

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

OFFICIAL INTERDIOCESAN ORGAN

● THE PHILIPPINE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW ●

MIXED MARRIAGES • IS CHRISTIAN
ETHICS OUT-MODED? • SITUATION
OF THE CHURCH AFTER THE SYNOD
• POSTSCRIPT TO MIXED PRIESTLY
TRAINING • SAINT ANTHONY MARY
CLARET AND VATICAN COUNCIL I •
FERTILIZATION "IN VITRO," ITS MO-
RALITY

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

EDITORIAL STAFF

EDITOR	LEONARDO Z. LEGASPI, O.P.
ASSISTANT EDITOR	FIDEL VILLARROEL, O.P.
ASSOCIATE EDITORS	FRANCISCO DEL RIO, O.P. QUINTIN M. GARCIA, O.P. JESUS MERINO, O.P. EFREN RIVERA, O.P. JOSE TINOKO, O.P. JOHN D'AQUINO, O.P. POMPEYO DE MESA, O.P.
BUSINESS MANAGER	FLORENCIO TESTERA, O.P.

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS Official Interdiocesan Organ is published monthly by the University of Santo Tomas and is printed at U.S.T. Press, Manila, Philippines. Entered as Second Class Mail Matter at the Manila Post Office on June 21, 1946.

Subscription Rates. Yearly subscription in the Philippines, ₱15.00; Two Years, ₱26.00; Three Years, ₱40.00. Abroad, \$5.00 a year. Price per copy, ₱1.50. Subscriptions are paid in advance.

Communications of an editorial nature concerning articles, cases and reviews should be addressed to the Editor. Advertising and subscription enquiries should be addressed to the Business Manager. Orders for renewals or changes of address should include both old and new address, and will go into effect fifteen days after notification.

Address all communications to:

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS
Fathers' Residence
University of Santo Tomas
Manila D-403
Philippines

Vol. XLIV • No. 493

May-June, 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL	348
THE POPE SPEAKS On Mixed Marriages	351
DOCUMENTATION Pontifical Bulls, etc.	359
DOCTRINAL SECTION Is Christian Ethics Out-Moded? by JESUS DIAZ, O.P. Situation of the Church after the Synod	363 371
NOTES AND COMMENTS Postscript to Mixed Priestly Training by JESUS MA. CAVANNA, C.M. Indonesia at the Crossroads by JUAN SANZ, S.J.	380 392
PASTORAL SECTION Homiletics — 3rd to 8th Sundays after Pentecost by FERNANDO YUSINGCO, C.S.S.R.; 9th and 10th Sundays after Pentecost by EFREN RIVERA, O.P. Constitutional Convention Sermons	398 412
HISTORICAL SECTION History of the Church in the Philippines 1521-1898 (continued) by PABLO FERNANDEZ, O.P. St. Anthony Mary Claret and Vatican Council I by ALFONSO MA. SIERRA, C.M.F.	419 427
CASES AND QUERIES Fertilization "In Vitro", its Morality by MANUEL PIÑON, O.P. Questions on the Ordinary of the Mass	433 437
THE CHURCH HERE AND THERE	438

Pope John XXIII Guideline To Youthful Reformers*

The nation is passing through an unprecedented serious social, economic and political crisis. In the early part of this year, attempts were made, mostly by university students and labor elements, to make everybody advert to, and become deeply aware of the multiple critical illness which the national community suffers from. We need not describe the events which did shake the capital of the nation during the first three months of 1970... The crisis is far from being over; difficult days are laying ahead; it behoves us, as citizens and as Catholics, to take time out and see what our attitude and contribution must be; what our endeavor, in the light of Faith and with the strength of love, ought to be to make our institutions — whether economic, social, cultural or political in purpose — rather than create obstacles, facilitate or render less arduous man's perfecting of himself both in the natural order as well as in the supernatural (n. 146).

There are some few young men, in our large university population, no doubt endowed with generosity, who, on coming face to face with situations where the requirements of justice are not satisfied, feel enkindled with the desire to change the state of things instantly. They wish to have recourse to something like a revolution (n. 161).

The problem of bringing social reality into line with the objective requirements of justice is a problem which will never admit of a *definitive* solution; but this does not mean we should relax and feel satisfied with objectives already achieved (n. 155). In fact, all human beings ought rather to reckon that what has been accomplished is but little or nothing in comparison with what remains to be done. Human institutions must all be adjusted to this our era which the human family has already entered, wherein it has commenced its new advance towards limitless horizons (n. 156).

* "Pacem in Terris" (Peace on Earth), April 11, 1963.

Tear down...and then, *build up*...a new world, a new earth and, of course, new heavens! A small sector of our university youth is in the process of becoming mesmerized by this and other similar slogans. If one is going to believe them nothing short of a nation-wide revolution will render it possible for us to live a life worthy of man, with justice for all and malice towards none...

Let us be clear on this particular point. We honestly believe that the citizen, who sits back, with pleasure on the soft cushion of comfort which modern civilization provides, and does not contribute its own share to the improvement of the socio-economic conditions of his surroundings, of the community, local and national, of which he is a member, this citizen is not a *normal* man, much less a citizen worthy of respect.

The improvement of present-day national living conditions, depends on God and it depends on us. As it depends on God, man must live a life inwardly and outwardly in keeping with the dictates of a well informed and educated personal conscience. As it depends on us, if we remain passive, our passivity is contrary to the very sense of creation and the much talked about "man's creativeness". There are sins of inertia and intellectual laziness which will weigh more heavily on the day of judgment than sins of frailty. Yet one needs patience with others, rather patience with oneself; but patience and christian prudence are virtues strange to our age and time. Modern man seems to be possessed by the so-called *mentality of immediacy*. We have become accustomed to having our needs met immediately and tangibly. We do not wait very long for the removal of pain or the achievement of a satisfaction. The cumulative effect of such cultural factor is, in many cases, the growth of a subjective inability to see importance beyond the moment, the inability to sacrifice for a future value. Much the talk about *revolution* as the only means to extricate us from the terrible plight we are in, in the context of the present-day national situation, can be explained in the light of this unrealistic mentality: Let's change the world... But what about the means and ways! "It must be borne in mind that to proceed *gradually* is the law of life in all its expressions; therefore in human institutions, too, it is not possible to renovate for the better except by working from within them, gradually. Pius XII proclaimed, "Salvation and justice are not to be found in revolution, but in evolution through concord. Violence has always achieved only destruction, not construction; the kindling of passions, not their pacification; the accumulation of hate and ruin, not the reconciliation of the contending parties. And it has reduced men and parties

to the difficult task of rebuilding, after sad experience, on the ruins of discord." The words of Leo XIII (on *Christian Democracy*, January 18, 1901) to workers are equally valid for student masses: "To beware of sedition and seditious persons, wherever found (1); to hold inviolate the rights of every one else (2); to show willingly due deference to legitimate authority and do honest work (3); not to get a distaste for the life of the home (4); to attend especially to your religious duties, and seek in your Christian Faith the legitimate consolation she promises, amidst the hardships of life (5)." There is no heaven on earth!

Revolution, as it is commonly advocated, can mean, in the context of present-day national situation, one thing only, and this is—placing the country at the will of a communistic regime, by whatever soft name one may call it; and this is down right insanity. One cannot afford to close one's eyes to the hard and gloomy realities unfolding before our eyes. Do not underestimate, much less ignore, your enemy right in your midst. Indeed, "the future of the world (of nations) stands in peril unless wiser men are forthcoming," said Vatican II. Both youth and age will do well to reflect seriously on the words of Pope John XXIII, for as H. de Lubac says, "The Holy Spirit who guided the Apostle (St. Paul) is the same who still guides the Church, and speaks by the modern Popes. The path to which it commits us, is the only safe one. To follow it is neither *naivete*, nor syncretism, nor liberalism; it is *simply Catholicism*," the voice of Christ, "the same today, as he was yesterday, and as he will be forever (Heb. 13.8). Let us listen to them, today, for tomorrow may be too late!

• F. DEL RIO

THE POPE SPEAKS

An Apostolic Letter
issued "Motu Proprio"
determining norms for

MIXED MARRIAGES

Mixed marriages, that is to say marriages in which one party is a Catholic and the other a non-Catholic, whether baptized or not, have always been given careful attention by the Church in pursuance of her duty. Today the Church is constrained to give even greater attention to them, owing to the conditions of present times. In the past Catholics were separated from members of other Christian confessions and from non-Christians, by their situation in their community or even by physical boundaries. In more recent times, however, not only has this separation been reduced, but communication between men of different regions and religions has greatly developed, and as a result there has been a great increase in the number of mixed marriages. Also a great influence in this regard has been exercised by the growth and spread of civilization and industry, urbanization and consequent rural depopulation, migrations in great numbers and the increase in numbers of exiles of every kind.

The Church is indeed aware that mixed marriages, precisely because they admit differences of religion and are a consequence of the division among Christians, do not, except in some cases, help in re-establishing unity among Christians. There are many difficulties inherent in a mixed marriage, since a certain division is introduced into the living cell of the Church, as the Christian family is rightly called, and in the family itself the fulfillment of the gospel teachings is more difficult because of diversities in matters of religion, especially with regard to those matters which concern Christian worship and the education of the children.

For these reasons the Church, conscious of her duty, discourages the contracting of mixed marriages, for she is most desirous that Catholics be able in matrimony to attain to perfect union of mind and full communion of life. However, since man has the natural right to marry and beget children, the Church, by her laws, which clearly show her pastoral concern, makes such arrangements that on the one hand the principles of Divine law be scrupulously observed and that on the other the said right to contract marriage be respected.

The Church vigilantly concerns herself with the education of the young and their fitness to undertake their duties with a sense of responsibility and to perform their obligations as members of the Church, and she shows this both in preparing for marriage those who intend to contract a mixed marriage and in caring for those who have already contracted such a marriage. Although in the case of baptized persons of different religious confessions, there is less risk of religious indifference, it can be more easily avoided if both husband and wife have a sound knowledge of the Christian nature of marital partnership, and if they are properly helped by their respective Church authorities. Even difficulties arising in marriage between a Catholic and an unbaptized person can be overcome through pastoral watchfulness and skill.

Neither in doctrine nor in law does the Church place on the same level a marriage between a Catholic and a baptized non-Catholic, and one between a Catholic and an unbaptized person; for, as the Second Vatican Council declared, men who, though they are not Catholics, "believe in Christ and have been properly baptized are brought into a certain, though imperfect, communion with the Catholic Church".¹ Moreover, although Eastern Christians who have been baptized outside the Catholic Church are separated from communion with us, they possess true sacraments, above all the Priesthood and the Eucharist, whereby they are joined to us in a very close relationship.² Undoubtedly there exists in a marriage between baptized persons, since such a mar-

¹ Decree on Ecumenism *Unitatis Redintegratio*, 3, AAS 57 (1965), p. 93; cf. Dogmatic Constitution on the Church *Lumen Gentium*, AAS 57 (1965), pp. 19-20.

² Cf. SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL: Decree on Ecumenism *Unitatis Redintegratio*, 13-18, l.c., pp. 100-104.

riage is a true sacrament, a certain communion of spiritual benefits which is lacking in a marriage entered into by a baptized person and one who is not baptized.

Nevertheless, one cannot ignore the difficulties inherent even in mixed marriages between baptized persons. There is often a difference of opinion on the sacramental nature of matrimony, on the special significance of marriage celebrated within the Church, on the interpretation of certain moral principles pertaining to marriage and the family, on the extent to which obedience is due to the Catholic Church, and on the competence that belongs to ecclesiastical authority. From this it is clear that difficult questions of this kind can only be fully resolved when Christian unity is restored.

The faithful must therefore be taught that, although the Church somewhat relaxes ecclesiastical discipline in particular cases, she can never remove the obligation of the Catholic party, which, by divine law, namely by the plan of salvation instituted through Christ, is imposed according to the various situations.

The faithful should therefore be reminded that the Catholic party to a marriage has the duty of preserving his or her own faith; nor is it ever permitted to expose oneself to a proximate danger of losing it.

Furthermore, the Catholic partner in a mixed marriage is obliged, not only to remain steadfast in the faith, but also, as far as possible, to see to it that the children be baptized and brought up in that same faith and receive all those aids to eternal salvation which the Catholic Church provides for her sons and daughters.

The problem of the children's education is a particularly difficult one, in view of the fact that both husband and wife are bound by that responsibility and may by no means ignore it or any of the obligations connected with it. However the Church endeavours to meet this problem, just as she does the others, by her legislation and pastoral care.

With all this in mind, no one will be really surprised to find that even the canonical discipline on mixed marriages cannot be uniform and that it must be adapted to the various cases in what pertains to the

juridical form of contracting marriage, its liturgical celebration, and finally, the pastoral care to be given to the married people, and the children of the marriage, according to the distinct circumstances of the married couple and the differing degrees of their ecclesiastical communion.

It was altogether fitting that so important a question should receive the attention of the Second Vatican Council. This occurred several times as occasion arose. Indeed, in the third session the Council Fathers voted to entrust the question to us in its entirety.

To meet their desire, the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, on the 18th March, 1966, promulgated an Instruction on mixed marriages, entitled "*Matrimonii Sacramentum*",³ which provided that, if the norms laid down therein stood the test of experience, they should be introduced in a definite and precise form into the Code of Canon Law which is now being revised.⁴

When certain questions on mixed marriages were raised in the first General Meeting of the Synod of Bishops, held in October 1967⁵ and many useful observations had been made upon them by the Fathers, we decided to submit those questions to examination by a special Commission of Cardinals which, after diligent consideration, presented us with its conclusions.

At the outset we state that Eastern Catholics contracting marriage with baptized non-Catholics or with unbaptized persons are not subject to the norms established by this Letter. With regard to the marriage of Catholics of whatsoever rite with Eastern non-Catholic Christians, the Church has recently issued certain norms,⁶ which we wish to remain in force.

³ Cf. AAS 58 (1966), pp. 235-239.

⁴ Cf. *ibidem*, l.c., p. 237.

⁵ Cf. *Argumenta de quibus disceptabitur in primo generali coetu Synodi Episcoporum*, pars altera, Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1967, pp. 27-37.

⁶ Cf. SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL: Decree on Eastern Catholic Churches *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 18, AAS 57 (1965), p. 82; Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Churches: Decree *Crescens Matrimoniorum*, ASS 59 (1967), pp. 165-166.

Accordingly, in order that ecclesiastical discipline on mixed marriages be more perfectly formulated and that, without violating divine law, canonical law should have regard for the differing circumstances of married couples, in accordance with the mind of the Second Vatican Council expressed especially in the Decree *Unitatis Redintegratio*⁷ and in the Declaration *Dignitatis Humanae*,⁸ and also in careful consideration of the wishes expressed in the Synod of Bishops, we, by our own authority, and after mature deliberation, establish and decree the following norms:

1. A marriage between two baptized persons, of whom one is a Catholic, while the other is a non-Catholic, may not licitly be contracted without the previous dispensation of the local Ordinary, since such a marriage is by its nature an obstacle to the full spiritual communion of the married parties.

2. A marriage between two persons, of whom one has been baptized in the Catholic Church or received into it, while the other is unbaptized, entered into without previous dispensation by the local Ordinary, is invalid.

3. The Church, taking into account the nature and circumstances of times, places and persons, is prepared to dispense from both impediments, provided there is a just cause.

4. To obtain from the local Ordinary dispensation from an impediment, the Catholic party shall declare that he is ready to remove dangers of falling away from the faith. He is also gravely bound to make a sincere promise to do all in his power to have all the children baptized and brought up in the Catholic Church.

5. At an opportune time the non-Catholic party must be informed of these promises which the Catholic party has to make, so that it is clear that he is cognisant of the promise and obligation on the part of the Catholic.

6. Both parties are to be clearly instructed on the ends and essential properties of marriage, not to be excluded by either party.

⁷ ASS 57 (1965), pp. 90-112.

⁸ ASS 58 (1966), pp. 929-946.

7. Within its own territorial competence, it is for the Bishops' Conference to determine the way in which these declarations and promises, which are always required, shall be made: whether by word of mouth alone, in writing, or before witnesses; and also to determine what proof of them there should be in the external forum, and how they are to be brought to the knowledge of the non-Catholic party, as well as to lay down whatever other requirements may be opportune.

8. The canonical form is to be used for contracting mixed marriages, and is required for validity, without prejudice, however, to the provisions of the Decree *Crescens Matrimoniorum* published by the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Churches on 22nd February, 1967.⁹

9. If serious difficulties stand in the way of observing the canonical form, local Ordinaries have the right to dispense from the canonical form in any mixed marriage; but the Bishops' Conference is to determine norms according to which the said dispensation may be granted licitly and uniformly within the region or territory of the Conference, with the provision that there should always be some public form of ceremony.

10. Arrangements must be made that all validly contracted marriages be diligently entered in the books prescribed by canon law. Priests responsible should make sure that non-Catholic ministers also assist in recording in their own books the fact of a marriage with a Catholic.

Episcopal Conferences are to issue regulations determining, for their region or territory, a uniform method by which a marriage that has been publicly contracted after a dispensation from the canonical form was obtained, is registered in the books prescribed by canon law.

11. With regard to the liturgical form of the celebration of a mixed marriage, if it is to be taken from the Roman Ritual, use must be made of the ceremonies in the *Rite of Celebration of Marriage* promulgated by our authority, whether it is a question of a marriage between a Catholic and a baptized non-Catholic (39-54) or of a mar-

⁹ Cf. AAS 59 (1967), p. 166.

riage between a Catholic and a unbaptized person (55-66). If, however, the circumstances justify it, a marriage between a Catholic and a baptized non-Catholic can be celebrated, subject to the local Ordinary's consent, according to the rites for the celebration of marriage within Mass (19-38), while respecting the prescription of general law with regard to Eucharistic Communion.

12. The Episcopal Conferences shall inform the Apostolic See of all decisions which, within their competence, they make concerning mixed marriages.

13. The celebration of marriage before a Catholic priest or deacon and a non-Catholic minister, performing their respective rites together, is forbidden; nor is it permitted to have another religious marriage ceremony before or after the Catholic ceremony, for the purpose of giving or renewing matrimonial consent.

14. Local Ordinaries and parish priests shall see to it that the Catholic husband or wife and the children born of a mixed marriage do not lack spiritual assistance in fulfilling their duties of conscience. They shall encourage the Catholic husband or wife to keep ever in mind the divine gift of the Catholic faith and to bear witness to it with gentleness and reverence, and with a clear conscience.¹⁰ They are to aid the married couple to foster the unity of their conjugal and family life, a unity which, in the case of Christians, is based on their baptism too. To these ends it is to be desired that those pastors should establish relationships of sincere openness and enlightened confidence with ministers of other religious communities.

15. The penalties decreed by canon 2319 of the Code of Canon Law are all abrogated. For those who have already incurred them the effects of those penalties cease, without prejudice to the obligations mentioned in number 4 of these norms.

16. The local Ordinary is able to give a "sanatio in radice" of a mixed marriage, when the conditions spoken of in numbers 4 and 5 of these norms have been fulfilled, and provided that the conditions of law are observed.

¹⁰ Cf. *I Peter* 3:16.

17. In the case of a particular difficulty or doubt with regard to the application of these norms, recourse is to be made to the Holy See.

We order that what we have decreed in this Letter, given in the form of "Motu Proprio", be regarded as established and ratified, notwithstanding any measure to the contrary, and is to take effect from the first day of October of this year.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's the thirty-first day of March in the year 1970, the seventh of our pontificate.

