The cause of peace and harmony will be promoted if the Council issues a clear declaration on this point, expecially in those eras where the Church is living in a pluralistic society. Because Catholics have been accused of inconsistency and even of insincerity, as though they shifted their stand on religious liberty according to their majority or minority in social society, the text should be so formulated as to forestall any repetition of these doubts and suspicions. We should affirm the absolute incompetence of public officials to judge religious matters and we should reiterate their obligation to use all appropriate means to insure the free practice of religion with safety to the individual. Matters as sacred as this cannot be left merely to the majority vote of the citizenry.

9. The Declaration is a sign of our times, particularly in its desire to avoid all division and controversy. It is out of place to put into this Declaration a statement which would apply to all men. The Declaration is weak because it affirms a merely subjective principle as the basis for freedom of religion. By leaving too much to the dictates of conscience, it obscures the principal founts of Christian doctrine. What is said here on conscience, the divine vocation of the individual, and the following of both could cause confusion in the natural and the supernatural order. In the text, religious liberty arises from below, namely from the consciences of men, whereas its real source is from above. The text proceeds in a manner which is too profane and naturalistic. A Council document should not contain what only reflects our own times.

segue...

10. Liberty of conscience is not be be understood as a personal moral right but as a human right. It might even be called a negative right because it entitles us not to to be interfered with in the practice of religion. Consequently this liberty is never to be an object of violence in private nor even in public except when it is in conflict with the rights of others. Religion can be promoted by public authority when the common welfare so demands and finds expression in the will of the majority, provided all due provision is made to safeguard the rights of others. There is a universal obligation to respect good faith, no matter where it may be found. There are even atheists in good faith. A man's personal acts of religion are always acceptable to God, but this gives him no right to interfere with the acts of religion performed by others.

11. We should keep the doctrine explained in the Declaration, because the text, though pastoral in intent, cannot avoid being doctrinal at the same time, it should set forth all the principles governing the relationships of human persons with moral and religious truth. These principles can be summed up under three headings: 1) The foundation of all religious liberty is two-fold: a) a natural right to investigate moral and religious truth and to follow it according to the dictates of conscience, and b) the freedom of the act of Christian and Catholic faith. 2) We must insist on two other principles also: a) The obligation to investigate truth and to follow it and to investigate it through adequate means, chief among which is the doctrinal authority of the Church, and b) the special value of truth among the benefits of society. 3) The relationship of personal rights and freedom of faith with the demands of the common good. This problem cannot be solved always and everywhere in the same way. Solutionswwill differ according to circumstances. They will be aided by certain directive principles which are the foundation of religious liberty as it is desired today by so many.

After this speaker had concluded, Cardinal Suenens proposed to the Fathers a standing vote on the opportuneness of closing off debate on the Declaration on Religious Liberty. A vast majority of the Council Fathers declared themselves favorable. The Cardinal Moderator reminded the Assembly that the debate could be continued by those Fathers who would secure the support of at least 70 others.

Cardinal Suenens then invited Cardinal Augustin Bea to present the Relatio on the Declaration on Jews and Non-Christians. He explained that, normally, this Relatio would not have been presented until Monday, but at that time Cardinal Bea will be in Greece as the chief of the Pontifical Mission for the return of the head of St. Andrew Apostle to the Orthodox Metropolitan of Patras.

Cardinal Bea opened his Relatio by remarking on the vast interest aroused by this Declaration. There is practically no other schema on which so much has been written. The simple fact of this interest of public opinion shows how the world is looking to the Church for the approval or rejection of this document, and how the judgment of many on the Council will be based almost solely on this point. But the primary reason is that the Church must follow the example of Christ and the Apostles in their love for the Jewish people. Hence it was absolutely impossible that the treatment of this question should be stricken from the Council's agenda. For these reasons, the Declaration on the Jews was organized more logically to insure a better sequence of ideas. Certain Scriptural texts were also added on the prerogatives of The Chosen People and on our Christian hope for the final union of the Jewish People with the Chosen People of the New Testament.

The crucial point of this entire discussion is the question of "deicide," i.e. whether and in what manner the condemnation and death of Christ can be said to be the fault of the Jewish people as such. It is false to affirm that a persuasion of this kind is the chief reason for anti-semiticism, since there are many other reasons in the

segue...

religious, political-national, psychological, social, and economic orders. It is a fact of history that this culpability for the death of Christ has at times been laid on the en tire Jewish people with the result that they were often despised and pe rsecuted.

The leaders of the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem, although not democratically elected by the people, were nevertheless regarded as the legitimate authroity of the people. But were the leaders of the Jewish people fully aware of the Divinity of Christ to the point that they can be said to be formal deicides? Our Lord on the Cross, St. Peter and St. Paul indicate that the sentence of death was the result of ignorance. Could the entire Jewish people of that time be said to be responsible? We know that the Jews scattered throughout the Roman empire at that time numbered about 4 1/2 million -- more than the population of Palestine at the time. Could all these people be said to be equally guilty? In any case, there are no grounds for attributing to the Jewish people of doday any responsibility, as a people, in the death of Christ.

This difficult problem called for careful consideration of many possible formulae. A text was finally agreed upon but shortness of time made it impossible to submit it to all the members of the Secretariat and it was hardly p r actical to bring them all to Rome again for a discission of only this point.

The second part of the Declaration deals with Non-Christian religions, with explicit mention of the Moslems. This part is of special importance because even Non-Christian religions are assailed today by practical irreligiosity or even by militant theoretical atheism. It was agreed to stress three points: 1) God is the Father of all men and they are His children. 2) All men are brothers. 3) All discrimination, violence and persecution because of national origin or race is to be condemned.

The explicit mentio n of the Moslems was studied by two groups of expe rts in Cairo and in Tunisia, and their judgment was most favorable.

Many Fathers felt that the present Declaration on the Jews was out of place on the schema on eeumenism, which, should strictly speaking speak of the promotion of Christian unity. On the other hand, there is a close connection between all Christians and the Chosen People of the Old Testament, even though this bond is less intimate than among Christians themselves. A compromise was reached and the subject was treated in a separate document which is however connected with the schema on ecumenism.

We must insist most vigorously that we are here dealing with a purely religious question, and not touching in any way on politics. There is no questio n of Zionism, of the political state of Israel, but only of the followers of t he law of Moses, no matter where they may be. The aim and scope of this declaration is that the Church should imitate the charity of Christ and His Apostles and be renewed in this imitation, as she considers how God worked out her salvation and what great benefits He conferred on the Chosen People. We are to imitate charity of which we have been given such a sublime example. This renov ation of the Church is of such importance that it justifies running the risk of being accused of pursuing political ends in this declaration.

* * *

segue...

The following votes were taken this morning on Chapter 3 De Ecclesia:

Vote 25. Bishops do not have the gift of infallibility as individuals but the universal body of Bishops is infallible when it solemnly teaches in union with the Successor of Peter, especially in Ecumenical Councils. -- Votes cast, 2,198, Placet, 2,134; Non placet, 63; Null, 1.

Vote 26. The scope of this infallibility is co-terminus with the deposit of Divine Revelation. -- Votes cast, 2,192, Placet, 2,159; Non placet, 32; Null, 1.

Vote 27. The Roman Pontiff is infallible when he definitively proclaims a point of faith or morals as pastor and teacher of the faithful of Christ. His infallibility is not for the consent of the Church. This is because he does not declare his opinions as a private person but as the supreme teacher of the universal Church. -- Votes cast, 2, 187, Placet, 2,140; Non placet, 46; Null, 1.

Vote 28. The infallibility promised to the Church is found in the body of Bishops when it exercises the Supreme Magisterium with the Successor of Peter. Such definitions always have the assent of the Church because of the action of the Holy Spirit. -- Votes cast, 2,187; Placet, 2,139; Non placet, 46; Null, 2.

Vote 29. When the Roman Pontiff or a Council issue a definition, this is in keeping with Revelation which all are bound to accept. In the investigation and formulation of such definitions, the Roman Pontiff and t he Bishops, according to circumstances, cooperate, but they can never proclaim new public Revelation as belonging to the divine deposit of faith. Votes cast, 2,180; Placet, 2,155; Non placet, 25;

Vote 30. The Bishops' office of sanctifying is exercised especially through the Holy Eucharist. Votes cast, 2,162; Placet, 2,139; Non placet, 21; Null, 2.

The Cardinal Moderator adjourned the session at 12:30.

FINE

*** PLEASE NOTE THAT THE REGULAR WEEKLY PRESS CONFERENCE WILL BE HELD SATURDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 26, AT 11 a.m. IN THE SALLA STAMPA. THE SPEAKER WILL BE THE MOST REV. JOHN C. HEENAN, ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER, ENGLAND. THE TOPIC WILL BE"RELIGIOUS LIBERTY" AND "THE JEWS."

CONCILIO ECUMENICO VATICANO II

UFFICIO STAMPA

September 28, 1964

Session No. 3

NEWS BULLETIN NO. 10

General Congregation No. 89

The 89th General Congregation of the II Ecumenical Vatican Council opened on Monday morning, September 28, 1964. The Votive Mass of the Holy Spirit was celebrated by the Most Rev. Frantisek Tomasek, Titular Bishop of Buto, from Czechoslovakia. The Gospel Book was enthroned after the Mass by Bishop Emilio Sosa Gauna, of Sergenza, Paraguay. The work of the session was under the direction of Cardinal Gregory Peter Agagianian,

Archbishop Felice explained the procedure to be followed in the voting tomorrow on the details of the establishment of a permanent diaconate, if the voting today approves the principle of this restoration. He also announced that, at the request of the Theological Commission, the Moderators had agreed to replace the one vote scheduled for Wednesday on Chapter 3 De Ecclesia with two votes on distinct parts of the text. The reason is that these two parts are clearly distinguished, the one from the other, and it is hoped that this procedure will lighten the burden of the Theological Commission in the final drafting of the text to come after the vote. In answer to a further question, the General Secretary announced also that no one was empowered to vote through another, but that avery vote, as demanded by the Rules of Procedure of the Council, must be personal.

During today's session, six further votes were taken on Chapter 3 De Ecclesia. These were:

Vote 31. Deals with the Bishops' power to govern, as including the sacred right before God to make laws for their subjects, pass judgment, and direct everything which pertains to the organization of worship and the apostolate. -- Votes cast, 2,176; Placet, 2,088; Non placet, 86; Null, 2.

Vote 32. Takes up the Bishops' obligation to imitate the Good Shepherd, mindful of their own weakness, and of their obligation to evangelize. The text also speaks of the duty of the faithful to be united with their Bishop as the Church is to Christ. -- Votes cast, 2,169; Placet, 2,155; Non placet, 14;

Vote 33. Treats of priests in their relationship to Christ, to the Bishops, to fellow-priests and the Christian people. Votes cast, 2,164; Placet, 2,125; Non placet, 38; Null, 1.

Vote 34. Discusses the fraternal union among priests, their obligation of fatherly service and the obligation of the priest to promote unity. -- Votes cast, 2,168; Placet, 2,157; Non placet, 11.

Vote 35. Discusses the place of deacons in the Church, their sacramental grace, and their service of priests. Votes cast, 2,152; Placet, 2,055, Non placet, 94, Null, 3,

Vote 35. Proposes the restoration of a permanent diaconate in the Church. Votes cast, 2,148; Placet, 1,903; Non placet, 242; Null,3.

segue...

Having secured the signatures of at least 70 other Council Fathers, the following prelates were authorized to continue the discussion on religious liberty:

1. Archbishop John C. Heenan of Westminster, England;
2. Bishop Adrian Ndungu, of Masaka, Uganda;
3. Bishop John Wright of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania;
4. Archbishop Jean-Baptiste Zoa, of Yaounde, Cameroons;

The following paragraphs represent the substance of their remarks.

1. The 16th century saw a bitter battle between Protestants and Catholics in England. Religious liberty was soon banished and the number of martyrs was evidence of the ferocity of the persecution. In all honesty, it must be admitted that when a Catholic Queen occupied the throne, Protestants suffered a similar fate. By the end of the century, Protestantism had triumphed and the Church of the early centuries had almost ceased to exist. Great Britain can in no sense be described as Catholic today. The Church of England is the established Church, and the Queen is its head. The general mentality of the country is Christian in the sense that babies are usually baptized, couples generally prefer to be married in the Church and almost all are given Christian burial. It is true that many profess no religion. -- Nevertheless, religion is honored both publicly and in private. The Church makes substantial contributions for Church schools and pays full salaries to all teachers, whether they be lay or religious. Catholic schools are granted the same rights as the Church of England schools. Everyone recogniz es that liberty and equality of treatment for all is the only way to propose peaaeful civic relationships-- We praise and unreservedly approve this declaration on religious freedom. Because the world is small, what happens in one State can have repercussions all over the world. Some fear the danger of allowing the propagation of error. This is a genuine fear because no one can feel happy at the prospect of the young or ignorant being led into error. But against the contempt for all restraint, we must safeguard liberty. Freedom must be defended at all costs. Experience shows that any state interference in religious matters has always been harmful. The external practice of religion should be subject only to those restrictions which are absolutely necessary to safeguard public order. The text does well to base this right on something more positive than tolerance and the common good. This pastoral doctrine should not omit some doctrinal considerations, because we should give some indication of the methods by which we have reached our conclusions.

2. For newly independent African nations, the recognition of religious liberty is of the utmost importance. One consequence of independence has not infrequently been interference with schools, youth associations, and the very exercise of religious worship. The Church has the duty to proclaim all the rights of man and religious liberty is one of the chief among them. Such a proclamation is important because of the influence for good or for bad exercised on African nations by other continents. Any supposition that a Christian state can repress other religi o ns will necessarily lead to the conclusion that non-Christian states can repress Christian religions. This Council must go on record clearly as favorable to the principle of religious liberty. This will not harm, but will rather help the Church because it will be a defense of truth and Our Lord had promised that the truth will make us free.

segue...

3. Our treatment of the important topic of religious liberty tends to be too pragmatic. The text is too cautious when treating of the relationship between religious liberty and the common welfare. The questions are inseparable. It may well be argued that the preaching of error may in some degree be harmful for the common welfare, but any denial of religious liberty harms the common welfare in an even greater degree. This is because by its very nature, the common welfare demands this liberty and its recognition by civil authority and presumes it as an integral and essential element. However, the common welfare cannot be confused with the passive quiet or the forced conformism of the police state. The search for God can sometimes give rise to controversies and quarrels. Obedience to the Divine and human law for the common good must be a virtue, exercised with intelligence and wisdom. The common welfare is not a merely physical or mathematical collection of material goods in which all citizens share. It includes certain civic services, such as public highways, fire protection, and police service. But this is not the ultimate limit of the common welfare as Maritain has stated, the common welfare is something which is ethically good. In this common welfare there is included as an essential element, the highest development possible here and now for human persons! For those persons who constitute the united multitude in order to make up a people, according to relationships based not on force but on justice. Insofar as it is both ethical and moral, the common welfare demands and presumes religious faith, one which is true and integral, strong and fruitful. A purely pragmatic approach to this all important topic is unworthy of the subject. We must show how religious liberty corresponds to the truth of the individual person and the common welfare. It is better to acknowledge in all Christian simplicity how religious liberty corresponds to truth. As successors of the Apostles, we must be fearless proclaimers of this liberty because historically we are the heirs of a freedom which has almost always and everywhere been won only at the cost of blood and tears. Our experience shows us how dear our liberty is and how fruitful it is. We must endeavor to persuade our neighbors and our brethren to practice free obedience, a freedom which brings salvation because it is obedient, an obedience which brings salvation because it is free.

4. The world expects nothing more anxiously from this Council than a clear declaration on the reverent treatment of every human person in things religious. We must be universal in our consideration of religious liberty. Each of us naturally speaks from the context of freedom or persecution already experienced. This is not enough for an Ecumenical Council, which must consider things under their universal aspect, going beyond the experiences of individuals or nations. We must speak of man as such. Our declaration must be doctrinal in its foundation and not merely pragmatic. If the Church is to be cleared of the accusation of insincerity in its attitude on religious freedom, then we must demonstrate how our declaration rests on solid doctrinal basis. In its content this declaration is absolutely necessary.

After these four speakers, debate opened on the declaration dealing with the attitude of the Church toward Jews and other non-Christians. The following speakers took the floor:

1. Cardinal Achille Lienart, of Lille, France;
2. Cardinal Ignace Tappouni, Syrian Patriarch of Antioch; In the name of Stephanos I Sidarouss, Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria; of Maximos IV Saigh, Melchite Patriarch of Antioch; of Paull II Cheikho, Chaldean Patriarch of Babylon, and of Ignace Pierre XVI Batanian, Armenian Patriarch of Cilicia;
3. Cardinal Joseph Frings, Archbishop of Cologne, Germany;
4. Cardinal Ernesto Ruffini, Archbishop of Palermo, Italy;

segue...

5. Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro, Archbishop of Bologna, Italy;
6. Cardinal Paul-Emile Leger, Archbishop of Montreal, Canada;
7. Cardinal Richard Cus hing, Archbishop of Boston, Massachusetts;
8. Cardinal Frenziskus Koenig, Archbishop of Vienna, Austria;
9. Cardinal Albert Gregory Meyer, Archbishop of Chicago;
10. Cardinal Joseph Ritter, Archbishop of St. Louis, Missouri;
11. Archbishop Lorenz Jaeger, Archbishop of Paderborn, Germany;
12. Archbishop Philip Pocock, Coadjutor Archbishop of Toronto, Canada;
13. Bishop Peter Nierman, of Groningen, Holland;
14. Bishop Jules Daem, of Antwerp, Belgium.

