

# BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

OFFICIAL INTERDIOCESAN ORGAN

● THE PHILIPPINE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW ●

MAGNA CHARTA OF THEOLOGY ●  
CHRISTMAS MESSAGE ● WORLD  
DAY OF PEACE ● DECLARATION  
ON THE DUTCH CATECHISM ● RELI-  
GIOUS TEACHERS' RENEWAL AND  
COMMITMENTS ● THE FILIPINO  
CLERGY DURING THE SPANISH RE-  
GIME ● CHRISTIAN AND DOUBTS ●

# BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

## EDITORIAL STAFF

EDITOR	LEONARDO Z. LEGASPI, O.P.
ASSISTANT EDITOR	FIDEL VILLAROEL, O.P.
ASSOCIATE EDITORS	FRANCISO DEL RIO, O.P. QUINTIN M. GARCIA, O.P. JESUS MERINO, O.P. EFREN RIVERA, O.P. PEDRO V. SALGADO, 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, P15.00; Two Years, P26.00; Three Years, P40.00. Abroad, \$5.00 a year. Price per copy, P1.50. 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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EDITORIALS</b>	96
<b>THE POPE SPEAKS</b>	
Fidelity to the Teaching Mission of the Church	100
Christmas Message	105
World Day of Peace	111
<b>DOCUMENTATION</b>	
The Dutch Catechism: Introduction	
L. Z. LEGASPI, O.P.	116
Declaration	
COMMISSION OF CARDINALS	120
"Consilium" on the New Eucharistic Prayers	129
<b>DOCTRINAL SECTION</b>	
Religious Teachers' Renewal and Commitments for Catholic Education	
BRO. H. GABRIEL CONNON, F.S.C.	130
Promotion of Human Rights — Way to Peace	
MOST REV. JOSE CUENCO, D.D. Archbishop of Jaro	141
<b>HOMILETICS</b>	
Second, Third, Fourth Sundays of Lent, Passion and Palm Sundays	
DAVID TITHER, C.S.S.R.	143
<b>HISTORICAL SECTION</b>	
The Filipino Clergy During the Spanish Regime	
JESUS MA. CAVANNA, C.M.	153
<b>CASES AND QUERIES</b>	
Christian and Doubts	
F. DEL RIO, O.P.	162
<b>THE CHURCH HERE AND THERE</b>	174
<b>BOOK REVIEWS</b>	179

# MAGNA CARTA OF THEOLOGY

It is rather difficult not to be surprised with the much publicized "Magna Carta of Theology." Reported to have been signed by some of the most respected theological minds of our day, it begins with a protestation of "genuine, complete and unambiguous loyalty to the Church," and goes on to remind the Pope "that the freedom of theologians in the service of the Church, regained by the Second Vatican Council, must not again be jeopardized."

The avowal of a "genuine, complete and unambiguous loyalty to the Church" by a theologian is strikingly surprising because it should be assumed in a theologian worth his salt. Theology, after all, is the science of faith, and, by the will of Jesus Christ, the immediate and universal norm of this faith, can be found solely in the authentic magisterium of the Church, whose task is to safeguard faithfully and to explain infallibly the deposit of faith (cf. I Vat. Council, sess. III, ch. 4). It is inconceivable then for a theologian to wander away from the magisterium and still lay claim to the name of a theologian.

Again it is surprising to read that these theologians would almost pleadingly demand from Pope Paul VI intellectual freedom in theological investigations. For it was no less than Paul VI himself who not only assured them of this necessary freedom to investigate new problems and to perfect the necessary understanding of old problems, but also took pain to explain the real theological bases of this intellectual freedom. One has just to read his address on October 1st to the theologians, among whom the signers of the Magna Carta were conspicuously present.

Theology, he said, is a mediator between the faith of the Church and its magisterium, and a mediator in presenting the teaching of the magisterium to the Christian people to form the faith and moral observance among them. The exercise of this mediation demands from theologians a constant search for a more perfect understanding and expression of the divine mystery and in this way to do

all they can to provide an answer to the new questions which continually arise, many of them of the gravest importance, even for the existence of Christianity. It entails an attentive study of written and oral revelation, the discovery of its secret and subtle meaning and dominating synthesizing ideas.

In order to be able to accomplish this task adequately the necessary intellectual freedom to investigate must be imperatively granted, and the creation of a climate of freedom of theological investigation must be fostered. Always, of course, bearing in mind that this freedom must be contained within the limitations set by the Word of God as it has been constantly preserved and as it is taught and explained by the living magisterium of the Church and especially the Vicar of Christ. But within these limitations and demands of the Word of God, intellectual freedom is not only admitted, but even urged by the Pope.

In the light of these observations, one is inclined to wonder why so dramatic a manifesto had to be drafted at all. It is not at all hard to divine that this is due to a growing feeling among Catholics that the Church is in some ways reverting to the old defensive attitudes that prevailed before the Second Vatican Council.

Pope Paul VI's recent speeches almost always deprecate those who cause upheavals within the Church. He refers to the corrosive spirit of criticism in magazines and newspapers and the one-sided reporting of unpleasant news about events and persons in the Church. This feeling is heightened by the unfortunate way in which every negative aspect of these speeches is headlined and emphasized. From the manner of reporting it is difficult not to conclude that the Pope has lost spirit of optimism and that he is profoundly discouraged at some of the trends within the Church. People then begin to ask: are these not signs that the Church is suppressing intellectual freedom in the Church, and retarding the development of sound theology by muzzling even competent theologians?

This is most unfortunate because it is a typical example of criticism out of context. Pope Paul's recent speeches have been on the theme of the council, the need to follow the guidelines which it set forth and the meaning of an acceptable renewal not of betrayal. His addresses are full of instruction, encouragement and hope, not of gloom and pessimism. They explore many facets of the meaning of faith in the context of the contemporary world.

It is also unfortunate on another score: it misses completely the overall tone of his speech, the positive content, the mainspring of the papal addresses which is *the call to Catholics to love the Church and to make that love the basis of their apostolate*. Admittedly the human, historical and visible aspects of the Church make it doubly difficult to love the Church. But this human, historical and visible aspects of the Church do not make up the Church. The material reality hides the mystery of the dynamic presence of Christ in the Church. And this presence of Christ becomes for us the motive of our love for the Church. This love demands exacting standards of personal responsibility to truth and to interior renewal, both in the pastors and the community—the pastors to keep unsullied the Mystical Body of Christ, the community to live its salvific life.

The Pope's speeches then must be viewed in the light of his reiterated emphasis on the true spirit of the council and the need to follow its teachings faithfully. For in this context alone will the growing feeling of fear that Church is reverting to an inquisitorial posture be found baseless, and the "Magna Carta of Theology" will appear as a case of, what we locally call, over-acting.

## The Missing Portion of "Humanae Vitae"

We wish to call the attention of our readers to a passage which was omitted in the first English translation of the "Humanae Vitae" and subsequently published *sic* in our last year's September issue of the *Boletín Eclesiástico de Filipinas* (vol. XLII, No. 474). It should have read, after the third paragraph on page 650, as follows:

"Speak then with confidence, beloved Sons, secure in the conviction that the Holy Spirit of God, while assisting the Magisterium in proposing true doctrine, enlightens internally the hearts of the faithful and invites them to give their assent. Instruct married couples to have frequent recourse in a spirit of great faith to the Sacraments of the Eucharist and Penance, and never let them be discouraged by their weakness." (*L'Osservatore Romano*, August 8, 1968. English edition, p. 4, col. 4)

May we also take this opportunity to reproduce here in full, for the benefit of our readers, the brief but most pertinent comments of Rev. Fr. Leo A. Cullum, SJ, who was kind enough to inform us of the missing portion of the papal document.

"This text is of the utmost importance because it describes the manner in which the teaching of the Church should be received, namely, holily. As a matter of fact in many cases this was not the reception accorded to *Humanæ Vitæ*. Too many — in the picturesque description of the editor of *The Month* — met the encyclical "firing from the hip".

St. John, the Evangelist, in the first of his epistles (2, 21) says:  
 You have an anointing (grace) from the  
 Holy One (Christ) and you know all things. I  
 have not written to you as to those who do not  
 know the truth but as to those who know it.

St. Augustine commenting upon this said:  
 Here brethren you see a great mystery.  
 The sound of our words strikes you; the  
 teacher is within. Do not think that anyone learns  
 anything from men. We can admonish by the sound of  
 our voice; but if there is not one within who  
 teaches, the voice is in vain.

It is absolutely indispensable that Catholics listen to their pastors prayerfully. As the pastors themselves sorely need the assistance of the Holy Spirit in their teaching so do the faithful need this special assistance to hear that teaching properly, and this assistance will not be given to them unless they meet the teaching of their pastors in a prayerful mood and with the assistance of the Holy Spirit."

## **FIDELITY TO THE TEACHING MISSION OF THE CHURCH**

*At the General Audience on Wednesday, December 4th, the Holy Father spoke to groups of the faithful including many delegations of religious congregations. His exhortation to fidelity to the teaching mission of the Church follows:*

*The Catholic magisterium and the teaching problems of today*  
Beloved Sons and Daughters!

When we speak to you, when the duty of Our ministry obliges Us to express what We think is true and necessary for salvation ("woe is me if I did not preach the Gospel!", St. Paul admonishes: 1 Cor 9, 16), when some inner testimony gives us the exhilarating certainty of our faith (cfr. Rom. 8, 16), We are seized by a spiritual dismay, which only the duty and love of Our office enables Us to overcome. It is the fear of not being able to speak, of not being able to say what we should like to and what we ought to. We are always reminded of the groans of the prophet Jeremiah: "Ah, Lord God! Behold, I do not know how to speak" (1, 6); and not only because of Our own incapability, but for two other reasons: firstly, because of the greatness, the profundity, the ineffableness of what should be said; secondly, because of the doubt that those listening to Us may not understand what We say.

The last-mentioned difficulty, that of making ourselves understood, is becoming more and more formidable and more problematical at the present time for those whose mission it is to announce the doctrine of faith. How to translate religious truths into understandable words? How to preserve the inviolable orthodoxy of the Christian dogma and clothe it in a language accessible to the men of our time? How to maintain vigilantly the authenticity of the message of salvation and at the same time have it accepted by the modern mentality? You know



that this didactic difficulty is creating great problems for the magisterium of the Church today, and that it is inducing some teachers of religion and not a few publicists (whose art is to make everything not only understandable, but easy and impressive), to make an effort to express religious truth clearly, happily, so that everyone may accept it and, to a certain extent, understand it.

*Preaching, teaching, apologetics*

This effort is praiseworthy and deserving; it determines and qualifies the announcement of the revealed message, that is, preaching, teaching, apologetics, theological reflection. If the contact between God and man takes place normally through words, and not only through events, signs, charisms (cfr. 1 Cor. 2, 5), it is necessary for the words to be comprehensible somehow; they keep their transcendent depth, but, through the analogy of the terms in which they are expressed, they can be accepted, understood, reduced to the limited proportions of listeners (let us remember the scholastic saying: *quidquid recipitur per modum recipientis recipitur*; that is: what is received; is received according to the capacity of the receptacle). And this is the justification of the pedagogical art of gradualness, of exemplification, of the spoken language, and also of eloquence, or of figurative representation, applied to the communication, the transmission, the diffusion of the revealed Word.

*The universal significance and the objective authority of the Word of God*

This effort to adapt the revealed Word of God to the understanding of the listeners, that is, the disciples of God (cfr. Jn. 6, 45), it exposed to the danger of going beyond the intention that makes it praiseworthy, and beyond the limit which keeps it faithful to the divine message: that is, to the danger of ambiguity, reticence, or distortion of the message. It may even be led into the temptation of choosing among the treasure of revealed truths the ones that are popular, leaving out the others, or into the temptation of shaping these truths in accordance with arbitrary and particular conceptions, no longer in conformity with their genuine meaning. This is a danger and a temptation to which everyone is exposed, because everyone, coming into contact with the Word of God, tries to adapt it to his own mentality, his own culture;

that is, to submit it to that free examination which takes away from this same Word of God its univocal significance and its objective authority, and ends up by depriving the community of believers of adhesion to an identical truth, to the same faith: the "one faith" (Eph. 45) disintegrates and with it that very community that is called the one, true Church. This remark would be enough to convince us that the divine plan is right in wishing the revealed Word contained in the Scriptures and in the apostolic tradition, to be protected by a vehicle of transmission, We mean a visible and permanent magisterium, authorized to guard, interpret and teach that Word.

### *The richness of our doctrinal heritage*

You understand how grave and delicate the question of our religious language is (cfr. Denz. Sch. 1500, 782, 2831, 1658; 3020, 1800; 3881, 2309 John XIII, A.A.S. 1962, 790, 792). On the one hand, it must remain scrupulously faithful to divine Thought and to that Word that gave us its original expression; on the other hand, it must obtain a hearing, and to the extent possible be understood by those to whom it is addressed. It is not surprising if religious teaching seems difficult in itself, both because of its content and because of the genuine expression that communicates it. Nor is it amazing if that effort at adaptation, about which We were speaking, or of "aggiornamento" as is said now, may sometimes be imperfect both as regards the doctrine to be set forth, and as regards the listeners by whom it is to be accepted. Nor should we wonder if the forms of study and of theological exposition are multiple; one form may be occupied in consideration of a given aspect of the doctrine, while another is taken up with an authentic, but different, aspect. On the contrary, this multiplicity of forms is desirable; it indicates the richness of our doctrinal heritage and the inexhaustible fruitfulness of the exegetical, speculative, historical, literary, moral, biblical, liturgical mystical explorations, etc., of which it can be the object. It also indicates the relative freedom of study and exposition, which permits scholars, teachers, artists and even simple believers to draw what is necessary for our thirst from the spring of running water of the doctrine of the faith.

*Absolute respect for the integrity of the revealed message*

But one condition is necessary, the one We mentioned of the absolute respect for the integrity of the revealed message. On this point the Catholic Church, as you know, is watchful, severe, demanding, dogmatic. The very formulas in which the doctrine has been deliberately and authoritatively defined, cannot be abandoned. In this connection the magisterium of the Church is adamant, even at the cost of bearing the negative consequences of the unpopular terms in which the doctrine is expressed. It cannot do otherwise. Jesus himself, moreover, experienced the difficulty of his teaching; many of his hearers did not understand it (cfr. Mt. 13, 13), in fact even his beloved disciples found his words hard and were upset by them (In. 6, 60-62), when he announced the mystery of Holy Eucharist to them, and Jesus did not hesitate to ask them a very painful question: "What about you, do you want to go away too?" (ibid. 68).