Paulus pp. vi

DOCUMENTATION

PONTIFICAL BULLS

Most Rev. Francisco Cruces, D.D.

PAULUS EPISCOPUS SERVUS SERVORUM DEI

venerabili fratri FRANCISCO CRUCES, adhuc Episcopo titulo Tambeaensi, ad cathedralem Sedem Ilaganensem translato, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Munere fungentibus supremi Ecclesiae pastoris id in primis summopere cordi est, ut conditis recens dioecesis accommode provideamus, peridoneis delectis repunctiatisque Episcopis. Dioecesi ideo Ilaganensi, die tricesimo primo mensis ianuarii, hoc ipso anno, conditae per apostolicas litteras "Quia urget", cum talis esset sacer Praesul dandus qualem eius condicio postulat, visum est Nobis posse Te, venerabilis frater, huiusmodi onere et officio cumulari, rerum pastoralium quam qui maxime peritum. De sententia igitur venerabilis fratris Nostri S.R.E. Cardinalis, qui est Sacrae Congregationis pro Episcopis Praefectus, deque apostolica Nostra potestate vinculo Te solvimus prioris Sedis titulo Tambeaensis et ad cathedralem Ecclesiam ILAGANENSEM gubernandam transferimus, datis iuribus officiisque impositis congruis. Ab iteranda autem catholicae fidei professione Te eximimus; ius vero iurandum dabis fidelitatis erga Nos et Successores Nostros, ante quem vis Episcopum, qui sit sinceris fidei vinculis cum Apostolica hac Sede coniunctus, formulamque iuxta quam iuraveris ad Sacram Congregationem pro Episcopis quam primum mittes, de more signatam sigilloque impressam. Mandamus praeterea ut hae litterae Nostrae clero atque populo in cathedrali dioecesis tuae templo legantur, primo post eas acceptas die recurrente festo de praecepto. Quos dilectos filios paterne monemus, ut non solum Te libenter accipiant, verum etiam mandatis tuis pareant, pastoralibusque faveant coeptis, quae danda ineundave esse censueris. Fac denique, venerabilis frater, ex Dei vocatu gregis eius factus pastor et pater, id cogites praecipue, id agas ut gravis tua dignitas munusque sacrum postulant. Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum, die quarto mensis martii, anno Domini millesimo nongentesimo septuagesimo, Pontificatus Nostri septimo. — J.T. —

Aloisius Card. Traglia
S.R.E. Cancellarius

Franciscus Tinello
Apostolicam Cancellariam Regens
Expedita die XI Apr. anno Pontif. VII
M. Orsini Plumbator

✠ Josephus Rossi, Epis. Palmyren.,
Proton. Apost.
Josephus Massimi, Proton. Apost.
In Canc. Ap. tab. VOL. CXXXV N.17

PAULUS EPISCOPUS SERVUS SERVORUM

AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM. Quia urget Christi iussum praedicandi Evangelium omni creaturae. (cf. Mc., 16, 15), neque tamen id ulla ratione consequitur Ecclesia sancta apte, nisi sacramentum divinae praedicationis excipiant nationes per finium dispositionem ceterarumque rerum ordinem atque distributionem, idcirco id semper in officiis Nostris praecipuum duximus munus, quo et dioeceses novas condimus, et conditas in aptiorem, si res poscat, formam redigimus. Quam ob rem, cum venerabiles fratres Theodulfus Domingo et Subugal, Episcopus Tuguegaraoanus, atque Saverius Julius Labayen, Episcopus titulo Sinnuaritanus et Praelatus Infantensis, ante audita Episcoporum Philippinorum conferentia, ut dicunt, ab hac Apostolica Sede petierint ut, diviso suarum Ecclesiarum territorio, nova exinde crearetur dioecesis, Nos, venerabilibus fratribus sententiam rogatis Carmelo Rocco, Archiepiscopo titulo Justinianopolitano in Galatia atque Apostolico Nuntio in Insulis Philippinis, ac S.R.E. Cardinalibus Sacrae Congregationi pro Episcopis praepositis, haec statuimus. Ab Ecclesiis Tuguegaraoana atque Infantensi partem detrahimus provinciae Isabellae cuiusque propriam — huius pars comprehendit paroeciam vulgo Palanam —, ac novam dioecesim condimus, ILAGANENSEM appellandam, quae fines eosdem habeat quos provincia Isabella iuxta legem civilem; quam sane Sedi Novae Segobiae suffraganeam facimus. Sedem episcopalem in urbe Ilagan statui censemus, cathedram vero in templo S. Ferdinandi, in eadem urbe, factis scilicet iuribus atque oneribus talibus aedibus propriis. Decernimus praeterea ut in nova Ecclesia Cathedrale Canonicorum Collegium constitutur per alias Litteras apostolicas. Interea tamen eligat Episcopus coetum Consultorum dioecesanorum, quorum consilio utatur. Mensam episcopalem constituent tum Curiae emolumenta, tum bona, si qua sunt, quae novae circumscriptioni obveniant, tum fidelium christianorum collationes. Ad Seminarium quod attinet, condant illud Episcopus ad normam legum sacri Dicasterii pro Institutione Catholica, iuris communis, atque Decreti "Optatam totius" Concilii Vaticani II. Cum praeterea iuvenes clerici ad aetatem pervenerint qua philosophia ac theologia imbui debeant, qui fuerint optimi Romam mittantur, in Pontificium Collegium Seminarium Philippinum. Iubemus etiam ut harum Litterarum praescriptionibus ad effectum adductis, Sacerdotes illi, qui in novae dioecesis territorio aut officium aut beneficium habeant, ei addicantur, tamquam proprius clerus; cetera tum clericis tum Seminaris tirones, ei in qua legitime degant. Documenta tandem et acta, quae novae Sedis vel clericos vel laicos respiciant, ad eius Curiam mittantur, ibique in archivio custodiantur. Ceterum, quae mandavimus, exsequi curabit venerabilis frater Carmelus Rocco, quem memoravimus, vel quem ipse legaverit, factis nempe necessariis facultatibus. Re vero acta, documenta exarentur atque sinceris exemplis ad Sacram Congregationem pro Episcopis cito mittantur. Hanc autem Constitutionem nunc et in posterum efficacem esse et fore

volumus, contrariis minime obstantibus, etiam speciali mentione dignis. Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum, die uno et tricesimo mensis Ianuarii, anno Domini millesimo nongentesimo septuagesimo, Pontificatus Nostri septimo. — J.T. —

Aloisius Card. Traglia
S.R.E. Cancellarius

Franciscus Tinello
Apostolicam Cancellariam Regens
Expedita die XVIII Apr. a. Pontif. VII
M. Orsini Plumbator

Carolus Card. Confalonieri
S. Congr. pro Episcopis Praefectus.
Josephus Del Ton, Proton. Apost.
Eugenius Levi, Proton. Apost.
In Canc. Ap. tab. VOL. CXXXV N. 11

APOSTOLIC NUNCIATURE
Manila — Philippines
N. 6103

March 19, 1970

Your Excellency:

Herewith, I am pleased to enclose the letter Port. N. 523/69, dated March 10, 1970 of the Sacred Congregation for the Discipline of the Sacraments addressed to you with the document regarding some norms on the celebration of the mass of Holy Thursday.

If possible, the same S. Congregation noted, the Holy Father desires that these norms are to be used for the coming Holy Week.

With sentiments of fraternal esteem and kind regards, I am

Cordially yours in Christ,

(Sgd.) ✠ CARMINE ROCCO
Apostolic Nuncio

Encl. a/s
H.E. Msgr. Teopisto Alberto, D.D.
President, Catholic Bishops Conference
of the Philippines

**SACRA CONGREGATIO
DE SACRAMENTIS**

Romae, die 10 Martii 1970

De mandato Ss.mi Domini Nostri Pauli Papae VI Congregatio haec quasdam confecit normas quoad Missae celebrationem atque concelebrationem feria V in Cena Domini.

Honori mihi est documentum Tibi remittere pro norma istius Conferentiae Episcopalis cui Excellentia Tua praeest.

Haec dum renuntio, quo par est obsequio, me libenter profiteor
Excellentiae Tuae Reverendissimae,

add.mum

(Sgd.) ANTONIUM CARD. SAMORÉ
Praefect

Excellentissimo Domino
Praesidi Conferentiae Episcopalis
in INSULIS PHILIPPINIS
(cum adnexo)

**SACRA CONGREGATIO
DE SACRAMENTIS****SACRA CONGREGATIO DE DISCIPLINA SACRAMENTORUM**

Diligenti examini subiectis plurium Ordinariorum precibus, qui ab hac Sacra Congregatione petierunt ut facilius redderetur participatio Celebrationi eucharisticae, feria V in Cena Domini, ad Communionem paschalem eo die sumendam, haec Sacra Congregatio, de mandato Ss.mi Domini Nostri Pauli Papae VI, ea quae sequuntur statuit:

1. Ubi ratio pastoralis id postulet, loci Ordinarius permittere poterit ut, praeter Missam principalem "In Cena Domini," altera Missa celebrari valeat, horis vespertinis, in ecclesiis aut oratoriis publici et semipublicis. In casu autem verae necessitatis, concedere poterit ut haec Missa etiam horis matutinis celebretur sed tantummodo pro fidelibus, qui nullo modo Missam vespertinam participare valeant; caveatur tamen ne huiusmodi celebrationes in bonum privatorum fiant, et ne praeiudicio sint Missae vespertinae principali.

2. Sacerdotes, qui in Missa chrismatis aut ad utilitatem fidelium iam celebraverint, denuo concelebrare valent in Missa vespertina.

Datum Romae, die 10 Martii 1970.

DOCTRINAL SECTION

IS CHRISTIAN ETHICS OUT-MODED?*

Fr. Jesus Diaz, O.P.

The world of today is very much confused about many things. It is confused about its youth, it is confused about its own development, it is confused about its ideologies and the conflicting solutions that are offered for its ills. Voices are raised all over, loud certainly, but not always clear, about injustices and inequalities that should have disappeared decades ago. Protests are issued, demonstrations are formed, and riots not infrequent. Modern man hardly knows where to turn — there is confusion all over. And not the least of these areas of confusion is the field of ethics and of morality. Even here, it is as if man has lost his moorings and has been set adrift.

That the confusion exists about almost everything should not surprise us. Mankind has suddenly entered in a world of rapid change, and the circumstances of stability and permanence that used to surround mankind in the ages past have gone — perhaps forever. Man's psychology has not yet quite adjusted to the new world of change he now lives in — a world of transient trends and of disposables, world where new discoveries are obsolete before they can even filter down to the majority of mankind, a world for which the moon was once "a veneer of sheerest Venus in the planks of time", but for which the moon is now a next-door neighbor, twice visited and explored, and now subjected to the intensest scientific scrutiny.

Address before the Manila Medical Society at the New Chinese General Hospital & Medical Center on December 7, 1969.

Change: Today's By-Word

Change is the by-word of the world today, for practically everything we come in touch with changes. There is little need to emphasize this to you, as scientific professionals since you are more acutely aware of it than I could ever be. And with this constant change has come a certain and inevitable disrespect and suspicion of authority — at least as it existed in the academic and scientific circles of some decades past, and for centuries before. After all, it was not really eons ago that the authority of a Galen was so strong he was the only recognized medical authority for close to ten centuries and where to deviate from his thinking was simply unthinkable. And yet, today, the only authority left, say in the medical profession, is the authority of scientific demonstration, the authority of validly collected statistics, the authority of frequency curves, the authority of an experimentally reproducible fact.

Mankind has been shaken to its very roots by this overwhelming revolution of the world he inhabits. And psychologically, he has come to accept the idea that all things change, that there is nothing immutable, that what does not change is necessarily obsolete, that what has been there for some time is no longer applicable or useful, that there is no longer any real authority, least of all, infallible authority.

It is with this psychology and with this expectation that we react to the norms of morality, to the ethics of Christianity, which have guided our actions from our earliest youth. We expect to see change there too, in the ethical rules as well as in the official proponent of those ethical norms, the Church. We expect to see this change — we sometimes call it by another name and say we expect adaptation — not only in the externals of the Church, but also in its fundamental doctrines, just as we have seen the changes transform our most cherished notions of physiology and pathology into complex and ever expanding ideas of biology and disease. For ages past, churches have been built in a traditional form, the liturgy of the Mass has been consultant, the ceremonials of the church unchanging. Suddenly our church buildings are circular, or triangular, the Mass is in the vernacular, the vestments are changed, and the ceremonials evolving so rapidly we may be having difficulty keeping up with the latest innovations. All these changes, with reason, perhaps,

in a desire to adapt to the changing patterns of life and society. But the trouble is, we somehow expect these changes too, in the doctrines of the church, and expect the church to modify its stand on moral issues to make them more consonant with the present conditions of mankind — in short, to get the church to adapt to the world, not the world to adapt to the Church.

The psychological frame of mind that leads us to this expectation goes beyond this mere expectation. We tend to apply to ethics and to morality all the adaptations we have made in our own lives and minds to cope with the changes that have engulfed us. We begin, for instance, to confuse statistics with morality, and to think that the moral norm can be found and established, and be made to conform, to the statistically determined behavior of mankind. Because we are conditioned to think of what is moral in the physical world in terms of the statistically established normals, we expect the norms of morality to be established also in consonance with the statistically established pattern of human behavior. The reasoning process goes: If everybody does such a thing, then there could not possibly be anything wrong with such a thing.

Morality By Consensus

We tend to think that we can arrive at morality by consensus. This is, of course, an outgrowth of the democratic system and of government by consensus. What laws are established in society for the governance of its citizens is arrived at by consensus, or by agreement of the majority. Subconsciously we seek the same process in the establishment of the norms of conduct in the moral sphere, so that for instance, if a sufficient majority of Catholics opt for the use of contraception, then contraception should be accepted within the licit means allowed by the Church. And when one man stands alone to proclaim the doctrine, even if he be vested with all the authority of the Heavens, he is questioned if he enunciates rules which the majority or not even a majority, but only a sufficiently vocal minority that is loud enough to make it sound like a majority — do not accept or even only wish could be disregarded. And because the rules do not conform to what we want, we denounce as out-moded, out-dated, obsolete, antique, or what-have-you, whatever it is we do not want to accept.

Furthermore, we tend to confuse expediency with morality. We are faced today with situations we have never had to face before, either because the situations are new, or because the technology of our times have brought the situations into bold relief and given us an awareness of them we have not had before. The urgency of these problems demand immediate attention, they cry out for solutions—and we envisage disaster if we fail to meet the challenges they provide. When solutions are proposed, they are necessarily considered in terms of the urgency of the problems faced, and the most expedient are given the primary consideration. If a moral issue arises, and ethical objections present themselves to the implementation of a solution, we expect a change again, not in the solutions offered, but in the ethical rules that should govern our actions. We expect the rules to bend so that we might utilize the means we find most expedient. We present the Church with all the economic, political, psychological, medical, sociological, etc., reasons why one particular line of action should be taken, and expect her to modify her ethical rules to make that possible. In short, we ask the Church to draw moral conclusions from non-moral premises, a feat at the same time impossible and ridiculous. This is what is happening in the problem of the population explosion.

Natural Law: Its Notion

We also tend to ignore and disregard what we find difficult to understand, as if by disregarding it, the thing would go away by itself. Few of us have the preparation, or even the inclination and willingness, to understand the notion of the natural law and the application that the Church makes of the natural law in the area of ethical behavior. And because we find difficulty in comprehending it, we disregard it as inapplicable and indemonstrable. Suddenly, it is no longer enough to be told that such a thing is as it is. Suddenly, we want to know why this is so, and if we do not understand it, we do not accept it. Again, this is an outgrowth of our modern system of so-called enlightened behavior. It is well and good to desire and expect that men should understand the why and the wherefore of things, and whenever possible we should strive for this understanding. But we cannot draw from this

the conclusion that what we fail to understand does not hold, particularly when we do not have the time, inclination or means to really understand.

Unfortunately, in this modern world of professionalization, there are professionals whose capacity we question. We question them not as individuals but as a group, while paradoxically, we accept implicitly whatever another group of professionals maintain. No one could dream, in our day, of leaving the control and manipulation of atomic energy to the ordinary lay person who has had no specialized training in nuclear physics. Only the most unenlightened would go today for medical advice to the herb-doctor—most of us would insist on a qualified physician, perhaps even on a specialist. No one would dream of establishing large corporations without experienced and trained businessmen at the helm. We do realize that as the world becomes more complex and sophisticated, the more specialized the preparation required of the professional involved. In most things, that is, except religion and politics. Just as we all tend to consider ourselves experts in politics, we also consider ourselves self-sufficient in matters of religion. In these two areas, and perhaps in a few others, we have reached the point where we tend to look upon one opinion as good as the next one. We do not require—or even acknowledge the need for—the specialization, the scholarship, the training, of the professional theologian and philosopher whose entire life has been dedicated to the study of these matters. In religion and ethics, the boundary-line between the amateur and the professional is blurred in the minds of many, and all opinions and ideas are just as valid.

Ethical Principles

Not only do we tend to disregard what we find difficult to understand in religion, we also tend to misunderstand many of the ethical principles that are meant to govern our behavior. Two outstanding examples of this lack of understanding and perspective that has thrown the rules out of context are the question of the Christian conscience and the doctrine of love. We are saturated today with the doctrine that the ultimate guideline for ethical action is the Christian conscience, and

well it is. And we might add, the catechism has always taught this in the past. But in the emphasis that is given to the individual conscience as the ultimate guide, the imperative of a well-formed conscience is obscured. The emphasis is rather on the reliance that must be, or can be given to the individual conscience. Conscience is a reasoned judgment on the goodness or badness of an individual action about to be performed, and how fallible, we are known, our reason can be at times. The great Jesuit Karl Rahner chides confessors who are fond of telling their penitents to follow their own conscience with the thought that they are doing so "as if the penitent were not precisely asking, and rightly asking, which of the thousand voices of his conscience is the authentic voice of God." After all, as he points out, it is not before our consciences, but before God, that we are ultimately responsible. He added the following very pertinent observation: "and when is the voice of God more easy to recognize than when He speaks through the mouth of His Church? It is indeed only when the judgment of conscience coincides with this word that one can be sure of hearing truly the voice of conscience rather than the voice of one's own culpable self-deception."

The fallibility of the human mind, particularly when it must consider something which involves the person himself is well known. It was this fallibility that the great poet and Christian T.S. Eliot referred when he wrote his "Thoughts after Lambeth," and commanded on the resolution on contraception adapted by the Anglican Church. He wrote, "I regret . . . that the bishops have placed so much reliance on the individual conscience. Certainly, anyone who is sincere and pure in heart may seek for guidance from the Holy Spirit; but who of us is always sincere, especially where the most imperative of instincts may be strong enough to simulate to perfection the voice of the Holy Spirit?" Unperturbed by those warnings, we continue to proclaim today the dominance of the individual conscience and underscore the explicit teaching of the Church.

Doctrine of Love

The other fallacy we have run into is a certain emotionalism expressed as the doctrine of Christian love. This thinking has been

expressed by many in different forms. One says: "There is a decisive norm that is valid for all human conduct—the norm of open and generous love." Love of God and love of fellow-men for the love of God is sufficient, it is said, as an ultimate guideline for moral action. Perhaps the idea is well summarized in a dictum of St. Augustine taken out of context. He says: "Love, and do what you will." Translated to concrete and contemporary human situations, this is what led one priest to say of the poverty and destitution of the slums: "Surely, God did not mean to have his creatures live this way." If they have nowhere else to turn, let them turn on contraception."