Their observations can be summed up as follows:

1. The text should be kept as it is, although some touching up needs to be done in some details. There should be no fear of making this declaration because the aim of the Council is exclusively spiritual. The text is generally acceptable in its treatment of the common patrimony of Christians and Jews. Nevertheless, more stress should be placed on the statement that the Jewish people is not to be regarded as reprobate. St. Peter and St. Paul never regarded the Jews as a rejected people, so neither can we.

2. We must confirm in this solemn assembly, our former declarations against a declaration of this kind coming from the Council. If this document is insisted on, it will cause most serious difficulties for the hierarchy and the faithful in many localities. The Council will be accused of favoring specific political tendencies. With full awareness of our pastoral duty, we remind the Council of what has already been stated, namely that this declaration is inopportune and we ask the Council merely to have it figure among the acts of the Council.

3. The two declarationsaare to be accepted and the reasons have been abundantly explained. The treatment of the Moslems is to be commended. But it regrettable that the beautiful theology of Chapter 2 of the Epistle to the Ephesians is practically ignored. This is the classical passage in Sacred Scripture treating of the old and new relationships between peoples of the Old and News Testaments. In the treatment of the non-culpability of the Jewish people as a whole in the death of Christ, we should return the previous text. -- The treatof non-Christians is too negative. We should point out in positive fashion, how notwithstanding their errors, they still reflect a ray of the light of God. At the end is is not proper for the Council to command the faithful to practice love of the Jews. Christ has already commanded it and the Council can only reiterate this Divine precept.

4. The praises outlined here in regard to the Jewish people are most commendable. It hardly seems necessary to insist that Christians should have love for Jews. Many incidents in the last war were eloquent proof of this, to the point that the Grand Rabbi of Rome felt obliged to express his thanks publicly for the asylum so generously granted by the Holy See and for other favors. It would be likewise in order to urge Jews to love Christians, particularly Catholics, and to desist from offensive practices auch as have characterized the past. It is a known fact that most Jews follow the Talmudic text which inculcate contempt for all who are not Jews. It is well known that the international organization of Free Masonry, which is so hostile to the Church and has been outlined to members of the Church under pain of excommunicatio n, is supported and encouraged by Jews. -- Why is there no mention in the text of redemption through Christ also for the Jews? The text says practically nothing of non-Christians except with reference to Moslems. But there are in the world as many Buddhists and Hindus as there are Moslems and they are no farther removed than the Moslems from our basic Christian teaching. segue...

5. The basic reason for this declaration on the Jews is not the events of the last war, nor any extrinsic or political motivation. Its cause is purely religious and spiritual and comes from within the Church, i.e., that deeper knowledge of itself and of its own essential mystery which the Church is tod ay acquiring. This declaration is the maturing and the necessary fruit of the dogmatic constitution on the Church and on the Liturgy. The text should be perfected and be completed. It should suggest Biblical discussions with Jews and with greater reverence should express the hopes of the Church for exchatolocal re-integration of the Jewish people. The Jews of today should not be called an accursed or deicide people, but we should recognize tha t all of us "have strayed like sheep." It is not a new doctrine in the Church but a traditional one that the Jews crucified Christ out of ignorance, as can be seen in the Catechism in the Council of Trent.

6. The importance of the declaratio n on Jews and other non-Christians is evident. It in an act of a renewed Church. The text does well to present the two new articles, lest anyone feel excluded from the maternal interest of the Church..On some points, the text needs to be modified, References to the Jewish origin of Jesus, Mary and the Apostles should be made more clear and specific and not just set down as passing references.. We should explain why we condemn hatred of the Jews, i.e., not only because they are men but because they are specially related to us. We should declare that past persecution of Jews came from false philosophies and wrong interpretation of Christian doctrine. On the relations of Christians and Jews, the text is too generic and ambiguous. To stress that the Jewish people is not reprobate, why not quote St. Paul when he states that "God did not reject the people whom he had chosen." We should make it clear that we are not speaking of the Jews of today but of Jews as such and everywhere.

7. Our declaration of the scheme for the Jews and love for the sons of Abraham must be more clear and positive, less timid and more charitable. In a word, it must manifest Christ. The text must rule out any special culpability for the death of Chrsit which can be made to affect later generations. We have no right to set ourselves up as judges in the place of God. The declaration should likewise include an avowal and a disclaiming of t he sins of some Christians, even in our own time; sins against the law of Christ and against Christian life and doctrine. We must proclaim to the world in this sacred assembly that there is no logical or historical reaon which can justify the iniquity, the hatred or the pe rsecution of our Jewish brethren. It may well be true that not many voices of this kind were lifted in the past but at least they can be lifted now..

8. The special mention of the Moslems is most acceptable because of their profession of belie f in one merciful God. One may wonder why the passage condemning persecution of the Jews has omitted the words, "formerly or in our own time," which appeared in the previous text. Several detailed modifications would greatly improve the general tenor of the text.

9. The importance of t his declaration has been stressed by many and it should be accepted with our whole hearts. Last year's text was better and more ecumenical in tone. It is not enough to say that the Church deplores the persecution of Jews merely because it condemns injustice to all men. There should be explicit mention of the special bonds uniting us to the Jews, as was done in the previous text. St. Thomas Aquinas has reminded us that no Jew in the time of Christ was formally guilty of deicide because they did not know the Divinity of Christ. -- There would be reasons for treating here only of the Jews and taking up other religions in schema 13 on The Presence of the Church in the Worl d. There are the s ame reasons for treating of other

seguo..

religions here as for t he Moslems. The text should make very clear tha t the Church takes a vigorous stand against any and all discrimination on the basis of nation, race, etc. This should be set forth in greater detail and with greater clarity.

10. The approval of a declaration regarding the Jews would provide an opportunity to repair the injustices of past centuries. For this purpose, the text proposed last year is better than the one now under consideration. The present document has several weaknesses: 1) the style apparently recognizes only half-heartedly the close relationships existing between Christians and Jews. 2) Because of certain omissions, the text does not really go to the heart of the Jewish problem. 3) There are offensive ambiguities, because in some places what is not said is more eloquent than what is said.

11. Because Jews are also non-Christians, the title should be changed to "Declaration on Jews and other non-Christians." There are certain texts of Scripture which could be used to enrich the declaration, while some others which are used are not really to the point.

12. There are historical reaons why the Church should retract the accusations made against the Jews in the past. The Church must absolve the Jewish people from all false accusations made in the past through an abuse of truth and charity. Sometimes it is argued that this cannot be done because a stand of t his kind would put the Jews in a better light than is justifi ed by Sacred Scripture. But the harsh words used by Our Lord, Stephen and Paul, who were all Jews, were used as exhortations to conversion. Such expressions cannot be taken as an objective descript ion of the w h ole people. These words were intended to stir consciences and to move hearts. Often in St. Joh, the terms, "the Jew," refers not to the Jewish people but to the enemies of Christ. Thus these words were applicable not to all but only to a few.

13. The declaration is most acceptable because it shows on the pa rt of the Church an increasingly clear perception of the religious values of the Jewish people and of other religions, in all of which are found some elements of truth coming from the Father of Light who wishes to save all men. To safeguard harmony and to strengthen the tex t , certain detailed changes should be made.

14. The text is acceptable but it could reflect more perfectly the conditions of our present day dialogue with Judaism. The Church should judge the human and religious values of Judaism, not only in the light of history and theology but also in the light of the religious and human state of Judaism today. Tod ay's dialogue with the Jews is based on an antinomy found in Sacred Scripture: on the one hand a condemnation of the Jews, and on the other hand, God's will to save all men. Thus our dialogue today is taking place according to the plan of God.

The General Congregation adjourned at 12:35.

FINE

16-E-1964

CARDINAL OTTAVIANI SEES WEAKNESSES IN RELIGIOUS LIBERTY DECLARATION

Rev. Dr. Ralph M. Wiltgen SVD
Divine Word News Service
C.P. 5080, Rome, Italy
Tel. 63.70.105

ROME, Sept. 23 (DW) - His Eminence, Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani, 73, head of the Doctrinal Commission of the Second Vatican Council, today pointed out various weaknesses in the schema on Religious Liberty for the Individual in Human Society. He said the Church had always taught the general principle contained in the declaration, that "no one must be forced into religion," and quoted Tertullian as a witness of this.

But he said the schema was guilty of exaggeration where it said "he is worthy of honor" who obeys his own conscience - and thus also God - even though "sometimes in a confused or unconscious manner." He said it would be better to say that such a person is worthy of "tolerance" or, at the most, "respect" or "charity".

Listing various weaknesses in the schema text, Cardinal Ottaviani said "the principle which says eachone has the right to follow his own conscience must suppose that the conscience is not contrary to the divine law."

He said there was lacking in the text "an explicit and solemn affirmation of the first and genuine right to religious liberty which objectively belongs to those who are members of the true revealed religion." Such a religion's right is at once subjective and objective, while on the contrary for others who are in error there is only question of a subjective right.

To assert that every kind of religion has the liberty of propagating itself, he said, "is a very serious matter." He said this would "evidently result in harm for those nations in which the Catholic religion is the one generally held by the people," and added that their unity of faith "would thus be rent asunder."

He asked that religious liberty be not promoted too strongly, quoting the words of St. Paul to Timothy: "Reprove, entreat, rebuke with all patience and teaching, for there will come a time when they will not endure the sound doctrine (2 Tim. 4, 2-3)."

An Ecumenical Council of the Catholic Church, Cardinal Ottaviani said, cannot ignore the fact "that the rights of the true religion are based not only on merely natural rights, but also - and to a much greater degree - on the rights which flow from revelation." He reminded the Council Fathers that they are not taking part merely in some philosophical or naturalistic congress, but in a Council of the Church of Christ, and therefore have the obligation to proclaim and defend true religious liberty, trampled under foot today in so many countries.

CONCILIO ECUMENICO-VATICANO II

UFFICIO STAMPA

SESSION III -- DOCUMENTATION

Background and Summary

DECLARATION ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTYm ir ON THE RIGHS OF THE HUMAN PERSON AND OF COMMUNITIES TO FREEDOM IN RELIGIOUS MATTERS

Introductory note:

The revised text ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY comprises 5 pages as an Appendix to the schema DE ECUMENISMO with the indication DECLARATIO I, along with another DECLARATIO II, dealing with the Jews and non-Christians. The Declaration on religious liberty is accompanied by five pages of Notes, a Relatio, and a brief Summary. The text was transmitted to the Council Fathers on April 27,1964.

The genesis of the amended text on Religious Liberty.

In the Second Session of the Coujncil, on November 19,1963, the Fathers were given the fascicule on Religious Liberty as Chapter 5 of the schema "De Ecumenismo", and in the 70th General Congregation held on that same day, Bishop De Smedt, of Bruges, Members of the Secretariate for Christiah Unity, read to the Cojncil an explanatory and introductory Relatio. Conflicting opinions were immediately evident among the Council Fathers, ranging from enthusiasm to severe criticism. The text was not brought up for discussion on the Council floor for want of sufficient time.

Up to February 27,1964, the Secretariate for Christian Unity accepted observations from the Council Fathers and incorporated them into a volume of some 280 pages. Some of the Fathers wanted the text on religious liberty incorporated into the schema on Ecumenism, inasmuch as the recognition of religious liberty forms part of the foundation of Ecumenism. According to certain other Fathers, however, the text in question should constitute a distinct chapter of the schema on Ecumenism. Still others would have abbreviated the presentation and included it in Chapter I of the schema, treating of the basic principles of Ecumenism. Lastly, others prposed the presentation of the subject as a decree distinct from that on Ecumenism, considering the fact that, notwithstanding its ecumenical importance, the subject matter exceeds the limits of Ecumenism strictly so called.

The test was amended by the Secretariate for Christian Unity according to the recommendations made by many of the Fathers, but its great importance did not permit it to be compressed into such compact form as would have permitted its insertion into Chapter I of the schema on Ecumenism. Thus, according to the desire expressed by the Co-ordinating Commission in its metting of April 18,1964, the text on religious liberty, like that on the Jews and non-Christians, is now submitted to the Council as a "Declaration" distinct from, but adnexed to the schema on Ecumenism.

The criteria followed in the revision of the text.

After a careful study of all the observations sent in by the Council Fathers concerning the revision of the text,the Secretariate for Christiah Unity saw fit to retain five principal points:

a) A clearer expression of the concept of religious liberty.

The purpose of this clarification is to forestall any fallacious or equivocal interpretations of the text. Consequently, at

segue .....

at the very beginning of the new text, an additional paragraph dxplains the exact significance of the concept of "religious liberty". A distinction must be made between freedom as fr as relations with God are concerned, and freedom in relations with men. The text is concerned exclusively with religious liberty in relation with other men, considered either as individuals as members of religious groups. The foundation of these rights comes from the very serious obligation of respecting human dignity and following the law of God according to the dictates of a conscience sincerely formed. Freedom to follow one's own religious conscience is the greatest advantage of every person and for this reason it is a strictly personal right in social association, and there must be respect for freedom fo following the call of God, in which we behold the peak of the dignity of the human person.

b) Explicit indications of the rights of religious groups.

To these groups is recognized authentic religious liberty in those things which develop spiritual life among men.

c) A better explanation of the principle by which our rights can be restricted.

The aim of society is the complexus of those conditions of social life which aid men to achieve the more fully and the more expeditiously the perfection at which they are aiming. It is thus the duty of public authority in matters of religion to reconcile and to harmonize among themselves the exeercise of the rights of both, in such wise that the exercise of the rights of one group will not constitute an obstacle to the exercise of the rights of the other.

A distinction mustalso be made between the right to propagate sincerely and honestly one's own religion and the abuses of this right when dishonest means are employed in religious propaganda.

d) Emphasis on/objective truth of the Divine Law with all its exigencies.

This is done in such a way as to exclude all danger of subjectivism and indifferentism.

e) Present-day circumstances confirm the necessity and the rights of religious liberty.

The urgency of this problem becomes all the more evident because of the closer bonds created among men of diverse cultures and religious, along with the increased conscicusness of personal responsibility, with the evolution of the juridical structures of civil institutions.

SUMMARY OF THE DECLARATION ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

The numbering of the articles follows that of the schema on Ecumenism, which comprises 24 numbers. Hence the articles of this Declaration begin with No. 25.

No.25 - The consideration of the problem of religious liberty favors contacts among Christians. This emphasized its ecumenical aspect.

segue .....

No.26 - The nature of religious liberty.

a. Its foundation: In the religious field, it is both a duty and an honor for man to follow the will of God, according to the dictates of conscience. This is the very root of the right to religious liberty.

b) The right to religious liberty in society puts men in a position to be able to practise privately and publicly their own religion, and no restriction must be placed on this religious practice,

c) Religious liberty demands that there should be established in society the conditions required to guarantee it.

d) The Conncil, in its affirmation of man's dependence on God, proclaims that religious liberty in society must be recognized and respected by all and everywhere.

No.27 - The task of the Church.

According to the mandate received from the Lord, the Church propagates the Word of God and prays for the salvation of all men, exhorting her own children to spread the life-giving light of the Gospel.

No.28 - No one can be forced to embrace the Faith.

With love, prudence and patience, in accordance with the ways of God, contact is established with those who do not have the true Faith. But all coercion, direct or indirect, is to be excluded from the preaching of the Truth, because according to the traditional norm of the Church, based on the very nature of the act of Faith, the acceptance of Faith must be fully free.

No.29 - The religious liberty of the individual in human society.

In human society, religious liberty is to be respected not only by Christians and for Christians, but by all and for all -- persons, individuals, and religious groups.

Freedom to follow God's call is the peak of human dignity, and consequently this liberty in in social co=existence is a right in the truest sense of the term, and is the foundation and safeguard of other freedoms.

The objective, absolute and universal Divine Law is the norm of our relationships with God, whence there derives man's obligation to acquire diligently the knowledge of this Law. But man can follow the Divine Law only through the judgment of his own conscience which he forms for himself under the guidance of prudence. In sincere obedience to conscience, a man implicitly obeys God. If, in his attempts to know the Will of God, a man falls into an erroneous interpretation of that Will, no man and no power has the right to induce him to act contrary to the dictate of his conscience.

An essential element of religious liberty is the right to practise one's religion publicly. Hence the Church proclaims not only the right to one's opinion and freedom to practise the rites of one's own religion, but also an individual's genuine right to observe and to witness his private and public worship

segue ....

before God and men, whether individuals or groups, and to organize according to the precepts of his religion the whole of his own individual, family, educational, cultural, social and charitable life.

The exercise of this right must be adapted to the exigencies of the social nature of man. Hence it can be subject to restrictions. But it can be restricted legitimately only when it it is grave conflict with the end of society. Consequently, it is umlawful for State authorities tc discriminate in any way against religion. It is, on the contrary, their duty to protect and to encourage religious liberty.

No.30 - The freedom of religious groups in social co-existen existence.

Men have the right of free assembly in groups, which groups in turn, within the limits determined by the end of society, have the right to govern themselves according to their own laws, to honor God with public worship, to sssist their members in their religious life, and to create institutions of social character based on religious principles.

The Catholic Church expects from State authorities a recognition of the right of religious liberty in social co-existence.

Any violent oppression of religion itself or of the religion of a determined religious group is in opposition with the Divine Will and with human rights.

Religious groups are entitled to carry on sincere and honest propagation of their religion, but they must refrain from any "proselytism" which would employ dishonest means.