The problem is still a tormenting one. Then, too, the function of the ecclesiastical magisterium has become difficult and contested today. But it cannot fail to carry out its orders, and must give its faithful testimony, at all costs, should it be necessary in the matter of faith and divine law; nevertheless it is the first to study and encourage everything that can make its doctrinal and pastoral teaching more acceptable to men of our time.

You, beloved Sons, who are certainly aware of the difficulties with which the teaching mission of the Church has to cope today, will share them and sustain her effort, with your fidelity, your support of good theological and didactic studies, promotion of genuine religious teaching, the profession of your Christian faith, in liturgical prayer and in moral life, and also with a certain family indulgence or the not infrequent imperfections of ecclesiastical and Catholic expression, both written and spoken. Confident of this, We thank you with Our Apostolic Blessing.

*Special greeting to young farmers*

We now wish to address a particularly warm greeting to the five hundred participants in the National Congress of Young Farmers and of the Rural Women's Movement, led at this Audience by the National

President of the Confederation of Farmers, Paolo Bonomi, and by the Ecclesiastical Counsellor, Msgr. D'Ascenzi. The interest with which We follow, and the importance of the subject of the Congress, which deals with "Rural youth and the problem of the formation of the new family", would have called for far more time than is at Our disposal, to be able to tell you what you are expecting of Us. But we know that, both during the preparation of the Congress, and in the last few days, you have studied and will continue to study the teaching of the Church on the family, as it has been given by Our Predecessors, and as it was illustrated by Vatican II and proposed by Ourselves, in the recent Encyclical "Humanae Vitae", for the good of society and the serenity of families.

We exhort you, therefore, to make this teaching yours, more and more yours acquiring a clear knowledge of its main lines and generously putting it into practice in your lives. Today the rural family is going through a period of difficulties, the material aspects of which are certainly not the hardest ones, in comparison with the change in mentality that is going on and with the hedonistic lure of the outside environment. On you young people, looking to the future in a realistic, positive spirit, lies the great responsibility of the families of the future: how they will live, how they will move in the context of social progress, how, above all, they will be centres of spiritual cohesion and moral energy for each of their members. To you, women, is entrusted the most difficult part, because it is the most hidden one, that of ensuring your families, today and tomorrow, warmth of affection, constant educational care, upright Christian morality, the fervour of piety and the riches of faith.

Prepare yourself for your tasks. As the creators of a well-balanced, hard-working humanity, know how to acquire day by day that wealth of personal gifts, professional concepts, spiritual resources, which are and will be an irreplaceable help to you in giving the best of yourselves in this vast, severe but exciting duty. The Lord, who will call you to account for it, also gives you the grace to carry it out in a worthy way. We pray ardently for you, that he may grant you the abundance of his graces, of which Our Apostolic Blessing to you, to your dear ones and to the whole beloved Confederation of Farmers, is an affectionate token.

## POPE PAUL'S CHRISTMAS MESSAGE

"CHRIST IS OUR TRUE AND HIGHEST HOPE"

Beloved Brothers and sons!

and all of you, both men and women, who hear Our voice!

Citizens of the world!

We, Paul, Servant of the servants of God, Bishop of Rome and Pastor of the Catholic Church, invested with the mission of preaching the Gospel of Salvation and peace, We wish to announce to you once again, in this year nineteen hundred and sixty-nine which is about to dawn, the Birth of Jesus, called the Christ (Mt. 1, 16) Our Lord (Rom. 1, 4).

In Our plaintive voice there resounds the voice of the centuries. For centuries, indeed, this announcement has been repeated; yet always, in its authentic message or even in a confused echo, there comes to us as a new statement the good news for mankind. Every year, at this pleasant hour, the clock of time marks a moment full of surprise, of meaning, of interest and of hope. It is indeed a happy moment, deeply human, mysteriously sacred. It is a moment which intimately affects our life, its conscience, its essence and its destiny. At this moment there rise up before our gaze the first concrete values of life, the childhood, the family, the home, the family table, rest, serenity and peace; and in our hearts there rise up the finest feelings, of goodness, compassion and love. Christmas is like that.

At this time We desire to consider the aspect of the intention of that prodigious fact which is Christmas: namely, the reason why Christ came among us.

Brothers, sons and all men who hear Our voice! Our joy is the truest and greatest of all joys! The reason for the coming of

Christ is our salvation! No other event concerns us so directly as Christmas does. We repeat this every time that we recite the "Credo" during Holy Mass: "for us men and for our salvation, He came down from Heaven"!

### **The Strength of Hope**

Therefore We are happy to repeat to the world today the announcement of Christmas as a message of hope: Christ is the true and the highest hope of mankind!

It is not difficult to see how active hope is in our time; indeed it is even characteristic of its most salient aspects. Everything today moves and changes under the sign and with the strength of hope. Today, man thinks, acts and lives by virtue of hope. Is not hope the interior mainspring of modern dynamism? Is not hope the root which nourishes the immense task of the world, as it reaches forward towards its transformation and progress? Is not hope that apocalyptic attraction towards a future to be conquered, towards a new humanism which should spring forth from the chrysalis of the traditional concepts of social customs? No one is any longer satisfied with what exists at present. At one time, the experience of the older generation was the guarantee of actual or desirable order; but now it is just that order which is attacked, precisely because it is inherited from the past; it is overturned rather than conserved and renewed, in the blind hope that what is new will of itself be fruitful for human progress. No further credence is now given to the stable values of faith, culture and institutions; men look towards the future not in its chronological aspect of coherence with an organic and developing tradition, but under a rebellious, surprising and indeffinible aspect, with an almost fatalistic and messianic confidence in a radical and general renewal, and a happiness finally free and entire. Two factors have concurred to generate this tension of hope: the discovery of ever-increasing possibilities of unforeseeable conquests through scientific exploration and the technical domination of nature; and the observation of the conditions of need in which under so many aspects, the greater part of mankind lives. Consequently, this twofold discovery has awakened new and immense desires in human hearts: that is, the hope of using the riches of the

means acquired to fill the lack caused by hunger, misery, ignorance, insecurity and insufficiency, from which the man of our century still suffers.

We live in the era of hope.

It is, however, a hope in the kingdom of this earth, a hope in human self-sufficiency.

### **The Crisis of Hope**

And it is precisely in our day that that hope is going through a most serious crisis.

Before the terrified gaze of contemporary man, a grandiose and complex phenomenon emerges. First of all, well-being itself, built up by intelligent and painful human efforts, easily becomes a source of new needs, and often of even greater evils. Progress itself, in some fields, craves enormous fearful dangers for all of humanity. The use which modern man can make of the murderous forces which he has mastered raises on the horizon, not hope, but heavy clouds of terror and folly. The peace of peoples, or in clearer words, the existence of man upon the face of the earth, is put in peril. The destructive power of modern man is incalculable; and the fatal probable use of such power to devastate the city of man depends upon causes which are tragically free, which neither science nor technique can of themselves dominate. Thus it happens that instead of hope there comes forth anguish.

Unfortunately, too, by yet another road, our generation is coming to an analogous result. Today's man has observed that the entire construction of the economic and social system, which he painfully builds up with superb practical results, is in danger of becoming his prison, of depriving him of his personality, of turning him into a mechanical instrument of the great machine of production. That machinery, while it provides enormous wonderful external improvements, subjects man to a colossal apparatus of domination. In this way there will arise a society redundant with material well-being, satisfied, satiated, but lacking

in superior ideals which give meaning and value to life, and deaf, as it were, to the groans of the poor, near and far, who yet call themselves men and are in fact brothers. The gaze of some young people in particular, of those who are usually clairvoyant and prophetic, has been darkened by their never being taught absolute principles, by the systematic spread of doubt and agnosticism. At a certain point, then, contestation became the fashion, with the temptation of degenerating into rebellion, violence and anarchy. In this social and ideal field, too, human hope is being degraded and extinguished.

With sorrow do We see that, because of these ill-advised collective confusions, historical, cultural, moral values which are still valid and worthy are being lost, with consequent damage to the entire civilized community. We see with amazement how many sane and honest citizens, even wise and heeded-teachers, and responsible public men, cannot find in themselves the energy to defend and revive intelligently a patrimony of civilization won by immense sacrifices and available to the enjoyment of all; the energy to save society, and especially future generations, from the consequence of useless and ruinous material and moral destruction. With regret also do We see that often the presumed remedy for these disorders, real or anticipated, is nothing more than a recourse to heavy-handed repression of lawful freedoms, or general deprivation of civil rights, or refusal to recognize the imploring needs of poor people. In this way, too, hope is wounded.

The argument could continue with regard to international life: Does hope for peace falter today?

It could also penetrate to the depths of many minds representative of modern culture. Perhaps never before, as much as in our day, literature, theatre, art, philosophical thought, have cruelly borne witness to the deficiency of man, his mental debility, his domination by sensuality, his moral hypocrisy, his facile delinquency, his increasing cruelty, his possible abjection, his inconsistent personality. All these self-satisfied accusations are based on a terrible and seemingly irrefutable argument: Such is man! Such is the great and miserable son of the century! This is the true reality of life.

Where, then, brother man, is your hope?



In proposing for your meditation a theme so complex, so vast and, We may well add, so real, it is certainly not Our intention to perturb the serene observance of Christmas with sinister and disconcerting thoughts. Rather, We do so in order to help you understand better and welcome the joyous message of hope which Christmas brings to us.

### Proclamation of Salvation

The experience of the dramatic and, in itself, desperate condition of human life, an experience which modern progress, instead of suppressing, often sharpens and exacerbates, must call us back to admit an unavoidable need which humanity, in various forms and degrees, has always preserved in its deepest consciousness: the need of being saved. Indeed, all of us have need to be saved. We cannot succeed in this by our own strength alone (cf. Rom. VIII, 15 sq.). Our presumptuous struggle to save ourselves by ourselves only serves, finally, to underline the conviction of our radical incapability. We can go even further, in virtue of man's conscience and that of history: we have need of a Saviour, of a Messiah. The name of Jesus means Saviour; and Christ means Messiah. That name "Jesus Christ", is the proclamation of our salvation; it is necessary that He have divine power, because no other power can overcome our ills. It is necessary that He have brotherhood with men, because if He were not a brother, we could not understand Him. Saint Leo, the great Pope of the mystery of Christ, says: "If (Christ) were not true God, He could not offer us a remedy; if He were not true man, He could not offer us an example" (Sermon XXI; P.L., liv. 192).

That is why our proclamation of Christmas, after nearly twenty centuries, remains fresh and new; and, by reason of our faith in Christmas, we may add, remains valid. We are authorized to make our own the piercing words of the Christmas Angel: "I bring you good tidings — the good news of the gospel — of great joy that shall be to all the people: today in the city of David, there is born to you a Saviour" (Lk. II.10-11).

This proclamation is not in vain, because the hope we place in it will not be in vain. On that blessed night, through the virginal motherhood of Mary, Christ inserted Himself into the history and destiny of mankind, and He still lives today. He lives in the fulness of a glory which for now we cannot properly name or imagine, in the life of heaven; but He lives also here among us, being continually reborn, like a fountain from its spring, in His Mystical Body which is the Church, ever spreading throughout the world His truth and His grace.

The Evangelist says: He was filled with grace and truth (Jn. 1.14). His truth, that is, His word, making His thought tangible among us, is our teacher of life, revealing Who God is, teaching what man is, telling us what we must do and love, helping us to see, in a man who suffers, not only our brother but Christ Himself, restoring us to the freedom, dignity and expectation of the ideal man, making us capable of goodness, justice and peace: He is the light of the world. Then, in order that His bright and lofty word should not blind us, should not oppress and confuse our innate weakness, He strengthens it with a mysterious and powerful aid, the action of His Spirit. This is Christmas. This is the Incarnation, which spreads from Christ to embrace all mankind; to shake and arouse it, to torment it, to regenerate it now, in time, so as to guide it beyond time towards eternity.

This revival is slow but sure, toilsome but triumphant, ancient but thrillingly new. This is Christianity. It has the power to infuse hope and give life, not only in its own order which is that of religion and the supernatural, but also in the profane and natural order; for when that order links its own earthly and therefore fallacious hopes to that unshakeable hope which descends from the kingdom of heaven, it no longer doubts that its work may be in vain. Christianity lives in the reality which Christ works among us: the candid pious innocence of children, the sufferings offered by the sick, the healthy deep love of families, the generous unselfishness of youth, the humble invoking patience of the poor, the yearning struggle for greater justice of workers, the silent active charity of the good, the unceasing prayer of the community of the faithful. This is Christianity alive in the holy Catholic

Church, which upholds eternal hope, and also strengthens earthly and truly human hopes (cf. *Gaudium et spes*).

We are so deeply sure of this, beloved Brothers and sons, that with all Our heart We again announce to you this happy message, and We add to it Our Apostolic Blessing.

## THE POPE'S WORLD PEACE DAY MESSAGE

To all men of good will, to all those responsible for the development of history today and tomorrow; hence, to those who guide politics, public opinion, social directions, culture, education, to youth, rising up in its yearning for world-wide renewal, with a humble and free voice, which comes forth from the desert where no worldly interest is. We again proclaim that imploring and solemn word: Peace.

Peace is today intrinsically linked with the ideal recognition and effective realization of the Rights of Man. To these fundamental rights there corresponds a fundamental duty, which is Peace.

### Peace is a duty

All the comments of the modern world concerning the development of international relations, the interdependence of the interests of peoples, the accession of new States to freedom and independence, the efforts made by civilization to attain a single world-wide juridical organization, the dangers of the incalculable catastrophes should new armed conflicts occur, the psychology of modern man with his desire for undisturbed prosperity and universal human relationships, the progress of ecumenism and mutual respect for personal and social freedoms, all this persuades us that Peace is one of the supreme benefits of man's life on earth, an interest of the first order, a common aspiration, an ideal worthy of mankind, master of itself and of the world, a necessity in order to maintain the conquests achieved and to achieve others, a fundamental law for the free circulation of thought, culture, economy, art, and a demand which can no longer be suppressed in view of human destiny. This is so because Peace is security. Peace is

order. A just and dynamic order, We add, which must continually be built up. Without Peace there is no trust, without trust there is no progress. And that trust. We declare, must be rooted in justice and fairness. Only in a climate of Peace can right be recognized, can justice advance, can freedom breathe. If, then, such is the meaning of Peace, if such is the value of Peace, then Peace is a duty.