Unfortunately, this expression of the doctrine of Christian love is out of context. It is incomplete without bearing in mind what Christ Himself said about the love for Him and for His Father. "If you love Me, keep My commandments," the Gospel relates. And St. Paul himself completes this by adding: "Love is the fulfillment of the law." It is only in this sense, in this context, that the love of God as a guideline for moral action can have meaning and can be understood. If there is love, that love is expressed in the fulfillment of the commandments. There can be no fulfillment outside of these norms.

Questions on Authority

And finally, the truly regrettable fact is that we have contributed to our own confusion, because the Church itself does not present the solidarity, the unanimity that might be expected of it, and that one might hope for. There are elements of dissent within the very Church. There are questions raised concerning authority. There is defiance of doctrine and of the magisterium, in proportions that might well constitute a crisis. And what is the layman to think and to do if he does not see in his own pastors the example of union and submission that is expected of him? He is told one thing, and he sees another. And his confusion is compounded all the more.

It is not surprising, therefore, that man today is confused concerning the moral principles that must guide his action. It is not surprising that he finds himself lost, without a sense of direction, without a point of

reference, without an ethical foot-hold on which to stand. He has been dizzied by the heights to which he has attained, and it will be a little while before the world stops spinning around him and he recovers his sense of perspective.

Man has to come to the realization that there are things that do not change, just as he has had to move from the position that nothing changes to accept the fact that some things do. He must draw the distinction in his mind between physics and metaphysics, and learn to accept both things for what they are. He must realize that just as the physical world around him is in a process of constant change, and that just as his own physical being is in constant change the spiritual world around him does not and cannot really change, just as his own spiritual being is permanent. Only through this recognition and acceptance of both worlds will he be able once more to re-establish his own direction in this life towards the next.

The problem is, in the last analysis, not whether Christian ethics is out-moded. The problem is, rather, whether man has somehow lost his way. When he finds himself again, the original question will appear for what it is: a contradiction in terms.

THE SITUATION OF THE CHURCH AFTER THE SYNOD

At the close of the year 1969, the Christian Centre of Patrons and French business directors welcomed Cardinal Danielou who had accepted an invitation to participate in an after-dinner discussion on the topics the situation of the Church after the Synod.

The Church of today must be present in ... contemporary civilization, she must not get lost in it—**Cardinal Danielou**

The period before the Synod was quite agitated and troubled. The events of last May were not without repercussions even within the Church. Last year we witnessed various movements of contestation, either by priests or laymen. The *Humanae Vitae* and the Profession of Faith of Pope Paul VI occasioned various reactions.

On the eve of the Synod, there was in the Church a situation of anxiety and expectation: people were asking themselves what the Synod would contribute in the face of this disturbance.

But the Synod proved to be a new starting point, not only with regard to the specific problems submitted to it, but also concerning the spirit it manifested, a spirit which appears as a sort of example for the entire Church.

In fact, on the eve of the Synod, people freely spoke of opposition between those who supported the democratization of the Church and those who were more faithful to its monarchical character. Moreover, one of these attitudes was supposed to be symbolized by Cardinal Suenens, and the other by Cardinal Danielou! All this was a sort of myth which seemed to presage spectacular confrontations.

Sense of Common Responsibility

From this point of view, those who were hoping for spectacular events were disappointed, for what actually happened in the Synod was something quite different. The Synod was a meeting of men endowed with the highest responsibility. It united around the Sovereign Pontiff the Presidents of the Episcopal Conferences and a certain number of other responsible persons appointed by the Holy Father. Above all there was a sense of common responsibility in the face of the immense tasks of the contemporary Church, and a very loyalty and sincerity in tackling the questions posed.

It is clear that the Church of today finds itself in the movement of contemporary civilization. She must be present in this movement but she must not get lost in it. Therein lies the whole problem.

An attitude of systematic opposition and rejection of all change would be a betrayal of the mission of the Church and of the representatives of Christ. On the other hand, to allow the very substance of the Faith to be eroded in our contemporaries would likewise be a betrayal.

What appeared to me essential in this Synod was the awareness of the common responsibility of the Sovereign Pontiff and the Bishops — an example, I believe, for all Christians. It was in the nature of an appeal to strive to overcome the partisan oppositions that paralyze the immense activity which the Church should exercise on the spiritual plane, and, in a general way, on the plane of civilization. These oppositions are a scandal to non-believers. Because of the very sense of these common and essential responsibilities, we are entering into a more constructive period.

The Synod must be the sign of a new step forward in this post-conciliar period which is distinguished by two factors: on the one hand, a constructive period, and on the other hand, unity between men and movements which can be legitimately different but which, nevertheless, must collaborate together in the accomplishment of a common task.

There were two categories of questions in the Synod: those about which we spoke and those about which we did not speak. The paradox is this: those about which we did not speak were the most important

ones in the final analysis, that is they were constantly present in the mind of the Synod members but as a sort of back-drop.

The Bishops frequently said that the problems tackled, problems of structure, were secondary in relation to the problems of life which were primary. Moreover, the Bishops put the Synod on its guard against the tendency — it was the Cardinal Archbishop of East Berlin who made the remark — a tendency all too frequent at the present time, of believing that the renewal of structures or the formation of new structures solves all the problems.

The Bishops pointed out that it was not sufficient to change structures. More fundamental problems existed, human problems, problems of attitudes which were more important than the problems of organization and structure properly so called.

What We Spoke About in the Synod

The essential theme of the Synod, therefore, was the organization of the collaboration between the Sovereign Pontiff and the whole Episcopate, the problem of primary and collegiality.

Two Concomitant, Fundamental Affirmations

First of all, there was a doctrinal problem. On this question the Bishops were agreed, namely, that we had to abide by what had been defined by Vatican Council I and II, that is to say, that there are two equally fundamental principles in the Church. On the one hand, there is the personal responsibility of the Bishop of Rome, successor of Peter, such as Vatican I had defined it and which was not questioned by any member of the Synod; on the other hand, Christ entrusted the responsibility of the Universal Church to the twelve Apostles united with Peter — this is the collegiality of Bishops, heirs of this responsibility.

There is a paradox here, namely, two supreme authorities, the Sovereign Pontiff personally, and all the Bishops united with the Sovereign Pontiff. But as often happens in Christian realities, we find ourselves in the presence of two affirmations which must be posed

at the same time and which cannot be limited or weakened in relation to each other.

I am thinking, for example, that when we say that Christ is true God and true Man, we have stated two truths whose close relationship or unity we do not clearly see, and which, nevertheless, must be simultaneously respected. Therefore, we have to admit that there are in the Church two fundamental principles as the summit of its structure. In this sense, it is important to say that any description of the Synod considered as a slight victory of collegiality over the authority of the primacy, or a slight victory of primacy over collegiality is a caricature.

A Church Adapted to its Times

Having said this, it is clear that the structure of the Church exists in a world beset with problems. It is also perfectly true to say that this structure has existed in a primitive Christian society, in a Byzantine and medieval *milieu*, in the 19th century, and exists in our own times. The Church of 1969 must be of its time. A collegiality — in the sense of a greater participation of everyone in all the responsibilities exercised today in all domains without exception — must also find a very legitimate expression within the Church, not in such a way as to change the structures, but in a manner that gives life to these structures in cooperation with contemporary man.

It is from this point of view that a greater participation of all the Bishops on the one hand, of all the priests on the other hand, and finally of all the laity in the responsibilities of the Church (without a confusion of competencies) constitutes precisely the authentic requirement of today. But one must not mix up the fundamental problems of structures — which are unalterable — and the manner in which these structures are exercised within a living human context where, in fact, they must take on different forms of expression.

This is the whole problem of the Church which is permanent in its essential elements and which, on the contrary, is contingent in its accidental elements. This is fundamental. We understand, then, that in the Church there is always the possibility of creating new situations whilst remaining faithful to the doctrine of the Church.

Having said this, once again, the Synod considered that a more thorough reflection on these questions was not its essential task. Its essential task was the practical implementation of collaboration between the Holy See on the one hand—that is to say, the Sovereign Pontiff and the various departments at his service, what we call the Roman Congregations, the Curia and, on the other hand, the Episcopal Conferences.

We are no longer involved here with theoretical problems. We are concerned with problems that are almost sordidly practical. That is to say, it is essentially a question of the mechanism of administration and, from this point of view, we can say that, well understood, the perspectives have come down from utopian principles into a world of concrete facts.

I myself was a *rapporteur* of one of the linguistic groups which were happily formed. Apart from the general assemblies, the Bishops met in linguistic groups: an Italian group, a Spanish group, two French groups, two English groups, and one German group.

Need to Modernize Administrative Structures

I was in one of the French groups with Cardinal Marty, some African Bishops, and a few Bishops of the Oriental Church. As *rapporteur* of this group, I was extremely interested when a recently appointed Cardinal presented the legitimate complaints which Bishops were making against the Roman Curia. I am in perfect agreement with this: the Roman Curia is a rather old-fashioned administration from many points of view, and is terribly in need of reform. It is essentially a question of the technical problem of organization. This is important, for if an organization does not function well, it can give rise to fundamental problems. We became aware of this especially during the Synod: the modernization of the methods of the Curia is particularly urgent and important.

From this point of view, what seems to me very important in this Synod was essentially the practical implementation of the decisions of Vatican Council II.

Concerning these questions of Church structure, it is evident that other problems have arisen at the present time, which affect not only the Universal Church, but also the National Churches. The re-adjustment of ecclesial structures for adaptation to modern sociological situations is fundamental — everywhere.

At all levels, there is a certain realism, a certain common sense which should prompt us to take into account the present situations of the contemporary world, so that the Church may give its attention to vital points, and not find itself cast aside on the fringe of this society about to be constructed.

What We did Not Speak About

Apart from matters about which we spoke, there were other matters about which we did not speak, but which, however, were in the background of the questions treated. In fact, several Cardinals and Bishops intervened to say: "In as much as the world is in great expectation, the Synod should not be concerned only with problems of interior structure and be indifferent to the dramatic problems the Church faces today in its confrontation with the contemporary world."

Here, I shall simply indicate a few guidelines for study. It is clear that the problems concerning the Faith, that is, those which constitute for a Christian the primary and essential matter, are confronted at the present time with a very serious contestation linked to the evolution of contemporary culture.

Confront the Contemporary World

The Faith of the Christian today must face up to everything in the contemporary world that represents the cultural changes of our times. I am thinking here of all the progress made in scientific research, and more so in human sciences — sociology, psychology, psycho-analysis — which affect the very core of man and intelligence much more intimately than the sciences of the physical and biological world.

Man has the impression that he is beginning to conquer the cosmic destinies to which he had been subjected. This gives him a sort of

boundless confidence in his capabilities: he wonders if it is not more worthy of him to solve his own problems himself rather than seek external help or help from God, from whom he thinks he can free himself.

All these problems arise from the nature of modern man's evolution. The obsession to construct human society causes spiritual problems, contemplation and prayer to be regarded as evasions, even by many Christians today.

The immense forces of contestation of Faith form part of the very structure in which we are immersed. We should face up to these forces calmly and without any inferiority complex, for we cannot but be concerned with a certain weakening of the fundamental elements of Faith, of the spiritual life, and in a general way, of the religious man.

It is evident that the Synod could not but have this problem in the background of its discussions, and that this problem still remains today.

What does a Christian believe today? The troubles of many people, the problems raised by the catechism and by the various new theological expressions show that this is a vital question. It is evident that this problem must be tackled in the same spirit as the one I have alluded to above, that is, we should be concerned to integrate all the values of today's civilization—all forms of progress in modern science have very positive factors—but at the same time, we have to confront whatever is not positive and which constitutes, on the contrary, a perversion of intelligence and of mankind.

Moreover, there is a magnificent confrontation today with regard to all modern trends. But the Faith of Christians must be sufficiently implanted, sufficiently young and living, so that it can face these forces without allowing itself to be contaminated by them, and that it may, on the contrary, and as I hope, plant in this technical civilization the Cross of Christ, without which this civilization would not be Christian. Here you have an essential problem which could inspire our young people today. Let us not have an inferiority complex in matters that are not of the modern world. We have a deep love for this world, for

all its positive aspects, but we do not love it in its perversion, in its lack of all morality, in its loss of the sense of God. We wish to defend it against the poisons that could prevent it from fulfilling its purpose.

This is what was in the background of the preoccupations of the Council and the Synod. It is something essential.

...in a Spirit of Faith

And this leads us to the question: What is a Christian of 1969? Is a Christian one who goes to Mass or one who fights in the underground forces of South America?

Today we have images of the Christian that end up by presenting a fan of so many different expressions that we finally get lost in them. What finally runs the risk of becoming jeopardized is a certain unity of what is specifically the Christian spirit. What are the Beatitudes? What does it mean to be a poor man in 1969? What does hunger after justice mean?

Two points are fundamental. In the first place, we know how it is essential that the message of the Gospel be expressed through the forms of life of contemporary man. An industrial or a common labourer, as well as a contemplative or a priest must bring the Christian salt to the world, but how is one to express the spirit of the Gospel within the real context of situations lived? Christians must make researches on these points. In this sense, certain forms of temporal commitment, for example, appear as the expressions of authenticity and charity even today, that is, a concern for the temporal, as well as the spiritual welfare of one's neighbor.

But in the second place, it is evident that we sense here certain basic threats for the whole Christian life. A Christian who does not pray is no longer a Christian, no matter how much he dedicates himself to social or trade union movements.

At the present time, the Christian is inclined to reduce Christianity to a certain type of social or political commitment. This social or political engagement is a duty of the layman and a duty of the Christian

layman. But if it separated from prayer, then it will very quickly and inevitably cease to be genuinely Christian. When this happens, the Christian will no longer be distinguished from any other man of our times, for, after all, it is not necessary to be a Christian in order to devote oneself to one's neighbor. Only Christians can give a spiritual dimension to their activity, on condition that this activity be linked to Christ.

Therein lies the Christian's authentic contribution to the world of today. If Christians do not understand this, then the salt loses its flavour and deserves to be cast into the garbage can.

The Danger of Moral Looseness

Certain forms of crises are characterized by what I would call the Atlantic countries, that is, countries of long-standing Christianity. These countries are going through the crisis of an old organism that must be renewed. Countries recently converted to Christianity — I am thinking here especially of the extraordinary role played by the African Bishops in the Synod — can contribute a great deal in this domain. We do indeed run the risk of perishing from the looseness that characterizes our consumer society. The great problem is that we should be able to overcome this looseness, that is, to show that liberty does not necessarily entail degradation and loss, and that men can be free without abusing freedom.

I would hope that our western Christian world could demonstrate this and create a civilization capable of stimulating the enthusiasm of young people, for which enthusiasm they would willingly fight and if necessary — surrender their life.

In the spirit of liberty upon which our society rests, there is a principle which conforms more to the dignity of man than the principle of discipline imposed from without and which, therefore, crushes initiatives. But again, we should demonstrate that liberty is susceptible of creating a world worthy of stimulating enthusiasm.

(to be continued.)

NOTES AND COMMENTS

MIXED PRIESTLY TRAINING

IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY AND THE MAGISTERIUM

An appraisal of certain disastrous reforms in Seminary education which boast of "inventing" today experience that have failed yesterday.

• **JESUS MA. CAVANNA, C.M.**

(continued)

POSTSCRIPT

I am very grateful to a good friend of mine who did not hesitate to confide me his misgivings regarding the adverse reactions of many to my previous study concerning mixed priestly training. He told me frankly that "some are going to criticize my ideas as old fashioned, Trent-inspired, etc." I only hope the phrase "Trent-inspired" is not said in a sarcastic tone. For any orthodox Catholic, Trent has as much elaborations of self-styled proponents of a "modern theology".

Some of these "modern theologians," according to my friend, averred that "things have changed and must change. The experience of centuries — for them — has no validity against modern trends." This may be true in many cases: what was valid in the past may have no relevance to the present. However, we must be careful about a reckless "relativism" which tends to deny the changeless principles of science and, particularly, of faith. True, we have made meteoric leaps in technology. But one thing, among others, has not changed: human nature. Its physiological and psychological drives, function and aspirations; its inordinate passions — corollaries of original sin; the *basic* pedagogical norms for educating the adolescent and the youth in the formation of sterling character and, still more, in the attainment of a genuine Christian and priestly holiness. All these do not change; they remain the same — in the Middle Ages as in our own contemporary technology.

oriented society. Hence, we can and should learn something from history, if we are to avoid future blunders. "History," it is said, "is the mistress of life."

My friend further informed me that the advocates of a mixed priestly training may possibly point out that such is the system used by Protestants and Moslems whose *married* ministers turn out to be "fairly good men, dedicated to God and close to the people in *all kinds* of civic activities". Protestant ministers were usually educated in regular colleges or universities; some took theological and philosophical courses, but always living a mixed life with their people. Moslem spiritual leaders were not subjected to a closed training, segregated from the world, as that of our Seminaries. They are chosen from among the people. This system which has worked well for the ministers of other religions, why would it not work well for our Catholic priests of today? Is there anything wrong with that system of priestly training?

The objection at first sight seems to have some value; but its fallacy can be soon detected. First, let it be noted that there is a great (we should say, *immense, essential*) difference between the Catholic *Priesthood*, and the religious *ministry* of Protestants and Moslems. Strictly speaking, Protestant *pastors* and Moslem *imams* are *not* real priests, since these *ministers* lack the "typically priestly function of *sacrifice*".¹ Hence, to establish a comparison between Catholic *priests* and Protestant or Moslem *ministers* seems to be inadequate. But let us overlook this difference and take a closer view of the comparison presented as an objection to our Seminary type of education for the candidates to the Priesthood.

If Catholic priests were to limit their ministry to leading in communal prayers and singing, reading and explaining the Bible or the Koran, officiating at initiation rites, wedding ceremonies or funerals, and offering some guidance and counseling now and then; if they would be able to fix certain "office hours", instead of being on the beck and call 24 hours a day, rain or shine; if they were not bound to such heroic holiness as to profess *consecrated celibacy*, in order to remain, like

¹ cf. *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967, Vol. XI, pp. 766-767: *Priest and Priesthood*.

Christ — whose supreme and eternal Priesthood they share — “totally dedicated to the service of God and men”²... then, I would say, our Seminaries are superfluous! Many of our zealous lay apostles (especially in the case of married deacons) can lead the worshipping people as well as any Protestant or Moslem minister. Many of our good Catholic Actionists actually turn out — without any Seminary training — “fairly good men in the apostolic ministry, dedicated to God and close to the people in civic activities”, as the spiritual leaders of other religions. But obviously they cannot offer the Holy Sacrifice, forgive sins, administer the last Sacraments: they are not *priests*, “Christ’s servants, stewards entrusted with the mysteries of God”,³

The Sacramental character of the Catholic Priesthood demands a greater holiness of life, both interior and exterior, than that of the laity,⁴ and even of the religious state.⁵ It demands the “HEROISM of a unique and limitless love for Christ the Lord and for His Church”, “modeled on the *total and exclusive* dedication of Christ to His mission of salvation”,⁶ so as to attain “even in the practical field, the maximum efficiency and the best disposition of mind, psychologically and effectively, for the continuous exercise of a perfect charity. This charity will permit him to spend himself *wholly* for the welfare of all, in a fuller and more concrete way (2 Cor. 12,15). It also guarantees him obviously a greater freedom and flexibility in the pastoral ministry, in his active and loving presence in the world.”⁷ “Like Christ Himself, His minister is *wholly and solely* intent on the things of God and the Church (c.f. Lk.2, 49; I Cor. 7, 32-33), and he imitates the great High Priest who stands in the presence of God ever living to intercede in our favor...; and he recognizes (through the devout recitation of the Divine Office) the necessity of continuing his diligence at prayer, which is the profoundly *priestly occupation* (Acts 6,4).”⁸

² cf. Pauli Pp. VI, Encycl. SACERDOTALIS CAELIBATUS, n. 21.