Civil authorities have no direct power to regulate the relationips of their citizens with God. Consequently, they may not subject religious groups to the temporal aims of the State. On the contrary, it contributes to the common welfare when conditions are created which will favor religious life.

No.31 - Religious life in the world today.

Today in particular, the problem of religious liberty is of greater urgency because of the more extended contacts which exist between men of different cultues and different religions, because of an increased consciousness of personnal responsibility, because of the juridical organization of today's civil order -- all of which set off in a clearer light the incompetence of the State to establish itself as a judge of religious truth.

There can be no peaceful co-existence in the human family in the world today without religious liberty in society.

fine .....;

CONCILIO ECUMENICO VATICANO II

September 23, 1964

Sessione IV ~~UFFICIO~~ **STAMPA**

NEWS BULLETIN NO. 7

GENERAL CONGREGATION NO. 86

A special ceremony opened the 86th Congregation of the II Ecumenical Vatican Council on Sept. 23, 1964. At 9:10 a.m. Pope Paul VI arrived in the Basilica, carrying in procession the reliquary containing the head of St. Andrew the Apostle, which is being returned to the Orthodox Metropolitan of Patras, Greece, after having been preserved in St. Peter's Basilica since 1462. After taking his place on a special kneeler before the Council Altar, His Holiness assisted at the Mass celebrated by Cardinal Paolo Marella, Archpriest of St. Peter's Basilica. The Mass was that of the feast of St. Andrew, Apostle. After Mass, Cardinal Franziskus Koenig, Archbishop of Vienna, delivered a brief discourse. He saluted St. Andrew in the name of all the successors of the Apostles assembled as brothers from all over the world, because they see in St. Andrew, as an Apostle, the foundation for bishops in the Church. His Eminence spoke of the vicissitudes undergone by this relic of St. Andrew. In the latter half of the 15th century, when the division of the Eastern and Western Churches had been consummated and when Christianity was sorely threatened, Thomas Palaeologus of Patras sent the head of St. Andrew to Rome, as to the center of Christian communion. It was solemnly received in Rome by Pope Pius II on April 21, 1462 at the Milvian Bridge. On that occasion Pope Pius II spoke of the relic as coming into exile, giving assurance that the relic would be returned in glory when the time came. That relic is now returning to Patras as a pledge and a sign of charity.

His Eminence continued, stating that the exile of the Apostle, Andrew ends today as his head returns to its original resting place. The pilgrimage of Paul VI to the Holy Land early this year gave to the Orient the opportunity of pe rsonal contact with Peter's successors. Now his brethren in the Episcopate salute the Pope for his gesture of unity in returning the relic of St. Andrew to Patras.

The Cardinal concluded that although the residence of St. Andrew in the Central Basilica of the Christian world has come to an end, this does not put an end of the affection to our hearts. All of us burn with the desire and the hope to consummate unity. May the tomb of St. Andrew become a center of devotion and a sanctuary of prayer. May he assist all -- Pope, Bishops, Priests, Faithful - to be faithful to their vocation for the glory of God. May Peter and Andrew together pray for the entire Christian pe ople and for the realization of peace and concord.

The Gospel Book was not enthroned according to the usual procedure. In its place, the head of St. Andrew remained exposed on the Council altar throughout the whole of the General Congregation.

The six votes scheduled for this morning's congregation were carried out as planned. The results of each are as follows:

Vote 13. The order of bishops, succeeding the College of the Apostles in magisterium and pastoral government, in union with its Head, the Roman Pontiff, and never without this head, is likewise a subject of supreme and full power over the universal Church, but this power may never be exercised independently of the Roman Pontiff.-- Votes cast, 2,224; Placet, 1,927; Non placet, 292; Juxtum modum therefore null, 1; Null, 4.

Vote 14. The power of binding and loosing given to Peter personally was also given to the College of the Apostles in union with it s Head.-- Votes cast, 2,254; Placet, 1,943; Non placet,307;

segue...

J.M.T.N., 1; Null votes, 3.

Vote No. 15. With due respect for the primacy and authority of its Head, Bishops exercise their own power for the welfare of the faithful and even of the whole Church through the help of the Holy Spirit.-- Votes cast, 2,251; Placet, 2,096; Non placet, 152; Null, 3.

Vote No. 16. This supreme power is exercised in Ecumenical Councill Only the Roman Pontiff can invoke, preside over and coffirm Councils . There can be no Ecumenical Council not confirmed or at least accepted by the Successor of Peter. Votes cast, 2,245; Placet, 2,114; Non placet, 127; Null, 4.

Vote. No. 17. This same collegial power in union with the Pope can be exercised by Bishops throughout the world provided the Head of the College calls them to collegial action or at least approves their unified action freely. Votes cast, 2,214; Placet, 2,006; Non placet,204; J.M.T.N., 1; Null, 3.

Vote. No. 18. The Collegial union of the Bishops is reflected in their relationships w ith their particular churches and with the Church Universal. Individual Bishops represent their churches and all of them together wit h the Pope represent the entire Church in the bond of peace, love, and unity. Votes cast, 2,220; Placet, 2,163; Non placet, 56; Null, 1.

Two speakers concluded the discussion on the Pastoral Duties of Bishops:

1. Bishop Charles Greco, of Alexandria, Louisiana;
2. Bishop Rafael Gonzales Moralejo, Auxiliary of Valencia, Spain.

The substance of their remarks is as follows:

1. The text should make explicit mention of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and should even include a special exhortation to Bishops to introduce and promote the Confraternity in their Dioceses, if they have not already done so. Objectively speaking, the omission of such an exhortation would be an affront to those Popes and Sacred Congregations who have promoted the Confraternity in recent years. The schema says nothing on the scarcity of catechists, whereas it is common knowledge that one of the greatest needs of the Church today is for persons who can assist priests in teaching because of the scarcity of priests and religious.

2. The texts referring to the Church's freedom in Episcopal appointments is not yet sufficiently clear. This point must be treated because the Church must initiate its reform by a reform of Church institutions. Among these the appointment of Bishops is of the utmost importance. The Council mustt formula te concrete principles on Episcopal appointments, and do this, not negatively but positively as was done in the schema for the appointment of pastors. It must be clearly stated w hat is the competent authority to act, what aids it can count on, and what is the role of Apostolic Nuncios in bringing about t hese appointments. The opinion of the speaker was that the matter should be in the hands of the National Episcopal Conferences, after consultation with the priests of the interested dioceses, and not omitting the opinion of the laity.

With the conclusion of the debate on the Pastoral Mission of Bishops, the way was open for the Declaration on Religious Liberty. Bishop Emile-Joseph De Smedt, of Bruges, Belgium, presented the Relatio on this declaration. He stated that the text has been considerably improved since it was first presented a year ago, thanks to the Collegial discussion by the Fathers. It is evident proof of the assertion

segue

of Paul VI that "the Spirit of God is here." No less than 300 observations and amendments were presented in writing to the Secretariat before the revision of the text was undertaken. All these remarks were carefully examined and many of them served as guidelines.

In the present text the following points have been given greater emphasis: 1. The idea of religious liberty has been clarified in the light of observations made in the Council discussion. 2. There is a more explicit statement on the rights of religious groups. 3. There is a more careful examination of the limits within which the exercise of religious liberty can be restricted. 4. To forestall all danger of subjectivism and indifferentism there is a clearer explanation of how man, informing his conscience, must make serious inquiry into what is demanded by the Divine Law, which binds all men. 5. The text gives a deeper explanation of why in the present circumstances of human society the observance of religious liberty must be emphasized.

Against the objection that we should not speak of "religious liberty" but rather of "religious tolerance", we reply that "religious liberty" is a modern term commonly accepted. If we are to address our declaration to modern society, then we must use a modern expression. We are dealing with a religious liberty as a formally juridical concept which enunciates a right based on the nature of the human person, a right which must be respected and acknowledged by all. His Holiness Pope Paul VI has used the term, religious liberty.

A two-fold danger had to be avoided: first, that of making this difficult declaration a simple list of practical points, and that of turning it into a merely juridical treatise. After summing up the content of the individual articles of the declaration, Bishop De Smedt went on to point out that the basic foundation of relisious liberty is the nature of the human person as created by God. The right to religious liberty rests on the fact, that, under the guidance of his conscience, every human person must obey God's call and will. In forming his conscience each one must sincerely examine what the Divine Law demands of him in his concrete case. The Catholic who believes in the Church must, in forming his conscience, not act as though the Church had received no doctrinal authority from God but must inquire into what the Church teaches on a particular point in order to follow freely the guidance of the Church.

Regarding the very difficult problem of the restriction of religious liberty, we do not appeal to the common welfare but go more deeply to the end established by God for society. In a matter of this kind it is impossible to find any formulate which cannot be distorted by abuse in the hands of ill-intentioned public authority.

This does not mean that public authority is expected to be neutral, in the sense that it would have to be at least "separated" or indifferent to religion. Public authority must indirectly favor the religious life which its citizens live according to the dictates of their conscience. The state has no power to pass judgment on religious matters, to interfere directly in things touching the religious life of the citizens, or to subordinate the life of religious groups to its own political ends. Public authority must be recognized as having a lay character, but without accepting any laicism which would be offensive to religion and which is forbidden to public authority by the natural law itself.

In this whole field we must act with that kindliness, moderation, and respect for the human person of which Christ Our Lord has given us the example.

The following speakers initiated the discussion of the declaration on religious liberty:

segue...

3. Cardinal Ernesto Ruffini, Archbishop of Palermo, Italy;
4. Cardinal Fernando Quiroga y Palacios, Archbishop of Santiago de Campostela, Spain;
5. Cardinal Paul Emile Leger, Archbishop of Montreal, Canada;
6. Cardinal Richard Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, Mass;
7. Cardinal Jose Bueno y Monreal, Archbishop of Seville, Spain;
8. Cardinal Albert Meyer, Archbishop of Chicago;
9. Cardinal Joseph Ritter, Archbishop of St. Louis, Missouri;
10. Cardinal Raul Silva Henriquez, Archbishop of Santiago, Chile in the name of 58 Latin American Bishops;
11. Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani, Secretary of the S.C.of the H.Office.
12. Bishop Smiljan Cekada, of Skoplje, Yugoslavia:

The following paragraphs summarize the observations made by the preceding Fathers:

3. Although it can be correctly understood the title of the declaration would more appropriately be "freedom to profess religion" or "the free exercise of religion." We must take care to confirm the dignity of the human person as redeemed by Christ. We should not confuse freedom which is proper to truth, with tolerance, which certainly must be patient and kindly. Only truth has rights, and truth is one.-- There are grounds for concern over the words of the text regarding public authorities. It is true that public officials are bound to respect the freedom of all citizens, to profess any religion not in conflict with the public welfare. But shuch officials cannot be forbidden to accept as proper to their State a religion which they beliebe to be true, always wit h out prejudice to the religon of others. Any limitation of this right of State officials would require the rejection of most concordats made by the Holy See with different nations. Hence we must proceed cautiously. -- The forceful exhortation to Catholics not to use force in bringing about conversions seems inappropriate as it can hardly be imagined that any Catholics are in need of any such declaration. We should vindicate the protection of common law for our holy religion.

4. The text is good and is laudibly concerned with furthering union with our separated brethren, but it appears to ignore the grave dangers for faith and charity among faithful Catholics to which it opens the way. It seems t o have been written in view of so-called Protestant countries, and to have paid no attention to the situation of Catholic countries. Hence the text is often ambiguous and obscure and leaves the door open to misunderstanding. The declaration treats more of new elements than of those which are traditional in the Church and does not maintain balance between continuity and progress. In order to correct these and other weaknesses, the text should be completely recast by a new mixed commission of periti which would be in a position to appreciate the importance and delicacy of this point. The text would appear to be solemnly confirming the Liberalism which the Church has so often condemned. We should not confuse religious liberty with liberty of conscience. The latter is in the inner realm os the soul whereas the former sets up a false objective situation in the society.

5. The text is acceptable because it safegaards the rights both of individuals and of groups. It answers the patient expectation of those who are suffering everywhere for their religion. It provides a foundation for dialogue with our separated brethren. The text is prudent and cause in its warning against relativism and indifferentism. But it needs to be clarified on two points. On the subject of religious liberty what the text says is strictly speaking applicable only to believers. It must, however, be applicable to all men without exception, even those who do not believe. We must a ffirm the freedom of religion of thos who wish to profess no religion at all. As for the foundation of religious liberty, it is inexact to put it in following the will of God or corresponding to man's divine vocation. This presupposes God, and

segue...

some will not accept God. This foundation should be put in the highest exercis e of human reason. Anything against religious liberty is also against man and his reason.

6. It is cause for joy that at long last we have an opportunity for full and free discussion of this important topic in the Council Hall. The Catholic and Non-Catholic world alike is waiting for this declaration. It is a practical question of major importance, besides being also an important doctrinal question. It aims to safeguard what has well been called "decent respect for the opinion of mankind." -- The Church must show herself as a champion of religious liberty. Although this text will call for some revision, nothing should be done to make it weaker. Its essential substance must be retained. -- The question of religious liberty is by some regarded as complicated, hwereas in itself it is simple. It has a two-fold aspect: first, the assertion of the freedom of the Church, i.e., her divine r i ght to achieve her supernatural end, and secondly, insistence by the Chur ch on this right for every human being. The safeguarding of religious liberty is a contribution to national welfare, because, as Lord Acton declared, "freedom is the highest political end!" In the encyclical, Pacem In Terris," John XXIII has outlined the more cogent reasons demanding this declaration on religious lib erty.

7. The doctrine of the declaration is generally correct but needs certain clarification. It differs from previous stands of the Church on this topic. We should not forget that although applications may sometimes change, fundamental principles always remain the same. One weakness of the declaration is that it makes a transition from the doctrinal level to the juridical or political level and also passes from personal liberty freedom of action in social society, i.e., that to circumstances whi ch may interfere with the rights of others. It is sometimes lawful to prohibit the spread of error when it can do harm to those who want to profess the faith they have received from Christ.

8. The declaration should be accepted because it is in line with the declarations of modern Popes, especially of John XXIII. The declaration is necessary for the following reasons: 1.) Men wantsfrom the Church a proclamation of religious liberty because their common experience has shown that where the State dominates religion, civic welfare is generally harmed, whereas where religious freedom is enjoyed, civic welfare is in a flourishing state. 2.) This confirmation of religious liberty by the Council will point the way to civil governments to show them how to act in this same connection. 3.) It will show that true religion is not in external acceptance but consists especially in the conscious and full acceptance of the will of the Creator. 4.) It will aid the Apostolate by making it clear that religion is best promoted by interior conviction. 5.)A declaration is necessary to insure fruitful dialogue with our separated brethren. We must give to others what we claim for ourselves. The importance of t his declaratio n is so far-reaching that if the Council were not to approve it, nothing else which it might do would satisfy the expectations of men.

9. This declaration is both acceptable and necessary. It should be accepted because of its pastor al character, the prudence of its arguments and its conclusion, and its adaptability to the actual needs of society. However, accept ing the substance of the declaration does not mean acdeptance of the reasons given in the text. It is suggested to the Moderators that they separate the vote on the substance of the declar ation fro m the vote approving the reasons listed. Consequently, the declaration is acceptable Juxtum modum and the modus would be: 1.) avoid anything smacking of argumentation and 2.) declare only that all men ha ve an inborn right to religious freedom.

10. The text is acceptable and is much better than the one presented in 1963. It is acceptably because it is not a chapter but a

segue

distinct declaration. It is correct in declaring incompetence of civil authorities in matters religious. The statement that the doctrine given here is traditional in the Church is also approved. This declaration will have extreme importance not only for Christians but for all men, Especially in Latin America, it will dissipate certain opportunistic ideas, according to which the stand on religious liberty would vary according as the Church is in the majori ty or the minority. The decla r ation will have a special impace on the work of evangelization. The peoples of Latin America need a new Christianization. They need to adapt their preaching methods and to pay more attention to the evolution of human personality. This declaration will be an incentive to purer apostolic activity, not stopping at simple proselytism, in the spirit of the declaration. There will be more stress on the necessity of good example. Proselytism is a deviation from genuine Christkan witness. In some localities, the quantity of conversions may drop, but their quality will increase. We need to stress the importance of educational activity and personal maturity.

11. There are some exaggerations in the text, as for example where it states that even though he be in error, a man is worthy of honor. Actually, a man in error is deserving of charity and kineness but it is not clear how he is entitled to honor. The declaration forgets many elements which are byond the field of ecumenism and it does not pay sufficient attention to non-Christian religions. Attention must be paid not only to natural rights but also t o supernatural rights. Those pfofessing a revealed religion haverights over and above those coming from the natural law. We must profess and defend our Catholic faith no matter what the consequences. How many priseons have been sanctified by confessors of the Faith! Religious liberty can exist only in dependence on the Divine Law. It is not true that the state is incompetent to choose a religion. If this were so, we should have t o suppress all the Concordats made by the Holy See. This would entail the suppression of the many benefits which these Concordats have produced, such as the protection of marriage and religious education in the Concordat with Italy. It is not lawful to admit freedom to spread a religion when this may harm the unity of a Catholic nation and culminate in weakening it. What is said on proselytism should be omitted completely. It could easily be used against us to get us out of missionary fields. Let us take care not to harm our adversaries.