It is the duty of present history. Whoever reflects the lessons which past history teaches us will proceed at once to declare that a return to war, to struggle, to massacre, to the ruins caused by the psychology of conflicting arms and forces, even to the death of men who are citizens of the earth, the common fatherland of our life in time, that such a return is absurd. He who knows the significance of man cannot avoid being a follower of Peace. He who reflects on the causes of the conflicts between men must recognize that they betray a lack in man's mind, and not true virtues of his moral greatness. The necessity of war could be justified only in exceptional and deplorable conditions of fact and law, which should never be verified in modern world society. Reason, and not might, must decide the destinies of people. Understanding, negotiations, arbitration, and not outrage, blood and slavery, must intervene in the difficult relationships between men. No precarious truce, unstable equilibrium, fear of reprisals and revenge, successful conquest or fortunate arrogance, can guarantee a Peace worthy of that name. Peace must be willed. Peace must be loved. Peace must be produced. It must be a moral consequence; it must spring up from free and generous spirits. A dream it may well seem; but a dream which becomes a reality by virtue of a new and superior human concept.

Yes, a dream, since the experience of these recent years and the rise of recent murky floods of evil ideas, such as radical anarchic contestation, violence considered lawful and always necessary, the policy of power and domination the armaments race, trust in methods of cunning and deception, the inescapable tests of strength, and others, seem to suffocate hope for the peaceful ordering of the world. Yet that hope remains, for it must remain. It is the light of progress and of civilization. The world cannot give up its dream of universal Peace.

It is precisely because Peace is always coming to be, always incomplete, always fragile, always under attack, always difficult, that We proclaim it. We proclaim it as a duty, an inescapable duty. The duty of those responsible for the destiny of peoples. The duty of every citizen of the world; because all must love Peace, and all must work together to produce that public mentality and common conscience which make it possible and probable. Peace must first be in men's minds, so that it can then exist in human events.

Indeed, Peace is a universal and perennial duty. In order to recall this axiom of modern civilization, We invite the world to celebrate once again, for the year 1969 which is about to begin, World Peace Day on the first of January. This is a wish, a hope and an engagement; the first sun of the new year must shed upon the earth the light of Peace.

We dare to hope that, above all, it will be Youth who will grasp this invitation as a demand which can interpret everything new, lively and great, yearned for by their exasperated spirits, because Peace demands the correction of abuses and coincides with the cause of justice.

This year a special circumstance recommends Our proposal to all: there has just been celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights. This event interests all men, individuals, families, groups, associations and nations. No one must forget or neglect it, for it calls all to the fundamental recognition of the full dignified citizenship of every man on earth. From such recognition springs the original title of Peace; in fact, the theme of World Peace Day is precisely this: "The promotion of Human Rights, the way to Peace". In order that man may be guaranteed the right to life, to liberty, to equality, to culture, to the enjoyment of the benefits of civilization, to personal and social dignity, Peace is necessary: when Peace loses its equilibrium and efficiency, Human Rights become precarious and are compromised; when there is no Peace, right loses its human stature. Moreover, where Human Rights are not respected, defended and promoted, where violence or fraud is done to man's inalienable freedoms, where his personality is ignored or degraded, where discrimination, slavery or intolerance prevail, there true Peace cannot be.

Peace and Rights are reciprocally cause and effect, the one of the other: Peace favours Rights, and Rights in their turn favour Peace.

We presume to hope that these arguments will prove valid for every person, every group of persons, every nation; that the transcendental importance of the cause of Peace will encourage meditation upon it and application of it. Peace and Human Rights — such is the thought with which, We hope, men will commence the coming year. Our invitation is sincere, having no other purpose than the good of mankind. Our voice is feeble but clear; it is the voice of a friend, who desires that it be heard not so much because of who says it, but of what he says. It is addressed to the world; that world which thinks, which works, which suffers, which waits. Oh! May this voice not be ignored! Peace is a duty!

This message of Ours cannot lack the strength which comes to us from that Gospel of which We are minister, the Gospel of Christ.

It, too, like the Gospel, is addressed to everyone in the world.

More directly, however, to you, Venerable Brothers in the Episcopate, and to you, beloved sons and faithful members of the Catholic Church, do We repeat Our invitation to celebrate the Day of Peace; and this invitation becomes a precept, not of Ours but of the Lord, Who desires that we be convinced and active workers for Peace if we are to be numbered among the blessed marked with the name of sons of God (*Mt. v. 9*). Our voice addresses itself to you; it becomes a cry, because for us believers Peace takes on an even deeper and more mysterious meaning, for us it acquires the value of spiritual fulness and personal as well as collective and social salvation; earthly and temporal Peace, to us, is the reflection and prelude of heavenly and eternal Peace.

For us Christmas, Peace is not only an external equilibrium, a juridical order, a complex of disciplined public relationships; for us, Peace is above all the result of the implementation of that design of wisdom and love, through which God willed to enter supernatural relations with mankind. Peace is the first effect of that new divine economy which we call grace—"Grace and peace," as the Apostle says—it is a gift of God which becomes the style of Christian life; it is a

Messianic phase which reflects its light and hope upon the temporal city also, strengthening with its superior motives those reasons upon which that city bases its own Peace. To the dignity of citizens of the world, the Peace of Christ adds the dignity of sons of the heavenly Father; to the natural equality of men, it adds that of Christian brotherhood; to human competition which ever compromise and violate Peace, Christ's Peace weakens pretexts and opposes motives, thus showing forth the advantages of an ideal and superior moral order, and revealing the marvellous religious and civil virtue of generous pardon; to the incapability of human art to produce a solid and stable Peace, Christ's Peace lends the aid of its inexhaustible optimism; to the fallacy of policies of proud prestige and material interests, Christ's Peace suggests a policy of charity; to justice, too often weak and impatient, upholding its needs by the fury of arms, Christ's Peace infuses the unconquerable energy of those rights derived from the deepest reasons of human nature and from man's transcendental destiny. The Peace of Christ, which derives its spirit from the redeeming sacrifice, is not fear of might and resistance; the Peace of Christ, which understands pain and human needs, which finds love and gifts for the little, the poor, the weak, the disinherited, the suffering, the humiliated, the conquered, is not cowardice tolerant of the misadventures and deficiencies of man with no fortune or defence. In a word, the Peace of Christ is, more than any other humanitarian formula, solicitous of Human Rights.

This, Brothers and sons, is what We would have you remember and proclaim on World Peace Day, under the auspices of which the new year commences, in the name of Christ, the King of Peace, defender of all authentic human rights. So be it, with Our Apostolic Blessing.

*From the Vatican,  
December 8, 1968.*

## DOCUMENTATION

### THE DUTCH CATECHISM<sup>(1)</sup>

#### Historical Background

In October 1966 the Dutch Hierarchy presented their *The New Catechism* (*De Nieuwe Katechismus*), with a foreword in which they say: "In the following pages we hope to present anew to adults the message which Jesus Christ brought into the world, to make it sound as new as it is."

The work was intended to replace their conventional type of catechism of 1948. It is written in an engaging, extremely simple, narrative style and is more existential than existentialistic in its study of the meaning of revelation, historical rather than dogmatic in its orientation.

The Dutch Catechism was the result of combined effort of some 150 contributors under the Higher Institute of Catechetics in Nijmegen. This explains the Extensive use of the existentialist-Teilhardin categories and rhetoric, so strikingly evident throughout the book.

Barely a month after its publication a group of Dutch Catholic laymen circulated a petition they had sent to the Holy See. They alleged therein that the catechisms ran counter to accepted Catholic teaching on seven different points: *the virginity of our Lady, original sin, the Eucharist, the nature of faith, birth control, the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the existence of angels.*

The petition, done in Latin and Dutch, was published in the Dutch Catholic daily *De Tijd*, on 22nd November, 1966. On 23rd November, *De Tijd* published a short reply by Fr. E. Schillebeeckx, O.P., and a long one by the Jesuit Fr. Piet Schoonenberg, in two articles, on 10 and 17 December. These diverse views made it clear that the disagreement did not center on what the catechism said about debatable points, but rather on what it omitted to say. Later the debate shifted rather sharply to the contention of the defenders of the catechism that the points under discussion were "open questions" rather than matters of faith.

---

<sup>1</sup> A NEW CATECHISM: Catholic Faith for Adults. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967. PP. 510.



The first official discussion in what was turning to be a growing controversy was held at Gazzada, near Milan, from 8th to 10th April, 1967. The participants were three theologians named by the Holy See and three others designated by the Dutch Hierarchy. The purpose of this discussion was clear-cut: to arrive at an acceptable solution to the difficulties posed by the text of the catechism. The discussion, on the whole, was a failure.

Upon receiving the joint report of this group, the Holy Father set up a Commission composed of Cardinals Frings, Lefebvre, Jaeger, Florit, Browne and Journet. They were to pass upon the matter. Two meetings were held before they issued the Declaration.

The first was held on the 27th and 28th June 1967. In it they reached this decision: (1) the New Catechism was to be carefully revised before new editions and translations thereof were made, and (2) a group of theologians from seven different nations should be chosen to study the text of the Catechism and submit their opinion thereon. Incidentally this group submitted a unanimous report, after a couple of months of continuous hard work.

The *second* meeting was held from the 12th to the 14th of December 1967. On January 4, 1968, a thirty-three page report on the catechisms was sent to Cardinal Alfrink. In essence, the commission requested that changes be made in the statement of *fourteen major* points of doctrine (among them the virgin birth, birth control, original sin, the problem of after-life), and of *forty-two minor* points. It was also decided that these decisions be carried out by a drafting committee composed of two theologians to be unanimously nominated by the Commission and two, by the Dutch Hierarchy. Those nominated by the Commission were Fr. E. Dhanis, S.J., a Belgian residing in Rome, theological adviser to the Pope, secretary to the doctrinal commission at the Synods of Bishops, and Fr. Jan Van Visser, C.S.S.R., a consultant of the Congregation of the Faith and professor at the Alphonsianum, Rome. Those designated by the Dutch Hierarchy were Fr. Joseph Mulders, S.J., a co-author of the catechism, head of the religious department of the Dutch radio, and Fr. Fortmann, rector of the Utrecht Senior Seminary. Fr. Mulders later on requested to be relieved.

By then, several translations of the Dutch Catechism were either in preparation or ready for publication. The bishop of Freiburg, in Breisgau, held up publication of the German edition of the Dutch catechism until the German hierarchy should have read the translation and given their approval. The Bishop of Burlington, U.S.A. gave his Imprimatur to the English edition in July, 1967, only to revoke it later in deference to the awaited findings of the investigating commission. The edition published by Messrs. Burns and Oates and Herder and Herder carries this Imprimatur. The edition published in America carries the imprimatur of the original Dutch edition. This

was denounced by Cardinal Alfrink (*Osservatore Romano*, Nov. 2-3, 1967) as being unapproved and published before the eventual changes could be made.

Added to these unfortunate events was the arbitrary and misleading act of attributing theological opinions appearing in the Dutch catechism to the theologians named by the Holy See. All these subsequent events seemed to manifest a determined effort to frustrate the plan of the Holy See to resolve the question of the Catechism through mutual understanding with the Dutch hierarchy.

It was then that the Commission of Cardinals decided to release this *Declaration* to present a compendium of the consensus on the New Dutch Catechism. The unanimous Declaration, issued on October 15, 1968 is divided into two parts: historical and doctrinal.

The foregoing has taken up its historical part.

The doctrinal part is subdivided into ten cardinal sections, each containing two or more doctrinal observations, as to what should be changed and in what manner. Clear-cut and concise, the doctrinal part of the declaration needs no further elucidation; it is a re-statement of Traditional doctrines.

In order to facilitate cross-references between each observation of the Declaration and the pertinent statements of the Dutch Catechism, we offer the readers the following table.

DECLARATION	DUTCH CATECHISM
1. <i>Points concerning God the Creator:</i>	
a) Angels	p. 482; on demons, pp. 109-10;
b) Individual human souls: immediate creation	pp. 382, 473.
2. <i>The Fall of Man in Adam: Original Sin</i>	pp. 259-270 "The Power of Sin".
3. <i>With regard to the conception of Jesus by the Virgin Mary:</i>	
a) Virginal Conception of Jesus	pp. 75-77
b) Perpetuity of Mary's Virginity	pp. <i>ibid.</i>
4. <i>The "Satisfaction" made by Christ Our Lord</i>	pp. 279-283.
5. <i>The Sacrifice of the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Mass</i>	pp. 3067; 332-47.

6. *The Eucharistic Presence and the Eucharistic Change: Dogma of Transubstantiation* pp. 342-343.
7. *The Infallibility of the Church and the Knowledge of Revealed Mysteries:*  
 a) Infallibility of the Church pp. 364-367;  
 b) Understanding of dogmas pp. 365-366.
8. *The Ministerial or Hierarchical Priesthood and the Power of Teaching and Ruling in the Church:*  
 a) Dignity and importance of the Ministerial Priesthood pp. 369-370;  
 b) Power of Teaching and Ruling in the Church: Magisterium pp. 371-375.
9. *Various Points Concerning Dogmatic Theology:*  
 a) Mystery of the Three Persons pp. 498-502;  
 b) Efficacy of the Sacraments pp. 111-117; 252-255;  
 c) Miracles pp. 107-109;  
 d) Souls of the just, which, having been already purified, already rejoice in the immediate vision of God, purgatory, last things. pp. 472-477.
10. *Certain Points of Moral Theology:*  
 a) Existence of objective moral laws, binding in conscience always and in all circumstances pp. 449-51; 373-6;  
 b) Indissolubility of marriage pp. 394-398;  
 c) Conjugal morality pp. 402-403.

## Declaration of the Commission of Cardinals of the "New Catechism" ("De Nieuwe Katechismus")

### I. HISTORICAL PART

When the "*New Catechism*" was published in Holland ("De Nieuwe Katechismus", 1966) — a work which on the one hand is marked with exceptional qualities but on the other hand, because of its new opinions, from the very moment of issue disturbed not a few of the faithful — the Apostolic See, in virtue of its office of protecting the faith of the people of God, could not fail to take cognisance of the affair. And so the Holy Father wished that, to begin, a discussion should take place between three theologians named by the Holy See and three theologians named by the Dutch hierarchy concerning the difficulties which the text of the Catechism presented.

In the discussion held from the 8th to 10th April 1967 the theologians chosen by the Holy See, according to an agenda sanctioned by the authority of the Sacred Congregation of the Council and according to the mind of the Holy Father, asked with confidence that certain things be introduced into the Catechism which, in more precise formulation, would beyond doubt correspond to the faith of the Church, to objective truth and to the conviction of the faithful. But the discussion produced very few results; and no change was made with regard to those points which by way of example, the Holy Father himself had indicated: "for example, what pertains to the virginal conception of Jesus Christ, a dogma of the Catholic faith to the teaching supported by the Gospel and the Tradition of Church by which we believe that angels exist; and to the satisfactorial and sacrificial character of the redemptive act which Christ offered to His Eternal Father for the remission of our sins and to reconcile men with the Father."