³ I Cor. 4, 1.

⁴ cf. C.I.C., can. 124.

⁵ cf. S.Th.Aq., *Summ. Theol.*, 2,2, q. 184, a.8.

⁶ cf. Pauli Pp. VI, *op. cit.*, n. 25

⁷ *Ibid.*, n. 32

⁸ *Ibid.*, n. 28

This high degree of holiness and its consequent HEROIC AND LIFELONG demands, in particular that of *consecrated celibacy* evidently cannot be attained without a *very special* and "adequate formation" that "should harmoniously coordinate grace and nature."⁹ "The young candidates for the priesthood should convince themselves that they *could not follow this difficult way* (of life) *without a special type of asceticism, more demanding than that required of all the other faithful, and which is proper to themselves.* It will be a demanding asceticism but not a suffocating one, which consists in the deliberate and assiduous practice of those virtues which make a man a priest: self-denial in the highest degree... (Mt. 16, 24; Jn. 12, 25); humility and obedience...; prudence, justice, courage and temperance...; a sense of responsibility, of fidelity and of loyalty in the acceptance of one's obligations; a balance between contemplation and action; detachment and a spirit of poverty...; chastity, the result of a persevering struggle, harmonized with all the other natural and supernatural virtues; a *serene and secure* contact with the world..."¹⁰

Cardinal Lavigerie, founder of the White Fathers missionaries of Africa remarked: "You must be fully convinced of this: for the apostle (as all priests ought to be) there is no medium between HOLINESS, if not acquired, at least *desired and striven after*, and GRADUAL PERVERSION."¹¹ And a contemporary writer, Erik von Kuehnelt Leddihn in *Commonwealth*, describes it more graphically: "A priest is a man who has risked almost everything in a Divine Game in which a *glowing SANCTITY* and a *particular dry ROT TO THE SOUL* are the frightening alternatives."¹²

Thus we are ready to understand better the absolute need of the *special* (not "abnormal") type of training given in our Seminaries. That training aim mainly to educate the youth from their early adolescence for the HEROIC LIFE OF THE CATHOLIC PRIESTHOOD, and not simply for the professional career of a Protestant pastor or a Moslem

⁹ *Ibid.*, nn. 60-63

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, n. 70

¹¹ cf. Dom J. — B. Chautard, *The Soul of the Apostolate*, New York, 1933, p. 181.

¹² cf. Leo Trese, *Tenders of the Flock*, Sheed and Ward, 1957, p. 180.

imam. Military or naval academies offer also and demand an "especial" (not "abnormal") kind of training with very rigid and strict regulations, discipline and even a certain segregation from the world, because the future officers and leaders of the army and navy need that peculiar training to succeed in the most exacting duties and far-reaching responsibilities they will assume in the future. The prospective "soldiers of Christ" (II Tim. 2.4), nay, future captains and leaders of the People of God, our candidates to the Priesthood ought to have similarly the "special" (not "abnormal") Seminary training demanded by the wisdom of centuries and proposed by the Church, *not only in Trent but also in the Vatican II.*

I have stressed the words "special" — not "abnormal" —, because the rather secluded life of our seminarians, "segregated," not "separated," from the world, has been over exaggerated. Its main purpose is to discern and foster the seeds of a priestly vocation in a suitable environment; to safeguard the unexperienced and immature minds from the allurements of the world, at an age when they need most a kind, wise understanding and a sure spiritual guidance to overcome the crisis of adolescence and reach the solid Christian maturity of manhood, ready to make a free and deliberate choice of the priestly vocation with its consequent vow of perfect and perpetual chastity. It is true that Seminary directors in the past committed the mistake of keeping young seminarians quite far removed from suitable contacts with their family and with the world, so that their training seemed more proper for those called to a monastic life than to the diocesan priesthood. This mistake — which should not be unduly exaggerated — was a reaction to the bigger mistake of a "mixed clerical education" that preceded it and prevailed in former ages. But the mistake of an excessive seclusion from the world should not be attributed to the Seminaries as an institution, but to the shortsightedness of Seminary educators who, religious as oftentimes they were, thought well to apply to diocesan Seminaries the type of training they got in their novitiates and scholasticates.

Pius XII, however, years before the Vatican II, pointed out already this mistake, proposing in his MENTI NOSTRAE (23 September 1950) that seminarians should "come in *closer* contact, GRADUALLY AND PRUDENTLY, with the judgments and tastes of the people..." The

mistake denounced by the Pope was "*too much* seclusion from the world,"¹³ whereby he takes for granted that *some* seclusion from the world is inherent to the very nature of Seminary training. Hence, the Pope's wise directive in no way could be interpreted as if we should push the seminarians into the world, or bring the world into the Seminary — as many seek to do in our days. Seminarians should certainly have normal contacts with their families — especially if these are true Christian homes, which unfortunately is not always the case — and a GRADUAL and PRUDENT contact with the people of the world whom they will serve. Let us not forget the Pope's qualifying words: GRADUAL and PRUDENT. Such contacts will most aptly be obtained, generally, in the exercise of apostolic works, helping the parish priests in visiting the poor, the laborers, the sick; directing youth organizations and wholesome recreational activities: sports, scouting, etc.; teaching catechism to the children... And many of these things were already practiced in Seminaries of the first half of this century, though not always in sufficient degree, as Pius XII has hinted.

But this is very different from mixing the seminarians with worldly youths in habitual social intercourse, letting them attend parties and socials (including dances!) or lose precious time in frivolous visits and worldly conversations that foster dangerous friendships and companionships. Many of these social activities may be, with due cautions, quite proper and unobjectionable for young men who do not aspire to the lofty ideals of priestly life and consecrated celibacy; but for unexperienced and immature candidates to the Priesthood such familiarity with the world may prove fatal. In the same Apostolic Exhortation *MENTI NOSTRAE*, Pius XII warns *all priests* about the dangers to their chastity because of "laxity in public morals, or because of the allurements of vice so easily seductive in these days, or, finally, because of that excessive liberty in relations between the sexes which at times dares to insinuate itself even into the exercise of the sacred ministry." And on this account the Pope enjoins *the priests* that in directing associations and sodalities of women, they should "avoid every familiarity, give their services in a

¹³ cf. A.A.S., 42 (1950), pp. 686-687. The Pope speaks of "*locis... ab hominum societate paulo nimium seiunctis*"; and "*ut alumni SENSIM PRUDENTERQUE in intima populi consilia ac studia penetrent...*"

way befitting sacred ministers, and let their activity be confined within the limits of their priestly ministry.”¹⁴ Will not these warnings and recommendations of a document so frequently cited by the Vatican II be more suitable for the young aspirants to the Priesthood?

There is doubt that “segregation” — not “separation” — from the world (the distinctive words are based on the Gospel — Jn.71, 11-17 — and the Vatican II, PRESBYTERORUM ORDINIS, n.3) is a must in the training of future priests, as it is in the actual life of any Catholic priest worthy of that name. And yet it is common nowadays to claim and emphatically assert in the name of modern science — Psychology, Pedagogy — that such type of education is something “abnormal” for the youth. I am not expert in those sciences, although, modesty aside, I have completed the studies required for an M.A. in Education. And frankly I can say that in the long course of my studies I have not found any serious pedagogical work offering solid proofs to conclude that Seminary education (a special boarding-school type of training) reasonably removed from worldly influences is anything “abnormal” for adolescents. Nay, I could cite a lot of psychological and pedagogical investigations of contemporary and even post-Vatican II authors¹⁵ who do not support the above contention, which on the other hand is clearly rejected by the OPTATAM TOTIUS of Vatican II. The glaring fact that thousands and thousands of exemplary, deeply mature, saintly and dedicated parish priests and Bishops were formed, trained and educated during the last four centuries in the Tridentine Seminaries — so unjustly denigrated today — is sufficient to refute the derogatory remarks hurled

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 664.

¹⁵ Cf. Roberto Zavalloni, *Psicopedagogia delle Vocazioni*, Brescia, 1967; *Studi Psico-pedagogici sulla Vocazione*, Brescia, 1961; Andrea Maggiali, *Psicopedagogia dei candidati al sacerdozio*, Ed. Ancora, Milano, 2a.ed., 1965; Nazario Giordani, *Quaderni di Pedagogia Seminaristica: La Psicologia a servizio della Vocazione; La Cartella Personale nei Seminari*, Grottaferrata (Roma), 1964-1965; Giuseppe Cenacchi, *La Pedagogia Seminaristica nei documenti del Magistero Ecclesiastico*, Rovigo, 1964; Pier Carlo Landucci, *Formazione Seminaristica moderna*, Borla, 1961; Luigi Marinelli, *I Seminari verso nuove conquiste*, Ed. Paoline, 1965; J. Matte-Langlois, *Famille, Vocation et Seminaire*, Ed. du Cerf, 1966; Clemente Sanchez, *Seleccion y Formacion de los Aspirantes al Sacerdocio*, Madrid, 1961; etc. etc.

against such institutions of the Church. I have spent a quarter of a century in Seminary work and I can affirm, perhaps with a little more experience than many self-made modern "reformers" (or rather, destroyers) of our Seminaries, that these educational centers, in spite of their past defects, undeniable imperfections and imperative need of renewal, have done an immense good to the Church.

Let us sum up these observations with a few questions and answers — as in a true dialogue — related with all that has been said already.

"Protestants seem to have fairly good men as ministers dedicated to God and their people; and these have been usually trained in regular colleges and universities, living a mixed life with their people. *Have they failed in their spiritual mission? Why shall we not train our future priests in the same way?*"

No! We do not say that Protestant pastors fail in their spiritual mission. But we maintain that our priestly life and ministry is quite different from theirs: the heroic demands of our apostolic mission are obviously much higher than those of pastors whose services are well remunerated and may well be coupled with the duties towards a family they have the right to form and support. Hence, since our priestly profession is so different from their evangelical ministry, the kind of education that may be good for them, is not and cannot be good enough for us. As simple as that! And the proof may be found in the history of past centuries, where the same type of education for the Protestant ministry was in vogue in the Catholic Church, and it failed dismally.

"Have Protestant ministers given bigger scandals, by their improper behavior, than Catholic priests?"

I think we make too big a fuss about the scandals of Catholic priests who, unfaithful to their duties, form a small but noisy minority: noisy, precisely, because they are rather the exception, as Judas among the Twelve. Why shall we overlook and bypass the silent but heroic life of thousands and thousands of Catholic pastors who, day after day, year after year, to the very end of their life, go on quietly through the hidden path of their priestly duties, unknown to the world, but "beloved by God and men," highly esteemed and venerated by the flock they serve so disinterestedly? And if it is true that Protestant ministers do not give big

scandals, why not ask and find out whether they offer as many and as high examples of heroic dedication as our Catholic missionaries in remote and lonely regions (as many of our rural parishes are), destitute of all material comforts, and as St. Paul "perfectly willing to spend all what they have, and to be expended, in the interest of the souls" (2 Cor. 12, 15) entrusted to their care?

"Minor Seminaries, at least, have no reason to continue. Children should be with their parents: the home is their normal environment. They are too young to decide what to do with their lives. There is not enough freedom in the Seminary where they are indoctrinated. Later on they wake up to the problems of life; but it is too late. Hence, they become dissatisfied. And if ever they are ordained, they make frustrated priests."

Let us examine these alleged reasons against Minor Seminaries. "*Children should be with their parents.*" True, at least, as a general rule, since admittedly everybody knows many exceptions to that ideal rule. But, strictly speaking, we do not send "children" to the Seminary. We send "boys" who — according to Trent's injunction — must be, "at least, *twelve years old*," that is, those who are either beginning their adolescent age already. For *adolescents'* education we cannot say that only the family is necessarily the normal environment. Admittedly, the ideal education of the young at any age should be found, *whenever possible, in the home*... This is not any "modern" discovery. Tacitus in days of old acknowledged this pedagogical principle when he said: "*In gremio matris educari.*" But there are many cases, especially for the secondary education of adolescents, when circumstances demand that a good boarding school should provide "in a normal environment" the education they cannot get staying at home. No one ignores the advantages and the dangers that any boarding school (even a good one) may present to the youth. But the risks may well be prevented, at least in great part; and, on the other hand many of the advantages can not be obtained in the limited circle of ordinary families, especially if they are not true Christian homes, as is, unfortunately, the case more than often in our times.¹⁶ All this is particularly true with reference to Seminaries: they

¹⁶ Cf. Dr. Tihamer Toth, *Formacion religiosa de jóvenes*, Madrid, 1955, pp. 451-456.

are an especial type of Boarding Schools which provide, in an especial but normal environment, educational opportunities for those adolescents who want to follow, or may presumably have the call to pursue such an especial vocation as that of the Catholic Priesthood.

"But they are too young to decide what to do with their lives." Good heavens! Who says a minor seminarian should decide already what to do with his life! What we do is to *prepare* him at an early age for that decisive step which he will take in a distant future; otherwise it may be too late. "There is a proverb: a boy will keep the course he has begun; even when he grows old, he will not leave it." (Prov. 22, 6).

"There is not enough freedom in the seminary; the boys are indoctrinated. Later on they wake up to the problems of life; but it is too late." Seminarians make their well pondered and final decision when they are at least twenty-one years old (not before that age); they have then as much freedom and maturity — if not more — as any youth who gets married at this age. With respect to "indoctrination," could we not retort the objection, and say that without the Seminary training they are easily "indoctrinated" in the world's maxims, and almost pushed into the easier and more comfortable life of the rank and file of the ordinary laity? Pope Paul VI in SUMMI DEI VERBUM (Nov. 4, 1963) said: "Precisely because the secular culture of our days stresses too much among the Christian people the esteem and pursuit of external goods, the esteem of many towards the lasting values that belong to the supernatural order diminishes. In the face of this, how our youths, even those animated with the best intentions, resolve to follow the vocation to the sacred ministry, if *in their own homes or in the schools* where they attend, all that they hear are only praises on the excellence and advantages of profane sciences?

"Therefore — continues the Vicar of Christ —, in order that the young and the adolescent acquire and foster in themselves a just *esteem of the priestly life*, and be encouraged to embrace it with enthusiasm and generosity. IT IS NECESSARY ... THAT THOSE ADOLESCENTS WHO SHOW CLEARLY A SINCERE INCLINATION TOWARDS THE PRIESTHOOD TOGETHER WITH A FIT-

NESS FOR SUCH CALLING, *ENTER AS SOON AS POSSIBLE THE SEMINARY OR A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.* Only thus, by means of this timely measure, can be safeguarded in these youths, *far from the seductive fascination of the world*, and can be cultivated in a most suitable nursery THE SEED OF A DIVINE VOCATION, whose existence the Directors of the Seminary or Religious Institute shall have to discern with utmost care, and if found authentic they should help in making it grow into maturity. "And all this great and difficult educational work — concludes the Holy Father — must be carried out WITHIN THE SEMINARY."

That is why Vatican II in OPTATAM TOTIUS speaks so forcefully about the utmost opportunity and convenience of MINOR SEMINARIES, and the absolute need of MAJOR SEMINARIES. Those who want to eliminate these venerable institutions are obviously going against the mind of the Church, as expressed not only in Trent, but also in Vatican II.

But the new "reformers" insist: "*The youth in the Seminaries become dissatisfied. And if ever they are ordained, they make frustrated priests.*" About frustrated priests we should indeed admit that their failure in many cases could be traced to a defective, superficial formation in the Seminary; but not to the Seminary itself. In this connection we deem it opportune to quote here the wise remarks of Bishop Adrian of Nashville, U.S.A.: "Who is responsible that so many priests have been derelict in our day? Not that the priests themselves are not to be blamed — they are intelligent, mature men; but evidently the faculty of the Seminary which these young men attended for eight or twelve years have a great responsibility *Lax discipline; POOR SPIRITUAL DIRECTION; TOO MANY CONTACTS WITH THE WORLD; the teaching of false or questionable doctrine or behavior* — these and like causes prevented these fine young men from acquiring that *solid faith* and DEEP LOVE FOR PRAYER AND MEDITATION which are *so essential for every good priest*. And if the corruption occurred after ordination, then the Bishop probably has not been sufficiently vigilant."¹⁷

¹⁷ Cf. *L'Osservatore Romano*, English edition September 11, 1969, p. 3.

These serious words should give us all plenty of food for thought. There is indeed a crisis of priestly vocations. It is a blunder to attribute it to the Seminaries as an institution; and yet, there is no doubt that such crisis is *partly* due to grievous defects found in the training given in many — if not most — of our Seminaries. There are certainly other causes that explain the crisis; but the above mentioned is what concerns us now. And the remedy is not to eliminate the Seminaries, but to correct their defects. We do not cure a headache by beheading the patient! Our Seminaries are in dire need of “renewal” and *aggiornamento*” in all levels: scientific, pastoral, disciplinary..., but above all in a deep, solid SPIRITUAL FORMATION and authentic SPIRITUAL DIRECTION, without which all the rest may be of little or no use at all. The Church Magisterium in the Encyclicals of the last Popes since St. Pius X, and lately in the OPTATAM TOTIUS and PRESBYTERORUM ORDINIS of the Vatican II, has given us clear and precise norms on these matters. In my modest opinion we have not observed these norms with unreserved fidelity. Perhaps, here lies the heart of the problem, and the real key for solving the crisis of priestly vocations.

INDONESIA at the CROSSROADS

● **Juan Sanz, S.J.**
Spiritual Director
Novaliches, Quezon City

Introduction

The country we are about to see is one of the Southeast Asian countries. Like the Philippines, Indonesia too is composed of some 3,000 islands. Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao comprise the big islands or group of islands in the Philippines. They are five large and important islands which comprise the Republic of Indonesia: Java, Sumatra, Borneo, Celebes and the recently acquired Western Irian. The fabulous island of Bali has become a tourist favorite spot and has been immortalized in a movie **SOUTH PACIFIC**.

Formerly known as the Dutch East Indies, Indonesia at present is the world's largest archipelago. Placed from east to west, the Republic would extend from Honolulu to San Francisco. In the island of Java alone, there are about 700 million inhabitants, making it one of the densest populated areas in the world.

The first Europeans to reach Indonesian shores were the Portuguese who arrived early in the 16th century. Then the Dutch came in 1595 colonizing that area till 1945. Right after the Japanese surrender, a bloody revolution started in that Southeast Asian country. The Indonesians

* Rev. Juan Sanz, S.J., is a member of the Philippine Jesuit Province. He volunteered for missionary work in Indonesia from 1963 to 1966. He was in that country during the most turbulent years of Indonesia's history which lead to the coup d'etat in 1965. He worked for one year in Djakarta's parish by the Port Area, called Tandjung Priok. For the last two years he was assigned to teach English, religion & Latin in Central Java, Mertejodan Seminary.

were tired of their Dutch masters who had exploited their natural resources and enslaved their economy. Led by the youthful rebel SUKARNO, the revolution succeeded in ousting the Dutch. This is the historical background of the country we are interested in knowing more about concerning our missionary activities there.