12. Prescinding from the reasons given in the text, it is imperative that we have a declaration on religious liberty. Such liberty must always be respected pr ovided its exercise does not clash with the absolute rights of God. Where there is no liberty many things necessary for human life are found wanting. We need a declaration of this kind in order to take a clear stand in the face of various ideologies. Marxism adapts itself to circumstances and grants or suppressed religious liberty according as it sees fit. This is one of the most fundamental problems of modern life. The Council should send a delcaration to the United Nations, asking this organization to proclaim solemnly obligation of respecting religious liberty in any land and nation. It should spell out the elements falling within this category, such as freedom of worship, freedom to have schools, freedom to own buildings for religious purposes, and freedom to engage in any kind of religious activity. A special commission of Council Fathers should be appointed to prepare this text text and have it discussed before transferring it to the UN. Such a step would not be beneath the dignity of the Council. It should leave nothing undone which would promote this good cause. In this we should learn from our adversaries who use any and all means to achieve their purposes.

The Moderator of the morning's session, Cardinal Leo Jozef Suenens, Archbishop of Malines-Bruxelles, Belgium, adjourned the General Congregatio at 12:35.

FINE

American Bishops at Vatic

By FR. RAYMOND BOSLER

(The author of the following article is editor of the Indianapolis Criterion.)

ROME—The bishops of the United States are very much aware of the criticism aimed against them for not offering greater leadership in the Council. As representatives of the most powerful and influential nation in the world, they know they are on the spot, and they are extremely uncomfortable about it.

In many ways the U. S. bishops are unprepared for what the Council demands of them. They are not theorizers; they are doers. Few are theologians. Most of them with degrees are specialists in Church law. Practical men they are, for the most part.

They are pastoral bishops—the very type that Vatican Council II is trying to produce more of. They would proudly and willingly show their fellow bishops from other nations around their dioceses to demonstrate for them practical examples of pastoral institutions and organizations, but they are not prepared to theorize about them.

The truth of the matter is that the bishops of the United States have not yet been forced to re-examine and criticize their institutions and organizations as have the bishops of Europe, South America and the mission territories, where the Church has suffered serious losses or failed to make progress. The Church has continued to grow and become an ever greater influence in the United States, and it has been all that the bishops could do to keep up with it.

Our bishops, however, have not been idle in this second session of the Council. A number of them have spoken and spoken well. They are speaking effectively now on the lay apostolate and the importance of proclaiming clearly to the world the essential place of the layman in the Church. And many of them are busy working behind the scenes to prepare for a strong statement on religious freedom in the modern state.

But the obvious weakness of the U. S. bishops is their failure to organize themselves. They speak and act always as individuals and never as a group, whereas the bishops of other nations and territories (such as the African nations) have formed groups that speak and act as units.

There are many reasons for this failure to organize: the vastness of our country, the large number of bishops, the division of the nation into states. And not to be ignored, the American spirit of independence. For years now the U. S. bishops have preferred to deal directly with Rome rather than through a national organization that might regulate individual bishops. The National Catholic Welfare Conference has never had any authority over individual bishops.

Perhaps the greatest obstacle to the organization of the U. S. bishops is the conviction of many of them that to form blocks is a political maneuver totally out of place in anything so sacred as an ecumenical council. This, in spite of the fact that the bishops were encouraged at the opening of the Council to form national groups to expedite the work of the Council.

It is a great pity that the U. S. bishops, of all national groups, have failed in organization. The principal task of this Council is to develop new forms of government within the Church. No group is better fitted for this than the U. S. bishops.

Every age leaves its mark upon the Church. It is easy—and now frequently embarrassing—to see what effects the Roman Empire, feudalism and monarchy have had upon it. So far the modern democratic form of government and living have failed to make an impression.

If the Church is to be brought up-to-date, then somehow it must embrace the values and customs of modern democracy. Not that the Church is to become democratic in the way authority is determined and exercised—though the early Church did practice democratic methods of electing bishops and popes. Christ gave His own constitution to His Church, which He built upon the Apostles, with Peter as their head and source of unity, and this must continue in the bishops as successors of the Apostles, who in turn are under the Pope, successor of Peter.

It is not correct to speak of the Church as democratic or monarchial. The Church is not like any other institution on earth. It is not a political institution. Therefore, it can be neither an empire nor a monarchy.

If it takes on the aspects and appearances of an empire or a monarchy or of feudalism, it does so for the same reason that Christ was Jewish in his thinking and living. God became man in Christ Jesus. This we call the Incarnation—God taking flesh and dwelling amongst us. The Church is Christ's prolonged dwelling amongst men. The Church is incarnated in the sense that God becomes man in Christ living amongst men of every generation and nation.

There is no reason why the Church can not take to itself modern democracy as it took to itself the Roman Empire and the feudalistic and monarchial way of living. The Pope and bishops must know the people of God who make up the Church, must know their wants and needs, must know also their ideas and suggestions, for the Holy Spirit is at work in all the people of God. The modern systems of government have devised various means of granting representation to the people. And modern education has prepared the people for more responsibility who will no longer be satisfied with a system of Church government designed for a feudal or monarchial age. It is this contribution to human understanding that should leave its mark upon the Church.

Here is where the U. S. bishops could be expected to make their principal contribution to the Council. They better than others should know that representative government can not be organized from the top down, but must spring from the grass roots and that without organization there can be no successful representation.

In civil society the people do not make their wants felt as isolated individuals but as units agreeing to support the stand arrived at by majority vote. This is what the bishops of France, Germany, Holland, Africa and many South American countries are doing in the

Pitts. Catholic 10/24/63

;an Council II -- Two Views

By FR. V. A. YZERMANS

(The author of the following article is editor of the St. Cloud Visitor.)

ROME (NC)—A prominent U. S. Scripture scholar has expressed concern about the image certain reporters are creating of American bishop in the ecumenical council.

Fr. Barnabas Ahern, C.P., prefect of studies at the Passionist seminary in Louisville, Ky., and a former vice-president of the U. S. Catholic Biblical Association, said in an interview here:

"Although the press in general has been both generous and sympathetic, I feel that some writers have often missed the true spirit of the council and have failed to measure justly the character and role of the American bishops."

A Council expert, Fr. Ahern has frequently addressed national hierarchies, including the American bishops.

"The recurring use of the convenient cliches 'left and right wings,' 'liberal and conservative,' 'progressive and reactionary,'" he said, "has given a simple and understandably human explanation of council deliberations. This simplification, however, obscures the fact that most bishops belong to neither group."

He said the bishops "are seeking the best good and the most effective means of Church reform."

He went on to say that those who interpret the council as a struggle between two opposing sides do not see the total picture.

Fr. Ahern, who goes to all the general meetings of the Council, said that in the council hall one senses a real groping for truth "through a process of testing and sifting." All the speeches in the Council, he said, are the means the Holy Spirit uses to enlighten the "minds of the Council Fathers to formulate whatever is best for the life of the Church."

The American bishops, he observed, are fulfilling the role of "impartial arbiters." Those who minimize their contribution fail to take into consideration the distinctive American character of the U. S. hierarchy, he said.

"To appreciate their contribution," he continued, "one must always bear in mind the unique qualities of the American hierarchy, qualities which the press many times has failed to place in proper focus."

Fr. Ahern said that these "unique qualities" are:

1) As bishops of a growing, developing Church, the American bishops had to become builders, administrators and financiers. "To shirk these duties," he pointed out, "would mean a real neglect of interests which are essential for the proper functioning of the Church in our country." He said that the fervent spirit of Catholicism in the U.S. is a tribute to our bishops who "have chosen to serve wholeheartedly according to the demands of the particular way of life thrust upon them in the American scene."

2) The American bishops are men totally dedicated to the good of the Church. This dedication has made them, as a body, willing to listen and learn and accept ideas with open-mindedness. "They have shown," he said, "a remarkable diligence in studying the various propositions, and a determination to choose whatever is best for the good of the whole Church."

3) The American bishops' reluctance, if it can be called reluctance, is best explained by the American character itself. "An American," he said, "prefers action to speech. He finds it embarrassing to create tedium by voicing views which another has already expressed." This national temperament has restrained more than one American bishop from addressing the council assembly, he said.

4) Fr. Ahern sees merit even in the reluctance of the American bishops to speak. He says that when an American bishop does speak, the others listen with special interest. "Aware of the strength of Catholic life in America, and aware too that American bishops are not given to much talking," he said, "the other bishops know that the speaker feels that he has something worth saying and they give him wholehearted attention. The discourses given by some American bishops have been a real contribution to the council and have accomplished a great deal in directing the course of the council."

Fr. Ahern said he feels a "great injustice" has been done by those writers who fail to take these and other observations into consideration when writing about the American bishops. He said he feels that this false representation is due to the fact that writers "have not treated adequately the background, characteristics and spirit of eminently sincere and holy churchmen who, as bishops of America, have had to be wholly American."

Council. When a bishop announces that he speaks for the bishops of Germany, Austria and Scandanavia, everyone listens with more attention—even though he knows that surely not all the bishops named could agree to everything said.

The U. S. bishops, as I have said, have not done this, to the great puzzlement of the bishops of other nations, who expected that the bishops of the most successful modern representative nation would take the lead.

It is absolutely essential for the success of the Council that the bishops of the world learn now how to work together and come to agreements. For the decentralization of the Church they all desire will be but a temporary affair unless the national and territorial conferences of bishops organize with authority to oblige the individual bishops to abide by rules and practices agreed upon by majority vote. If every bishop were to make his own regulations regarding fasting, vernacular in the Mass, mixed marriages, etc., there would be chaos. And little by little, one by one, the bishops would plead with Rome to take over and straighten out the mess.

So it is to be hoped that the bishops of the world do organize themselves for proper local self-government and above all for proper representation at the Roman Curia. It is also to be hoped that this will help the bishops realize the need of some organization within the diocese and even the parish for a proper representation of the laymen in the Church.

24-E-1964
LOGICAL AND THEOLOGICAL GROUNDS FOR TREATMENT OF JEWS BY VATICAN COUNCIL

Rev. Dr. Ralph M. Wiltgen SVD
Divine Word News Service
C.P. 5080, Rome, Italy
Tel. 63.70.105

ROME, Sept. 29 (DW) - Bishop Donal R. Lamont, 53, Bischop of Umtali Diocese in Southern Rhodesia and a member of the Council Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, today said the question of the Jews must receive treatment by the Council for logical, theological and pastoral reasons. He also seemed to express the fear that the Secretariat to which he belongs may be dissolved at the end of the Council, because in concluding his intervention he said, "Let us hope that the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity may continue in existence even after the Council, lest the work which it has so happily begun, and the abundant fruit it has brought forth, may come to nought."

Bishop Lamont, a Carmelite of the Ancient Observance, stressed again the point emphatically made by Cardinal Bea last Friday that no political opportunism whatsoever was responsible for treatment of the Jews by the Second Vatican Council. He said he could not understand why some were still claiming this, and proceeded to show theologically and logically how the Declaration on the Jews was intimately bound up with the Declaration on Religious Liberty.

"Such a connection does exist," he said, "even though it is not so evident from the present internal organization of material in the two Declarations." According to Bishop Lamont a better sequence would be: First, treatment of Religious Liberty "in which principles are laid down for our relations toward all men." Then, flowing logically from these principles, would come the paragraph titled "All men have God as their Father," where it is shown that all men are brothers in the divine family. Finally would come the part on the Jews, "who have such close ties with us in the history of Divine Providence."

"If the questions are treated in this order," the bishop said, "it seems to me it would be more clearly apparent that we are treating the Jews in the Council for theological reasons and that we are under compulsion from these reasons alone." He said that logic too argued in favor of treatment in this sequence, since it proceeded from the generic to the specific.

The bishop took exception to the charge that the Jews by being treated first are getting preferential treatment. He said such a complaint was "unreasonable" in view of the history of God's dealings with the Jews. "Are we Christians not spiritually Semites, finding our origins in Judaism?" he asked. "Are not the chosen people of the Old Testament the rock from which the chosen people of the New Testament have been hewn?"

Bishop Lamont said that "omitting treatment of our Jewish brethren in a pastoral Council would be just as absurd as writing the history of Europe without saying a single word about the Roman Empire!"

Regarding the admonition in the Declaration which says that Jews are not to be called reprobates "in catechetical instructions, in preaching the word of God, and in daily conversations", the bishop said it would be much better to alter this and to state in a more positive manner "our sincere desire that the Jewish people should always be held in honor by all Christians". The present phrasing, he said, could lead future generations falsely to believe that at the time of the Second Vatican Council anti-Semitism was widespread in the Church.

October 16, 1964

Mr. John Slawson
165 East 56th Street
New York City

Dear John:

The week that started with disappointment followed by confusion is ending in an atmosphere of mild hope that events will resume their course in the same direction as before October 9th. As of this moment, however, there is no evidence of any concrete act by the Vatican authorities that could give assurances of such a radical change. Notwithstanding the newspaper reports, nothing is known of positive instructions by the Pope to annul the orders given by Cigogniani to alter the structure and content of the declarations on the Jews and religious liberty.

The general impression that the conservatives Curia has partly failed in its attempt to reverse the will of the majority of the Council is based on the following: a) the Pope could not disregard the vigorous counteraction by leading Cardinals of various countries and particularly the forceful criticisms of influential newspapers throughout the world, b) the strong interventions by Cardinal Frings, Dean of the German Episcopat and Cardinal Bea, c) the realization that the American Church cannot consider a defeat on two issues on which they are vitally committed. One can safely say that Cicogniani's instructions have not been carried out this week by Bea's Secretariat which is working on a redrafting of both declarations in the light of the discussions on the floor of the Council. It is important to recall that the precise instructions of Cicogniani were to the effect that the declaration on Jews be split up into two parts, one dealing with the theological aspects and therefore to be incorporated into the Schema on the Church as one short paragraph and the other part having a more pastoral character and expressing condemnation of anti-semitism and calling for mutual respect between Catholics and Jews was to become part of Schema XIII which deals with contemporary problems. Cardinal Bea firmly believes that if this declaration is to have the impact and strength it deserves, it must retain the status of an independent document and that the entire subject must be treated as an organic entity. His Secretariat is preparing the text as though nothing had happened.

On Monday, October 19th the Council is scheduled to begin discussions on Schema XIII which includes such acute problems as birth-control, disarmament and nuclear war, racial conflicts, etc. It is expected by some that these discussions might continue for about two weeks unless there develops such a division of views among the Council members that it will become necessary to send back the Schema to the appropriate commission for rewriting of the text. Meanwhile no public action will probably be taken on the two declarations. Cardinal Bea himself hopes to be able to muster during next week support for his views among various Episcopates and particularly among the Americans and Germans. At the same time his Secretariat will put the final touches to the two declarations for re-submission in due time to the Council. At this moment, however, no one can say when it will take place for the Agenda is made up by the Presidency of the Council only a few days before it is announced.

One can also not ignore the possibility that the two controversial declarations as well as Schema XIII might be postponed for a fourth session of the Council to be convened either in the spring of 1965 or in two or three years from now. This consideration is based on the assumption that both camps, the conservatives and progressives, might prefer to bide their time in the hope that this will give them the opportunity to gather the support necessary for their objectives. Each side is beginning to feel that this Council has been proceeding too rapidly and without sufficient planning and strategic preparation in order to carry out the original purposes. Strangely enough each side feels that time is on its side. In my own view a postponement of our subject will by itself not represent a failure for we shall not be the only "left-over" of this session. Also, the progressive forces which express the determination of the Church in all western countries except Italy and partly Spain will have learned a great deal from this session about how to improve their tactics for the forthcoming test.

Cardinal Bea remains the target of a violent and irresponsible opposition which uses every means to undermine his position, among them anti-semitism. At least four pamphlets have been distributed up until now in which anti-semitism is the major theme. One of them is thirty pages long and is entitled "The Killers of God and the Jewish People". The volume "The Plot Against the Church" which was distributed during the first session has been translated into German in two editions, one in Germany and the other in Austria. Another pamphlet

bears the title "Actions of Jewish FreeMasons at the Council". The authorship is attributed to a "group of priests from the orders and world clergy". The venomous character of this pamphlet can be illustrated by the following passage:

> "The Jews who have reached high position in the hierarchy of the Catholic Church have convinced by fraudulent methods the Pope John XXIII to form a Secretariat for the unity of Christians which was used by them as a springboard to carry on all kinds of propaganda in favor of the Jews, The eternal anti-Christs. Among those Jews are Cardinal Augustin Bea and the Monsignores Oestreicher and Gregory Baum together with Bishop Walter Kempe from Western Germany, all of them of Luther's country, and Sergio Mendez Arcio of Mexico. The direct contact between the Jewish Lodges and Cardinal Bea was established by the converted Jews and present day Catholics, the priests Oestreicher and Baum".

The same pamphlet also says that Cardinal Bea is not a German but of Spanish Jewish ancestry and that the origin of the name is sephardic Beja or the Spanish Beha.

Cardinal Bea remains unperturbed and is going on with his work. He still hopes that the declaration will retain its original form and content. A great deal of work, however, will have to be accomplished before this all becomes a reality.

With warmest regards,

Sincerely,

Zachariah Shuster

The Vatican and Jewry

The Two Ecumenical Councils, 1869 and 1962

by Sister Marie Louis-Gabriel of Sion

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

"The Catholic Church looks . . . beyond the confines of the Christian horizon. For how can she put limits to her love if she would make her own the love of God the Father, who reigns down His grace on all alike . . ." (Pope Paul VI, opening the second session of Vatican II)

"No one can predict what will be the decisions of the Council," a distinguished French observer, Jacques Madaule, recently remarked, "we have, however, strong reason to hope that they . . . will open a new era in the history of the relationship between Jews and Christians." It seems possible to go one step further and to affirm that this new era is already upon us. To prove this one need only recall some incidents that took place at the First Vatican Council less than a hundred years ago.