When he knew of the outcome of this discussion, especially from the joint report of the theologians designated by the Holy See, and

the theologians of the Dutch hierarchy, the Holy Father ordered that a Commission of Cardinals (Frings, Lefebvre, Jaeger, Florit, Browne and Journet) examine the matter and give their opinion about it. This Commission meeting for the first time on the 27th and 28th June 1967 with theologians familiar with the Dutch language at hand to assist them, decided that the New Catechism was to be carefully revised before new editions and translations were made, and chose another group of theologians from seven different nations to study the text of the Catechism and to express their mind about it.

Besides the Catechism itself this group was given the above-mentioned report of the first discussion between the theologians. In September a series of emendations presented in the meantime by the authors of the Catechism was added to this report. After painstaking work the group of theologians drew up their observations with regard to the text of the Catechism and with regard to the series of emendations proposed which on the whole did not seem sufficient. Every single observation of the group was approved unanimously in its entirety by the members.

When the designated Cardinals had received these observations of the theologians along with other documents, they met again from the 12th to 14th December 1967. After discussing each of the observations they definitively decided, by vote on each item, what things had to be changed in the text of the Catechism and how they were to be changed; they provided with the help of Cardinal Alfrink that a small commission be set up consisting of two of their delegates and two delegates of the Dutch hierarchy to accomplish the task. The Commission completed this assignment in February 1968 and submitted the results to the Holy See, to the designated Cardinals and to the Dutch hierarchy.

Previously, however, contrary to the wish of the Dutch hierarchy and without the prescribed correction, an English translation of the New Catechism was published; and likewise more recently a German translation has appeared and finally a French translation. Besides, reserved documents of their very nature secret pertaining to this affair, have recently been presented to the public; among them there is even a letter

of the Holy Father himself. This was done in a Dutch newspaper and also in a book published in Italy.

In the book just mentioned copious notes and explanations are added to the documents published, and in these not only are there assigned to the theologians named by the Holy See opinions which they never held, but also the very points of the Catechism which needed correction are glossed over time and again in various ways so as to seem harmless enough while they are not so in reality. Not infrequently they really are not sufficient to correct the opposite explanations. This is all the more true because very frequently these explanations agree with opinions expressed by the authors of the Catechism in other words. With regard to future editions of the Catechism, solutions are proposed contrary to those which the Commission of Cardinals, with the approval of the Holy See decreed, and it is suggested that only those corrections of the Catechism which the Holy Father expressly mentioned, be admitted at all; although as is clear from the above quotation from the Holy Father, he himself was only giving examples of the clarification which he wanted.

In that same book a wrong use is made of the opinion of some modern exegetes as to how St. Matthew and St. Luke wanted to present and explain the principal facts about the birth and infancy of Our Lord. Although the particular theologians and authors to whom the book refers hold that the virginal conception of Jesus is to be placed among the principal events which the Gospel of our Lord's infancy proposed as altogether real, the book itself dares to come to the conclusion, not without violation of the Catholic faith, that the faithful are to be permitted not to believe in the virginal conception of Jesus in its both spiritual and corporal reality, but only in its certain symbolic signification.

These publications strive in various ways to frustrate the plan of the Holy See to resolve in mutual understanding with the Dutch hierarchy a matter of no small moment for the good of the people of God. For this reason, and because the Catechism in an unamended edition, has already appeared in four language, it seems necessary even before the amended editions and translations of the Catechism are published, to give in this present declaration a compendium of the judgments of

the Commission of Cardinals. In this way it will be clear to the faithful how, in full accord with the Church of Christ and the See of Peter, they can think and bear witness without fear of error about the good tidings of salvation.

## II. DOCTRINAL PART

**1. Points concerning God the Creator.** — It is necessary that the Catechism teach that God, besides this sensible world in which we live, has created also a realm of pure spirits whom we call Angels, (Cf. v.g. Conc. Vat. I, Const. Dei Filius, cap. 1; Const. Vat. II, Const. Lumen Gentium, n. 49, 50). Furthermore, it should state explicitly that individual human souls since they are spiritual (Cf. Conc. Vat. II, Const. Gaudium et Spes, no. 14) are created immediately by God (Cf. v.g. Encycl. Humani Generis, ASS, 42 (1950), p. 575).

**2. The Fall of Man in Adam.** — (Of Conc. Vat. II, Lumen Gentium, n. 2). — Although question regarding the origin of the human race and its slow development present today new difficulties, to be faced in connection with the dogma of original sin, nevertheless in the New Catechism the doctrine of the Church is to be faithfully proposed, that man in the beginning of history rebelled against God (Cf. Conc. Vat. II, Const. Gaudium et Spes, n. 13, 22) and so lost for himself and his offspring that sanctity and justice in which he had been constituted, and handed on a true state of sin to all through propagation of human nature. Certainly those expressions must be avoided which could signify that original sin is only contracted by individual new members of the human family in this sense that from their very coming into the world, they are exposed within themselves to the influence of human society where sin reigns, and so are started initially on the way of sin.

**3. With regard to the conception of Jesus by the Virgin Mary.** — The Commission of Cardinals has asked that the Catechism openly profess that Blessed Mother of the Incarnate Word always enjoyed the honor of virginity, and that the fact itself of the

conformity with the mystery of the Incarnation itself, be taught clearly. In consequence the Catechism should offer no excuse for abandoning this factual truth—in face of the ecclesiastical Tradition founded on Holy Scripture—retaining only a symbolic signification, such as the complete gratuity of the gift which God has given to us in his Son.

#### 4. The "Satisfaction" made by Christ Our Lord. —

The essential elements of the doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ which pertains to our faith are to be proposed without ambiguity. God so loved sinful men as to send His Son into the world to reconcile men to Himself (Cf. 2 Cor. 5, 19). As St. Augustine says: "We are reconciled to a God who loved us even when we were at enmity with Him because of sin" (*In Ioannes Evangelium* Tr. CX, n. 6). Jesus therefore, as the first-born among many brethren (Cf. Rom. 8, 29) died for our sins (Cf. 1 Cor. 15, 3). Holy, innocent, immaculate (Cf. Hebr. 7, 26), he underwent no punishment inflicted on him by God, but freely and with filial love, obedient to His Father (Cf. Phil. 2, 8) he accepted, for his sinful brethren and as their Mediator (Cf. 1 Tim. 2, 5,) the death, which for them is the wages of sin (Cf. Rom. 6, 23; Conc. Vat. II, Const. Gaudium et Spes, n. 18). By this His most sacred death, which in the eyes of God more than abundantly compensated for the sins of the world, He brought it about that divine grace was restored to the Human race as a good which it had merited in its divine Head (Cf. v.g. Hebr. 10, 5-10; Conc. Trid., sess. VI Decr. De justificatione, cap. 3 et 7, can. 10).

#### 5. The Sacrifice of the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Mass.

It must be clearly stated that Jesus offered Himself to His Father to repair our wrong-doing as a holy victim in whom God was well pleased. For Christ "... loved us, giving himself up in our place as a flagrant offering and a sacrifice to God" (*Eph. 5, 2*).

The sacrifice of the Cross is perpetuated in the Church of God as eucharistic sacrifice (Cf. Conc. Vat. II, Const. Sacrosanctum Concilium, n. 47). In the eucharistic sacrifice Jesus as the principal priest offers Himself to God through the consecratory oblation which priests perform and to which the faithful unite themselves. That celebration is both sacrifice and banquet. The sacrificial oblation is completed by commun-



ion, in which the victim offered to God is received as food, to unite the faithful to Himself and to join them with one another in charity (Cf. *I Cor.* 10, 17).

#### 6. **The Eucharistic Presence and the Eucharistic Change.**

—It is necessary that in the text of the Catechism it be brought out beyond doubt that after the consecration of the bread and brought out beyond doubt that after the consecration of the bread and wine the very body and blood of Christ is present on the altar and is received sacramentally in Holy Communion, so that those who worthily approach this divine table are spiritually renewed by Christ Our Lord. Furthermore, it must be explained that the bread and wine in their deepest reality (not in appearance or phenomenologically), once the words of consecration have been spoken, are changed into the body and blood of Christ; and so it comes to pass that where the appearance of bread and wine (the phenomenological reality) remains, there, in a way most mysterious, the humanity itself of Christ, lies hidden together with His divine person.

Once this marvellous change has taken place, a conversion which in the Church is termed transubstantiation, the appearance of bread and wine,—since they actually contain and present Christ Himself, the fountain of grace and charity to be communicated through the sacred banquet,—take on as a consequence indeed a new signification and a new end. But they take on that new signification and that new end precisely because transubstantiation has taken place (Cf. *Enycl. Pauli VI, Mysterium Fidei*, AAS, 57 (1965), p. 766; *Schreiben der Deutschen Bischöfe an alle die von der Kirche mit der Glaubensverkündigung beauftragt sind* n. 43-47).

#### 7. **The Infallibility of the Church and the Knowledge of Revealed Mysteries.** — It should be more clearly stated that the infallibility of the Church does not give her only a safe course in a continual research, but the truth in maintaining doctrine of faith and in explaining it always in the same sense (Cf. *Conc. Vat. I, Const. Dei Filius*, cap. 4, et *Conc. Vat. II, Const. Dei Verbum*, cap. 2) "Faith is not only a seeking of the truth but is above all certain possession of truth" (*Paulus VI, Alloc. ad Episcoporum Synodum*, AAS,

59 (1967), p. 966). Nor is it to be allowed that readers of the Catechism think that the human intellect arrives only at verbal and conceptual expressions of the revealed mystery. Care must be taken rather that they understand that the human intellect is able by those concepts "through a mirror in an obscure way" and "in part", as St. Paul says (*I Cor.* 13, 12) but in a way that is altogether true, to express and grasp the revealed mysteries.

#### **8. The Ministerial or Hierarchical Priesthood and the Power of Teaching and Ruling in the Church**

Care must be taken not to minimize the excellence of the ministerial priesthood, that in its participation of the priesthood of Christ, differs from the common priesthood of the faithful, not only in degree, but in essence (Cf. Conc. Vat. II, Const. *Lumen Gentium*, n. 10; *Instructio de Cultu Mysteriorum Eucharistici*, AAS, 59 (1967), n. 11, p. 548). Care must be taken that in describing the office of priest there is brought out especially the mediation which they exercise in preaching the word of God, in forming the Christian community, in administering the Sacraments and above all in offering the Eucharistic sacrifice. One must be careful, therefore, not to make their office seem to consist principally in helping human society in temporal concerns.

Furthermore, the Cardinals asked that the Catechism clearly recognize that the teaching authority and the power of ruling in the Church is given directly to the Holy Father and to the Bishops joined with him in hierarchical communion, and that it is not given first of all to the people of God to be communicated to others. The office of Bishops, therefore, is not a mandate given them by the people of God to be communicated to others. The office of Bishops, therefore, is not a mandate given them by the people of God but is a mandate received from God Himself for the good of the whole Christian community.

It is to be brought out more clearly that the Holy Father and the Bishops in their teaching office do not only assemble and approve what the whole community of the faithful believes. The people of God are so moved and sustained by the spirit of truth that they cling to the word of God with unswerving loyalty and freedom from error

under the leadership of the Magisterium to whom it belongs authentically to guard, explain and defend the deposit of faith. Thus it has come about that understanding the faith that has been handed down, in professing that faith and in manifesting it in deed, there is a unique collaboration between Bishops and the faithful (Cf. Conc. Vat. II, *Lumen Gentium*, n. 11, and *Dei Verbum*, n. 10). Sacred Tradition and the Sacred Scripture—which constitute the one and only holy deposit of the word of God — and the magisterium of the Church are so joined that one cannot stand without the other (Cf. Conc. Vat. II, Const. *Dei Verbum*, n. 10).

Finally, that authority by which the Holy Father directs the Church is to be clearly presented as the full power of ruling, a supreme and universal power which the pastor of the whole church can always freely exercise (Cf. Conc. Vat. II, Const. *Lumen Gentium*, n. 2).

#### 9. Various points concerning Dogmatic Theology. —

In the presentation of the mystery of the three Persons in God, the Catechism should not seem to deny that Christians do well to contemplate them with faith and love them with filial devotion not only in the economy of salvation where they manifest themselves but also in the eternal life of the Divinity, whose vision we hope for the efficacy of the Sacraments should be presented somewhat more exactly.

Care must be taken that the Catechism does not seem to say that miracles can only be brought about by divine power insofar as they do not depart from that which the forces of the created world are able to produce.

Finally, let open reference be made to the souls of the just, which, having been thoroughly purified, already rejoice in the immediate vision of God, even while the pilgrim Church still awaits the glorious coming of the Lord and the final resurrection (Cf. Conc. Vat. II, Const. *Lumen Gentium*, n. 49 et 51).

#### 10. Certain points of Moral Theology. The text of

the Catechism is not to make obscure the existence of moral laws which we are able to know and express in such wise that they bind our conscience always and in all circumstances. Solutions of cases of conscience should be avoided which do not sufficiently attend to the in-

dissolubility of marriage. While it is right to attach great moment to the moral habits, still one must be on guard lest that habit be presented without sufficient dependence upon human acts. The presentation of a conjugal morality should be more faithful in presenting the full teaching of Vatican II and of the Holy See.

\* \* \* \*

The above observations, though not few and not insignificant, still leave untouched by far the greater part of the New Catechism with its praiseworthy pastoral, liturgical and biblical character. Neither are they opposed to the laudable purpose of the author of the Catechism, namely, to present the eternal good tidings of Christ in a way adapted to the understanding and the thinking of the present day man. Indeed the very fine qualities which make this an outstanding work demand that it ever present the true teaching of the Church in no way obscured or overshadowed.

Joseph Card. Frings  
 Laurentius Card. Jaeger  
 Joseph Card. Lefebvre  
 Hermenegildus Card. Florit  
 Michael Card. Browne  
 Carolus Card. Journet

PETRUS PALAZZINI  
*Secretary*

October 15th, 1968.

## CONSILIUM

### ON THE NEW EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS

De nonnullis in novis precibus eucharisticis definiendis

In conficiendis popularibus interpretationibus novarum Precum Eucharisticarum, haec serventur:

1. Summus Pontifex accedendum esse statuit desiderio a pleribus expressum, ut in formulis consecrationis verba Domini modo uniformi in omnibus excribantur, ita ut facilior evaet eorum recitatio ex parte sacerdotum, praesertim vero in concelebratione.