Political Situation

We will divide our study of Indonesia into two parts. First, it would help us much to know the political situation in the country for the past 10 years so that we can assess the Religious situation which will follow. As can be seen, the political and religious elements cannot be separated, especially so, in Indonesia because of their Constitution. Indonesia's basic law is called PANTJASILA, translated into English, FIVE BELIEFS on which the Republic rests. The people and government of Indonesia believe:

- 1) In ONE Supreme Almighty GOD
- 1) In Democracy
- 3) In Social Justice
- 4) In Love for your fellowmen
- 5) In National Unity. This last BELIEF has been achieved so well by the introduction of one common language called BAHASA INDONESIA.

From the CONSTITUTION of the Republic, one can see the religious belief of the people who helped frame it. Although Indonesia is mostly Moslem, yet every Moslem believes in ALLAH, God almighty. This is his first concern in life.

As we have already mentioned, SUKARNO was one of those responsible for Indonesia's independence. In gratitude for his noble work, the people voted him into office. As president of the republic he did his best to bring prosperity and peace to his newly created country. While Sukarno was president, Mohammed Hatta was his Premier. But as the years went on Hatta could not see eye to eye with his President, and this led to Hatta's resignation from public office. From that time on, Sukarno was unchallenged as the dictator-leader of Indonesia. One of his first follies was to have himself elected as President-for-life by

members of Congress whom he had himself chosen. These Congressmen owed Sukarno a big favor. In return they unanimously elected him as their leader for life. A second folly made by Sukarno was his decision to combine THREE POLITICAL Parties, although one was contradicting the other. He himself coined up a new word NASAKOM. Breaking this up into their meaning:

- 1) *NAS* — *Nasional* (National Party)
- 1) *A* — *Agama* (Religious Party)
- 3) *KOM* — *Komunis* (Communist Party)

Each of these Political Parties was supposed to uphold and be true to the basic law of the Republic, to the PANTJASILA. The Chairman of each Party was to swear to God to be faithful to and protect the Constitution. Here we have the greatest lie of the century. How could communism ever affirm its belief in God? It disowns the very existence of the almighty! How could communism affirm its belief in democracy, in social justice, in love for one's fellowmen and in national unity? Communism goes contrary to all of what the CONSTITUTION believes in. The PKI (Partai Komunis Indonesia) in the meantime started its campaign of infiltration and subversion. Cabinet officials, high ranking Military Personnel were not spared. They made it hard for missionaries to do their work, blocking any entrance from abroad of any supplies needed for the missions.

Next, they started to have students involved in every sort of rally and demonstration. Every demonstration was a bloody one. Prices had gone way, way up. The economy of the country was ruined. Anti-Western feelings were instilled every day through the Mass Media of TV, press, speeches and radio. When Malaysia became independent, on Sept. 16, 1963, the greatest and most tumultuous riot ever recorded in Djakarta occurred. The British Embassy was completely burned down: the ambassador's car was turned upside down and burned; the British flag was desecrated. The political situation seemed ripe to declare a revolutionary situation.

There was just one big thorn which was an irritant factor to the PKI: a good number of high ranking Army and military officers were anti-communists. Among them was the Chief of Staff himself, the only four-star general, Gen. NASUTION. He was joined by another staunch

foe of communism, Gen. Yani, Commanding General of the Army. Men like these had to be liquidated and disposed of before they thwart the communist officers in the Armed Forces. Six Army Generals lost their lives on that fateful September morning. Gen. Nasution was in the list of those to be killed but by a stroke of fortune he was able to escape. General Yani and five other top anti-communist generals lost their lives. GESTAPU reminds one of the Secret Police Force of the Germans. In Indonesian it is another abbreviated word meaning:

GE — Gerakan (Movement or revolution)

S — September

TA — Tiga

Both words mean 30

PU — Puluh

Hence, GESTAPU means, *September 30th Revolution*, of 1965. This was the state of affairs politically up to the coup-d'etat where many Generals, Admirals and the Air Marshall himself had been implicated, tried and found guilty of high treason to their country, to the PANTJASILA, Indonesia's Constitution.

The very puzzling figure of Sukarno has never been really analyzed. Historians and experts in political science have all been puzzled at the actuations of Sukarno ever since the coup d'etat started. It was Sukarno who had withdrawn Indonesia from the United Nations, the only country ever to do so since the UN had been founded; it was Sukarno again who had withdrawn Indonesia from the Olympics by forming his own GANEFO = *Games of the New Emerging Forces*. All members of this organization were communist countries. It was clear Sukarno was veering his country towards Djakarta-Peking axis. Could it be possible that the great Sukarno, who was once known as the Father of the Revolution, may now be branded as TRAITOR to that same revolution he had once led? We leave this to history to write.

It is a sad event to recall that the students had continually been challenging Sukarno to step down from his life-long presidency. So on March 11, 1967, as Congress convened, this same congress who had voted him President for life, now eased him out of office and appointed Gen. Suharto as Indonesia's second president since her independence, in 1945.

The present situation politically is better. The original NASAKOM has now been reduced to a mere NASA. Even between these two Political Parties, there is a fight for utter domination. The NASional Party which is predominantly MOSLEM is bitter against their counterpart the Agama (Religious Party) which is made up predominantly of Christians: Catholics and Protestants of all sects. This is how the Political Situation is in that Republic.

Religious Situation

If one were to look at statistics or numbers as the norm for things, then one would have to conclude that Christianity has been a failure in that country. Simply glancing at statistics we find the following:

- 1) Islam: 90%
- 2) Catholics: 1%
- 3) Protestants: 1%
- 4) Animists & others: 8%

But statistics, impressive though they may be, is not everything. Although a minority, Catholics are a militant force and a group to be reckoned with. For a population of about 150 million, there are only 2,600 priests ministering to the spiritual needs of the people of God. Catholics have played an active and prominent part in the political situation of that country. They have held posts in the Cabinet and have done well in promoting peace and order. During the turmoil of the coup, they were instrumental in the capture of communist traitors in both the civil and military departments. Sukarno's number TWO man, Dr. SUBANDRIO, Minister of Foreign Affairs, was a real PKI sympathizer, yet no body knew about this except for the fine cooperation of the Catholic Party. This was brought to the attention of proper authorities in the Military branch. Subandrio was captured, tried and found guilty of treason. He is at present awaiting execution before a firing squad. The Catholics and the Armed Forces have worked hand in hand to rid the government of undesirable elements as well as subversive ones.

The Catholic mission in Indonesia is doing fine. Many converts are recorded due to a large measure to the works of mercy rendered selflessly by Catholics in hospital work, free clinics, orphanages and parish schools.

The Catholic Church has found deep roots in Indonesian soil and it is there to stay. Unfortunately, though, there seems to be bitter opposition between the Christians and non-Christian communities. The Moslems have long been clamoring for a Moslem state-religion. Sukarno has always been against this and so has his successor Pres. Suharto. One reads of reports of a clash between Christians and Moslems. Recently, a church and a Catholic school were set on fire and damaged by extremists. A Protestant temple was desecrated and torn down by a fanatical group. Now that the Communist Party is outlawed, a new enemy has loomed in the horizon.

CONCLUSION

If we were to gather some food for thought for both the Political and Religious Situations in Indonesia, our first conclusion would be that if Indonesians would keep true to their PANTJASILA, their Constitution, they would certainly go forward in progress and peace. Second, one can learn a lesson from what took place in that country. Communists CANNOT be trusted. They use all means to obtain what they have in mind. They use violence, trickery, force, sabotage, murder and deceit. Although the stage was all set for the PKI to take over yet the coup d'etat failed miserably. This proves to us that there are still men who are intelligent enough to see through a fake front.

Lastly, when a people is given a choice between slavery and freedom, between communism and democracy, the choice is clear and loud. It is our hope that the Catholic Church in Indonesia may continue to spread the Gospel of love unhindered and may it grow in number and in quality. Indonesia has proved to the whole world that a foe can be beaten if the people as a whole come out in the open to denounce what is evil. It took a lot of courage for Indonesia to go against the regime of Red China. Peking has been taunting Indonesia ever since that coup failed. She had called the present government of Pres. Suharto a puppet tool of the Western kind of imperialism. But Djakarta has dared to put Peking in its proper place by closing her embassy in Peking and recalling her diplomats back home. Let this be another of the countless other lessons Indonesia has taught this weary world.

* * *

PASTORAL SECTION

HOMILETICS

● **Fernando Yusingco, C.SS.R.**

3rd Sunday after Pentecost (June 7)

NEED FOR FRIENDSHIP

There are many talents among our people — musical talents, dramatic talents, etc. Our farmers speak in concrete imagery. They talk in pictures of nature, the earth, the plants, the animals and the life moving and throbbing. If some of them were to speak out now, I am sure they would write these lines: "Am I really that which other men tell of or am I only what I myself know of myself, restless and longing and sick, like a bird in a cage, struggling for breath, as though hands were compressing my throat, yearning for colors, for flowers, for the voices of birds, thirsting for words of kindness, pausing in expectation of great events, powerlessly trembling for friends at infinite distance, weary and empty at praying, at thinking, at working, faint and weary to say farewell to it all." This is the frustration of mind that most of our people are feeling deep within, feelings like this surge beneath the surface. They are told that they are indolent. They are told that they lack initiative, they are told that they are poor, ignorant. Yes, they acknowledge all these. But why are they poor? Why are they ignorant? Why are they lazy, if they are? Years and years of want, of working from sunrise till sunset, how we deprive them of hope, of initiative. Years and years of seeing the good part of the harvest, going to people who have not lifted a finger to bring about the harvest. Years and years of toiling under the sun, in mud, when the rains have made them still poor, still ignorant, still unable to call the land they sweat over they till, their own.

Again and again we warn those who can do something to at least go out and do feel this among our people, to feel what they are feeling,

restless and longing and sick and struggling for God. They want a feeling of oneness, cohesion with the earth, the plants, everything about them, yet they are tied down to drudgery and poverty from sunrise to sunset and their dreams are haunted on what to eat tomorrow. They are haunted how to procure medicine for the baby crying in the night.

We can still give hope, assurance. We can give hope of our words, assurance of our presence and better still the courage of our action for them, with them, we should allow them to organize, we should help them to organize, we should unify their feelings, their yearning, their longing.

The main reasons why there should be organization of farmers, workers and people is because there's a need for united efforts to get their rights respected but aside from this, man we know is social being. He needs to share his suffering with others. He needs to be with others one way or the other, for fun or for work. There's a quotation, it reads: "If each of us is forever a stranger and alone here and now, then how much strange, how much more alone would we feel in a world where we belong to no one and no one belongs to us." To belong is a necessity of any human person. That's why we see a proliferation of organization, of clubs, yet the type of organization that has just the personal need to belong somehow breaks up eventually, but on the other hand too, organization formed and existing solely on a need to acquire rights eventually breaks up once the rights are acquired. We need the two kinds of organization or rather the two in one, that of common need and that of personal need, these two elements should be there, hence fighting for a cause and establishing personal bonds of friendship with each other must be the reasons for organizing.

Our landowners and our factory owners and our managers should not be afraid of the people, their employees, their tenants, their workers organizing. They should recognize these basic needs hence these basic rights in man. They should perhaps for their own good also try to seek people who will help them organize in the right way for the right ends, but they should not, never try to be paternalistic or to control their workers or their tenant's organization. They should recognize these basic need and right and try to seek people who also recognize this basic need and right and recognize the value of the human person. It's about

time that we create power, mass power, of our people, of the many, to balance the money power, the political power of the few.

4th Sunday after Pentecost (June 14)

CRIME OF CONTENTMENT

Why is it that in any active movement for social reforms or any activity that fight and seek for justice, that involves a personal commitment very few grown ups or elders are there? Have they lost their idealism and settled down to a life of mediocrity? Are they complacent or perhaps too busy feathering their nest? Will they, the younger generation, rise up in judgment on their elders and ask them what they have done to give them a better world to live in.

Really, this is a question which the older generation will have to ask themselves. Often elders complain what is happening to our young people, and often they say, "When we were young, how proper and how behaved we were." Yes, perhaps they were just too behaved and too proper, they just nodded and said amen to what was happening and remained proper and prim and behaved. No letter of the law or rule was broken, only the purpose and the spirit of the law was shattered and killed. Legalities and superficialities were the only things left, conventions—a way of acting. So this, lives were lived in empty peace and contentment and contentment like the contented cow. Nothing alive. Nothing challenging. Nothing really happening. Only events are allowed to happen.

Perhaps, this quotation I'd like to share with you of Patricia Mack, which she wrote of Christ, maybe some thought, useful thought: "for death that cast its shadows grim upon the walls of timeafter ten thousand years, the verdict and the sentence passed, involvement was his crime." What is your crime? Is it involvement? Just as Christ was? Or is your life just too prim and proper and well behaved to be so lifeless and so loveless? Or do you believe that it is better for the poor and the oppressed to stand up and to organize and fight for their rights? In doing this they gain self-confidence, they break the bonds of paternalism that make them subservient and slavish. They grow up and behave becoming the dignity of human beings. They need the conflict but conflict of a known bloody type. This is necessary for the growth of the oppressed.

But to do this is painful, it means going against tradition, well ordered structures, even friends and benefactors. It means not being accepted when formerly one is welcomed.

However, that quotation 'involvement was his crime...' is precisely what Christ had pointed out to us in his life, when he was left by himself on the cross because he has dared to stand up against Judaism of his day. We too have to stand up against oppression, the universal injustices of our days. If involvement should be our crime and not complacency. Really, Christianity is just that. That's why the symbol of Christianity is the symbol of the cross. Feelings, interest — personal or otherwise, sometime cross with principles. Every Christian at one time or the other will come to the crossroads and he'll have to take a decision, he'll have to make a decision to just lie down horizontally or to stand up vertically upon his cross, open his arms and welcome the consequences of abiding by his principles. For those, with a lot of possessions it is hard. It is hard to open up your arm and welcome the implementation, the social doctrines and principles of the church, to share your profit, to share justly your land and its fruit, to share the sweat, to share the suffering of your people, your own Filipino brothers and sisters, your own Christian brothers and sisters.

5th Sunday after Pentecost (June 21)

HOPE FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

Social reforms or change must be build on hope, but what kind of a hope? Is this hope a longing, a desire or a wish for a better life? A better life in the form of a house, a car, gadgets, material security? Definitely no. Because such kind of a hope would mean that once it is fulfilled there is no need for change and reforms. But change or reforms must still go on to keep with the ever constantly changing situations.

What then is the hope upon which social change and reform must be based? Has it the quality of passiveness, a kind of waiting for something to happen, a kind of resignation, of hope against hope? This is the kind of hope that is uplifting our society. It comes in different forms. For some it takes the form of dictatorializing, talking and planning. It

is like a man waiting and waiting to see a government official, of waiting and waiting for the process of law and the red tapes of bureaucracy to take their long, long course. There is no ceasing of the opportunity and standing up for the rights. Hope for social change and reforms can also take the form of radicalism but a radicalism that is based really on hopelessness and fear. It is opposite of real hope. It is a total disregard of legality but something can be done yet to enkindle the divine spark in man. There is a forcing of circumstances a lack of timing in this kind of hope for social change.

But the hope of social change and reform is neither a passive waiting or resignation nor is it an unrealistic forcing of circumstances. It is like a man ready to act, watching for the right moment to act. It is a hope that is ever ready to move into action once the circumstances are right. It is a hope that is aware of the signs of the times. It is a consciousness that man can rise to heights yet unscaled, it is a positive and active hope. It moves the man to something that can be done and sells others to it that now the time has come. Many times this hope moves man to put all time, energies and means at his command to get ready for the moment of action in concrete. This means that activity, constant activity, constant thinking, constant listening is the form of this hope and all activities are directed to the moment when that which is hopeful, the chance to effect social change arrives.

We believe that the time has arrived, that each one of us should now move — move into action, otherwise, if we just wait for something to happen then it would be too late, then something would really happen, something that we wouldn't like. In the gospel of today, Christ rebuked the wind and said to the sea: "Quiet now, be calm." The tide dropped and all was calm and he said to them: "Why are you so frightened, how is it that you have no faith?" Thus the hope that social involvement and change must be viewed is a hope that has come but yet like a flame it burns, it moves man into action because he sees the ray of light that will dispel the darkness of injustice. It is quite ironical that we can create a situation of hopelessness even in seeking for social reforms and justice, if we don't stress that the objective of this reforms that we seek, the justice that we seek is really development of the human individual person, in the person of the farmer, in the person of the worker, in the

person of the landowner in the person of the employer, in the person of everyone that each one of us in being good and just and in fulfilling justice, in changing or being changed will become really free. We seek to remove the obstacles of pride, of greed, of selfishness, of hate, these obstacles that are really at the bottom of our situation today where injustice lies.

We seek in our efforts for justice and for reforms that man, every Filipino man and woman would come to realize that we are a people, realize our worth and our contribution to betterment of the world here and now, to realize the need of respect for each one, each other and for everybody. Human and Christian values like these — respect, worth of the human person, freedom, love are what the soul is to the body, culture to nationalism, music to the ears — without these values we can cease to be human and humane. We become machinelike, cold and calculating. When people become things not beings with feeling, problems, emotions, joys and dreams then we have perhaps progress but no reforms, perhaps justice but not social justice, in other words justice all around not just justice by the law. In short, hope must be the base, hope that things can change, situation can change and people can change and be changed.

6th Sunday after Pentecost (June 28)

CONCERN FOR OTHERS

Margaret Bannings, a novelist, wrote this incident in her life. She had a secretary, one day she scolded the secretary for a small mistake. It was a serious scolding, the secretary cried and had a heavy heart. Years later the secretary died. She died young and Margaret Banning wrote a friend at about the time of the secretary's death: "I have always regretted having caused a few hours of hurt and pain in her short life."

I wonder if all hacendados and our factory owners and our politicians ever thought of the years of hurt and pain they have caused in the entire lives of our people. Christ tells us we must love and perhaps we never did really love, we do not really care for others, we do not really respond to the need of others, we do not really respect others, we do not really know others and ourselves. For love is this four together: care, responsibility, respect and knowledge. That love implies

care is most evident in a mother's love for her child. No matter how much a mother assures us that she loves her child, yet if we see her neglecting to feed, to bath, to give physical comfort to a child, all her assurance, all her words will strike us as insincere. So no matter how we profess to be Christians and go to the rites and sacraments and the Christian religion, yet, if we neglect our neighbor, neglect to give them a decent living, then, whatever we do in Church, whatever we say will always be insincere.

To be 'responsible' is to respond. By having response, the life of his brother is not his brothers' business alone but also his own. He sings a song — 'Each man's joy is joy to me, each man's grief is my own'. If he is responsible for his fellowmen as he feels responsible for himself, but when he is irresponsible in his duties as a Christian, of justice, of respect, then he is not loving nor in love. Really, he is not a Christian.

But then this responsibility must be joined with respect. Otherwise it deteriorates into domination and possessiveness. Respect means the concern that the other person should grow and unfold and mature as he is. Respect implies the absence of exploitation. Respect means allowing the other to make mistakes. Respect means to treat him as a grown up person or at least to allow him to grow up and not guiding him by the nose all the time. Yet above all the other three — respect, responsibility, care — there must be knowledge. All the three must be guided by knowledge. But the person as he is with his problems, his conditions, his dreams, his weakness and his strength, we must know him. If we know, say, our tenant well, if we know our workers well, if we know our neighbor well, if we know our driver well, we can care. Then we can respect, then we can feel responsible and then you will have peace which is the peace of Christ; the peace of a Christian, the peace of a Christian society.