While the Jews were not the object of any pronouncement of this Council, which was interrupted by the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, they easily might have been. Everything had been prepared by the zealous twins, the Abbés Lémann, whose great good will and enthusiasm were matched by a total lack of tact and judgment and by an equally great ignorance of Judaism. The curious episode, related by them in *La cause des restes d'Israel introduite au Concile Ecuménique du Vatican* (Paris, 1912), and much discussed in the Jewish and Catholic press of the time, deserves to be told, if only because it allows both Jews and Catholics to measure the distance they have travelled since then.

Recently, at one of the General Sessions of Vatican II, a Council Father requested that the Council's statement on the nature of the Church include special mention of the Jews as "people of God" of the Old Testament. This is one more sign of the "new era" in the relationships between Jews and Christians that the author traces from Vatican I through the first session of Vatican II. Sister Marie Louis Gabriel who wrote her thesis at London University on "The Portrait of the Jew in English and German Literature of the 19th Century," was born in Germany and has spent some years in Israel and in the Arab Middle East. She is a member of the Sisters of Our Lady of Sion who last year founded the Centre for Biblical and Jewish Studies in London.

The two Abbés, whose "extreme courtesy and tender and affectionate language," was favorably commented upon by the editor of *L'univers Israélite* on Dec. 1, 1869, had come to Rome with the idea of asking the Fathers of the Council "to have pity on the remnants of Israel." They had prepared their venture by publishing a pamphlet on *La question du Messie et le Concile du Vatican*, in which they set out to prove that 19th century Judaism had forsaken the tradition of its ancestors and had given up the belief in a personal Messiah; they therefore appealed to Jewry —in the flowery style of the period —to consider the Vatican Council as an invitation to turn their eyes to Rome. The lengthy pamphlet (it has 156 pages) abounds in historical errors and misrepresentations. One may read there, for instance, that the medieval ghettos "were positively desired" by the Jews themselves. Our more exact and less biased view of the Jewish past makes it impossible today for any but the most inveterate anti-Semite to commit those blunders which exposed the Abbés Lémann to the correction and ridicule of the Jewish press.

OTHER ELEMENTS vitiated the well-meant attempt of the brothers and shock the mentality of our ecumenical age: they constantly speak of "the blood which stains the forehead" of those whom they frequently call "the guilty people"; indeed, they go so far as to say that Jews are born under the stigma of "a kind of second original sin," the consequence of their "deicide." When in the winter of 1869-70 they started their peregrinations in Rome to collect the bishops' signatures for a *Postulatum pro Hebraeis*, they presented themselves as the Wandering Jew, "personification of the guilty Jewish people," who had, till then, always come "to bargain and to haggle." Instead they humbly implored the Council to issue an affectionate invitation to the Jewish people that, they hoped, would almost overnight draw them closer to the Church. It might also make it possible to limit their "disastrous influence," put a stop to their "invasion" of all domains and render innocuous "their dangerous weapon: gold."

That the two brothers were typical of the general prejudiced attitude of their times is illustrated by the answers of the bishops, who, in some instances, had to be persuaded to sign this intervention in favor of the Jews; for—as one put it —"was it not the role of the

dispersed Jews to manifest everywhere the chastisement due to their deicide?" Another bishop thought that there was not much hope: "Try as you like, they will ever remain perfidious." When a third called them "the very worst of men," the brothers bowed their heads, "for he was only too right."

This theologically ill-informed view of the Jews, accompanied, at its worst, by a complacent self-righteousness and, at its best, by a condescending pity, naturally roused the indignation of the Jews, who due to their past experiences were following the events at Rome with apprehension. Rabbi S. Bloch, the editor of *L'univers Israélite*, spoke of "an unprovoked aggression against our religion" and of "public violations of our spiritual domain," while *Die Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, after quoting the text of *Postulatum*, refused the "pity," which the Council was being asked to show to the "unfortunate Jews," and called the *Postulatum* "a foolish enterprise."

A long and fruitless polemic continued on both sides, with Louis Veuillot in *Le Monde* as the champion of the two Abbés. In the measured words of Bloch the controversy only led them "to say disagreeable things to each other." The reticence of the English press, Catholic as well as Jewish, compared favorably with the agitation on the Continent. There was one brief mention of the Abbés Lémann's dispute with *L'univers Israélite* in *The Tablet* (Jan. 22, 1870). *The Jewish Chronicle* (May 27, 1870) also paid little attention to it: a notice in small print spoke of the "fanatic brothers" and their plan, "by which stiff-necked Jews should be brought to see the light." After quoting the text of the *Postulatum* it cautioned its readers to take the whole story with "a grain of salt."

THE ERA OF TALKING down to others has today given way to one of serious self-examination in the Church. Hand in hand with a new self-knowledge goes the desire for a better understanding of our separated brethren. Today, Pope John XXIII, speaking of the non-Christian "multitude of human beings," could say: "We have the deepest regard for what they have to say and for what they are trying to do"; elsewhere he spoke with great respect of their "religious and cultural values." This time no harangue has been addressed to Jews, but they have been encouraged to submit their suggestions to Cardinal Bea's Secretariat, which includes several specialists on Jewish problems. Jewish organizations have readily availed themselves of this opportunity, and it is not surprising that their wishes are mainly concerned with a condemnation of anti-Semitism and with a change in the presentation of the Jew in religious instruction and in the liturgy.

But such a reform will usually not be carried out as rapidly as when John XXIII on Good Friday crossed out the adjective *perfidis* before the word *Judaeis*. It is not an easy task to correct the secular misrepresentation of the Jew in religious instruction, and to give a

more balanced account of, for instance, the Pharisees, the part played by Jews in the crucifixion and the conflict of the Church and the Synagogue during the first centuries. Yet it is just this which our Jewish fellow citizens demand of us.

The octogenarian pioneer for such a revision, Professor Jules Isaac, has of late twice again reminded us of our responsibility. In 1961 there appeared in the United States his short book *Has Anti-Semitism Roots in Christianity?* with a "Preliminary Word" by Cardinal Cushing of Boston. This is in itself an event not much less important than Cardinal Liénart's famous Lenten Pastoral "On Racial Prejudice" (1960). Both are proof of the tendency to admit that the Christian attitude toward the Jews —as well as toward others—needs, in Cardinal Cushing's words, "a self scrutiny which may result in modifying our opinions and action."

Jules Isaac's latest book, *The Teaching of Contempt, (L'enseignement du mépris,* Paris, Fasquelles, 1962) has just been published in the United States by Holt, Rinehart & Winston. It is probably the author's supreme effort to emphasize that, as long as there exists what he calls "Christian anti-Semitism," or "the theological myth of Israel," which is rather a thoughtless transmission of inexact formulas and the slipshod use of traditional generalizations on Jews, such teaching must necessarily engender contempt. It seems reasonable to suppose that Professor Isaac, who was warmly received and encouraged by both Pius XII and John XXIII, wants, at the time of the Ecumenical Council, to remind us of the expectations of so many Jews—and their Christian friends — of a definite pronouncement against anti-Semitism. A clear statement would make it impossible for a Catholic to hold and propagate such violently anti-Semitic views as those of the Argentine, F. Julio Meinvielle, in his recent book *El Judio en el Misterio de la Historia* (1959), which seems to claim a certain authority as it bears the words "Con las licencias necessarias," (with the necessary permissions).

Assessing the important part played by Jules Isaac in calling the attention of Christian doctrine teachers to the problem of anti-Semitism, the French Catholic writer Pierre Daboville hopes that the day will soon come when, at the instigation of the Council, "solemn declarations will not only definitely correct mistaken or unfair views, but will moreover give rise to a new manner of looking at the Jewish world, its past and its present." What has already been done in this field by way of amending textbooks and changing liturgical passages, is a matter of common knowledge. Yet the Ten Points of Seligsberg (1947), which aim at the reform of the catechetical presentation of the Jew, have not yet reached the great majority of the teachers of religion. This was pointed out recently at the Inter-European Conference of Educators in Wiesbaden (Nov. 1962) by the

specialists and confirmed by the experiences of the fifty delegates present.

Father Gregory Baum of Toronto, a member of Cardinal Bea's Secretariat, is of the same opinion, when he speaks of the still current "legends concerning the malediction of the Jewish nation, its rejection because of the crucifixion, its dispersion in punishment for the death of Christ, and of its suffering being interpreted as a chastisement which it has somehow deserved." That this unfortunately is no exaggeration is borne out by what, only a few months ago, a German girl told the writer: when she had asked a priest about the massacre of the Jews in Germany, he answered that this time it was the Germans who had been chosen as God's instrument to continue His punishment of them.

Though these echoes of the past still remain with us, there are excellent reasons to believe that they will not do so much longer. In 1869 a forerunner of the notorious French anti-Semite, Drumond, the Chevalier Gougenot des Mousseaux, published his *Le Juif, le Judaisme et la Judaisation des peuples chrétiens*, (Paris, Plon), in which he set out to convince the members of Vatican I that all present calamities were the fault of the Jews. A glance at the Table of Contents is sufficient: "The Jew is the lowest of men"; "Israel's determination to rule over all nations"; "The Messiah expected by the Jews is the Anti-Christ." *Le Juif* was prefaced by a letter from Père Voisin, director of a seminary at Paris, and it merited the author a letter of appreciation from his archbishop: "Yours is a great book; it reveals, it analyzes, and, as far as this depends on you, it defeats a vast conspiracy . . . You are a man of courage! I wish you every success in your fight for the cause of God and man."

Gougenot des Mousseaux has had a successor: a certain Maurice Pinay addressed to each of the Fathers at Vatican II his *Complotto contro la Chiesa* — 617 pages as full of anti-Jewish denunciations as the 568 of the Chevalier—but there were no laudatory epistles this time; the bishops were so disgusted with this "*Conspiracy*" that they threw it straight into the wastepaper basket, to the great regret of students of anti-Semitism.

THE CHANGE OF HEART has not been on one side only. In 1870 the well-organized Jewish press on the Continent was generally hostile to the Council; in referring to it they spoke of "the poison of intolerance, of religious prejudices, of hatred sponsored by the Church," and protested against all attempts "to re-establish the medieval power of the Church." In 1962 the Chief Rabbi of Rome, Rabbi Toaff, publicly extended his greetings to "the spiritual leaders of the world's Catholic communities," and alluded to "the luminous example set by Pope John." This was at the beginning of the Council, at the opening ceremonies of which three Jewish delegates assisted. Its first session has inspired such confidence among Jews that the American Jewish Committee states that

it looks to the Council "as an historic opportunity to eliminate once and for all time the misconceptions about Jewry and Judaism."

THE LAST ENCYCLICAL of John XXIII, with its clear statement as to the inalienable rights of all men and particularly its insistence on the fact that all men have the indisputable right "to serve God according to the dictates of an upright conscience" has found a tremendous echo in all Jewish circles. It is the first encyclical to be translated into Hebrew, a translation sponsored by the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

How seriously the Vatican, under Paul VI as well as under John XXIII, considers the possibility of a Council statement on the attitude of the Church toward the Jewish people has been illustrated again quite recently. Rumor has spread that the project of such a declaration was abandoned because of alleged opposition by the Arab States, but it was authoritatively reported from Rome that this was not the case and that these obstacles would not block the discussions on the subject. Indeed, the newspapers have reported that a statement or official document "On the Catholic Attitude Toward Non-Christians and Especially Toward Jews" has been drafted.

Poem for Editors

JOHN TRAVERS MOORE

Lord, it must be warm and good
To get a load of seasoned wood,
Toughened, tried, and weathered strong,
Not too short and not too long,
And ready, when the need is dire,
To cradle the spark and catch fire.

Green wood is another thing.
It holds too much of early spring;
Yet in the darkness and the snow
It will season, come to glow.

CATHOLIC PRELATE URGES COUNCIL
CONDEMNATION OF ANTI-SEMITISM

By Religious News Service (7-8-63)

TEL AVIV, Israel (RNS) -- Greek Catholic Archbishop George Hakim of Haifa said here that he has urged adoption by the Second Vatican Council of a resolution condemning anti-Semitism.

In an address before the Tel Aviv Press Club, Archbishop Hakim announced he had written to Augustin Cardinal Bea, president of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, to say he "strongly" favored such an action by the Council in its second session.

The prelate's talk came, observers said, at an opportune time. They cited reports in publications here which alleged that Greek Catholics and Oriental Rite Catholics had exerted an "adverse influence" on the Vatican Council's approach to a resolution on anti-Semitism.

(In the U.S., meanwhile, considerable discussion was under way on whether the Council would vote a resolution condemning anti-Semitism. Father Gustave Weigel, S.J., noted American Catholic theologian, had said that a Council statement on the topic may not be issued because of the possibility it would cause resentment in Arabian countries.

(The American Jewish Committee, on the other hand, said sources "very near" to the Presidency of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity denied that such a statement would be dropped. At the same time, Saadat Hasan, chief of the Arab Information Center in New York, said Arab nations would welcome a "clear and forthright" statement on anti-Semitism. Mr. Hasan claimed that Arabs distinguish between Judaism and the Jews on one hand and Zionism and Israel on the other.)

In his address, Archbishop Hakim spoke frankly in his "dual capacity as an Arab and an Israeli" as he discussed the minority situation here. He called on the government for more goodwill and funds, especially for landless peasants and refugees.

While Arab workers are better off in Israel than in neighboring countries, the Catholic prelate said, those from the educated classes are in a "difficult situation" here.

RNS FOREIGN SERVICE

RELIGIOUS NEWS SERVICE, 43 WEST 57TH ST., N. Y. 19 N. Y....

....AUTHORITATIVE CABLE AND WIRELESS REPORTS OF MAJOR

RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENTS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.....

STEPPED-UP PACE MARKS
VATICAN II'S THIRD SESSION

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1964

By John Cogley
Religious News Service Special Correspondent

VATICAN CITY (RNS) -- Discussion moved at breakneck speed during the first week of the Vatican Council's third session. Last year a complaint commonly heard in Rome was that the Council was proceeding at a monkish pace, with preachers preaching to preachers as elderly prelates slipped comfortably into old sermons. But in the first few days of the third session even cardinals were told abruptly to get on with it and state their point please.

Among those stopped short this way was the first U.S. prelate to speak during this session, Archbishop Robert Lucey of San Antonio, who has long been counted a leader of the social-minded faction in the American hierarchy.

In the midst of a discussion of the pastoral duties of bishops, Archbishop Lucey began to talk about the necessity for teaching children their catechism. The moderator, Julius Cardinal Doepfner of Germany, shot him down in mid-flight. Later in the day at a press conference the Texas prelate was asked by an editor of Cardinal McIntyre's Los Angeles diocesan paper whether he believed he had really been out of order. "You should know," the archbishop replied with perhaps no touch of innuendo, "that cardinals are always right."

One result of the new speed-up is that some Fathers of the Council have a vague feeling that the Council is slipping away from them and is being taken over by its Rome-based managers. Discussions are frequently interrupted for votes on already discussed material. A good number of the bishops find this constant shifting of attention confusing. "Much of the time I feel like a nun who has lost her place in the missal," is the way one African prelate put it.

Another result is that discussion has moved from topic to topic with dismaying celerity. In a mere four days the Council Fathers, hurrying through the all-important schema (draft) De Ecclesia (On the Church), touched on a number of issues that have been the source of historic arguments within Catholicism and even today are matters of profound disagreement.

Among these were the relations between bishops and religious orders, a hotly contested controversy as far back as the time of Thomas Aquinas; the redemptive role of the Blessed Virgin Mary; the authority of bishops in the universal Church; the rights and privileges of secular governments to nominate new bishops or to veto names proposed by the Holy See; and the present elaborate procedures for the canonization of saints.

With the emphasis Vatican II has placed on the bishops' responsibility for the spiritual welfare of the whole Church, it was inevitable that attention would be drawn to the fact that members of religious orders, like the Jesuits and Dominicans, are largely exempt from a diocesan bishop's "interference" and are directly responsible to the Holy See.

(more)

The problem was solved in theory centuries ago. In those matters where the work of an order or congregation of priests, monks, or nuns touches directly on the life of the diocese, the bishop has the final word: in the internal affairs of the order, though -- the keeping of monastic discipline or the acceptance of new members, for example -- the community answers directly to its own superiors who in turn are responsible to a special body of Curial prelates in Rome, the Congregation of Religious.

But keeping the lines of authority drawn sharply has not always been easy in practice. At times rivalry between the secular and the order clergy has burst into jealous flame. Even where the two are on the best of terms, problems arise. What happens, for example, when an "exempt" order wants to start a new college or university? Must it have the permission of the local bishop? Does a bishop have the right to demand that priest-members of religious communities give up some favorite work in order to do what must be done to meet the pastoral needs of his diocese? Should a bishop be free to suppress money-raising schemes carried on by the orders which are siphoning off funds needed in his diocese?

During their first breathless week the Fathers touched on some of the pros and cons. Several bishops who are themselves members of orders argued that the international character of the orders makes it mandatory that their present exemptions be kept intact. Bishop James Corboy of Northern Rhodesia, for example, criticized the present schema for not being strong enough on the point. "Weakening of exemption would be a blow to the Church, especially to the mission," he held. Other bishops thought the schema went too far in upholding exemptions. They argued that superiors in far-off Rome or elsewhere do not always understand local conditions and move their subjects around without regard to diocesan needs or the overall good of the Church.