Quapropter verba Domini in novis Precibus Eucharisticis sic scribantur:

*In consecratione panis:*

Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes:  
Hoc est enim Corpus meum,  
quod pro vobis tradetur.

*In consecratione vini:*

Accipite et bibite ex eo omnes:  
Hic est enim calix Sanguinis mei  
novi et aeterni testamenti,  
qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur  
in remissionem peccatorum.  
Hoc facite in meam commemorationem.

Haec eadem verba, omnia, typis evidentioribus in universo textu conscribantur, ad normam eorum quae statuuntur n. 21 b) Instructionis S.R.C. "Eucharisticum mysterium".

2. In iisdem novis Precibus Eucharisticis, saltem in editionibus Canonis ad usum Episcoporum, post verba "et Episcopo nostro N." vel "et Episcopi nostri N." in intercessionibus occurrentia, ponantur verba quae ipsi respondent "et me indigno servo tuo" vel "mei indigni servi tui", eadem ratione ac in Canone Romano adhibenda quando Missa celebratur ab Episcopo.

E Civitate Vaticana, die 6 mensis novembris 1968.

De mandato Em.mi Praesidis

A BUGNINI, CM

*a Secretis*

**RELIGIOUS TEACHERS'  
RENEWAL AND COMMITMENTS  
FOR CATHOLIC EDUCATION**

**Bro. H. Cannon, F.S.C.**

Once Cardinal Suenens was asked, "what do you believe will be the main problem of the Church in the post-councilar era?" He replied, "the application of the conciliar teaching will be the main problem. It needs men of faith and in a special way of knowing how to realize that faith. In the council text you have a general orientation but now you must build of a methodology. The question is, how are we to implement Vatican II in a practical way? And it is a very important question. I think that there is present sufficient power to achieve this methodology of the apostolate on every level—laity, nuns, religious, priests, bishops, synods of bishops. We have only to find our way."

The following remarks have to do with one method that might be used to make the conciliar teaching applicable to today's apostolate. It's a method which might be used at all levels. It's highly practical and is being used to some extent in too few pockets of the Church. It has no clearcut, precise label. It might be named, "Creative Problem-Solving" or even better, "Creative Problem Finding" which is by far the more original. It might be called "Ideation Techniques," "Imaginative Research" or "Scientific Creativity". Its aim is to find new solution to new problems and where possible to foresee future problems and solve these problems originally. This method is best understood as a tool, a tool for releasing not simply vast quantities of ideas but ideas of quality; ideas triggered from that precious resource, the human imagination; ideas that will help men realize their faith; ideas that will enable the Church to apply the spirit of Vatican II to the modern apostolate.

Interest in ideas is nothing new. It began with the dawn of reflection and has not only kept pace with man's progress but has led him on his way. However, within the past one-hundred years, the concern for new ideas has steadily gained in momentum until we come to today's daily barrage of ideas.

The notion that the present day world is in a period of rapid change has been expressed so often that it has become trite. But trite or not, it's a fact. The world is in an age that sees changes taking place at an almost frightening rate. The older one is, the more frightening change is. The young thrive on it. Mathematicians graphically label this accelerated change as being "exponential". Cardinal Suenens has said: "every thoughtful man today is confronted with two inescapable facts of twentieth-century life—the diversity and speed of change, and the depth and urgency of the human search for meaning and unity in individual and social life. It would be naive to suppose that the religious life would be unaffected by these two powerful influences."

Today's challenge is to successfully cope with and, to go a step further, influence change. This is especially true for religious educators. The fundamental task of religious education is the forming of youthful minds in a Christian way. We are working with the future Christian, the future Church. To say the least, the task and the responsibility is awesome. It's this aspect of our life that places on us the responsibility to be vitally interested in such things as change and how to cope with it.

One might ask, "just how did it all start?" "Why are things not the way they used to be?" "Why isn't the pace nice and slow, then people would all be much happier?"

It is clear that Council was for the Church, an awakening, a surge of hope, of confidence, of faith, of optimism. The religious of today, young in age or in heart and spirit, see the message of the Council, as aligned with the mentality of the Church of today, accepting the challenges of this historical period and of the world of this later twentieth century. For these, the Vatican II is a motive for encouragement and enthusiasm.

other inner force destructive of dialogue is fear to speak the truth as one sees it. Ordinarily this fear is generated by the intolerant attitude of the group or of influential elements in the group. But whatever the cause, fear is a destructive force because the real problems of the adapted renewal can be fruitfully discussed only when each member of the dialogue says frankly what he thinks, even when it is a question of espousing an unpopular cause or of criticizing what the majority or the authority is doing.

It is not enough, however, to know and to combat the enemies without and within the dialogue in order to arrive at a really fruitful and satisfying exchange of views. There are certain positive aspects of the dialogue that must be cultivated: (1) All statements, criticisms, objections, suggestions, should be based on knowledge of the facts and principles involved, and on the history and the aims of the practices or the institutions under study. In other words, what the dialogue needs is not critics, but informed critics. This implies study and research. (2) The statements, criticisms, objections, and suggestions must not be exaggerated; they should be kept within the bounds imposed by truth. (3) In making statements, criticisms, objections, and suggestions they should, of course, be courteous and respectful, but at the same time fearless, fearless in speaking the truth as they see it, but fearless also in recognizing and accepting the truth about their own ideas when these are shown to be incorrect and exaggerated. (4) Before presenting statements, criticisms, objections, and suggestions, they should have thought out how the proposals are to be implemented and what will be the consequences of them, and such methods of implementation and such consequences should form part of the exposition. (5) In the presentation of criticisms, objections, and suggestions, disagreement with others must be a function of love for them. Among intelligent persons in mutual search of the truth and the common good, intellectual disagreement need not involve interpersonal alienation. Men disagree in order to arrive at eventual agreement, so their dialogue must be aimed at harmony.

This consideration dwelt thus long on the technique of dialogue because of the difficulties sometime found in the dialogue and the dis-



cord it has occasioned in certain groups. There is also a positive reason, because without dialogue there is small chance of achieving a real adapted renewal.

One of the subjects under serious discussion today is education. In many places today the Catholic school system is being questioned. It is not enough simply to reaffirm the principle that the Christian school has an apostolic value. This will not satisfy everyone, including many of those who have given their lives to this form of education and who now wonder whether such a school has any real effect, or indeed, any future at all.

Every period of important change in the history of civilization has known similar cases. The solution, however, was never to suppress the school, or abandon it, but rather to emphasize its renewal. Today the Church is committed to make its contribution to the rebirth of the Christian school, to help make it capable of preparing men for the twenty-first century. The Council is pleased to take cognizance of the desire of many, evident throughout the entire world, for this renewal of the educational apostolate. All are invited to participate actively in this movement, committing themselves with confidence and courage to the new directions necessary to answer the needs of youth today. Insofar as such a renewal is undertaken and pursued with intelligence and perseverance, the importance of the school will become more evident than in the past, and the relevance of the education provided in the Christian school will be felt more than ever before. But the implications of such a renewal are many and complex.

The renewal of the school calls for reference and relevance to contemporary culture.

First, it is important that the Christian school at every level be characterized by quality education, a truly professional spirit and genuine service to students and to society. The Church is very explicit in its desire for excellence in education. A poor standard, or a lack of quality is somehow not to add glory to the Church or to radiate the splendour which is rightfully hers.

The school must be aware of the tremendous cultural changes of these times and consequently update itself in its objectives, programs and methodology. In its objectives, the school must impart to the students more than mere book knowledge, by emphasizing instead the development of the powers of observation, imagination, reasoning and discrimination. In its curriculum the school must keep in mind the present importance of physical sciences, the need for sociology, anthropology, the behavioral sciences, modern languages and the significance of mass media and increased leisure time. In its methodology the school must highlight research and creativity rather than rote memorization, by using the best audio-visual materials, and by taking advantage of the more recent developments in pedagogical techniques. In this way the school will play a specific and important part in the total process of education by enabling a man to profit better from other communications media, thus providing a completeness and synthesis to all that he learns.

One of the fundamental functions of the school is to promote "the vitality and growth of a new culture without sacrificing fidelity to the living heritage of tradition." It favors "increased cultural exchange" in such a way that "it does not undermine ancestral wisdom or jeopardize the uniqueness of each people." It is for this purpose that schools now emphasize a more dynamic approach to the teaching of history and the masterpieces of the past. In this same vein the school today stresses training in sensitivity, the ability to form judgments and the development of a critical mind. This is important in a world in which discernment in the use of mass media is required to maintain one's personal liberty in the face of all the propaganda that abounds. The mission of the school is more indispensable than ever in forming men who can think. In an atmosphere of quiet, study and reflection it introduces the person to the life of the mind, to an intuition of and reverence for the inner reality of things, a sense of the sacred and a response to values, an awareness of the limitations and sinfulness of man, and an acknowledgement of the reality of the invisible world.

Education to the faith must also renew itself in terms of the modern world. In a secular society catechesis linked to cultural formation can provide a needed purification for religious thought by ridding it

of magical notions of the world and superstitious practices. In a world in which man is tempted to confine his vision to this life and to think of Christianity as useless or dangerous because it is inhuman, catechesis can point out that man realizes himself only by reaching beyond himself and that "men are not deterred by the Christian message from building up the world, or impelled to neglect the welfare of their fellows. They are, rather, more stringently bound to do these things.

The renewal of the school calls for great attention to persons and to the community life of the school.

The Catholic school, then, will be characterized by a concern for each student. Modern techniques of psychology and pedagogy make it possible for the individuality of each one to be known and respected. This concern encompasses the whole person; his family background, his temperament, his strong points, his special interests. He is more than just another student who happens to attend the school. The teacher will endeavor to discover and develop more and more the special talents of his students, not concentrating on shortcomings and mistakes. Thus the school will be a living community where young people, coming from different social and family backgrounds, educate one another by mutual understanding and respect, openness of mind in dialogue, acceptance of the uniqueness and limitations of each, growth in the spirit of service, and the practice of justice and fraternal charity.

To give a living example of the true meaning of community, the Catholic school will strive to promote the students' personal freedom, encouraging them to assume the responsibility for their own formation. Education to freedom is achieved by a cordial relationship between faculty and students, by intelligent school discipline, by the very approach to teaching itself. The experience of freedom is absolutely indispensable to training in responsibility, students need to assume an active part in the life of the school itself, its discipline and all its operations. Work in small groups will be preferred in order to instill self-confidence, a sense of responsibility and the spirit of collaboration. This will also minimize the problem of undue conflict and selfish ambition. The school will be molded into community only through a faculty rich

in the diversity and the unity of its members. For this reason the religious staff members work closely with lay teachers, who make a unique contribution through their knowledge of the world, of family life and of civic affairs. Lay teachers should be completely involved with the whole life of the school with catechesis, apostolic organizations, extra-curricular activities and administration. Finally, the administration will do everything possible to facilitate the ministry of the religious spirit of the school as a community, and in the Christian education of the students.

More than in any other domain education to freedom is required when there is question of instruction in the faith. The Christian school should be the freest of institutions, it suggests without coercion the infinite possibilities of life according to Christ; it announces the Good News of the Gospel to each one insofar as he is ready for it, and with absolute respect for the freedom of all. To students who have heard and accepted the call of Jesus Christ, the teachers explain the Christian mysteries, and work to develop their faith and their Christian life.

The renewal of the schools calls for an openness to the life of the world and of the Church.

The work of education is achieved by many influences over the course of a lifetime. The modern school therefore endeavors to collaborate with every educational agent. We work closely with parents, who have the first responsibility for their children's education; both must keep in mind that they can learn much from each other. We seek to establish friendly ties with other educators, particularly with those who are concerned with the activities of the young in their moments of leisure. In certain cases it may become necessary that teachers themselves take charge of these leisure activities. We can also work closely with parish priests, chaplains of Catholic Action groups, and with laymen in charge of apostolic organizations directly influencing the life of the young. Thus the school becomes a focal point where educational agencies can meet and enter into dialogue for the greater good of the students. Such openness to the realities of the contemporary world can be furthered in particular instances by having the

school make its facilities and equipment readily available to the public of the local community for adult education and youth activities.

The Christian school endeavors through its program of instruction to prepare its students for their professional life, for marriage and its responsibilities, for service to society and the Church. It makes known to them the great needs and aspirations of modern man. It encourages them to be competent in today's world and to work closely with all men of good will, especially with those not of the faith, for the welfare of mankind.

One way for educators to get to know better the real situation and the real needs of a world in evolution is to take full advantage of a continuing dialogue with the graduates of the schools, both those who have recently finished school and those who have had long experience in the adult world. This makes it possible to give to the students still in school an education that is more realistic and better adapted to the demands of modern life. Following the recommendation of Vatican II in this matter, it is an integral part of the work of education to be concerned about the human and religious difficulties that students encounter when they leave school. Schools should "continue to assist them with advice and friendship and also by establishing special groups genuinely inspired by the spirit of the Church." From an ecclesial point of view, this implies on the part of educators an unselfish dedication that will respect the initiative and responsibility of laymen. It is in this spirit that the Catholic teacher offers to graduates the support of professional competence and religious motivation. Special attention is due to the younger alumni who are in unfortunate financial circumstances or who have need of other support and encouragement. Alumni relations aim to help the graduates become actively involved in civil society, in the Church, and in movements appropriate to their age and station which foster an informed and responsible laity. In this way the important apostolate on behalf of the graduates of the schools will maintain a true harmony with the ultimate goals, and the school's educational activity will enjoy a greater efficacy.

The renewal of the school calls for teachers who are prepared to meet the needs of modern man. "But let teachers realize that to the

greatest possible extent they determine whether the Catholic school can bring its goals and undertakings to fruition." A society committed to the education of the youth of the world will contribute to the renewal of the school only to the degree that it emphasizes and develops the value of the teacher's vocation.

The teaching profession requires by its very nature a broad experience with men and society. The training of young teachers must not, then, cut them off from the life of the men of our time, but must help them, to participate deeply in it, according to their state and in view of their mission. The professional preparation of the teacher is not reduced simply to academic degrees and intellectual excellence. It must provide an education "in the prevailing manners of contemporary social life, and its characteristic ways of feeling and thinking."

Speaking of the religious educator his formation and spirituality will prompt him to perceive and live his teaching career as the expression of his consecration as a religious. He will strive to understand and grasp the significance of his vows for his educational apostolate. He will discover in his love for Christ and for his students the energy to renew—for their sake—the work of his own education, the development of his teaching skill and the interest and joy he finds in life. The formation and the style of his religious life will tend to develop this "constant readiness to begin anew and adapt," demanded by the very nature of the teaching vocation. Finally, the meaning and the interpretation of the "separation from the world," which is part of the religious life, must be reconsidered; it cannot ignore the need for a real presence in the world, nor justify a lack of interest in the needs, anxieties and hopes of all mankind.

## PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS — WAY TO PEACE

● Most Rev. Jose Ma. Cuenco, D.D.  
Archbishop of Jaro

Human dignity is best understood when it is associated with the term "rights." Man possesses rights because of his moral dignity as a human person. Animals are not persons, hence, they have no rights. Rights are inalienable, that is, they cannot be taken away by another even by the Government.

Chief among the rights are-1) The right to life. 2) The right to liberty. 3) The right to the pursuit of happiness. Let us elaborate them.

1) *The right to life*—We should do our utmost to respect and defend the right to life. Life begins with the conception of the child. Therefore, abortion, that is, the premature ejection of the baby, is criminal. And yet, there are many abortionists in the Philippines. There are doctors, who, to make money, practice this immoral action. We must fight abortion by all means. We must safeguard life in its inception.

Adults have a right to life. On them largely depend the stability or and the future of the State or of the nation. Yet, in some nations, particularly, in the Philippines, the right to life is a mockery. For any trifling reason, life is taken away or destroyed. This happens especially during the electoral campaign. Our elections are always bloody. Leaders and candidates in their disputes make use of deadly weapons, with the result, that in every election, hundreds are either wounded or killed.

Religious freedom is one of the most noble rights of man. But, what is religious freedom? Religious freedom means freedom from coercion. No one has the right to force his neighbour to accept or follow his own belief. But, religious freedom must be reasonable.

Through Tradition and Revelation, we know that Christ has founded a Church, the Catholic Church. It is our duty to seek and

embrace it, once found. Were we free to follow any religion or Church, it would have been futile for Christ to establish His Church. The power He has given to His Vicar on earth to bind or loose, would have been useless. Religion is the best safeguard of human rights, and of Christian civilization.

The Hon. Henry Wallace, Vice-President of the U.S.A., in an important speech delivered on May 8, 1942, said—"The idea of freedom derived from the Bible with its extraordinary emphasis on the dignity of the individual democracy, is the *only* true biblical expression of Christianity. Not only does the democratic way of thought spring from evangelical consideration, but, it cannot survive without it." To keep faith in the forward march of humanity, to have faith in the dignity of the person, in human rights and justice, are essentially spiritual values. To have faith in freedom and fraternity, we need a heroic inspiration which strengthens and vivifies reason and which none but Jesus Christ of Nazareth has brought to the world.

Human rights are greatly emphasized by the Declaration of American Independence. "We hold these truths to be self evident" says the Declaration "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among them are, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights Governments becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to abolish it and to substitute it with another Government." In the framing of the Declaration of the American Republic, Jefferson and others who had read Cardinal Bellarmine and Fr. Suarez—the influence of these great theologians of the 16th century is clearly noticeable in the documents. The same scholastic ideas were later engraved in the federal and state constitutions of America. These constitutions served as patterns to other constitutions — among them the Constitution of the Philippines — and were more or less copied by the United Nations on the formulation of the Bill of Rights.

Pope Paul VI, in declaring a year of peace—the year 1969—thought it wise and practical to bring to our minds and to our heart—the right to life, to liberty and to the pursuit of happiness. For true peace is based on respect for life, for liberty, and for the pursuit of happiness. Lasting and enduring peace is enshrined on justice and charity.



## HOMILETICS

● David Tither, C.S.S.R.

### SECOND SUNDAY OF LENT (March 2) BEING INVOLVED

As we get nearer to Holy Week, the reading at today's Mass recalls the transfiguration of Our Lord. The passing glimpse of Who Jesus really was prepared the Apostles for the shock of seeing Him crucified. Moses and Elias, the leading persons of the Old Testament discussed with Him the trial He would undergo in Jerusalem before His glorification in the Resurrection.

Before joining Christ in glory we must pass the test of this life. We will be judged on our charity. Charity means loving men with God's own love. Charity is the love of God, come to live in a man's heart, enlarging it, ennobling it, giving it an unexpected power and capacity. It is God Who comes to live in us and wants to love through us.

The more room we make for him, the less we resist, the more will Christ, living in us, be enabled to love Himself in others.

How do we judge if our charity is Christian? Jesus told us that friendliness and natural kindness are not sufficient. "Will not the heathen do as much? He asked. It is not until we find ourselves thinking in a way that cannot be explained naturally, or doing actions that cannot be explained in human terms, it is only then that we can say we are on the right road, and the love of God is at work in us. Charity goes beyond the obligations of family ties, beyond 'utang na loob', it includes everybody. We should love as God loves.

How does God love? Relentlessly, doggedly, unceasingly. He loves us, whether or not we are aware of it, whether or not we react to it. Even if, here and now, we couldn't care less, God loves us, awaiting a return of love from us. Never forget, He loved us first. "It is not as though we first loved God, but God first loved us." If we love men with God's love, we'll

love men first, whether or not they have qualities we like, even if naturally they are quite unattractive to us. Someone once said to Father Libermann: "If only you knew how much I hate you!" He gently replied: "If only you knew how much I love you."

Charity means much more than giving alms. It is much more than concern about individuals. It means having a heart as large as God's, taking society under your wing to reduce its inequalities, and make life more livable. This is the picture of true Christian Charity.

You've heard of the River Jordan. Jesus was baptized in it. It flows through the Holy Land. Two seas are fed by its waters. One sea is so stagnant and sulphurous that nothing lives in it or around it. It is called the Dead Sea. . . . Further back along the Jordan is another sea teeming with life. Fishermen live all round it, getting food and life from its waters. Sea-birds of all kinds get their living from it. Jesus walked by its shores, on one occasion He walked right on top of its waters. He loved this sea. He used its water as a picture of the life He came to give. He spoke of it in His parables. It is called the Sea of Galilee.

Now, what is the difference between these two seas? The Dead Sea is also fed by the Jordan. The same water as fills the Sea of Galilee pours into it. However, it does not have an outlet — no outlet at all. Its water is so stagnant that no living thing can survive in it. Nobody can derive any use or profit from that Dead Sea.

On the other hand, the Sea of Galilee, fed from the same Jordan, has an outlet. This is the only most important difference. What it receives it pours out, so its waters are always fresh, and life abounds in it.

In the world today, there are two kinds of people. There are people like the Dead Sea and people like the Sea of Galilee. Who are the Dead Sea types? These who grab and take everything they can, and give nothing. Selfish people, who only think of themselves. They are spiritually dead, no use to everyone else, not even to themselves, they will only benefit the world when they leave it. It will be a happier world after they are gone.

On the other hand, we have truly Christian people, typified by the Sea of Galilee. Be it much or little they have. They share it. They are generous, not just with those they like, but with everyone they can help. A kind word here, a good deed wherever they can, a reverence for the inherent dignity of all men, as children of God and brothers in Christ. These are the people that give life and dignity to the world, these are the people who have happiness and spread it all around. If you try to keep your happiness to yourself,

it will perish and so will you. But, give it away, spread it around and it will come back to you in rich dividends, a thousand-fold.

There are such true Christians. May I be another one added to their number.

THIRD SUNDAY OF LENT (March 9)

COMMUNION—SOURCE OF CHARITY

**“Walk in love, as Christ has loved us and delivered Himself for us. — EP.**

“No man is an island. This is truer now than even before. We live in society. As Vat. II reminds us, we can neither live nor develop our gifts except in relationship with others. It’s easy to forget our need of others, of our food, our transportation, our health needs. Imagine if you were suddenly left all alone on a desert island — how much you would have to learn in order to survive — I wonder how many of us would survive. Sure, that very thought of being alone like that makes us shudder. God meant us to live with others to give our help to others, to receive help from them. It’s this way that we become truly human.

You workers don’t work alone. You don’t relax alone either. You students don’t learn all by yourselves. You are taught along with others. To try and live our lives all alone is impossible, and the effort makes us less and less human. We become human, because Christ-like, only when we take His special commandment seriously: “This is my Commandment that you love one another as I have loved you.” We’ll be reminded how high that standard is when Holy Week comes. “Greater love than this no man has that a man lay down his life for his friends.”

Our Saviour summed up the 10 Commandments in these two: Love God all the way, love our neighbor as He did. This is Christianity, if we don’t learn this from our Sunday Mass, then we’re not offering Mass properly, we can ever say that the celebration has passed us by as if it never happened.

Maybe you think I’m exaggerating. I’m not. St. Paul told the Christians of Corinth that their gathering for Mass was voided because of their lack of charity. When you gather, it is no longer to eat the Body of the Lord. For there are dissensions among you.” At the Lord’s Table, one thing is asked outright of those present—that they be filled with love. (Needless to say,

this does not mean emotions or feelings, we're not asked to like people, but to want to love them, as Christ did). Lack of love cannot be tolerated around the Holy Table. In a home a child who quarrels at mealtime is sent away from the table. How often we have noticed that we just cannot eat when there is contention during a meal. Doctors tell us not to eat when we are disturbed — to wait till the tension is over.

King David was being wounded by his enemies, and had to hide in caves for fear of his life. One of his Psalms tells God how great was his grief. And the part he felt most intensely was that the one persecuting him was actually one who had eaten with him. The Bible speaks with horror of any one daring to share a meal with someone whom he deliberately hates.

Our Lord showed the same sentiments — a horror of sharing a meal without sharing love. At the Last Supper, referring to Judas' treachery, He said: "One of you will betray me, one of you who is eating with me."

The Sacred Banquet produces love, but it also presupposes love. Our Lord chose the first Mass as the time to announce His special commandments of love. Love is the apex of all commandments, and the Mass is the apex of worship. Here we see the necessary connection between our worship of God and our dedicated service of Him in others. It is only in this way that unity among men will be perfected.

We know only too well the problems oppressing us and calling for urgent action. The uneven distribution of wealth, the gap between rich and poor, subhuman living conditions, corruption in high places, squandering of natural resources. All these are screaming for speedy action, for immediate solutions, before it is too late. But let's not rush into action without properly understanding what it is all about. To join clean government leagues, to join and actively support organizations for the relief of poverty and inequality is to be encouraged in every way. But, remember what Christ said: "Without Me, you can do nothing."

Our efforts to remove misery will certainly not do any lasting good, they could even do more harm than good, unless we keep a Christian balance. We love our neighbour effectively, precisely because we love God. This Commandment we have from God, that he who loves God love also his brother. Only if we love God with all our hearts will we look unceasingly for ways and means to help all, even those who are ungrateful, grasping, selfish. We will become involved, we will become Christ-like in the degree that we realize that God is our Father and Christ our brother, that we are all, without any exception, brothers and sisters in Christ. If any man say he loves God and hates his brother, he is a liar.

## FOURTH SUNDAY OF LENT (March 16)

**"The bread I will give is my flesh for the life of the world." — GOSPEL**

A gift is a token, a sign of our love for someone. It is a sign of self-giving. A mother, dying, gives a remembrance to each of her children—something of her love is contained in this gift. When we invite guests to a meal, in some way we give ourselves in the food we offer those guests. But, of course, in actual practice we can never identify ourselves fully with the food, we can't actually become food.

In the Mass, this imperfection has been removed. Here we really have the past made present. As realistically as possible, Jesus tells us that His flesh is really food, His Blood really drink. Those who found it hard to believe were given a clear choice: "Unless they would eat His flesh and drink His Blood, they would have no share in His life. Some went away—He let them go. He even asked those who remained would they also go away.

The night before He died, He fulfilled this promise. Taking the bread on the table and breaking it, He said: "Take this and eat it, all of you. This is My Body, which will be given for you. This parting gift was the ultimate in gift-giving even though he is God as well as man, he could not give us any greater token of love.

Now the very idea of a gift includes the readiness of the other to accept it. Suppose you've given a child a toy he wanted. How you enjoy seeing him forget everything around him as he gives all his attention to that gift of yours. We rejoice when our gift is accepted and appreciated. But, if it is ignored, or taken for granted, we are hurt. And, should it be refused or rejected, it leaves a wound that nothing can heal. Nothing is more painful than a rejected gift, because it is rejected love.

We see Him only with the eye of faith. We see now, says St. Paul as in a reflection, but the day will soon come when we will see Him face to face. Communion is precisely the guarantee of that. "He who eats my flesh . . . abides in Me and I in him, and I will raise him up on the last day. He that eats this bread, the same shall live forever.

An aspect of Communion that we easily forget is this — in it we achieve union with the whole Christ, as He is now, Head and members. That is why mutual charity and forgiveness of enemies is an essential preparation for communion. And, (please God we'll come more and more to realize this,) charity, a truly effective concern for others, is the first and best result of

our communions. So, let's not think of Communion in an individualistic way—just Jesus and myself. It's a family meal, and its effect must be to make us realize our oneness as God's family, as Christ's brothers and sisters, really concerned for the spiritual and temporal plight of others.

I want to put a thought before you at this Mass. The union we achieve with Christ is more than a sacramental confirming of a union that lasts all the time, it is more than a further guarantee of the union that will last forever. We achieve union, here and now, with all our loved ones, including those who have passed out of this life, and are now perfectly united with the whole Christ, the Total Christ. In Him we are united with all who are His.

Surely these thoughts should force us to see the fittingness, the correctness of accepting the gift of Himself, so perfectly contained here. Not just at Easter, dear God no, not just once a month, but every time we are at Mass. Surely we will no longer be indifferent, or coldly ungrateful. God forbid that any of us be of the pitiable number who are at Mass every Sunday and Communion once a year because they must, because it is an obligation. Let our Mass and Communion be approached out of sheer gratitude, with a joyful eagerness, with a glad realization that here we are most especially one with the Lord and with each other.

There's a picture of Our Lord which I'm sure you've all seen. Its title is His own words: "Behold I stand at the gate and knock." Jesus is depicted, holding a lamp, standing at a door knocking on it. A strange feature is that there is no handle, no knob to the door, no way of opening it from outside. Someone pointed out this lack to the painter. His answer was profound. "Yes," he said, "there is a handle, but you don't see it in the picture. It's on the inside. The door of our heart cannot be forced open, it can only be opened by ourselves.

Christianity is not automatic salvation. God has done everything He could, left nothing undone. But will not save us in spite of ourselves. Let's tell Him we'll respond, we'll open the door of our heart to Him. And then we'll see our selfishness melt like ice in the sun, and our Christian concern for others will flourish and grow.

PASSION SUNDAY (March 23)

MASS OFFERS MUCH NEEDED SECURITY

**This Cup is the New Covenant in My Blood.—Comm.**

This new optional Eucharistic Prayers for Mass stress the fact that the Mass is covenant, and alianor, an agreement between God and His people.