7th Sunday after Pentecost (July 5)

OWNERSHIP OF LAND

We wonder what do we mean when we say we own a person. Can we own a person? Of course, you may be shocked at this question. Of course, you will say no — we can never own a person. Yet we see or

hear new songs that she or he is mine, his possession. But what kind of a possession, what kind of an ownership? Now, there's a question for you to answer. I'd like to discuss ownership or possession of land. Is ownership of land same as ownership, say of book? Can you say I own this land and do what I like just as I own this book? If I don't use the book will I throw it away, give it away or destroy it? Really, does it matter very much to others? It really does not matter so much to anybody else what I do with a book but yet regarding the land, if you own a land, I mean a piece of land, can you really do with it as you like? In other words, is your ownership of your land in accordance with its use to society? On the use of the land depends the economic, family and even moral life of people, a land cannot be just like a book or a shirt. Its uses should not depend totally and absolutely on your arbitrary will. The common good and the fruit of the people depends a lot on the use of your land. But then, how is the right to the ownership of the land acquired? By what title has a person to the land? Legally, we have a title of purchase or inheritance. But, basically what is the title of the claim to ownership. It is labor. The money used for the purchase of the land, it is basically labor-saved. Inheritance is labor-saved land.

So, let's take the case of an owner who had bought a piece of land and allowed another person to actually till the land while he, the owner, just receives the fruits of the land. Maybe he invested in fertilizers and seeds but the time will come when the owner will have recovered his capital plus his profits, and the tiller who has worked on the land and put into the land labor that equal at least the investment and the capital of the owner is still left with nothing, never yet acquired an inch of the land. Now, the question is, since both had put into the land equal investments more or less and since they both have got returns from the land then who has the right of ownership of the land, the legal owner or the tiller? Well, what do you think? Should the legal owner keep enjoying the fruits of the land he never actually worked on? Should the tiller never get to own the land to which he puts in parts of himself? This quotation from *Rerum Novarum* of Pope Leo XII — 1898 nearly a hundred years ago may provide some light: "When man spends the industry of his mind to the strength of

his body in procuring the fruits of nature, by that act, he makes his own portion of nature's field which he cultivates, that portion on which he lives, as it were the interest of his own personality; and it cannot be just that he should possess that portion as his own, and should have a right to keep it without molestation." These words of Pope Leo XII are the basis of the slogan: land to the tiller.

Christianity has really some revolutionary principles especially in social doctrines but they hurt, they hurt very much because to the very owner it means a source of income is cut off but yet this source of income is not his own. He has more than got his share. He has not put in his personality, he has not put in himself directly into the land he should have give away to the tiller the man whose sweat has mingled with the solid, the man whose hands have touched the earth and his feet have trodden the soil. He should, but will he? That is a question that most of our landowners should be asking and they should resolve to be really unselfish and reasonable, then they should give up the land they own for so many, many years now.

8th Sunday after Pentecost (July 12)

WEAPONS FOR THE POWERLESS

Fashion or fad?

First what is fashion and what is fad?

Fashion seems to be a novelty in style while fad is a novelty in gadget, perhaps. It looks like before you used to ask: are demonstrations, strikes, protest rallies, walk-outs fashionable fads? Are riots, violence fashionable fads? It looks like it is neither one or the other. They are here to stay. They are the weapons found by the powerless, by the voiceless to have will power and to be heard. Students found out that they can exert pressure on the highest office of the land for what they think is due to them. Even those that are traditionally conservative, like teachers, found demonstrations, rallies, etc. as very handy weapons to exert pressure. Is this right or is this wrong? No doubt this is a sign of growth.

As a person grows, he encounters more conflicts and tension. Conflict is necessary in a free society. Gunnar Myrdal started his speech in the Canada Expo '70 this way: "Neither in history has an upper class climbed down from its privileges and open its monopolies out of sheer idealism. Although, idealism can play its role when the pressure from the underprivileged has been ineffectively applied." No wonder if the effective application of this from below has been found in demonstration, rallies and most specially in organizations. This leverage of pressure is specially necessary when the elite or the upper class is well entrenched socially, economically and politically and the lower class has very little. It seems to be the only powerful enough weapon that the exploited and the underprivileged have at present in our situation. The danger now lies in the abuse of this new-born power—not that a demand will be unfair or unreasonable but there are priorities like the needs of power for the implementation of land reform, of teachers, of nurses and other employees for basic salary increases. The needs—root needs—like a free election of delegates to the constitutional convention—needs like a representative delegates from every class and every section of our society.

Yet, if each group, each sector of our society, students, teachers, upper and lower class, squatters, farmers workers, laborers, business section and landowners, if each group is aware of the strength of the other and respect the other as a cooperating partner, then the temptation to achieve the goal by force alone will be far less. Conflict force men to reach higher for a mutual satisfactory solution. It prevents facile and superficial solutions. This can make a better society. In short, we need pickets; we need demonstrations, we need walk-outs, strikes. We are here to stay till better society emerges. But towards this better society both sides have to exercise quick courage, understanding and utter unselfishness. We are living in the age of change. We are in that road of rebirth. The pangs of the birth of a new society or a death rattle of a totalitarian society. Either we surge up or we plunge down, either to be really democratic and free or we will be communistic slaves.

When Christ stood and looked over the city of Jerusalem, he cried, he wept. He said, "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often have I long to gather as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, and you refused. So, be

it. Your house will be left to you desolate. My promise, you will not see me anymore, until you say, 'Blessings on him who comes in the name of the Lord.'

Here we would like to appeal again to our people, to our leaders, to you who hear me now who have in your power to rectify past errors, to heed again the signs of the times. To try to effect the remedies that are in your hands. To forget your own greed. To forget your interest and to think of everybody including yourself, too. Now, is the time to act. Now is the time to be really a Christian. Whatever errors in the past, whatever injustice in the past, let it not continue to the present and let it not appear in the future.

Ninth Sunday after Pentecost (July 19)
Mk. 6, 30 - 34

● **Efren Rivera, O.P.**

V.I.P.

If someone very important, very famous and very popular comes to visit our town, I am sure there will be a lot of excitement. People will decorate the streets and organize a parade. When the famous guest arrives, a band will play, children will run in the streets to keep up with the parade. People will gather to see the celebrity and cheer. There will be a fiesta in the town hall. Everyone, young and old will want to see the great visitor smiling at them.

The Gospel text we have read tells us that people showed enthusiasm like this when Jesus Christ and his disciples were still very popular. Do you know what made them popular? It is not hard to answer this question. As they went to the towns and villages preaching, they cast out devils, they gave sight to the blind, they made the lame walk, they cured all kinds of sickness. No wonder people forgot to eat and drink in their eagerness to see Christ and his disciples.

Do you think Christ enjoyed being popular? No. He liked helping people. He loved to talk with everybody. But he did not care

about the excitement and enthusiasm of the people. He was really very different from charlatans who want to be the idols of the masses although they have nothing to offer but big smiles, handshakes, wisecracks and empty promises. Christ was different. He wanted simply to be a teacher. He wanted to teach the truth to people. He wanted people to love the truth and nothing but the truth. When great crowds looked for him, he did not just wave his hand at them, he did not just stand up to be idolized with applause and wild cheers. No. The Gospel tells us that "he took pity on them because they were like sheep without a shepherd, and he set himself to teach them at some length." For Jesus Christ, it was much, much more important to be a teacher of truth than to be popular.

For us, my dear people, it is much, much more important to hear the words of Jesus Christ and learn the truth from him, than just to go about clapping for movie actors and actresses and listening to the empty promises of politicians. People today are like sheep without a shepherd—not because there is no Shepherd, but because people run away from him. Is it not true, my people? Is it not true that you are running away from Jesus Christ and you do not want to hear his words? Is it not true that you do not read the Gospels? You know "komiks" much better than your Catechism... you know top tunes better than prayers like the *Act of Contrition* and the *Hail Holy Queen*... Is it not true that you know so little about the life of Christ and so much about the scandalous lives of actors and actresses?

Christ is not popular today. But he is still a *very important person*. He is still the Teacher who can tell us the saving Truth, show us the only Way, and give us eternal Life. So, let us give him the VIP treatment by listening to his words in the Bible and inviting the Blessed Sacrament into our hearts.

Tenth Sunday after Pentecost (July 26)
Jn. 6, 1-15

FIT FOR A BLOWOUT

A "blowout" not only for ten or ten times ten but for five hundred times ten people is certainly something big. What reason or occasion

would be good enough for such a great affair? A victory celebration? A propaganda gimmick? These reasons may be good for politicians or businessmen. But not for Jesus Christ. He fed five thousand men for one simple reason: to teach them a lesson.

Just think of it. If Jesus performed the great miracle of feeding five thousand men by multiplying five loaves of bread and two fish, just to teach a lesson, that lesson must be very, very important! Yes, it is lesson number one. So let us pay careful attention to that lesson.

It is a lesson of love. Jesus wanted to show that he cares for people—for us. He would not think of telling people to go home and risk collapsing in the way because of hunger. Like a mother providing food for her children to show her tender love for them, Jesus gave bread to five thousand hungry men in order to show to all men by this symbolic action, that his heart overflows with love for them.

But did people understand the lesson? No, they did not. Instead of recognizing the miracle as a gesture of love, they thought it was an exhibition of power. They wanted a powerful king. So, they began thinking: here, at last, is a powerful man who can be our king. If he can multiply loaves and fish, certainly he can also give us gold and all kinds of riches. He can abolish taxes and work. He can conquer the Romans and make us lords of all peoples. They thought this way. So they wanted to make Jesus their King.

Jesus, however, did not want to be a political king. Certainly, he is a King—but his kingdom is not of this world. His kingdom is a kingdom of love.

Isn't it strange that some people are impressed by power but not by love? If the earth quakes for one minute, you will see people falling down on their knees right in the middle of the street, asking God to forgive their sins, to have mercy. But tell these people that, not only for one minute but minute after minute for hundreds of years Jesus has been in the Blessed Sacrament offering himself as our spiritual food, proving his love with his self sacrifice, inviting people to a life of love—tell this to people and they will not listen to you.

When shall we learn that God truly loves us? He sent his Son Jesus Christ to tell us his loving plan for our salvation — but men prefer to follow their own plans. Jesus Christ died on the cross with open arms to show his love for us — but we ran away from him as from a bandit. Jesus Christ stays in the Blessed Sacrament to give witness to his persevering love — but we prefer to go to movies and cockfights and forget to spend even just a few minutes before the tabernacle and feel the greatness of divine love.

My dear people, let us not wait for a calamity before we turn to Jesus Christ. War, earthquakes, typhoons, fire — or miracles — these lead some people to recognize Christ as their king. But Christ does not want to be a king only in time of war, earthquake, typhoon or fire, he does not want to be a king only on account of a miracle. He wants to be a king because of his love for us and our love for him. This is the lesson fit for that miraculous blowout in which he fed five thousand men. This is the lesson he still teaches as he remains with us in the Blessed Sacrament. Let us listen to him. Let us make him the King of our hearts.

Constitutional Convention

Sermons

OUR HOUSE

It is 6:30 in the morning, in our house.

Your house, and mine. Any house.

It is 6:30, and the baby is crying. Mommy is heating the bottle, for the baby.

The little boy howls, from the bedroom: "Mommy! Where are my *shoes*?" He can not find his shoes, because they are under the bed.

At the same time, the little girl is tugging at the apron of her mommy, saying: "Mommy, Mommy, my *dress*!" The dress is not yet ironed, and she needs to wear it, this morning, for school.

And the husband is pounding on the table. He is roaring: "*Do I get my coffee in this house, or don't I?*"

Mommy is in the middle, heating the bottle for the baby, crawling under the bed to get the shoes, ironing the dress, boiling the coffee on the stove... and sometimes she stops. She stops, and says: "I am a *servant* in this house! A servant is better! A servant gets *paid*!"

Mommy is the beast of the house. She labors for everyone, and everyone loves her, even though they do not say it. When the husband goes off to work he kisses her goodbye, without thinking, saying: "Make sure you have supper ready early tonight. I have an appointment. I'll come home for supper, and then I have to go right out!"

The little boy kisses her, saying: "Mommy, the fifty centavos! I *need* the fifty centavos!"

The little girl kisses her, saying: "Mommy, my *book*! Remember my *book*! You must go downtown and buy my book!"

And when the family is all gone, she washes the dishes, and cleans the house, and goes down to the market-place to buy the fish. This is her service of God: quarreling with the fish vendor over the price of fish.

But this is *religion*! This is her vocation: wife and mother. This is the job that God has given her. This is her apostolate: our house.

And suppose that she was very *devout*? Suppose she wanted to go to Mass and Communion every day? This is good... But suppose that the only available Mass was at 6:30 a.m. — precisely the hour of crisis in our house?

Which should she do?

Should she go to Mass, where it is peaceful and quiet, with no babies crying, and have breakfast with God?

Or should she stay home, and make the coffee for her mean, ugly, disagreeable husband?

Mass is good, and beautiful; Holy Communion is food for the soul; but if she has to make a choice, it *must be the home*! This is how she serves God — with the labor of her hands! This is her apostolate, and it must come *first*! If she can do *both* — that is the best! But her work as wife and mother — this is the work given to her by God.

So it is with the husband. He gets up every day and goes to work, in order that he may bring home the money to pay the rent, to buy the food, to pay the tuition at school, to run the house.

And when they come to die — the father and mother — God will say to them: "Come ye blessed of my Father, into the Kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world. For I was hungry, and you gave me to eat. I was thirsty, and you gave me to drink. I was naked, and you clothed me. I was sick, and you took care of me. I was a stranger, and you took me in!"

They will tremble, and say: "Lord, when did we do all this?"

And He will say: "Amen, amen, I say to you — so long as you did it to the least of these, my little ones, you did it unto Me!"

The labor and love of Mommy for her children — this is the service of God. The labor of the father — his labor of love — this is the service of God.

This is religion.

We serve God with *life!*

But we have a bigger house. It is the country. It is the nation.

This is also our house.

We have many children — in the mountains of the north, in the muddy rice fields, out on the sea.

We must also take care of *them!*

At once we get weary — just at the *thought!* The bottle for the baby is close at hand, real — you can touch it. You can taste the milk. You can hold the baby in your arms when you give it to her.

But social justice for the people in the mountains! Land for the tenant! Security for the fisherman! These things are too big, too broad, too far away, too complicated. It is hard even to *start* working on these things.

But we *can* start!

We can begin to work, personally, for our house, for the country, for the Philippines.

In November we will elect representatives to the Constitutional Convention. These men and women will write the law for all of us, for years to come. They will write the laws under which our children will grow up.

What must we do? *Work* to elect *good men*, and *good women!* Those who are honest, and wise. Those who really want to help our people, with all their hearts!

This is not too big. *This* is not too far away. *This* is something *definite, clean-cut, practical!* *This* we can do!

First, *vote!*

Second, vote *freely!*

Third, vote *honestly!*

Begin looking, right now, for those who — in your opinion — could best write the rules for our house, our great house, our beautiful house: the *country!*

And when we do this — *this is the service of God!*

That is why we talk about it in church!

This is religion!

* * *

MY BROTHER

On a street in Manila two men were dragging a girl into a waiting taxicab.

The girl resisted.

They pulled her, dragged her. When she clung to the doorway of the taxi, refusing to go in, they beat her.

She screamed.

Within striking distance there were about twenty people: shopkeepers, street vendors, passers-by. They stopped, and watched.

Nobody did anything.

Two young men passed, in a car. One of them, sitting beside the driver, said: "Look at that! Stop! Let's help her!"

The young man who was driving the car shook his head. "Nothing doing," he said. "That's the way to get killed. It's probably just a love affair. Leave them alone."

The car passed by.

The men finally forced the weeping girl into the taxicab, and off they went.

The spectators went back to their business. It was an exciting story for the shopkeepers to tell their customers.

Is this *right*?

Should it be this way?

Should we watch injustice, and do nothing?

Of course it is *trouble* to get involved, but is this not the kind of trouble we *must shoulder*?

And it is not just the stray street in Manila. Others are suffering, in other areas of the country.

In the mountains a rich landowner is gradually gobbling up the little farms of his neighbors.

A poor fisherman works all night, every night, and yet his children can not go to school because they have no shoes, no clean dress, no shirt.

Who is the brother of this farmer in the mountains, who is losing his land?

Who is brother to the fisherman, who has no money to buy shoes?

Should we not help the girl in the street? Should we not help the farmer in the mountains? Should we not help the fisherman?

Look. A lawyer serves God by being a *good lawyer*, by laboring to get justice for his client. A doctor serves God by being a *good doctor*, by going out into the night to deliver the baby of a poor woman. A teacher serves God by being a *good teacher*, by preparing her classes, by correcting her papers. A mother serves God by being a *good mother*, by loving her children, and caring for them.

A mechanic serves God by being a *good mechanic*; a maid serves God by being a *good maid*.

But all of us are *citizens*!

Should we not try to serve God by being *good citizens*?

And what does it mean to be a *good citizen*? It means that we should think of all the others in the country, not only ourselves. It

means that we should think of the farmer, and of the fisherman. It means that we should do what the gospel says: "*Love Thy Neighbor!*"

It means that when people really need our help, we have to get involved.

We can not pass the girl on the street, when she is in trouble — not with a clear conscience. We can not say of the farmer: "It's not my business. I don't live in the mountains."

We can not say of the fisherman: "It is not my business. I don't live by the sea."

We can *not* say, like Cain: "Am I my brother's keeper?" *All men are our brothers, and we must try to help our brother!*

How?

One great, obvious way is through the new constitution. In the basic law of the land we can lay the foundations for social justice.

Now, not everyone of us can be a law-maker. But everyone of us can *help!* We can choose — if we go at this thing with passionate perseverance — *good men* and *good women* for this coming Constitutional Convention.

We can elect *honest* representatives who really want to help the poor. We can elect *wise* representatives, who know how to do it!

We can do this, if we take the November elections seriously. We can do this, if we really get *involved!*

And if you say: "Well, politics is a dirty business. There is no use trying to clean it up. You can't win!" — if you say that, it is *despair!*

Of course politics is dirty, but we *can* clean it up! The crooked politician can only succeed when the good men stay out of politics.

If we do *not* try, we are betraying the country. The nation needs us now, just as truly as that girl on the street-corner needed help from *somebody!* We have watched violence too long! We have watched injustice too long. Now we have to *act!*

The action is very simple. Very clear. We have to get the whole country involved in this new constitution. The only way to start is with yourself. *You* get involved!

We must vote! We must vote freely! We must vote honestly. We must cast our ballot thinking of the farmer who needs help from *somebody*, thinking of the fisherman whose children *have to go to school!*

Why do we talk about this in church? Because *this* is religion!

This *is* the practice of the gospel!

This is what the gospel *means* when it says: "Love thy neighbor."

This *is* the service of God! We serve God as a lawyer, as a doctor, as a husband, as a father, and as a citizen!

Is it *troublesome*?

Sure.

The same kind of trouble that would come to a man if he stopped the car, and got out, to help a girl who was being kidnapped on the street.

The kind of trouble that would come to man if he tried to defend the poor against the rich. The kind of trouble that would come to a man if he really began to worry about the children of the fisherman.

It is the kind of trouble that comes to anyone who wants to live as a Christian.

It is trouble that comes straight from the hand of God.