The most concrete suggestion came from American-born Bishop John McEleney of Kingston, Jamaica. He proposed that a new office be established which would regulate relations between bishops and the orders working in their dioceses. Such a step, he pointed out, would not exalt the bishops by downgrading the present rights of the Pope (exercised of course through the Roman Curia). At the same time it would provide a practical solution to the perennial problems arising from the two classes of clergy in the Church.

For a while the discussion of the Blessed Virgin Mary seemed to be dangerously confused. Much of it centered around conferring on her a new title, Mother of the Church, a suggestion that delighted some of the Fathers and struck others as theologically meaningless. "The Church is our Mother. If Mary is the mother of the Church, then she must be our grandmother," one opponent noted caustically.

Another controversy hinged on the clumsy Latin expression "mediatrix," applied to Mary as a devotional title to point up the fact that she played a pivotal role in the redemption of the world by her Son. To complicate the issue, the word is also used in connection with a new doctrine which has been proposed by certain hard-driving devotees of the Blessed Virgin as being worthy of papal definition. According to this suggested doctrine, all the graces dispensed on mankind from heaven are mediated through the mother of Christ. The doctrine is vigorously opposed -- or at least its definition is opposed -- by many bishops who feel either that there is not sufficient theological justification for it or who believe that it is time to reassert the Christocentrism of Catholic thought and call a halt to the emphasis placed on Mary in the recent dogmatic definitions of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption.

(more)

Some of the Fathers felt that any use of the word "mediatrix" in the schema on the Church would be misleading and subject to misunderstanding by Protestants, who traditionally stress the Scriptural teaching of Saint Paul that Jesus Himself is the only mediator between God and man and consequently take a dim view of the emphasis on Mary in Catholicism.

Others, mostly from lands where the cult of the Blessed Virgin is highly developed -- "Italy is suffering from spiritual momism," said one sharp-tongued theologian at the Council -- saw in this ecumenical caution a kind of ungallant "minimalism" toward the mother of Jesus. Father Alfonso Monta, prior general of the Servite order, for example, warned the Fathers that "great harm" has always come to the Church whenever there was any attempt to de-emphasize Mary. Archbishop Gawlina, a Pole living in Rome, cited Martin Luther himself in making the case that devotion to Mary is a stimulus rather than a barrier to Christian unity.

(Luther, incidentally, whose great hymn A Mighty Fortress was sung by thousands of Roman Catholics attending the Liturgical Week in Saint Louis, Mo., last month, must, in his heavenly home, be taken aback somewhat by the favorable notice he is getting these days from his historic "enemies.")

Archbishop Gawlina also pointed up the traditional devotion to Mary found in the Orthodox Churches and quoted a contemporary Lutheran pastor in Warsaw who once told him that "Mary will teach both you and us."

These outbursts pointed at Marian piety were clearly embarrassing to some of the Fathers who favored the restraint (or "minimalism") being denounced in the aula of Saint Peter's. No Catholic prelate likes to be thought of as lacking in devotion to the mother of Jesus or to have it suggested that he is somehow "selling out" on her in the interests of interfaith harmony.

There was, then, a sigh of relief the next day when the lucid Cardinal Alfrink of Utrecht reminded the assembly that there could be no question of "maximalism" or "minimalism" in regard to Mary. It was not a question of devotion but of faith that was before the Council, he reminded his brother bishops -- not what piously was thought but what was authoritatively taught by the Church. "Mediatrix" and "mother of the Church" are devotional expressions, but neither of them contains a binding Catholic truth. There is really no good reason why the Council should canonize them by using them in a conciliar decree, especially since their use could widen the gap between Catholics and other Christians and thus defeat one of the major purposes of the Council.

Though last year the Fathers of the Council in a test of opinion voted overwhelmingly in favor of collegiality -- the notion that the bishops in union with the Pope have responsibility for, and exercise authority over, the whole Church -- the issue has not been finally settled nor have all been converted to it. There is still a powerful, strategically placed minority here who might justly be described as papal "maximalists" and who oppose collegiality on both theological and pragmatic grounds. They believe that Peter was given full powers over the Church without regard to the other Apostles, at the one level. They are also persuaded that Catholicism will fare better if the present disputed power of the Roman Curia is not diminished through the bishops playing a larger role in the government of the Church universal.

(more)

Several times during the week, when other matters were up for discussion, these conservative churchmen took the opportunity to remind the Fathers that collegiality is not yet a settled question. For example, Bishop Luigi Carli of tiny Segni, Italy, criticized De Ecclesia because he said it blithely assumes the collegial understanding of the role of the bishops. Then, mincing no words, he described the schema as objectionable on "historical, dogmatic, juridical, liturgical, and other grounds." He was backed up by the former head of the Dominican order, Bishop Michael Browne, a bulwark of Curial conservatism.

Bishops were the subject of discussion again when Bishop Antonio Pildain y Zapiain of the Canary Islands argued that the Vatican should be completely free in making episcopal appointments and not be dependent on the approval or favor of any secular power. This Spanish prelate's intervention was of course of more than ordinary interest since the concordat between Spain and the Holy See, signed in the early 1950's, gives General Franco a strong voice in the selection of Spanish bishops. Also, coming very shortly after the announced agreement between Communist Hungary and the Holy See, it had a certain bite in it. According to the official Vatican statement on the new agreement, it concerns, among other things, "the appointment of bishops."

Cardinal Suenens of Belgium, a leader of the "progressive" prelates, though he surprised many by showing up with the Marian "maximalists" later in the week, brought up the delicate subject of "in-group" canonizations.

Cardinal Suenens pointed out that 85 per cent of all the saints canonized were members of religious orders and a good 90 per cent of them came from the same 13 European countries. He would like to see not only an internationalization of the Roman Curia -- last year's watchword -- but a broader representation of all races, nationalities, classes, and occupations among the certified saints.

It is not that candidates are lacking. The problem, the cardinal said frankly, is money. Canonization, with its long painful investigations by ecclesiastical courts, is an expensive business. Only religious orders can afford it, or at least are ready to put up the necessary cash to get one of their own raised to the altar.

To get around this class difficulty, the Belgian cardinal suggested fewer saints and more terminal blesseds or beati -- currently "beatification" is a step along the way to full canonization. The men and women who ended up blessed would, according to the Suenens deflationary plan, be heroes of only local interest and significance and they could be beatified by the local bishop. Full canonization would be confined to persons whose lives were meaningful to the whole Church and would be the special perogative of the Pope.

The first week, at least for the English-speaking, ended with two press conferences. At the first Archbishop Joseph T. McGucken of San Francisco predicted that at the end of the Council a "senate" of bishops representing the entire hierarchy would be established to implement the principle of episcopal collegiality, which is expected to be approved shortly.

(more)

TEMPO OF COUNCIL
SEEN SET BY POPE

By Claud D. Nelson
Religious News Service Special Correspondent

VATICAN CITY (RNS) -- In common with the Council Fathers themselves, Protestant and Orthodox delegate-observers were acutely aware of the accelerated tempo that marked the first week of Vatican II's third session.

The opening allocution of Pope Paul VI, it was generally felt, was to be regarded less as the sort of "state of the whole Church" survey with which the first two sessions were opened, and more as an admonition to "get on with our business." Specifically, the Pope was referring to the schema, De Ecclesia (On the Church), in which the prime question involved is the collegiality, or collective authority, of the bishops.

Pope Paul himself did much to encourage supporters of collegiality and of the divine origin and Biblical support and authority of bishops as successors of the Apostles. There was ample reassurance for those who feared that papal primacy and infallibility were in jeopardy, reversing Vatican I. No, insisted the pontiff: Vatican II has merely to complete what was to have been on Vatican I's own agenda nearly a century ago.

It is useful to recall that last May, under Pope Paul's orders, the Council's Secretariat General consulted the Pontifical Biblical Commission (a standing body, not organized by the Council) as to Biblical support for collegiality, doubts about which had been raised by some members of the Theological Commission headed by Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani. Since a prompt answer seems to have been called for, only the experts (periti) available in Rome (they included several non-Italians) replied. They could give no clear and decisive verdict, but cited New Testament texts from which many exegetes would derive an affirmative conclusion.

It would be hard to say whether these citations influenced the revision of the schema on the Church. But it seems evident that Pope Paul in his allocution of Sept. 14 committed himself to the affirmative interpretation.

The discussion of chapter seven of De Ecclesia occupied little more than a day, and revealed no startling divisions or developments regarding eschatology, the doctrine of "last things," whether in reference to individuals or the Church. Some wanted more emphatic reiteration of long-accepted doctrines. Archbishop Alberto Gori, O.F.M., Latin Rite Patriarch of Jerusalem, held that more emphasis on the existence and the eternity of Hell would aid preachers in the combat against hedonism and materialism. Others found insufficient consideration of the Holy Spirit.

Six cardinals headed the list of 14 speakers on Sept. 16, when chapter eight, regarding the Virgin Mary in "the mystery of Christ and the Church" came up for discussion. The chapter was not intended to include a study of the whole doctrine of the Incarnation, according to Archbishop Maurice Roy of Quebec, who introduced the chapter. Nor, he said, was the title of "Mediatrix" acceptable to all members of the Commission; its use, he contended, requires a context making clear its secondary character, not obscuring "the sole mediation of Christ." Paul-Emile Cardinal Leger, Archbishop of Montreal, called attention to St. Paul's emphasis on Christ as sole mediator. Bishops from Poland have petitioned the Pope for official acknowledgment of the "spiritual maternity" of Mary for all men, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, the Polish Primate, declared, and want the Council to proclaim her the "Mother of the Church." He noted that similar petitions have been presented by bishops from Brazil and from Belgium.

(more)

Votes were taken approving the first two chapters of De Ecclesia. Majority and minority comments from the Theological Commission on chapter three were distributed to the Council Fathers in advance of voting on different points in that chapter. This voting was expected to begin during the session's second week, which was also to see the termination of the initial discussion on the pastoral role of the bishops. Several speakers made recommendations to tighten -- or not to tighten -- the control of bishops over the orders active in their dioceses. This raised the question whether control does or should extend to the order's internal affairs. It was observed by two speakers that the text under discussion assumed the approval of the present text on collegiality in De Ecclesia: changes there, as a result of the scheduled votes, it was pointed out, would require reexamination of the text on pastoral duties.

An air of deliberate and circumspect speed has now been well established in the Council. No one's freedom of speech is impaired. But five days' notice is required to get one's name on the list of speakers, and 70 supporting signatures are needed to get the floor on a given topic after the Council has closed discussion on it. (A cardinal and a bishop secured the necessary signatures and spoke on Mariology after the discussion had been closed by the Council on the previous day.)

Of still more interest to reporters is the fact that the periti (Council experts) are now on a tighter rein. Norms established by the Coordinating Commission last Dec. 28 have been announced and emphasized on the Council floor, and in the briefing session arranged by the American bishops. Some fear existed that certain members of last year's panel, who were not announced for the current one, had been more or less banished. But Archbishop Joseph T. McGucken of San Francisco, now chairman of the "U.S. Bishops' Committee for the Press Panel," presiding at the first panel session Sept. 15, indicated that they would reappear (naming them specifically) as their respective specialties appear on the Council agenda.

What the newly emphasized restrictions will mean in practice is probably that a reporter will get fewer quotable personal opinions from the panel, and more "off-the-record" statements, enriching his background.

The U.S. panel and reporters paused, as the first briefing session began, and stood for a moment in silent commemoration of a panel member, Father Gustave Weigel, S.J., and a reporter, Milton Bracker, of the New York Times, who had died since the 1963 session.

A regrettable gap in the ranks of Protestant guest observers occurred when Dr. Oscar Cullman of Basel, Switzerland, collapsed during the opening ceremonies and had to be carried away on a stretcher. His condition was described as not serious, but it was not immediately known whether or not he would resume his attendance at the session.

A noted theologian of the Swiss Reformed Church and a professor at the University of Basel and the Sorbonne in Paris, Dr. Cullmann is a friend of Pope Paul. At a press conference during the Council's second session he warned against undue optimism regarding what the Council can do to advance the cause of Christian unity. But at the same time he stressed that the Council "has already borne fruits" toward "our coming together."

-0-

AMERICAN CARDINALS LEAD
RELIGIOUS FREEDOM PLEA

By Religious News Service (9-23-64)

VATICAN CITY (RNS) -- Three American cardinals took the lead in one of the most dramatic sessions of the Second Vatican Council as they urged approval of a declaration on religious liberty prepared by the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity.

The debate was launched at the 86th general congregation by Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, who called freedom of worship "the most important issue before the Council Fathers." It was the first time that the 69-year-old prelate had addressed the Council.

He was followed by Albert Cardinal Meyer, Archbishop of Chicago, and Joseph Cardinal Ritter, Archbishop of St. Louis, Mo., who backed him in his demand that "we must give to others what we claim for ourselves."

Cardinal Ritter, however, expressed reservations about the "form" of the declaration.

Among nine other cardinals who took part in the initial debate were two Spaniards and two Italians who bluntly attacked the declaration as a danger to the Church.

A Canadian--Paul-Emile Cardinal Leger, Archbishop of Montreal -- aligned himself with the Americans.

The Spaniards were Fernando Cardinal Quiroga y Palacios, Archbishop of Santiago de Compostela, and Jose Cardinal Bueno y Monreal, Archbishop of Seville.

They spoke in support of the strongly conservative Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani, Secretary of the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office, who argued that "a man in error should not be entitled to honor" and there should be no freedom in Catholic nations to propagate religious information which might be harmful to Catholicism."

The other Italian Prince of the Church was Ernesto Cardinal Ruffini, Archbishop of Palermo, Sicily, who is also ranked among the conservatives in the Council.

Cardinal Cushing, who was greeted with applause at the close of his address, told the Council Fathers he spoke for "practically all the bishops of the United States" in calling for approval of the declaration on religious liberty as "an absolute necessity."

"The Catholic and non-Catholic worlds alike," he said, "are waiting eagerly for a Council declaration on this crucial point. We must insist on this declaration because it is so important for all nations...at last it has been possible to have full discussion of this very crucial point in the Council hall."

Cardinal Cushing told the assembly that the Catholic Church desires for all men and faiths the same freedom the Church has always desired for itself.

(more)

He spoke in Latin, but lapsed briefly into English to cite the British historian, Lord Action (1834-1902) as saying that "freedom is the highest political end."

The Boston prelate held that the declaration before the Council needed to be strengthened rather than weakened.

Cardinal Meyer, who said he also spoke for nearly all the 240 American bishops, said the declaration was of "immense importance" and "absolutely necessary."

"If it is not passed," he declared, "nothing else approved at the Council will have much importance."

The Chicago prelate said he accepted the declaration as being in full harmony with the statements of recent Popes, and especially with the social encyclical, Pacem in Terris, of Pope John XXIII.

"By affirming the principle of religious liberty," he said, "the Church could give an example to civil governments of how to act in this field."

Furthermore, he insisted, the declaration was necessary "in order to have fruitful dialogue with non-Catholic Christians."

Cardinal Ritter, in an individual statement, said he approved the substance of the declaration, but not the form.

He said anything in the declaration giving rise to controversy should be eliminated, and the text limited to a simple statement of the inborn right of all men to freedom of religion.

Backing the stands taken by Cardinals Cushing and Meyer, Cardinal Leger said the declaration was "very acceptable," one providing a good foundation for a dialogue with non-Catholic Christians.

However, noting that the text applied only to Christian believers, he said it should also affirm the right to freedom of religion for non-believers also.

Joining in praise of the declaration was Raul Cardinal Silva Henriquez of Santiago, Chile, who said he spoke on behalf of 58 Latin American bishops.

Declaring that the present declaration was better than the text drafted last year, he said it would have very far-reaching effects in Latin America and dissipate any accusations of opportunism made against the Church.

Heading the opposition to the declaration, Cardinal Ottaviani declared that "we must profess and defend the Catholic faith even if sometimes this brings persecution."

Asserting he detected "exaggerations" in the text of the declaration, he said that, for example, he could not understand the passage stating that "even a man in error was worthy of honor."

"He is entitled," he commented, "to charity, but not to honor."

Cardinal Ottaviani said he could not admit freedom to propagate religions which were harmful to the unity of Catholic nations.

(more)

Cardinal Ruffini said the title of the declaration should be changed. He said it should not be about freedom to profess religion, but "the free exercise of religion."

"One should not confuse freedom with tolerance," he said, stressing also that he worried about "what was said in the declaration about civil governments apparently not having the right to accept established state religions."

He also disliked, he added, an exhortation to Catholics at the end of the declaration "not to force people to embrace the faith."

Cardinal Quiroga held that the declaration had obscurities and weaknesses. He said he feared that liberalism might now be confirmed by the Council.

The declaration lacked the balance between continuity and progress and was aimed at the so-called Protestant countries and not at Catholic countries, he said, adding, finally, that he thought the text should be completely redrafted.

Cardinal Bueno joined him in supporting the view that civil officials have the right to establish a state religion.

-0-

LUTHERAN FREE CHURCH
REJECTS COUNCIL

By Religious News Service (9-23-64)

MELOY, Norway (RNS) -- Delegates to the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church of Norway synod meeting rejected a proposal to join a council of Free Churches.

Instead they asked the synodical board of the 19,000-member Church to explore the establishment of a joint council with the (Lutheran) Church of Norway, the country's state Church.