We often meet the idea of a covenant in the Bible. When Abraham, old and childless, was told he would be the father of God's First people, he felt afraid, he felt insecure, he asked a sign. The sign given was a covenant, the Old Covenant, a guarantee that put an end to all insecurity.

This covenant was renewed on Mt Sinai. "I will be your God and you will be My people. Such was the sacredness of a covenant once made that it could not be undone. When Josue was conquering the Promised Land, the people of Gideon were afraid. They saw themselves threatened, and decided to trick Josue. They pretended to be people from a far country, and asked for a covenant. Josue actually made a covenant with them. And then, when he was absent to attack their city, they revealed that it was with them he had made the covenant. Josue could do nothing about it. He had to spare them, a covenant cannot be broken. (Jos. 9.1-15)

Today, more than ever before, we need security, we need assurance that God cares, that no matter what happens in the world, we have the great living God Who loves us and has guaranteed our ultimate safety. How much He cares we are told in the Bible. He describes us as an unwanted, rejected child, discarded, naked and unwashed, at birth. But He our loving Father, seeing us abandoned, cared for us, brought us up. (Ez. 166). This is God's side of the covenant, described by Himself.

When a young man finds the girl whom God means to be his partner for life and the mother of his children, how concerned he becomes about her. How jealous he is in regard to her. And she feels the same way in his regard. God describes His part in the Covenant in terms of a lover's jealousy. We are His personal possession, and He loves us as the pupil of His eye. (Ps. 90).

Needless to say, there are two partners to every alliance. Life would be impossible if we could not mutually trust one another. Imagine how intolerable a man's life would be if he was not sure that his wife would be there, when he got home from work. The fatal results of insecurity in children from a broken home are too well known. A child needs assurance that his parents love him, and will care for him. We just must be able to rely on each other.

God understands this, and that is why He gave us a Covenant, a new and everlasting Covenant. It began at the first Mass when Our Saviour took the cup of wine and said: "This is the new Covenant in my Blood." His words recalled the Old Covenant, sealed in sacrificial blood. God's guarantee in this Covenant is nothing less than the Blood of the Son He had sent to become one of us, the Blood which would be poured out on the Cross. Let's deepen our awareness of this, specially now that Passiontide is upon us.

And while remembering the part played by God in delivering up His Son as a pledge, a guarantee of His side, let's remember the part we must play.

Scripture compares a Covenant to a marriage for which the mutual love of both parties is vital. In marriage, freely given love must come from both sides.

God's own description of the Old Covenant as a marriage between Himself and His people is dramatically seen in the Book of Hosea. Hosea had a truly tragic experience in his life. His wife Gomer left him for other lovers. This happened after their third child was born. Hosea's heart broke, but his love remained constant. And it finally had the effect of her returning, being forgiven and all forgotten as though nothing had ever happened.

No doubt God chose Hosea, whose tragic personal experience was like an acting out of the part of God to be the prophet who would show the sacredness of God's Covenant, and the sinfulness of our breaking it. Hosea's plea is for us as for his own people, but our Covenant, new and eternal, and renewed in every mass, means more than the former one. God our Father, in the Redemption, has done all that He possibly could to fulfill His part, and Christ, our Representative, has become the second party in the Covenant.

The degree in which it becomes real for each one of us depends on our sincerity in joining Christ at mass. To the degree that we identify ourselves with Christ, to that precise degree does the Covenant, renewed here in His Blood, become real for us. And (it cannot be stressed too often or too forcibly) it becomes actual by our living out our Mass, making a real bond between our worship and our lives.

#### PALM SUNDAY (March 30)

### THE WORLD SANCTIFIED THROUGH THE INCARNATION

#### **"The veil of the temple was rent in two." — Gosp.**

Perhaps the most important lesson of the new formulas for the Eucharistic Prayer at Mass is that they remind us that the whole world and everything in it has been sanctified through Christ. The fact that God's Son came into the world, lived in it, used its goods, He has radically changed the world. The fact that He still lives on in His Church, active specially through His Sacraments, and most of all the Eucharist, enables us to say to God, whatever Eucharistic Prayer is selected, that through Christ our Lord, He continues to bless the world, to give everything in it life and goodness, and to make all holy. In a word, the world and the things in it are good.

Maybe we used to regard the world as a wicked place from which we must escape. Maybe our religion was so other-worldly that we forget that we've been put into this world precisely to make it a better place. We must



admit that sometimes our worship of God did not force us to a more earnest concern about the world, no — perhaps to a greater love of our fellow men.

Now, I'm not talking of worldliness, you know that. It's a matter of getting involved in the world, seeing God, like Christ did, through a selfless service of our fellows. Christ did not flee from the world. He came into the world to sanctify and save it. At His prayer for us during the first Mass, He expressly said: "I do not ask to take them out of the world, but to save them from evil."

So, let's not think there is opposition between religious practices and concern for our neighbour. Our Lord saw no such opposition. He did not feel that He had to choose between God and men. He united God and men. He showed His love for God, by enduring for men the Passion that we recall this Holy week.

When the veil of the temple was torn in two at His death, it was God's sign that the Old Covenant was over, and a new, final arrangement had been made. God had identified Himself with men and the world to the extent of Himself becoming a man, and living on earth. The Father had shown such love for the world as to send His only begotten Son, who would after His death, be raised to a new and glorious life, and share that life with His brothers and sisters in an amazing intimacy.

Now, we know that we please a father by loving his child, that the best way to a father's heart is by taking an interest in his children. The link between God and us His children is so much more intimate, that it surely is clear that any Christian service done to God's children or God's world is done to God.

There is indeed a warning in order here. We must be God-regarding; religion is not natural kindness or benevolence, or humanitarianism. To lose sight of God, and forget that service of man is precisely service of God would ruin the idea of Christian charity that Christ came to proclaim. Service of God and neighbour stand or fall together.

We are to take His approach to religion. Learn from Him that we can't serve our Father unless we serve our brothers, we'll never do a favor to our Father unless we include His children.

You'll hear superficial people say: "I don't go to church, but I don't do any harm to anyone." They don't see that love of neighbor that is not founded on love of God is empty and shallow, and will not last long. Only when it is united with love of God does our charity become Christian and effective.

Why is this so? It was God who made us social, it is through Him that we are to be united. Besides, to make this real, He Himself became a man.

He came not to be served, but to serve. It is absurd to think that in our dealings with others we can ignore this central fact of history and religion, as though we had not been redeemed or sanctified by God, or made His own brothers and sisters. To be a Christian means to be aware of our relationship with Christ, and with one another in Christ — on any other basis, our relationships with others become weak and feeble.

The basic law of Christ is love. It must be admitted that sometimes church-going people lack this insight. It is a scandal that there are people who faithfully attend church, but share no concern about their fellowmen. St. James tells us that we may rightly reprove them. "If a brother or sister be in need, hungry or naked and you say to them, Go your way, be you clothed and fed, but do nothing to help them," this is not religion at all, it is a miserable mockery of religion. "He who has it in his power to do good, it is sinful of him not to have done it."

This week we recall all God did to make salvation available for us. Let our response be a redoubled, renewed readiness to allow Him who died and rose from the dead, and is living in us now, to serve Himself in others.

**THE FILIPINO CLERGY  
DURING  
THE SPANISH REGIME**

● **Jesus Ma. Cavanna, C.M.**  
Collegio, Filipino, Roma

PECULIAR CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE SPANISH COLONIZATION WHICH INFLUENCED THE SLOW FORMATION OF A FILIPINO CLERGY

**I. — THE SPANISH ROYAL PATRONAGE IN THE PHILIPPINES**

- a) Was it a real *cause*, or simply an *eventual occasion*, of the slow formation of a Filipino clergy?

The first accusation raised against the *Patronato Regio* to blame it for the slow formation of a native clergy is that *with it* the missions lost their *supernational* character, and consequently became unable to achieve fully the "planting of the Church" on the solid ground of a native clergy.

It is true that *under the Patronato* system, or better *during the epoch of the Patronato* the missions lost, *to a certain extent*, their *supernational* character; but it was *not because of the Patronato*, *with the Patronato* or *by the Patronato*. The simple proof is that even *without the Patronato* the so-called "*loss of supernational character*" of the missions would have taken place — *to a certain extent* — in any colonial mission land, due to the *evangelization undertaken through colonization* as it was the common case in the age of geographical discoveries. Not the *Patronato* but the very fact of *evangelization undertaken*, as it

seemed obvious and normal in those times, by *missionaries belonging to the colonial power* of the mission land was the real cause of a *certain nationalistic color* which tinged, in some way, the missions of the colonial period.

Our readers may notice that we underline and repeat the restrictive clause "in some way," "to a certain extent"; it is because we cannot assert sweepingly that in this period the missions lost their *supernational* character, and the missionaries in the colonies became *European agents, political instruments at the service of their own colonial regimes, foreign propagandists of the foreign interests of their own nations* in preference or even at the expense of the social and cultural patrimony as well as the political and national rights of the colonies. All such accusations might have been true with respect to some *particular cases* or *individual missionaries*; but in no way are such accusations justified when directed against the missionaries of any country *as a whole*. Catholic missionaries in general, abandoned their fatherland not moved by political motives but enkindled by apostolic zeal; looking for the salvation of souls and not for furthering their own national interests. Certainly, they did not and ought not have to lose or renounce the virtue of patriotism in order to become missionaries of Christ, Who was the first to give us the best example of true love for our own fatherland; but this love for one's own land has to be absolutely disregarded and put aside in the fulfillment of the evangelical mission, in such a way as to become, like the Apostle of the Gentiles, "everything by turns to everybody, to bring everybody salvation" (I Cor. 9, 1922). And this is what at times, some individual missionaries, human as they were, lost sight of to some extent; and still more, some colonial regimes under whose auspices the missionaries worked, tried to pay no heed to, in certain selfish policies imposed occasionally upon these missionaries. In this sense we can admit that during this age of *evangelization undertaken through colonization* the missions lost to a certain extent, in some way, their *supernational* character. The missionary activity of certain nations was then exercised, not exclusively indeed, but in special way, in their *colonies* or *protectorates*. France in Indochina, French Africa or Madagascar; Belgium in its Belgian Congo; Holland in Indonesia; and before them, Portugal and Spain in their overseas colonies (cf.

Angel Santos Hernandez, *Misionologia* . . . , op. cit., p. 513). It was then the normal and common practice that the missionaries of each nation should go to work in their respective colonies. It is not strange—although certainly to be regretted—that in such condition a certain “missionary nationalism” (“*pestis teterrima*” “most awesome pestilence” (as Pope Benedict XV styled it) might occasionally have crept into the very ranks of the missionaries, and still more in the political schemes of the governments under which they pursued their apostolic labor.

However, it is not entirely true, at least for the Spanish colonies, that the missions lost their *supernational* character, in all respects. The best proof is that we can notice in them a wonderful spirit of missionary adaptation: the missionaries, at least in the Philippines where the Spanish immigration was quite small, learned the native dialects and wrote the first grammars and vocabularies of the indigenous languages; preserved and fostered, improving or christianizing them when necessary, the customs, music, dances, arts and folklore of the natives; and although a notable degree of “europeanization” or “hispanization” was introduced by force of the colonial system it was not rigidly imposed by violent means, but through patient education so that it was gradually assimilated and integrated with the native culture itself in a precious blend of the “occidental” with the “oriental” which became in the course of time our own specific, truly original and national Filipino civilization, of which we may be rightly proud today.

Another proof that our missions did not lose totally, as writers seem to imply, their “supernational” character is the very clash which often took place between the missionaries and the civil authorities, in many cases because the former tried to defend the rights of the natives against the abuses of the foreign colonizers, in other cases because the missionaries refused to submit to unfair encroachments or interferences of the State against their rights as religious ministers of the Gospel and of the Catholic or Universal Church, as evangelical laborers sent by the Pope (although through the king, under the Royal Patronage) and recognizing always the Roman Pontiff, and not the Spanish king, as their Supreme Head and Pastor.

A further proof still is that, notwithstanding the general law of the Spanish colonies forbidding the admission of *foreigners* into the new lands under the Spanish regime, the law was most of the time very mildly interpreted and applied to *foreign missionaries*, and thus we can see from the 16th to the 19th centuries (that is, all the time of the Spanish colonization) a good number of foreign missionaries (quite a minority indeed as compared with the Spanish missionaries) working in Spanish American colonies and in the Philippines (cf. Lazaro de Aspuz, O.F.M. Cap., *La aportación extranjera a las Misiones españolas del Patronato regio*, Madrid, 1946 passim). It is worth noticing that such discriminating law against *foreigners* was then an accepted and common practice under all colonial regimes, at times with greater rigor in Portuguese, Dutch and English colonies than in the Spanish ones (Ibid., op. cit., p. 38). Catholic missions where foreign missionaries labored side by side (although in reduced numbers) with colonial and native priests, as it happened in Spanish-American colonies and in the Philippines, cannot be said to have lost entirely their *supernational* character.

Finally, it may well be remarked here that the aspersion cast upon the missionaries of the colonial times as if they acted in general as european agents and foreign propagandists of the interests of their own colonial regimes, has been more bitter in reference to the French missionaries than in regards to the Spanish ones. (cf. Angel Santos Hernandez, op. cit., p. 511.) And with respect to these last, the accusation may assume more resemblance of a truth if we consider the colonies where immigration became considerably great, as in America, than where the immigration from the mother country was too small to influence much in their favor the missionary policies of the Church, as it was the case in the Philippines.

However it may be, the accusation that *with the Patronato* the missions lost their *supernational* character is *not exact*, as we have already declared from the start. Whatever loss of *supernational* character there may have been in the missions of the colonial period should be traced back to the system of "*evangelization through or together with colonization*" as its *real cause*, and not to the *Patronato* or extraordinary privileges granted by the Roman Pontiff to the kings in charge of main-

taining that system, in recognition of the immense benefits derived for the propagation of the faith from that system, otherwise liable to bring along eventually some evil effects through abuses, defects or misunderstanding of the all but too human persons involved in it. Certain loss of the *supernational* character of Catholic missions seems to be inherent as an effect of undertaking the work of "*evangelization through or together with the task of colonization*," since the colonization is carried out by *one particular nation*, and thus the evangelization is also practically undertaken by *that particular nation*. The Patronato then comes only to give a formal recognition of that position of affairs, grants it officially a permanent status, elevating it to a privileged situation in acknowledgment of its beneficial fruits for the Church.