* * *

HISTORICAL SECTION

Notes on

THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN IN THE PHILIPPINES* 1521-1898

(continued)

● **Pablo Fernandez, O.P.**

Chapter Five

THE PARROQUIAL ORGANIZATION

1. Kinds of Parishes

In the Philippines for more than two centuries, there were no parishes except those administered by the secular clergy. Other centers of ministry, founded and maintained by the religious orders, were considered as "missions" until the arrival in Manila of Archbishop Sancho de Santa Justa y Rufina. Backed by royal power and the governors-general, he was able, in the face of great difficulties, to convert into parishes the missions attached to the archdiocese of Manila. The other bishops, following the lead of Manila, did the same. Since then, that is, from the year 1776 on, the parochial system has been followed by the religious orders.

And so, right from the sixteenth century, there were in the islands, parishes, mission-parishes, and active missions. Mission-parishes were

* An essay towards a history of the Church in the Philippines during the Spanish period 1521-1898, translated by Jose Arcilla, S.J., faculty member of Ateneo University, Department of History.

those administered by the religious, but had grown into the self-sufficiency of a parish. But, because they were not subject to the laws of Royal Patronage and to diocesan visitation, they had been classified, according to the Laws of the Indies, as "missions." The active-missions, as they were later called, were mission-parishes still in the stages of development.¹ Before the arrival of Archbishop Basilio Sancho, almost all the ministries in the Philippines were mission-parishes; after his arrival, the parishes outnumbered the missions.

2. Provision for the Parishes

According to the Laws of the Indies, provisions for the parishes was to be in this manner. When a parish became vacant, the Ordinary posted on the doors of the cathedral church and of the other churches a public notice to announce the vacancy. It should be done in such a way that it would reach those who wished to apply for the vacancy through competition. After the applicants had all been listed, they were examined by a board of diocesan examiners in the form required by the Council of Trent. After this, the Ordinary made the TERNA or list of the three most deserving candidates for presentation to the Royal Vice-Patron. The latter chose the one he thought best of the three and presented him in turn to the Ordinary for the canonical appointment. But, because of a great scarcity of secular priests, this was scarcely the procedure in the Philippines.

With regards to the curacies of the religious orders, the Laws of the Indies (*Recopilación de las Leyes de Indias*, Libro 1, título xv, ley 3) provided that:

¹ ...the laws of patronage distinguish between curacies, *doctrinas* and reductions. The curacies are those that are entrusted to religious by right of canonical institution and perpetual title; the *doctrinas* are those reductions which have been under the administration of the religious for ten years and are by law handed over to the bishops who would entrust them to the secular clergy; and the reductions, strictly understood, are those centers where there are actual conversions of the heathen, or those which are called active missions." Arbea, Carlos, O.P. *Memoria sobre el Estado actual de las Corporaciones Religiosas en estas Islas con relación á los decretos de las Cortes sobraenas de la Nación* (1823) in APSR, Sección Historia Eclesiástica de Filipinas, fol. 21.

a) When a curacy entrusted to the religious orders had to be provided for, the Provincial or the Provincial Chapter should name three religious;

b) This TERNA should be presented to the Royal Vice-Patron for him to choose one of the three;

c) Once the choice is made, the Vice-Patron would send his name to the Ordinary for the subsequent canonical investiture. The Ordinary could subject the chosen religious to an examination and scrutiny before granting canonical appointment, in accordance with the Laws of the Indies (ley 3, título xv, libro 1).²

It can be seen that the difference in the provision for parishes administered by secular or religious priests lies in two things: a) the religious were not obliged to take a previous competitive examination; b) the religious Superior, not the diocesan Ordinary, made the TERNA which was presented to Royal Vice-Patron.³

3. Philippine Parishes and Two Ecclesiastical Conferences

The synod held in 1582 concluded that the spiritual care of more than 600 souls could not in conscience be entrusted to one pastor.⁴ In 1771, the Council, keeping in mind the poverty of the towns and the dearth of ministers of the gospel, decreed that the priest who served a parish of more than 500 tributes (more or less about 2,000 souls) should be given an assistant. It also approved a triple classification of the parishes, and no pastor would be moved to the second class parish without having served in a parish of the first class. Nor could he be advanced to serve in a third class parish before having served with distinction in a second class parish for three years.⁵

² *Recopilación de las Leyes de los Reinos de Indias*. (Gráficas "Ultra," S.A., Madrid, 1943), T. 1, 131-32.

³ Cfr. APSR, Bases sobre parroquias, HEF (General), año 1887.

⁴ Marin, Valentín, O.P., *Ensayo de una síntesis etc.* (Manila: Imprenta de Santo Tomas, 1901), T. 1, 327.

⁵ Tamayo, Serapio, O.P., *Idea general de la disciplina eclesiástica en Filipinas durante la dominación española* (Manila: Establecimiento tipográfico del Colegio de Santo Tomas, 1906), 67-68.

4. Erection of Parishes

No parish in the Philippines could be erected without approval from the Ordinary and from the civil government. In the nineteenth century many new parishes were formed by separating them from the older ones. This was due to the great increase of population. It was customary to demand the local *gobernadorcillo* to build at least temporarily buildings for worship and for the priest's residence. Once they had these, the church authorities or the religious superior had no difficulty assigning a parish priest. The ideal of the pastors was to have all the faithful "*bajo campana*" (within earshot of the bell tower), as they used to say, to serve as a nucleus or center of residence, in the style of European towns. But this proved to be impossible for the Filipinos were very much attached to their fields and only with difficulty parted from them. This explains the existence of the "*visitas*," of which several became in time parishes.

5. Classes of Parishes and Missions by the End of the Nineteenth Century

By royal decree dated 10 July 1894, the parishes in the Philippines were for the future to be classed according to the following plan: parishes of 5,000 souls = *de primera entrada*; parishes of 5,000 — 10,000 souls = *de segunda entrada*; parishes of 10,000 — 20,000 souls = *de primer ascenso*; parishes of 20,000 — 30,000 souls = *de segundo ascenso*; parishes of more than 30,000 souls = *de término*. It was decided that the missions should be classified according to their level of advancement into "active missions" and "mission-parishes." The former could be assimilated to parishes *de primer ascenso*, and the mission-parish to the parish *de segunda entrada*.⁶

6. Assistant Priests

To help pastors in the administration of their vast parishes, the bishops of the Philippines used to ordain *titulo operarii* (with the title of worker) priests whom they assigned as assistant pastors wherever

⁶ Cfr. APSR, Mss., Sección Comunicaciones oficiales, Tomo 3, fols. 102-111; 135-152.

they were needed. They enjoyed rights of housing, food, and received a small stipend which was increased in cases where the assistant priest lived apart from the pastor. In the archdiocese of Manila, the coadjutor's salary in 1869 was ₱16.00 a month, ₱10.00 if board and lodging were provided. The salary in the other dioceses was a bit smaller.⁷

7. Parroquial Buildings

There were four parroquial buildings: the church, the parroquial house (in the Philippines called until now "convento"), the chapels in the "visitas" (or subsidiary chapels in the barrios), and the cemeteries. In the beginning, the churches were weak structures of nipa and bamboo; but in time, they gave way to edifices of more solid materials (stone, brick, tile, wood). Fires, earthquakes and typhoons, so frequent in the Philippines, taught the missionaries and pastors to construct the edifices of the parish solidly, except the barrio chapels which were used infrequently and so built provisionally. For that purpose, they taught the Filipinos how to make lime and brick, how to cut stone, erect stone walls — in general, to master the arts of carpentry and brickwork. The wood they obtained from neighboring forests. Because of lack of means, the construction of a church was delayed many years.

The rectories (*conventos*) were not built along aesthetic lines, but almost all of them, following a plan suited to the needs of the tropics, were large, spacious and comfortable. The expenses for the construction of these buildings were shouldered by occasional government funds, by the encomenderos who resided in the area, by the priest's savings, and, above all, by the people who contributed both gifts of money and their personal labor. For the support of the church services and the repair of the churches, *conventos* and cemeteries, the natives were taxed a half *real* per person, or a *real* for every tribute paid, and two *reales* per Chinese-Filipino mestizo. The king provided a newly constructed church with a set of sacred furnishings, a chalice with its paten, and a bell. The parishes and missions of the religious were for a long time supplied (also by the king) with mass wine and oil for the sanctuary lamp.⁸

⁷ Cfr. APSR, Mss, Sección Comunicaciones oficiales, Tomo 1, fol. 41.

⁸ Tamayo, *op. cit.*, 94-96.

8. Government Aid for Parishes and Missions

Following the laws of royal patronage, the Spanish government approved a stipend to support each parish and mission. The stipend was bigger for the poor parishes and the active missions, although the exact amount varied with time. In the beginning, it was either in money or in kind; but starting with a royal cedula of 1835, it was paid only in kind. During the seventeenth century, the government paid a stipend of ₱100 and 100 cavans of rice for the active missions; towards the end of the nineteenth century, it was ₱400, at times, ₱800.

By royal order dated 10 December 1835, the metropolitan government granted pastors a sum of ₱180 a year for every 500 tributes. The revolutionary government of 1868 in Spain wanted to reduce this amount; but, on petition and representation by the diocesan ordinaries and the religious orders, it was left as it was until then.⁹ When the old system of tribute in the Philippines was changed to that of the personal *cedula*, the government decreed in 1884 that for every 1000 *cedulas* on the official census, a stipend of ₱180 would devolve to the pastors, except those of Cebu, Bohol, Samar, Leyte, Misamis and Mindoro, who would receive ₱212.50 because of their special circumstances.

Another royal decree dated 17 October 1887 provided that the Vice-Patron, in accord with the prelates and the General Overseer of the Treasury (*Intendente General de Hacienda*), should specify a certain percentage in lieu of the categories designated for every thousand *cédulas*, as provided for in the decree of 1884. Accordingly, the Governor General decreed on 27 February, 1888 that the former categories had been abrogated by the 12 or 12½ percentage off the total revenue expected from the *cédulas*, following the lists of each parish.¹⁰ We shall discuss the diocesan fees elsewhere.

9. Influence of the Religious Pastors

Because of their knowledge of the idiom and customs of the place; because of the prestige and influence they generally had over the faith-

⁹ Cfr. *APSR*, *loc cit.*, fol. 40 ff.

¹⁰ Tamayo, *op. cit.*, 69-70.

ful; because of their tireless dedication to improve the material and moral condition of the towns—the religious pastors were as the axis around which revolved the governmental wheel in the islands. They were the indispensable element which both the church and the civil authorities had to use to institute reforms among the people, or whatever important measure they wanted to effect. If the pastors supported the will of the authorities, all went well. If secretly or openly they were opposed, the ruling powers were inviting failure. The religious parish priests had won their ascendancy and influence over the people by their selfless labor, and by having acted as the defender against abuses and outrages committed by both foreigners and natives. Nonetheless, one must admit that, because they had almost always through force or necessity served as the support of government action in purely civil, and sometimes hateful, matters, they incurred on themselves the hatred of those who disagreed with the government policies at the time, or of those who had suffered personally because of the pastor's intervention. And in the end this led to the loss of their parishes.

The religious pastors supervised public instruction, maintained several schools, or purchased on occasion the school furnishings with their own funds and paid the teachers when necessary. In several places, they took care of the physical sufferings of the faithful, giving them medicines. And in time of great calamity, like an earthquake, drought, fire, typhoon, raids by pagan tribes or by the Moslems, they were the ones who spoke for them before the government and before the public, seeking to alleviate their penury.¹¹

10. Statistics

In 1898, there were in the archdiocese of Manila 219 parishes, 24 mission-parishes and 16 active missions, a total of 259 ministries administered by 259 pastors. In the diocese of Cebu there were 166 parishes, 15 mission-parishes, 32 active missions, which reached a total of 213, under the administration of an equal number of pastors or missionaries. The diocese of Jaro had 144 parishes, 23 mission-parishes, 33 active missions, making a total of 200 under the spiritual care of as many

¹¹ Tamayo, *op. cit.*, 71-73.

pastors or missionaries. The diocese of Nueva Segovia reached a total of 171 ministries, divided into 110 parishes, 26 mission-parishes, and 35 active missions under the charge of as many pastors and missionaries. Finally, 107 parishes and 17 mission-parishes administered by 124 ministers was the total number presented by the diocese of Nueva Caceres.

The parishes totalled 746, the mission-parishes 105, and the active missions 116. The total number of pastors and missionaries in the Archipelago reached 967. Of them, 233 were Recollects, 228 Augustinians, 175 Franciscans, 109 Dominicans, 42 Jesuits, 16 Capuchins, 6 Benedictines, and 158 were from the secular clergy.

The number of secular priests distributed among the parishes of the archdiocese of Manila reached 198; while Cebu had 125, Jaro 73, Nueva Segovia 131 and Nueva Caceres 148. The number of souls of the dioceses was: Manila — 1,811,445; Cebu — 1,748,872; Jaro — 1,310,754; Nueva Segovia — 997,629; Nueva Caceres — 691,298. Their total: 6,558,998.

Saint Anthony Mary Claret and Vatican Council I

«1870-1970»

Pope Pius IX, in a confidential conversation with the Dean of the Roman Rota, a Spanish Monsignor at that time, when the First Vatican Council was about to start, said: "Your nation's bishops will come to Rome. What a group of Bishops! How good they are! Specially Claret! He is a saint! We'll be not the one to canonize him, but somebody will do it later on."

This prophecy became a reality when Pope Pius XII proclaimed the Archbishop Claret a Saint on May 7, of the Jubilee Year 1950: the First Saint of the First Vatican Council.

It is a coincidence: two celebrations are going on this year: the first centennial of Vatican One, and also of the Death of Saint Anthony Mary Claret (1870-1970).

Making a combination of the two topics, I will offer here some ideas on the second as projected on the first.

Archbishop Claret, an exile in Paris with Queen Isabel II of Spain, left for Rome to attend the Sacerdotal Jubilee of Pope Pius IX, who invited him to remain there for the preparation of the already convoked Vatican Council.

He considered this work as the last act of service for the Church, and indeed it was a magnificent one: a fitting crown for a man who spent long years of dedicated faithful service, as an apostolic priest, then as a missionary Prelate, and finally as the leader of the church in Spain.

His presence in the Council — he faithfully attended all the general Sessions, and almost all the Congregations — clearly shows the interest of the ailing 62 years old Prelate for the work of the Council.

His signature can be seen attached to all the Documents, in the 40th. line among the 700 Fathers in attendance.

We are happy to read the news that the saintly Council Father Archbishop Claret signed heartily the following petitions, which later on would be matter of faith, or strongly recommended as such: papal infallibility, Assumption of Mary, Universal Patronage of St. Joseph, Ecumenism towards the Jews, and condemnation of usury... and promotion of other social programs, as well as the unification of the Catechism in Spain, and the reform of religious life.

However, he only took the floor one time to address the Fathers in one of the general Congregations, exactly, the 62nd. on May 31, 1970. Two days before, on May 29, he suffered an attack of apoplexy, which almost prevented him from delivering his discourse. The cause of the attack, according to him, was his personal reaction to the "mistakes, blasphemies, and heresies" uttered in the Council chamber by some Fathers, opposing the infallibility of the Pope. "My indignation and zeal were so great that I felt a very high blood pressure and suffered a cerebral commotion."

The third among the five speakers of that congregation, he spoke after the Archbishop of Utrecht, Holland, and the Patriarch of the Latin Rite of Jerusalem, and after him other two speakers, namely, the Archbishops of Cincinnati and of Halifax.

The Allocution of Archbishop Claret — according to one of the Fathers — "made a deep impression in all, and many of them will not forget in their lives the things he said, and the way he pronounced them." This was, perhaps, the only way to silence the opposition. He sounded truly as a Confessor of the faith, a witness, a martyr, bearing the scars of the suffering for Christ.

This is the text of the address:

"Everything has its own time: there is time for silence,
there is time for talking

(Eccl. 3; 1, 7.)

Most Eminent Presidents,
Most Eminent and Most Reverend Fathers:

I have kept silence until now in this sacred Council. But having heard one of these days (17th of the present month) certain words that I extremely dislike, my conscience compelled me to talk, afraid as I was of what Prophet Isaias said: 'Woe to me if I do not talk' (Isa. 6,5.)

And so, I will speak of the Supreme Pontiff and of his infallibility, according to the Scheme we have at hands.

And I say that, after reading the Holy Scriptures explained by the catholic Expositors; considering the never interrupted tradition, and after a deep meditation of the words of the Holy Fathers of the Church, of the Sacred Councils, and of the reasons of the theologians, that, for the sake of brevity, I will not mention.

I do say: that I am highly convinced and, led by this conviction, I assert that the Supreme Pontiff is infallible in that sense and way held by the Roman Catholic Apostolic Church.

That is my belief, and earnestly desire that this faith of mine be the faith of all. Let us not be afraid of these men who have no other criterion than the prudence of this world, a prudence truly inimical to God, a prudence with which Satan is transfigured into an Angel of light: that prudence is harmful to the authority of the holy Roman Church. (Cor. 11, 14) Finally I say that such a prudence is a helper of pride in those people who hate God: the pride, which, in the words of David, is constantly increasing. (Ps. 74,23)

I have no doubt at all, most eminent and Reverend Fathers, that the dogmatic declaration of the Infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff of Rome will be the winnowing-shovel with which Our Lord Jesus Christ will thresh-out his grain and gather the wheat into his barn, and burn the chaff in a fire that never goes out. (Luke 3, 17) This declaration will separate light from darkness (Gen. 1,4.)

Oh, if I could, in the confession of this truth, shed all my blood and suffer unto death!

Oh, if I could consummate the sacrifice started in the year 1856 when I was coming down from the pulpit, after preaching the faith and christian morals, on February 1st., vigil of the Purification of Our Lady, the Most Holy Mary. I bear the scars of Our Lord Jesus Christ in my body (Gal. 5, 17), as you see in my face and arm.

Oh, if I could finish my life professing and saying in the abundance of my heart this great truth: I believe that the Supreme Pontiff is infallible!

I earnestly desire, most eminent and reverend Fathers, that all of us acknowledge and profess this truth. In the life of St. Therese we read that Our Lord Jesus Christ appeared to her, and said: 'My daughter, all the evils of this world come from the people who do not understand the Holy Scriptures.'

Truly, if men understand the Sacred Scriptures, they would see clear and openly this truth: that the Supreme Pontiff of Rome is infallible, because that truth is contained in the Sacred Scriptures.

But, what is the cause of not understanding the Scriptures? Three are the causes:

1. Because men do not love God, as the same Jesus said to St. Therese.
2. Because they are not humble, as it is stated in the Gospel. "O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, I thank You because you have shown to the unlearned what you have hidden to the wise and learned." (Luke 10, 21.)
3. Finally, because there are some who do not like to understand the Holy Scriptures, so that they would not be obliged to do good works.

Let us say, therefore, as David:

May the Lord have mercy on us,
and bless us.
Shine His face upon us,
and have mercy on us.

(Psalm 67, 2.)

I SAID."

His ardent desire was satisfied one month and a half later, on July 18, when all the 535 Fathers, except two, gathered for the 4th. General Session, approved the Scheme, which the Pope immediately confirmed with his supreme authority.

In his own words, the Saint recalls this happy event, in his Autobiography:

In the Sacred Vatican Council.

On the 18th. day of July, 1870.

The Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff when he speaks
ex cathedra has been defined.!

This truth has been always believed in the Apostolic Roman Church, and always has been taught in the Schools of sound theology; but because Satan has raised so many errors and deceits, the Supreme Pontiff, with the opinion of the Fathers of the Sacred Vatican Council, has been pleased to declare and define this great truth, and place it as a beaconlight, so that the faithful that sail through the perilous sea of this world may know where the port of truth and virtue is, and may avoid the obstacles of error and vice.