Some 96 per cent of Norway's population are members of the state Church. The Free Church was organized in 1878.

The Rev. Jens Lund Andersen of Oslo was elected president of the synod.

A proposal to set up a Lutheran Bible and Congregation Seminary in Oslo was approved. Designed for the training of religious teachers and other church workers, the seminary's curriculum would be planned so that students could take the examinations of the University of Oslo for religion teachers in the schools.

-0-

BILLY GRAHAM PLANS
EUROPEAN CRUSADES

By Religious News Service (9-23-64)

COPENHAGEN (RNS) -- Plans for two European crusades by Evangelist Billy Graham are being developed.

Mr. Graham is expected to conduct a crusade in Copenhagen in May, 1965, and another in West Berlin in October, 1966.

The Copenhagen crusade is said to be Mr. Graham's only engagement outside the United States during 1965, it was reported here.

U.S. CARDINALS ASK STRONGER
STAND IN JEWISH DECLARATION

By Religious News Service (9-28-64)

VATICAN CITY (RNS) -- Three American cardinals, four other Princes of the Church, and four bishops, speaking before the Second Vatican Council's 89th general congregation, demanded that the draft declaration on the Jews be strengthened to absolve the Jewish people of blame for the crucifixion of Christ.

However, Ignace Gabriel Cardinal Tappouni, Patriarch of Antioch of the Syrians, speaking for himself and four other Middle East patriarchs. warned that any Council statement on the Jews would open the Church to the charge of having "political tendencies." He said "we affirm our solemn opposition to this document."

Also speaking out against the draft document was Ernesto Cardinal Ruffini, Archbishop of Palermo, Sicily.

The draft before the Council was a revision of a document on Catholic-Jewish relations originally prepared by the Secretariat on Christian Unity, but later amended by the Council's Coordinating Commission. The first draft declared that the Jewish people as a whole, in Christ's time or today, could not be held responsible for the Crucifixion. The current draft altered the text to state merely that today's Jews cannot be blamed for what happened 2,000 years ago.

As the debate began, Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, rose to urge that the original wording of the text be restored. He said the declaration "must deny that there is any special culpability of the Jews in the death of Christ... Far be it from us to set ourselves up as judges in the place of God."

His voice echoing strongly in the Council hall, the Boston prelate declared: "Our respect for the Jews and our love for the sons of Abraham must be made clear. This document must be made less timid and more positive...The Jewish people cannot be accused of deicide. If no voice has been raised in the past (in defense of the Jews), it falls upon us to raise our voices now."

Referring to "the sins of Christians in our own times," the cardinal went on to denounce anti-Semitism, saying that the assembly should proclaim that there was no logical reason for persecuting Jews.

Cardinal Cushing was supported by Albert Cardinal Meyer, Archbishop of Chicago, and Joseph Cardinal Ritter, Archbishop of St. Louis. Absent from the Council because of illness were James Francis Cardinal McIntyre, Archbishop of Los Angeles, and Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York.

Cardinal Meyer expressed a "hearty hope that this Council will return to the draft of last year."

He cited St. Thomas Aquinas, the great Doctor of the Church, as having said that Jews could not be accused of deicide because they were not aware of Christ's divinity.

The cardinal suggested that a reference to Moslems and other non-Christians in the second part of the declaration be transferred to another draft decree dealing with the Church and the modern world.

(more)

He said the text should carry specific condemnation of anti-Semitic persecution and, in addition, should mention that the Church is "against any discrimination for reasons of race, creed or color."

"This," Cardinal Meyer stressed, "should be set forth to leave no mistake and no doubt in the minds of anyone."

Cardinal Ritter said the text "should express rejection of the description of the Jews as an accursed people, a reproached people, a people of deicide."

Among other Council Fathers demanding specific rejection of the charge of deicide leveled against the Jews were Achille Cardinal Lienart Bishop of Lille, France; Joseph Cardinal Frings, Archbishop of Cologne, Germany; Giacomo Cardinal Lercaro, Archbishop of Bologna, Italy; and Paul-Emile Cardinal Leger, Archbishop of Montreal.

Discussing the opportuneness of the declaration, Cardinal Lienart said the risk of creating particular political tensions must not weigh on the Council because it had "a mind to tackle this problem from a religious point of view only."

After speaking on the Hebrew origin of Christianity, the French prelate said he hoped that the text would be changed to affirm that the Jewish people should never be referred to in the catechism or in sermons as reprobate or deicide, because this was "contrary to charity and truth."

Cardinal Frings also upheld the opportuneness of the declaration. But he said he deplored the fact that the text had overlooked the theological doctrine contained in St. Paul's Epistle to the Athenians on relations between the people of the Old and the New Alliance.

Cardinal Leger stressed the need for explicitly affirming that the Hebrew origins of Christianity will reach the fullness of the truth by deepening knowledge of the Scriptures and by praying in the spirit of the Psalms.

Firm objection to the document was voiced by Cardinal Ruffini, a strongly conservative prelate, who declared that the Talmud, the body of Jewish civil and canonical law, spoke with contempt of Christians. Moreover, he stated, Freemasonry was supported and encouraged in many ways by Jews.

The cardinal said he favored some things in the declaration, but stated it would be well to urge the Jews to show more love to Christians especially Catholics."

He suggested also that a reference to Buddhists, Hindus and Moslems be incorporated in the declaration. -0-

KADAR FORECASTS LONG STAY
IN LEGATION FOR CARDINAL

By Religious News Service (9-28-64)

BUDAPEST (RNS) -- Prime Minister Janos Kadar of Hungary said here that Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty "may stay for some time" in his refuge at the U.S. legation here. The Communist leader claimed the Roman Catholic Primate was intractable, that "Mindszenty does not understand the situation which was correctly evaluated by the late Pope John...We are prepared to settle the problem but Hungary is unwilling that Mindszenty go out a winner in the present fight."

-0-

U.S. PRELATES CONTINUE PLEA
FOR STRONG JEWISH STATEMENT

By Religious News Service (9-29-64)

VATICAN CITY (RNS) -- Further pleas for a strong repudiation of the charge of deicide made against the Jews because of Christ's crucifixion were heard as the Second Vatican Council gathered for its 90th general congregation.

Among a score of bishops taking part in the debate on a revised declaration on Catholic-Jewish relations were three prelates from the United States: Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle of Washington, D.C., Archbishop Lawrence J. Shehan of Baltimore, and Auxiliary Bishop Stephen A. Leven of San Antonio, Texas.

Bishop Leven said the text should state clearly that no one should ever call the Jews a deicide people.

"It is suggested," he said, "that the phrase had been omitted in the (revised) text because it is philosophically and theologically absurd, as though anyone could kill God. But our concern here is not over words.

"The sad reality is that this word was often hurled against the Jews in the past centuries to justify persecution. It is our duty to see to it that this word is never used again against the Jews. Our silence on this point would really be an act against justice."

Bishop Leven went on to stress that the reference to non-guilt in the death of Christ on the part of the Jewish people as such should also be made to include not only the Jews of our time, but likewise those at the time of Christ.

"There were millions of them scattered outside Palestine and because they did not even know Christ, they could not have been responsibile for His death," the prelate added.

Archbishop O'Boyle, declaring that he spoke as an American "whose country has more Jews in its population than any other country," called for "an act of contrition and reparation" from the Council for past misdeeds against the Jews.

He was followed by Archbishop Shehan who rose merely to say that everything he had on his mind in favor of a strong resolution had already been said. Resuming his seat, he was loudly applauded.

The only speaker to offer real objections to the draft declaration was Archbishop Joseph Tawil, Patriarchal Vicar for Melkite Rite Catholics in Damascus, Syria. He said that although anti-Semitism should be condemned in all its forms, the declaration should be rejected because of political consequences it might have in Arab countries.

(A similar viewpoint was expressed the day before by Ignace Gabriel Cardinal Tappouni, Patriarch of Antioch of the Syrians, speaking in the name of four other Middle East patriarchs.)

Bishop Daniel R. Lamont of Umtali, Southern Rhodesia, said the text should stress that "our treatment of the Jews was not motivated by any political consideration, but is the only logical consequence of our previous declaration on religious liberty."

(more)

"This relationship exists subjectively," he said, "but needs to be brought into bolder relief. The exhortation should take care to avoid injurious expressions in preaching and in catechetical teaching, because otherwise it could leave the impression that there is widespread anti-Semitism in the Church. This is obviously untrue."

Bishop Lamont closed his talk by urging that the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity be continued after the Council, "lest the work so happily begun be abandoned."

From Archbishop Joseph Parecattil of Ernaculum, India, came a request that the part of the declaration dealing with non-Christian religions be developed on a broader scale.

"The sacred books of Hinduism," he said, "contain passages setting forth aspirations to God as director and liberator. Such passages can be regarded as remote longings for Christ."

At the same time, he cautioned that "we must be careful with non-Christian students in Christian schools so as not to offend them by belittling their culture."

"The Church," he said, "needs to assimilate to itself whatever is good in every culture. In a sense, the Church must feel incarnated in every culture."

The Council was addressed again by Archbishop John C. Heenan of Liverpool, a member of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity who previously had spoken in support of a draft declaration on religious liberty.

He said it was not suprising that the Jews had received the new version of the draft on Catholic-Jewish relations "without marked enthusiasm." He was referring to changes which had resulted in substituting for a phrase absolving the Jews of deicide, one which stated merely that "one should be careful not to attribute to the Jews of our time what was committed during the Passion of Christ."

"It is natural," the British prelate said, "that they should be asking why certain changes have been made because of the subtle difference of tone and spirit of the new version. The wording of the document now before the Council is not precisely the wording given it by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity."

The changes referred to by Archbishop Heenan were made by the Council's Coordinating Commission, reportedly to avoid a possible future interpretation that Christ was not God.

(A Vatican source was quoted as reporting that a theological expert had pointed out a potential hidden danger in the original phrase, "The Jews are not guilty of deicide." The theologian, he said, had explained that the single statement while clear in meaning today, could possibly be seen out of context a hundred years from now as showing that the Vatican Council declared that Christ was not God.

(In other words, the source explained, future emphasis might shift from the word "Jews" to the word "deicide" in such a manner that it would seem the 1964 Council had said that "Christ was not God.")

(more)

Noting that the changes may have been made by "men inexperienced in ecumenism," the archbishop said another unpleasant reaction in Jewish circles had resulted from quoting St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, which speaks of the hope that "the whole of Israel will find salvation." This, he noted, had been interpreted to mean that the Church was seeking the conversion of Jews.

Archbishop Heenan explained that St. Paul was referring to the end of the world, when it was hoped that all men, including the Jews, "will return to the unity of the true people of God."

"It is my view," he said, "that the Jews are mistaken in regarding the text as a summons forthwith to give up their religion. However good the intentions of those who inserted this quotation from St. Paul's Epistle, the fact is that it has been taken badly by the Jews.

"For me, this is sufficient reason for removing the quotation from the declaration. Notice that in the same declaration, when talking about other non-Christian believers -- such as Moslems -- no word is said about converting them."

-0-

BROOKS HAYS MEETS
WITH POPE PAUL

By Religious News Service (9-29-64)

VATICAN CITY (RNS) -- Brooks Hays, U.S. Presidential adviser and noted Southern Baptist layman, was received by Pope Paul VI in a private audience.

No details of the audience have been reported by the Vatican, and Mr. Hays declined to comment. He is a special consultant to President Johnson.

Mr. Hays served as a special assistant to the late President Kennedy and President Johnson, but resigned early in January to become a professor at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

Last February he was national chairman of Brotherhood Week, sponsored annually by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. From 1957-59, Mr. Hays was president of the Southern Baptist Convention. In 1961 he had an audience with the late Pope John XXIII.

-0-

DR. RAMSEY CITES VIEWS
ON ISSUES IN ELECTION

By Religious News Service (9-29-64)

LONDON (RNS) -- Dr. Arthur Michael Ramsey, Archbishop of Canterbury, urged voters in the Oct. 15 general election to support candidates who favor the teaching of the Christian faith in all British schools.

In a six-point statement issued here the Anglican prelate also recommended support of a government that would help "establish right relations between races" and "give every possible help to countries where there is hunger and poverty."

In addition, he said, voters should elect a government that would "respect the sincerity of the other side," pledge "better use of resources now being spent on weapons of destruction," and provide "better housing and help for the aged."

-0-

CARDINAL BEA URGES PASSAGE OF DECLARATION ON JEWS

By Religious News Service (9-25-64)

VATICAN CITY (RNS) -- A great outburst of applause at the Ecumenical Council's third session came when Augustin Cardinal Bea, president of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, presented a revised declaration absolving "the Jewish people as such" of guilt in the crucifixion of Christ and strongly urged its approval.

The 83-year-old German-born cardinal said it was "absolutely necessary" that the declaration remain on the Council agenda and be acted upon. He said the statement "intends to see to it that the guilt cannot be ascribed to the Jewish people as such and certainly not to the Jewish people of today."

The declaration, Cardinal Bea told the Council, deals also with the attitude of the Catholic Church toward all non-Christians, and condemns every kind of discrimination based on religion, nationality or race.

It was announced that discussion on it would begin when the Council opened the third week of its current deliberations.

Along with the statement on religious liberty, the declaration on the Jews has been among the most controversial of all the matters before the Council.

The original draft was introduced toward the close of the Council's second session last year, but there was insufficient time to discuss it. The first version emphasized that all mankind, not the Jews alone, was responsible for the death of Christ, and this was hailed by Jewish leaders as a clear repudiation of the ancient charge of deicide which was regarded as a basic cause of anti-Semitism.

However, it was later reported that the declaration had been revised during the Council recess to state merely that Catholics should "refrain from accusing the Jews of our times of what was perpetrated during the Passion of Christ."

This, plus what was said to be a stress in the new draft on "the Church's great desire" for the conversion of the Jews, stirred critical reactions in many Jewish circles. American bishops at the Ecumenical Council have pledged united action to strengthen the new draft so that it would clearly repudiate the old charge of deicide.

In his speech, Cardinal Bea said some Council Fathers had urged that the declaration be dropped, but he stressed that it was vital that the Council adopt a statement aimed at "improving the Roman Catholic Church's understanding with the Jews."

He also emphasized that the declaration did not involve "any question of politics in any way, shape or form."

(more)

His remarks were clearly addressed to Arab circles and some bishops from the Middle East who had objected to the proposed statement on political grounds.

The cardinal said the declaration was "purely religious" and did not speak of Zionism or Israel, but was concerned with the "followers of the Law of Moses wherever they lived in the world."

Cardinal Bea said "the Jewish people as such today cannot be blamed for guilt that they do not have." Moreover, he said, whatever the blame for the crucifixion and "to whomsoever it belonged," it was the Church's duty to imitate Christ on the Cross by saying, "Forgive them, for they know not what they do."

He added that in imitating Christ's love for the Jewish people, "bishops should even be ready to lay themselves open to the danger of political accusations in this regard."

The cardinal said that the view that the deicide charge was responsible for anti-Semitism was "untenable," because economic and social charges have also led to anti-Jewish discrimination and persecution.

However, he added that "there is no doubt that the guilt idea had induced many Christians in the past to regard Jews as a deicide people, rejected by God, and that the Christians despised and persecuted them for this."

Cardinal Bea spent some time explaining that the Jewish people could not be considered guilty of killing Christ because of His crucifixion.

In regard to the charge of deicide, he asked:

"Did these leaders of the Jews at the time of Christ truly understand His divinity? Could the Jewish people be accused of what their leaders did? At the time of the Crucifixion there were 4,500,000 Jews in the Diaspora. The Jewish people as such in Christ's time, and even more today, cannot be blamed for a guilt which they did not have."

In the course of his speech, Cardinal Bea said "some new ideas" had been added to the original declaration, including a hope of "the final union of Jews with the new Chosen People, namely, the Church."

The only Jesuit in the Sacred College, Cardinal Bea, a noted Biblical scholor, has headed the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity since it was established by Pope John XXIII in 1960.

Regarded as the Church's top ecumenist, he was given a large share of the credit for the admission of non-Catholic delegate-observers to the Council.

-0-

EGYPT'S COPTIC CHURCH HITS
COUNCIL DECLARATION ON JEWS

By Religious News Service (9-29-64)

CAIRO (RNS) -- The Coptic Orthodox Church of Egypt will oppose any declaration by the Vatican Council which would absolve the Jewish people of guilt for Christ's death, a spokesman for the Church declared here.

He maintained that the statement is being sought by Zionist leaders for use in their "political aims," and that it will not be supported by Orthodox prelates in the Middle East.

The spokesman said that Patriarch Kyrillos VI of Alexandria, head of the Coptic Church in Egypt, is following with great concern discussions on the proposed statement by the Council Fathers.

According to the spokesman, the Coptic Church, one of the oldest in the world, believes that no Ecumenical Council can change the text of the Bible "which clearly states that Jews took upon themselves the responsibility for Christ's crucifixion by telling Pilate 'Crucify Him, His blood be on us and on our children.'"

The statement was issued as the Ecumenical Council heard the plea of Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, that urged a strong declaration clearing the Jews of the ancient charge of "deicide."

-0-

POPE URGES VIETNAM
TO END FRATRICIDE

By Religious News Service (9-29-64)

SAIGON, So. Vietnam (RNS) -- Pope Paul VI has made an "urgent appeal" to the people of South Vietnam to end the "fratricidal violence" in that country.

Although the pontiff did not specifically refer to recent violence between Roman Catholics and Buddhists in South Vietnam, his plea apparently came as a result of those incidents.

The Pope's message was sent to Archbishop Paul Nguyen Van Binh of Saigon and was dated Sept. 4, but was not released until now.

-0-

CARDINAL BEA CONFERS
WITH ORTHODOX LEADER

By Religious News Service (9-29-64)

ATHENS (RNS) -- Augustin Cardinal Bea, president of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, reportedly conferred here with Greek Orthodox Archbishop Chrysostomos of Athens and All Greece.

The meeting was unprecedented. Archbishop Chrysostomos has opposed conversations with the Roman Catholic Church and had refused to appear in a ceremony at Patras where Cardinal Bea had returned a relic, long held at the Vatican, to the Greek diocese.

-0-

ARAB DIPLOMAT HAS
AUDIENCE WITH POPE

By Religious News Service (10-2-64)

VATICAN CITY (RNS) -- Mohamed El Tabei, Ambassador to the Holy See from the United Arab Republic, was received in private audience by Pope Paul VI.

Authoritative Vatican sources said the envoy had asked for the audience in order to discuss the proposed declaration on Catholic-Jewish relations introduced at the Second Vatican Council.

Arab quarters have objected that the draft declaration was being politically exploited by "world Zionism and Israel" at the expense of the Arab states.

-0-

VATICAN PURCHASES LAND
IN JERUSALEM FOR SCHOOL

By Religious News Service (10-2-64)

JERUSALEM (RNS) -- Announcement that the Apostolic Delegation intends to purchase a large plot of land in the Jordanian sector of Jerusalem caused wide speculation in both Israel and Jordan.

A Roman Catholic spokesman denied vigorously one report that the plot would be used to build a "papal palace" where Popes could reside during visits to the Holy Land.

He said the land would be used to construct a home and school for deaf mute children, under Pontifical auspices.

Another rumor tried to associate the projected acquisition with the ecumenical center proposed recently by Pope Paul VI to study Christian and non-Christian religions.

-0-

SYRIAN LEADER HAILS PATRIARCHS' OPPOSITION TO JEWISH STATEMENT

By Religious News Service (10-2-64)

DAMASCUS (RNS)-- Syria's Minister of State has cabled Eastern Rite patriarchs attending the Ecumenical Council to applaud their opposition to the draft declaration on the Jews.

According to Syrian Radio, Mr. Thabet-Paris, a Roman Catholic, sent this message:

"As a Catholic of the Near East, I consider I must thank you for your firm attitude against the exoneration of the Jews.

"Wishing you final victory in forestalling a highly damaging act."

The Minister of State's action followed closely upon reports that Syria's Premier Saleh el-Bitar had addressed leaders of the Eastern Rite communities here. The premier had told them the Council draft on the Jews was being politically exploited by "world Zionism and Israel" at the expense of the Arab states.

During the debate two prelates from Arab nations addressed the Ecumenical Council to oppose the declaration. They were Ignace Gabriel Cardinal Tappouni, Patriarch of Antioch of the Syrians, and Archbishop Joseph Tawil, Patriarchal Vicar for Melkite Rite Catholics in Damascus.

Cardinal Tappouni said he spoke for himself and four other patriarchs of the East. He warned that any Council statement on the Jews would open the Church to the charge of having "political tendencies."

"We affirm our solemn opposition to this document," he said.

Archbishop Tawil stated that although anti-Semitism should be condemned in all its forms, the declaration should be rejected because of political consequences it might have in Arab countries.

Meanwhile, Syrian Radio also reported that bishops of the Syrian Orthodox Church have been examining closely the draft declaration on the Jews.

They also have conferred on the Council debate in which American prelates called for a stronger text which would absolve the Jews of Christ's time and the Jews of today of guilt in the crucifixion.

Al-Thawra, a semi-official Syrian newspaper, said the Orthodox prelates had met twice in one day to discuss the subject. The newspaper claimed Syrian Orthodox churchmen had said that "to raise such a question" (exoneration of the Jews) would be "in complete contradiction with the Pope's appeal for Christian unity."

-0-

ECUMENICAL STRESS ON LIBERTY
CITED BY WORLD COUNCIL LEADER

By Religious News Service (10-12-64)

ABOARD THE BORNHOLM (RNS) -- Stress placed on the importance of religious liberty over the years in ecumenical discussions has contributed significantly to "the present very important stage" reached on the subject at the Second Vatican Council, according to a World Council of Churches leader.

Dr. W.A. Visser 't Hooft, WCC general secretary, told delegates to the constituting meeting of the European Conference of Churches, that he believed the outspoken proponents of a strong Roman Catholic statement have been influenced by the concern long expressed by other Christians.

Holding a press conference aboard this Danish liner, the WCC official also said he believed those Catholic bishops were showing "real ecumenical convictions" and not speaking out of "political considerations."

Dr. Visser t' Hooft said the religious liberty debate at Vatican II held particular importance for Protestants in Spain, where a new law on religious liberty is in draft form.

He said the Council had given Spanish Catholic bishops, "perhaps for the first time in their lives," an opportunity to talk with Protestants -- delegate-observers -- and to discover that they were "really convinced Christians.

A leading Spanish Protestant churchman, Dr. Jose Cardonal Gregori, head of the Spanish Evangelical Defense Commission, agreed with the WCC leader as to the importance of the Vatican Council discussions for his co-religionists.

Dr. Cardona said it was his opinion that most Spanish bishops now feel that the Catholic position in regard to Protestants in the country has not been sufficiently broad."

While contents of the proposed law in Spain are not public, he added, "we know it will be consistent with the development of the principles of religious tolerance."

Dr. Cardona said he believed the law would call for a new "toleration...the guarantee of minimum rights" and stand as "a first step which will make it possible to evolve towards religious liberty."

Two Spanish Evangelical pastors, the Rev. Humberto Capo of Mallorca and the Rev. Carlos Morales Matthey of San Sebastian, noted growing contacts between Protestants and Catholics in Spain at the parish level.

They cited joint observances in many places of the annual Week of Prayer for Christian Unity and joint discussions on "common missionary problems," particularly in regard to establishing relations with non-Christians.

-0-

DON'T FEAR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY,
POPE TELLS SPANISH PRELATE

By Religious News Service (10-12-64)

MADRID (RNS) -- A special correspondent sent to Rome by Ya, Spain's leading Catholic daily, to cover the Second Vatican Council reported that Pope Paul VI had admonished a Spanish cardinal not be be "afraid of religious liberty."

The correspondent is Msgr. Jesus Iribarren, formerly editor-in-chief of Ecclesia, weekly organ of Spanish Catholic Action, which frequently reflected the views of Enrique Cardinal Pla y Deniel, Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain.

He quoted the Pope as telling a Spanish cardinal that "I know full well that circumstances in Spain are very special, and I shall be with Spain. But the Spaniards should be with the Pope; they must not be afraid of religious liberty."

Msgr. Iribarren did not name the cardinal, but he is generally assumed here to be Fernando Cardinal Quiroga y Palacios, Archbishop of Santiago de Compostela.

During the Council debate on the draft declaration on religious liberty -- a document returned to the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity for further study and possible amendment -- Cardinal Quiroga complained that the declaration "seems to have been written in view of so-called Protestant countries, and to have paid no attention to the situation of Catholic countries." He suggested having the text recast by a mixed commission of periti (experts) which would be "in a position to appreciate the importance and delicacy of this point."

The issue of religious liberty is of particular relevance in Spain because of proposed legislation designed to relax restrictions against the Protestant minority, said to number about 30,000.

Hopes for speedy enactment of the legislation -- drafted on the basis of negotiations begun with the Vatican more than two years ago by Foreign Minister Fernando Maria Castiella y Maiz -- have continued to be frustrated by what has been described as the stubborn resistance of some sectors of the Church and the Franco regime.

The latest setback came early in October when Vice Admiral Luis Carrero Blanco, influential Cabinet member, was reported to have told a meeting presided over by Generalisimo Franco that enactment should be delayed because of continued opposition among Church groups, both clerical and lay.

Manuel Fraga Iribarne, Minister of Information and Tourism, later said the government would "await the final results" of the Ecumenical Council before acting on the legislation.

He also stressed that the proposed statute was "clearly based on the principles of Catholic unity in our country and the confessional character of the state." This was understood to mean that the Catholic religion would retain its privileged position in the country.

The statute affecting the Protestants was discussed by the Spanish prelates now in Rome. An official report received here said Cardinal Quiroga had come to the meeting immediately after an audience with Pope Paul and that he had brought with him a message from the pontiff concerning religious liberty.

-0-

COPTIC ORTHODOX LEADER HITS
COUNCIL STATEMENT ON JEWS

By Religious News Service (10-13-64)

CAIRO (RNS) -- Condemning the Vatican Council draft on the Jews as "the biggest stab to Christianity," Patriarch Kyrillos VI of Alexandria has proposed a "summit meeting" of Orthodox Churches to study and discuss the document.

The head of the Coptic Orthodox Church of Egypt held that "no Ecumenical Council, whatever its level, can change the text of the Holy Bible."

He held that Orthodox Christians must oppose a document which would absolve the Jews of guilt in the crucifixion of Christ.

Patriarch Kyrillos said "the Holy Bible convicted the Jews and their children of Christ's crucifixion and to absolve them of that crime would be open refutation of the Bible."

He held that the church had received from the Apostles assurance that "the Jews crucified Christ. The Apostles' gospels were written with the inspiration of the Holy Ghost and after witnessing the events themselves."

"If the Jews are so eager to rid themselves of charges of Christ's crucifixion," he continued, "let them declare their belief in Christ."

The patriarch charged that politics were involved in the Vatican draft -- a draft that has been assailed in most Arab countries.

"There must be political significance behind the attitude of the Vatican in absolving the Jews of this crime," the Coptic leader said, adding:

"I am proud of the Coptic Orthodox Church attitude against the document."

Coptic spokesmen here said the Church was the first religious body to oppose the document now before the Roman Catholic assembly. They said Coptic Orthodox observers at the Council had stated their objections to Vatican authorities in November, 1963.

Patriarch Kyrillos, at a press conference, also announced a plan to establish "international religious resorts" at those sites reputedly visited by Christ.

He suggested that his proposed Orthodox "summit conference" be held at Marimina Monastery, about 10 miles from Alexandria. The patriarch also noted he planned a personal retreat there where, he said, he would pray for "the victory of President Nasser, the miracle of his age."

-0-

POPE BACKS PROPONENTS OF COLLEGIALITY,
RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, STATEMENT ON JEWS

By Religious News Service (10-14-64)

VATICAN CITY (RNS) -- Pope Paul VI, according to reliable sources, intervened on the side of 15 "progressive" cardinals who wrote him to complain that Vatican Council "conservatives" sought to water down two crucial draft declarations -- on Catholic-Jewish relations and on religious liberty.

The Pope also reportedly agreed that there should be no attempt to weaken the Council's stand in favor of shared papal-episcopal authority in the Church, or to end the Council after the current third session before the schema on the Church and the modern world could be fully discussed. This schema touches on such controversial topics as birth control and nuclear power.

Pope Paul was said to have made his position known after separate audiences with Joseph Cardinal Frings, Archbishop of Cologne, Germany; Bernard Cardinal Alfrink, Archbishop of Utrecht, Holland; and Augustin Cardinal Bea, president of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. Cardinals Frings and Alfrink were among the 15 who signed the memorandum to the Pope, news of which was first revealed by Dr. Gaston Cruzat, head of the press office of the Latin American episcopate.

None of the petitioning cardinals -- among them were Joseph Cardinal Ritter, Archbishop of St. Louis and Albert Gregory Cardinal Meyer, Archbishop of Chicago -- would comment on the Pope's reported intervention.

However, according to Dr. Cruzat, the Pope gave assurance that the main assertions of the declaration on the Jews -- notably the one absolving them from guilt in the crucifixion of Christ--would remain.

He intimated that the Pope had insisted that these assertions would remain even if the declaration, now appended to the schema on ecumenism, was transferred to the schema on the Church.

Italian Radio claimed the transfer would answer protests from Arab sources, including the Syrian government, as well as from Christian members of the Jordanian government, by telling them that the declaration had been put in a purely religious context concerning only the Roman Catholic Church.

The station said Pope Paul had decided to block moves to have the Council's declaration on religious liberty revised by a commission weighted with three well-known conservative prelates. It said the text was now being revised by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity in the light of the Council's criticisms.

Dr. Cruzat was quoted as saying the Pope had assured Cardinal Bea that his secretariat would be free from interference in revising and presumably strengthening the texts on the Jews and religious liberty.

It had been reported earlier that Archbishop Pericle Felici, the Vatican Council's secretary-general, had informed Cardinal Bea that the texts would be redrafted by commissions with heavy conservative representation.

(more)

Supporters of the declaration on the Jews were said to include many who felt it should be strengthened rather than toned down if made a part of the schema on the Church. Their argument appeared to be that by standing alone, -- and dealing with the problem of anti-Semitism merely in the pragmatic terms of the secular world -- it would fail to conform to the doctrinal and theological tone of the majority of the Council's pronouncements.

Including it in De Ecclesia, they contended, would both refute Arab claims that it was a political document and reassert in theological terms the special Jewish-Christian links forged by common acceptance of the Old Testament. -0-

RUSSIAN PRELATE BARRED
ENTRY IN AUSTRALIA

By Religious News Service (10-14-64)

CANBERRA (RNS) -- A Russian Orthodox archbishop has been refused a visa to enter Australia to attend the Congress of International Cooperation and Disarmament.

Archbishop Alexei Rieigjer, a member of the Moscow Patriarchate's foreign affairs department, was one of a number of Russians barred entry.

Protests lodged in parliament against the government's action brought the response that Archbishop Alexei sought entry not as a member of a church delegation but as part of a Russian delegation.

Government spokesmen said entry is refused any Russian who is suspected of attending a gathering with the aim of fostering political propaganda. This applied to the Russian delegation as a group, it was said.

A member of the House of Representatives questioned Minister of Immigration H.J. Opperman on the incident.

In opposing the ban, a Labor Party member said the archbishop was a high-ranking clergyman of a recognized Church, adding that the prelate had recently visited the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury in London and "had been welcomed in the United States, France, Denmark and Greece."

"On what grounds," he asked, "was this Christian, who enjoys a worldwide respect, refused permission to come to Australia?"

Mr. Opperman replied: "That has nothing to do with the question of the policy of the government. Where political events of any objectionable nature, mainly Communist events, are concerned, it is the policy that those coming as delegations from Communist countries will be refused.

"Archbishop Alexei was not coming as a member of the church but as a member of a delegation."

Anglican Bishop J.S. Moyes, a co-sponsor of the Congress to be held in Sydney, Oct. 25-30, protested the government's action in a wire to Prime Minister Robert Menzies.

Because "a Christian in Russia has courage," he said, the government should have been glad to admit the Russian Orthodox prelate.

-0-

CONCILIO ECUMENICO-VATICANO II

UFFICIO STAMPA

SESSION III -- DOCUMENTATION

Background and Summary

DECLARATION ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTYm ir ON THE RIGHS OF THE HUMAN PERSON AND OF COMMUNITIES TO FREEDOM IN RELIGIOUS MATTERS

Introductory note:

The revised text ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY comprises 5 pages as an Appendix to the schema DE ECUMENISMO with the indication DECLARATIO I, along with another DECLARATIO II, dealing with the Jews and non-Christians. The Declaration on religious liberty is accompanied by five pages of Notes, a Relatio, and a brief Summary. The text was transmitted to the Council Fathers on April 27,1964.

The genesis of the amended text on Religious Liberty.

In the Second Session of the Coujncil, on November 19,1963, the Fathers were given the fascicule on Religious Liberty as Chapter 5 of the schema "De Ecumenismo", and in the 70th General Congregation held on that same day, Bishop De Smedt, of Bruges, Members of the Secretariate for Christiah Unity, read to the Cojncil an explanatory and introductory Relatio. Conflicting opinions were immediately evident among the Council Fathers, ranging from enthusiasm to severe criticism. The text was not brought up for discussion on the Council floor for want of sufficient time.

Up to February 27,1964, the Secretariate for Christian Unity accepted observations from the Council Fathers and incorporated them into a volume of some 280 pages. Some of the Fathers wanted the text on religious liberty incorporated into the schema on Ecumenism, inasmuch as the recognition of religious liberty forms part of the foundation of Ecumenism. According to certain other Fathers, however, the text in question should constitute a distinct chapter of the schema on Ecumenism. Still others would have abbreviated the presentation and included it in Chapter I of the schema, treating of the basic principles of Ecumenism. Lastly, others prposed the presentation of the subject as a decree distinct from that on Ecumenism, considering the fact that, notwithstanding its ecumenical importance, the subject matter exceeds the limits of Ecumenism strictly so called.

The test was amended by the Secretariate for Christian Unity according to the recommendations made by many of the Fathers, but its great importance did not permit it to be compressed into such compact form as would have permitted its insertion into Chapter I of the schema on Ecumenism. Thus, according to the desire expressed by the Co-ordinating Commission in its metting of April 18,1964, the text on religious liberty, like that on the Jews and non-Christians, is now submitted to the Council as a "Declaration" distinct from, but adnexed to the schema on Ecumenism.

The criteria followed in the revision of the text.

After a careful study of all the observations sent in by the Council Fathers concerning the revision of the text,the Secretariate for Christiah Unity saw fit to retain five principal points:

a) A clearer expression of the concept of religious liberty.

The purpose of this clarification is to forestall any fallacious or equivocal interpretations of the text. Consequently, at

segue .....