The Decree ends with the following precise and fulminating words:

"If anyone — God forbids — dare to contradict
this our definition, — be excommunicated!"

* * *

As a conclusion of the preceding article, here is the sketch of the Life of St. Anthony Mary Claret.

Born on Christmas Eve, 1807, in Sallent, Barcelona, Spain, Antonio Claret y Clará spent his childhood and adolescence helping in the small textile mill of his parents.

At 18 he was enrolled in one of the best schools for Arts and Trades, in Barcelona. There he acquired the latest methods of the weaving industry, which he applied successfully in the plant of his father, making it progress considerably.

At 21 he started to feel strongly, and to follow, the vocation to priesthood, to which he was ordained on June 13, 1835. He was 28 years old.

Finding his apostolic work inadequate to cover the many needs of so many people, he founded the Congregation of Missionary Sons of the Immaculate Heart of Mary (CMF), on July 16, 1849. (This group of religious missionary men are called today, by the Founder's name: CLARETIANS.)

One month later, he was appointed and consecrated Archbishop of Santiago de Cuba, where he spent his best years as a missionary Prelate, until Queen Isabel II of Spain called him to the royal court of Madrid, in 1856, to become her spiritual adviser and Confessor. This job he combined with many others for the welfare of the Catholic Church all over Spain.

The Spanish Revolution of the year 1868 obliged him to flee with the royal family, from Spain to France. He continued his trip to Rome, where he took part in the preparations of the First Vatican Council, as we have seen in the previous article.

Stricken by apoplexy, and exhausted by the heavy climate of the eternal City, he was brought back to France, as a refugee, in the southern town of Prades, (by that time, there was a flourishing Community of Claretians — refugees too from Spain). There he stayed enjoying the family life of his brothers as religious, until the notice arrived that he was being persecuted by the revolutionaries. Secretly he went to the neighboring Monastery of Fontfroide, on August 6. Two months later the attack was repeated, of which he never recovered.

It was October 24, 1870: exactly 62 years and ten months since his birth.

On February 25, 1934 he was beatified by Pope Pius XI, and on May 7, 1950 — the Holy Year — he reached the supreme honor of the altars, as decreed by Pope Pius XII, a place he actually maintains, in spite of the many "drop-outs" of the calendar of the Saints.

● **Alfonso Ma. Sierra, CMF**

CASES AND QUERIES

FERTILIZATION "IN VITRO", ITS MORALITY

1. *May I have your opinion on the reported experiment in Britain about the production of a "test tube" baby?*
2. *Is there any justification for such a move?*
3. *How would you reconcile the "test tube" baby experiment with the current moves to check the population explosion?*

The Press Report

On or about last February 25, several local dailies carried reports concerning attempts done in London to fertilize the ripe ovum of a woman outside the womb, which was later to be implanted into the womb of the same woman for gestation and development. Apparently the action was not carried out for experimental purposes, and the male element was not procured from other than the husband of the same woman. The object was to ensure fertilization and provide more chances of having a baby to the woman, who apparently had difficulties attaining conception the normal way.

The Vatican Censure

The clinical venture can be described, therefore, as remedial. It attempted to help nature and to attain the aim of Nature. Nonetheless, a day or two later, the Vatican press office, in a statement attributed to its Director Msgr. Vallainc, labelled the action as immoral by Catholic standards. This statement has puzzled many. In order to provide some understanding of the background and meaning of this statement, as well as of others of similar nature, it will be useful to consider and answer the following questions:

Premises

First: Are sex and the human reproductive process the creation of God and, therefore, His property, or of private individuals? To say that they are creation of private individuals is tantamount to saying that private individuals made themselves. So we have to say that sex and the human reproductive process are essentially things of God.

Second: When God gave these things to individuals did He intend to engage their cooperation and does He expect such cooperation with regards to a definite purpose and design of His, or not? Quite obviously so. There would have been no sense in imbuing human individuals with sex and biological sexual processes.

Third: Does the Natural Law governing man, that is, the Law of God inscribed in the design of human nature, as male and female, embody not only an aim but also the manner of attaining the said aim? Laws do not only embody an objective, but also the manner of attaining it. So it is obvious that God's plan with regards to human procreation, not only involves the aim but also the manner of attaining it, that is, through the mutual cooperation and the precise roles to be discharged by the spouses.

Immorality of Fertilization of the Human Ovum "In Vitro".

Going back now to the London case, it is quite obvious that the action of the British Doctor does not contravene the aim of Nature, in the particular instance, on the contrary it appears to help that aim. However, it is against the manner laid down by the Natural Law of God governing the procedure to be followed by men with regards to the aim of procreation. One can offend the Law of God, not only by contravening the aim, but also by overriding the manner laid down to attain the aim.

Not against the Aim, but against the Manner Laid Down by Natural Law

It is due to the fact that the action of the British doctor appears to favor the aim of the Natural Law, that some people have been surprised at the censure of "immorality" levelled on it. Indeed, an action contravening the objective of Natural Law would be a more serious of-

fense and more immoral at that, as in the case of contraception; but this does not mean that an action overriding the manner prescribed by Natural Law should not be immoral at all. It is less immoral than the first one, but nonetheless also immoral.¹

No Moral Justification

If fertilization "in vitro" of the human ovum is against the Natural Law, as explained, and therefore immoral, no honest or rightful aim can justify it. As the principle goes: The aim does not justify the immoral means. The desire of the woman to have her own baby and our sympathy for her plight may be rightful, but these things cannot justify what of its nature is immoral. Otherwise a whole gamut of criminal acts could also be justified on the ground that the aim of the agent is good.

Doctrine of Pope Pius XII

The statement attributed to Msgr. Vallainc with regard to the action of the British doctor is nothing new. It is echo of what Pope Pius XII had already said in his address to the Second World Congress on Fertility and Sterility, on May 19, 1956. "On the subject of the experiments in artificial human fecundation 'in vitro' (test-tube) let it suffice for us to observe that they must be rejected as immoral and absolutely illicit." Anyone can see that the action involved is a replacement of the sexual intercourse of spouses, which Natural Law has laid down as the manner for attaining procreation, with another process.

Immorality of Human Artificial Insemination

It is also on account of this reason, that artificial insemination among humans, for the purpose of obtaining offspring, has been declared immoral, even if the donor of the male element is the husband. The procedure is an overriding of the manner laid down by Natural Law, and a substitution of the latter with something else. Some may see weakness in the Church's stand in this matter owing to the reason

¹ When we say that an action is less immoral than another, the statement should not be taken to mean necessarily that the former action is just a light or "venial" offense. An offense against the law of God is, of its nature, not a light matter. But, even within the category of serious offenses, one can be more serious than another.

that She does not object to artificial insemination among animals. But, there is a world of difference to be considered in this matter.

Duty to Respect the Rights and Law of God

In the case of animals, taken both as species and as individuals, God and Nature have ordained them to the utility of men. As long as, therefore, men use animals within the framework of such scope, men do not contravene the Law of God. But, in the case of men, who are equal in rational dignity, no man is simply ordained to the utility of another. Nor are the powers of man given to him by God in proprietorship, but for beneficial use according to the purpose and manner He has laid down. This truism men must keep in mind, namely, that they and their powers are the creation and property of the Creator, and they are duty bound to respect His rights with regards to the same.²

No Grounds for Apprehension

Apprehension has also been raised that the London attempt at fertilization "in vitro" may open the door to the mass production of human beings and thus worsen the population problem. The fear appears to be far fetched if we take the following into consideration: a) The action involves a highly technical procedure dealing as it does with a microscopic object, the female ovum, and requiring a special laboratory equipped with the proper instruments. These things are not readily found in every neighborhood. b) The action also requires an accurate knowledge of the release time of the ripe ovum, and of its precise location in the recesses of the woman. This knowledge is not readily available nor can it be readily obtained. c) The extraction of the ovum is also another problem.

Hence, even if theoretically and in a particular instance, in which a ripe ovum is already had, fertilization "in vitro" is "very simple";

² The foregoing moral evaluation will also apply to "Cloning", if and when the procedure becomes feasible for human beings. Cloning, from the Greek root which means "cutting", is defined as a "sexual reproduction", or reproduction without fertilization. The clonal offspring will have only one parent, whether male or female, and will be an identical twin or "carbon copy" of the parent. The theoretical basis for Cloning, and significant breakthroughs on the plant and animal levels, are reported in Science Digest, November 1969.

yet, it is not practical nor feasible as an ordinary way for human procreation. The procedure cannot, therefore, contribute in any significant manner to the problem of population explosion.

Manuel Piñon, O.P.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDINARY OF THE MASS*

1. *When no member of the congregation is present who can make the acclamation after the consecration, should the priest say "mysterium fidei"?*

No. The words *mysterium fidei*, which have been removed from the context of the words of the Lord and placed after the consecration, "provide as it were an introduction to the acclamation of the faithful" (cf. cons. Missale Romanum). When in particular circumstances no one can respond, the priest omits these words as is done in a Mass which, out of serious necessity, is celebrated without any minister and in which the greetings and blessing at the end of Mass are omitted (General Instruction, no. 211)

The same holds true for the concelebration of priests at which none of the faithful are present.

2. *In eucharistic prayers II and III, when may the special formula for the deceased be used?*

A doubt has arisen because the rubric of eucharistic prayer III reads: "When this prayer is used in *Missis defunctorum*, it is said..." This rubric is made clearer in the new Ordinary of the Mass (no. 322b), according to which the formula is said "when a Mass *pro aliquo defuncto* is celebrated." Therefore this particular prayer may be used in every Mass celebrated for a specific deceased person or in which some special remembrance of a deceased individual is made. The purpose of the law is to facilitate the execution of no. 316 of the General Instruction for calling for a "moderate" selection of Masses for the dead.

* From Notitiae (47, pp. 324-327) whose solutions enjoy only an "orientative" value; solutions ex officio are made public in the Acta Apostolicae Sedis.

THE CHURCH HERE AND THERE

SECRETARIAT GENERAL OF BISHOPS' SYNOD

Vatican City — Pope Paul VI has announced the names of the 15 bishops, who will make up the new council of the secretariat general of the Synod of Bishops.

Twelve members were chosen in two mail ballots by the bishops. Three members were appointed by the Pope. Only two of the 12 elected members, Cardinal Dearden of Detroit and Cardinal Zoungana of Ouagadougou, Upper Volta, were elected with a clear majority on the first ballot. The other 10 were selected on a second ballot, which contained the names of those bishops who had received the highest number of votes.

The council of the synod's secretariat general will assist Bishop Ladislav Rubin, secretary general of the synod, and the Holy See in preparing the synod meetings.

Nothing has been fixed as yet as to how often or when they will meet. The fact that the members have now been chosen, however, clears the way for more active participation of representatives of the bishops in the growth and development of the synod.

The other elected members are: Cardinal Gilroy of Sydney; Card. Gracias of Bombay; Card. Doepfner of Munich; Card. Duval of Algiers; Card. Rossi of Sao Paulo, Brazil; Card. Poma of Bologna, Italy; Card. Marty of Paris; Archbishop Cordeiro of Karachi, Pakistan; Apb. John Zao of Yaounde, Cameroon; and Aph. Marcos G. McGrath of Panama.

The Three members nominated by the Pope are Cardinal Felici, president of the Pontifical Commission for the Revision of the Code of Canon Law; Bishop Stepan Trochta of Litomerice, Czechoslovakia; and Maronite Bishop Michael Doumith of Sarba, from Lebanon.

LITURGY CONSILIUM HANDS OVER ITS WORK

Vatican City — The Consilium for the Implementing of the Constitution on the Liturgy, the special commission for liturgical reform which in the past seven years has overseen the sweeping changes of Roman Catholic rites and prayers, ended its work on April 10 with a final meeting and an audience with the Pope.

It met in Rome to complete the last details of its tasks and then formally turned over its mandate to the Congregation for Divine Worship. At the audience Pope Paul warned that the renewal of the liturgy must not be the "arbitrary decisions of anyone" and that people should "abstain from experiments that have not been approved by the competent authorities of the Church."

In the seven years since Vatican II called for a sweeping updating of the liturgy, the Consilium has supervised the vast programme which has seen Latin almost obliterated as the language of the Mass and the Mass itself altered greatly to make it more comprehensive and less of a private devotion than it had been in the past.

The liturgical reform touched on almost every sector of the Church's liturgical life.

As Pope Paul noted in his farewell address to the Consilium's nearly 100 members, consultors and guests, the Consilium has issued a wide variety of instructions and documents on liturgical changes. He cited the new Ordo of the Mass, changes in the Holy Week liturgy and reform of the rites of infant Baptism, the ordination of deacons, priest and bishops, and the marriage ceremony.

Other reforms carried out by the Consilium include the new order of readings for the Mass, which incorporate much more of both the Old and New Testaments into the yearly Mass cycle, funeral rites, the Church calendar, the breviary and the rites of Confirmation and the Baptism of adults.

Pope Paul thanked the Consilium members and consultors for their work. Speaking in Latin he said: "It is necessary that the renewal of the sacred liturgy shall be carried out with all care, with piety, wisdom and faithfulness and not by the arbitrary decisions of anyone . . .

"It is necessary also that people abstain from experiments that have not been approved by the competent authority of the Church." "A sacrifice offered without regard to the norms fixed by the Church is not acceptable. Liturgical renewal must be carried through with real support of the will of the Vatican Council, and in this holy task, which involves divine worship and the spiritual life, it is necessary to guard, protect and promote the unity and harmony of souls."

CATHOLICS GRANTED SACRAMENTS FOR 'PASTORAL' REASONS

Washington — Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad and Novgorod, U.S.S.R., who came here recently for talks with officials of the Russian Orthodox Church in the U.S.A., said that his Church's permission for Catholics to

receive sacraments from Russian Orthodox priests was granted for "pastoral" reasons.

The permission, issued by the Russian Orthodox Synod, of which he is a member, was especially "aimed at our own land — Russia," he said. In many parts of the Soviet Union there are small communities of Catholics and Old Believers — a schismatic branch of Russian Orthodoxy. Some of these groups have no priests from their respective Churches to minister to them and are asking for permission to receive the sacraments from Russian Orthodox priests.

These requests are being made "here and there," the Metropolitan said. In order to bring about a "unity of action," the synod meeting under Patriarch Alexei of Moscow, ruled in December that Catholics and Old Believers should not be refused the sacraments when they request them.

The Metropolitan said the synod's decision is "not a kind of ecumenical experimentation" but has ecumenical meaning. "Everything that aims at improving relations of separated Christians has ecumenical meaning."

Officials of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity had hailed the decision as a "breakthrough," since the Russian synod is the first major Orthodox body to grant such a permission. They also interpreted the decision as a reciprocal one, since the unity secretariat had issued in 1967 a statement referring specifically to Eastern Churches, saying "there would be reasonable ground for encouraging sacramental sharing if circumstances make it materially or morally impossible over a long period for one of the faithful receive the sacraments in his own Church."

In the same statement, the secretariat had urged: "In granting permission for sharing in the sacraments, it is fitting that the greatest attention be given to 'reciprocity'." Metropolitan Nikodim said the Russian synod's decision was not prompted by the Vatican permission. "That was not involved," he said. "Each Church took its own independent measures because of existing circumstances."

SURVEY ON PRIESTHOOD IN U.S.A.

The National Opinion Research Centre at the University of Chicago, is conducting a survey of the priesthood for the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB). It has reported that some dioceses and religious communities already have a completion rate of over 90 per cent.

Every bishop and major superior of Religious and 6,000 priests have received a 46-page confidential questionnaire to determine what they see as the past, present and future role of the priesthood and the Catholic Church in the United States.

The questionnaire, a sociological survey, forms part of a comprehensive study of priestly life and ministry under a contract signed by the NCCB. The Bishops' Committee on Pastoral Research and Practices, chaired by Archbishop Paul F. Leibold of Cincinnati, is responsible for their study.

The questionnaire was drawn up after long study and consultation among leading scholars in theology, psychology, sociology and allied fields. Aspects of the priesthood under investigation include: personal characteristics, spiritual and psychological growth, the roles of the priest, celibacy, professional performance, job satisfaction, decision-making and authority in the Church.

OPUS DEI WINS CASE AGAINST MINISTRY OF INFORMATION

Madrid — The Spanish Supreme Court has overruled the Ministry of Information suspension of the rights of an Opus Dei group to publish a newspaper in Toledo.

The Opus Dei group had published the paper, *Diario Alcazar* under an agreement made in 1959 with its owners, the Brotherhood of Santa Maria del Alcazar, a society of survivors of the siege of the Alcazar in Spain's 1936-39 Civil War. In 1968 the Brotherhood asked the government to remove the editors on the grounds that their policies violated the original agreement on upholding the principles of the Falangist movement.

The Minister, Manuel Graga, suspended the Opus Dei staff and replaced it with an editorial and management group acceptable to the Brotherhood. The Opus Dei editors appealed against this action.

The Supreme Court has ruled that the ministry's intervention in the case was technically defective in that the government overstepped its police powers under press laws. The Minister of Information was guilty of "a formal breach of administration" in declaring the contract void and dismissing the editors without a proper hearing.

The court ordered the ministry to reopen negotiations for bringing about a fair settlement of the dispute. In the cabinet reshuffle of October, 1969, Fraga was replaced by Alfredo Sanchez Bella, an Opus Dei sympathizer. Observers said at the time that the cabinet changes in general gave Opus Dei members a greater role in government affairs. The Minister of Information later banned the publication of the weekly, *New Force*, after it published an article allegedly detrimental to Opus Dei.

FOUR CANONIZATIONS ANNOUNCED

Vatican City — Pope Paul VI will canonize three individuals and a group of Croatian martyrs within the next three months.

It has also been announced that in the autumn he will solemnly declare St. Catherine of Siena and St. Teresa Doctors of the Church, the first women to be so honoured.

The canonization of the Forty Martyrs of England and Wales will be to sainthood "on schedule," according to the promoter of their cause, Father Clement Tigar, S.J. He has told N.C. News that he has not heard the official date, but that he expects the Pope to "announce the canonization at a consistory in May and raise the martyrs to sainthood at the end of October possibly on November 1, the feast of All Saints."

The four canonization ceremonies announced by the Vatican will honor an Italian priest, A Spanish spiritual adviser, a French nun and martyr of Croatia.

Father Leonardo Murialdo, who devoted his life to caring for poor boys, will be canonized in St. Peter's on May 3. In addition to his youth work, he was influential in social reform in Italy during the last half of the last century. He was most successful in founding the workers' movements and promoting reform in the apostolate of the press.

Marie Therese Victoire Couderc, foundress of the Sisters of Our Lady of the Cenacle Refuge, will be canonized on May 10.

A group of Croatian martyrs, chief among whom is Blessed Nikola Tavelic, will be canonized on June 21.

John of Avila early in the 16th century aspired to go to America as a missionary, spent his priesthood in Spain and Portugal. His early career was devoted to care of the poor. In later life he became the confessor to St. Teresa of Avila and St. John of the Cross.

The prospective new doctors of the Church lived nearly two centuries apart but both left written testimonials of their mysticism and clarity of doctrine. St. Catherine of Siena and St. Teresa of Avila produced their classics of ascetical and mystical doctrine during the 14th and 16th centuries, respectively. St. Teresa wrote her works. St. Catherine, who was illiterate, dictated hers.