Even if that state of affairs (sc. "*evangelization through or together with colonization*") would have not been privileged by the rights of the *Patronato*, the alleged loss of *supernational* character of the missions could have taken place just as well wherever the mission personnel would belong almost exclusively to one particular nation and would work more or less directly under the auspices of that nation. Such was the case of the missions in French colonies, for instance, which were not under any Royal Patronage, and whose missionaries, as we have said above, have been most bitterly accused of "missionary nationalism."

What in all justice can be admitted at most is that the *Patronato* not only did sanction but also confirm and *officially* recognize and establish an already existing system, ("*evangelization through colonization*") which although *essentially good and beneficial* in itself could *incidentally cause some detriment* to the missionary enterprise by giving it a certain *nationalistic taint* quite contrary to the *supernational* character of all Catholic missions. Only in this way, may the *Patronato* be said to have *possibly and indirectly* caused detrimental repercussions in achieving the ultimate goal of the missions, the formation as soon as possible of a native clergy.

The second accusation in this regard against the *Patronato* is that with it the formation of a local clergy was seriously hindered by the "European" organization given to the Church in those far missions, so widely different in most of their conditions from the centuries-old christianities of Europe.

Certainly, we agree and believe that the alleged fact was a serious mistake and became a serious handicap for the quick formation of a native clergy. But it was due to the unpreparedness of the missionaries of that epoch to face and meet a situation absolutely new for them; the Church had not yet developed by that time her doctrine and methods of missionary adaptation to the degree they are understood today.

However, we simply cannot see how the *Patronato* can be blamed for this fact; there seems to be no relation at all between the one and the other. Or shall we say that it was because the *Patronato* was granted to "European" Catholic nations? But, to what other nations could the missionary effort be entrusted then? Or should we say that it might not have been granted to any particular nation, that it might have never existed, reserving all the missions to the exclusive charge of the Holy See alone? But, the Holy See was in Europe, the Church of those days knew only of an "European" organization, and the missionaries which the Holy See would have sent could not be other than Europeans, and would have just the same established in those far mission an "European" organization, as the missionaries under the *Patronato* did. The defect, then cannot be attributed to the *Patronato*; it was a mistake and a consequence of the times, rather than of the men.

The third accusation is that under the *Patronato*, never was it thought of the need of forming an indigenous clergy or establishing an indigenous Church. When an indigenous clergy was mentioned or referred to, it was always with the aim of giving an *auxiliary* clergy, *subservient* to the European pastors, and *nothing more*.

This accusation, so often repeated, based though it may be on certain misleading facts, is certainly untrue, and cannot withstand the evidence on the contrary afforded by a close and critical examination of historical documents. In Chapter I, art. 2, and Chapter II, art. 2 of this study we have presented good enough evidence that from the beginning of the Philippine evangelization the missionaries and civil authorities under the *Patronato* thought of and actually worked for



the formation of a native, nay, and indigenous clergy. We may just recall here that the first Spanish Bishop of the Philippines, the Dominican Domingo de Salazar, as early as in 1581 decided to established a Seminary "secundum sancti decretum Concilii (Tridentini)" to form *as soon as possible* a worthy INDIGENOUS FILIPINO clergy to whom should belong by right and in virtue of his apostolic authority the ecclesiastical benefices of the Church in the Philippines: "donec in posterum, visa et cognita *per nos* et successores nostros christianitate et capacitate INDORUM, eis dicta beneficia conferri possint; tunc enim iisdem INDIS NATURALIBUS . . . *conferenda esse et conferre volumus et apostolica auctoritate decernimus*"; and that these were no empty words or mere wistful dreams, we may be sure at the sight of the actual efforts and deeds achieved by the zealous Bishop, generously seconded and encouraged by the first Spanish missionaries, ecclesiastical and civil authorities of the Islands during the 16th century (as we have already seen in the above Chapters) and in the following centuries to the end of the Spanish regime, as we shall see in the course of this study.

With regards to Spanish America, it may be enough to recall here the two early (most probably, too premature) foundation of the Seminary College of Sancta Cruz in Santiago Tlatelolco, Mexico in 1536 through the efforts of the Viceroy Don Antonio de Mendoza, Archbishop Fray Juan de Zumarraga, O.F.M., and other Franciscan Spanish missionaries, with the approval of the king of Spain, following the still earlier suggestion made in 1525 by the Spanish Contador (Treasurer) Rodrigo de Albornoz (cf. Carlo Santi, *op. cit.*, pp. 122-126), for the formation of an AMERICAN-INDIGENOUS clergy. It is beyond the scope of our study to investigate here the vicissitudes in the American colonies under the *Patronato*. But it may be opportune to remark that in the II Council of Lima, Perú, where, as the famous missionologist and missionary himself, Jose de Acosta, S.J., puts it, "PRUDENTER est a maioribus constitutum ut *nemo ex Indorum genere, sacerdotio aut gradu aliquo ecclesiastico donetur*" (cf. ACOSTA, *De Procuranda Indorum Salute*, lib. VI, cap. XIX, p. 565) in 1567, the very same words used later by our first Bishop Salazar indicating not

only a thought but a decided plan to form an INDIGENOUS CLERGY, are found: "donec in posterum visa et cognita per Nos et successores nostros christianitate Indorum . . . visum fuerit, INDIS etiam NATURALIBUS dicta beneficia esse providenda" (cf. Santi, op. cit., p. 149). From which provision added to the law forbidding provisionally or or for the time being the ordination for indigenous candidates to the priesthood, we may well conclude that this as well as other similar discriminating laws precluding the admission of the indigenous race to the Holy Orders ought to be understood as referring to indigenous candidates" . . . illegitimas, vel ad alios minus meritis, aut incapacibus" as the illustrious canonist JUAN DE SOLORZAN (cf. *De Indiarum Iure*, Lugduni 1672, t. II, lib. III, cap. XX, p. 683) declares, and by no means out of any racial discrimination (Sancti, op. cit., pp. 148-149).

And let us notice, on the passing, that from the words "ecclesiastical benefices" used by Bishop Salazar and by the II Council of Lima in the documents cited above, it is clearly seen that the aim of the Church authorities under the Patronato both in the Philippines as in America was certainly *not* to form an indigenous clergy to be given as an auxiliary to the European clergy. In Canon Law a curate or a coadjutor is not considered to possess an "ecclesiastical benefice" (cf. can. 142). Hence, the same texts cited above come to prove that it is a gratuitous and erroneous supposition the claim that when an indigenous clergy was mentioned under the Patronato it was *always* with the aim of giving an auxiliary, subservient clergy to assist the European pastors, and *nothing more*. This might have been true in some particular cases, under certain peculiar circumstances; but certainly *not always*. Under the Portuguese *Padroado*, in 1585 it seems that in India "the idea of developing the native clergy and training them in such a way that they would be able gradually to replace the European clergy even in offices of greater responsibility did not occur to them (to the Portuguese missionaries of India)" remarks Carlos Merces de Melo (in his work *The Recruitment and Formation of the Native Clergy in India, 16th-19th century*, Lisboa, 1955, p. 141); and he adds instantly: "No wonder, it was much too early then (in 1585), to think of that!" after more than three quarters of a century of evangelization in India. In the Philippines, however, we had the good fortune of

falling under the Spanish *Patronato*, and within the first quarter of the first century of evangelization, in 1581, our first Spanish Bishop, Domingo de Salazar, following the ideals pursued by the Spanish Fathers of the II Council of Lima in America, in his letters for the execution of the Bull of erection of the Manila Diocese, was already planning and dreaming on the granting of ecclesiastical benefices in a near future to the INDIGENOUS, full-blooded Filipino clergy. And from the words he used it seems that he intended to confer upon this indigenous clergy the ecclesiastical benefices in preference to any other foreign clergy; so that, if there were still foreign priests to work in the Philippines, they were to form an *auxiliary, subservient* clergy to the *indigenous priests!* Exactly the opposite of what is commonly admitted by the accusation we are refuting!

One thing is to say that for a longer time than what was convenient, or to a greater extent than what might have been opportune, the Filipino clergy remained in a subordinate position, as assistant of the Spanish clergy, due to various factors and peculiar circumstances of the times (and not on account of race discrimination); and another quite different thing is to affirm that the policy of the State and the aim of the Church authorities under the *Patronato* was to keep that *status quo of a subservient* indigenous clergy to assist the European clergy as mere curates. The first fact, we do admit; the second claim seems to us untenable in view of the evidence we have found and we shall see later in the course of this study. Who does not know in the Church history of Spanish America and the Philippines under the *Patronato* about the ever periodically recurring efforts made by the Church and State authorities to *secularize the parishes*, which, for all practical purposes and in the Philippines especially where this came to be known as "*Filipinization of parishes*," meant a removal of the Spanish religious pastors to put in their place the secular *native* priests as rectors of the parochial churches? If such efforts failed, and the proposed aim did not crystallize, at least they served to prove how gratuitous is the affirmation that under the Spanish *Patronato* never was it thought of forming a native clergy, and much less to establish an autonomous indigenous Church, with its own clergy (and not a foreign one) to rule it and assume full responsibility of the pastoral ministry.

### CHRISTIANS AND DOUBTS

F. DEL RIO

*My wife and I made the "Cursillo" nearly two years ago and soon after we joined the CFM. In the course of these two years we have come to meet many of priests and welcome them in our humble residence, after we joined the CFM. Indeed we have gained light and strength from this association. Present day problems of all kinds are the the subject matter of our informed conconversations; of late the letter of the Holy Father on "The Regulation of Births" and the various reactions all over the world to this papal document have been prequently the subject of our talks. My wife has noticed that as time goes on, some few priests choose to be non-committal, many seen to be uncertain as to here they ought to stand, and lastly one of them expressed his personal view which to us Catholics were plainly disturbing,—'contraception, he said, is not a sin, why so much fuss about it.*

*May we construe this fact as meaning that the strong reaction of opposition to the "Humanae Vitae" Encyclical has succeeded in opening new vistas, new aspects to this problem previously unknown to us, new insights and doctrinal development, on the strength of which a Catholic may reasonably entertain the just mentioned attitudes of some of our priests?*

Our answer to our consultant is quite simple and brief. Six months have past since the publication of the "Humanae Vitae," and too much has been said and written against this papal doctrinal document. In going thru the literature on this matter available to me, I have failed to discover new vistas, aspects, insights, doctrinal development. I believe I can make my own today, the statement of Denis O'Callagham, two years ago, "a good deal of this discussion is being carried on at a

very superficial level, where prejudice has masqueraded as fact, and individual experience as philosophical principle (Clergy Review, Nov. 1966, p 840.) The traditional doctrine of the Church as re-stated by Paul VI, on July 25, 1968 in the "Humanae Vitae" Encyclical stands as firmly established as ever, whereas the opposition has failed to show *any valid reason* justifying its stand. Those who advocate contraception, however limited in its application, will have to offer *new* arguments for it, instead of merely *querying* the traditional argument against or the authority supporting the traditional doctrine. This is not the place to test and evaluate the supposed to be valid reasons standing on the path of accepting the Church's doctrine as stated by the Sovereign Pontiff. We offer to our readers one presented, in a take-it or leave-it way, by seventy-six lay English Catholics who signed the following statement: They hold that—

- a) the adoption of a method of birth control of the rhythms inherent in the generation function *is as artificial*, as the use of a chemical or mechanical device (hence),
- b) the choice of method is one to be made by husband and wife, not in an arbitrary manner, but in the conscientious exercise of their responsibility before God to uphold and foster a creative love;
- c) the choice thus conscientiously made is not a matter for confession.

"We feel bound in conscience to make this statement and to advise in the above sense any who look to us for counsel."

*It is superficial, writes B. Haring<sup>1</sup> to maintain that the practice of periodic continency (or rhythm) is as unnatural as the use of artificial means, or that it demands constant and accurate calculation and destroys the spontaneity of love. Such expressions have been heard in the last few years even from Catholic doctors. The answer to this is, among other things, that working out the days when no conception will occur — or in the case of a couple who want a child, when conception may occur — is just one of many considerations such as whether one can accept responsibility for an increase in the family or not, which*

<sup>1</sup> *Marriage in the Modern World*, the Mercier Press, Cork, 1965. p. 335.

precede intercourse. No considerate husband expects intercourse with his wife during her monthly period. He has to take these periods into account just as he has to take many other factors into account; such loving thoughtfulness is not the negation of spontaneity in love but the negation of lack of control of his instincts.

"In accordance with the will of the Creator, sexuality in married life has two connected polar motives, a strong and a weak. The "strong" preferable motive is the maximum of fertility; it is the most intimate mutual giving in a common desire for a child. The infertile days are to a certain extent "weak" motive, the other pole, which devotes mutual intimacy in grateful recognition of loving devotion. Once husband and wife have recognized the meaning and intrinsic finality of the motive of fruitfulness in generous readiness to serve life, then their union even in infertile times acquires the same dignity through its polar unity with the "strong motive," through the will of creative love to engender "trinity." Thus, self-controlled love in renunciation and in fulfilment is an enduring and deliberate assent to the overall meaning of marriage, and also to the meaningful rhythm of nature.

"Intercourse in the so-called infertile periods becomes a real fulfillment of the meaning of marriage provided there is at bottom a common devotion to God's creative love in the form of assent, ready to make sacrifices, to the service of life. Here, too, we see the real meaning of the Church's teaching that children are the primary purpose of marriage; everything in marriage receives its ultimate fulfillment, its final form and supernatural spirit from the divine love, from a common, loving submission to God's will. But this necessarily included, or presupposes rather, loving submission to God's creative love.

"The knowledge we now have of the fertility cycle has not removed all the difficulties from married life, particularly since recourse to the choice of times is not available to women whose periods are irregular and who may have good medical grounds for not wishing to undertake another pregnancy. New and more accurate ways of determining the time of ovulation by the basal temperature method already constitute an extension of the possibilities of this recourse. It appears that the most recent scientific advance by a Japanese gynecologist provide a sample reagent test of the saliva or urine to determine whether

ovulation has or has not taken place and this makes it possible to determine the infertile periods with certainty."<sup>2</sup>

We are told that much of the doctrinal confusion existing in our midst seems to originate from the reading of several pastoral letters of the Conferences of Bishops in other countries, published in Catholic periodicals.

In the light of these pastoral letters, one is led to believe that the individual should solve problems or conflicts arising in this matter under consideration, ultimately as his conscience sees it proper and right, "Pastors, write the German bishops, will respect in their work, especially in the administration of sacraments, the decisions of consciences of the believers made in the awareness of their responsibility." The bishops of Belgium, England, France, etc, write along similar lines.<sup>3</sup>

I would like to make three remarks in this connection:

a) The Catholic Hierarchy of the Philippines issued a Pastoral Letter on the "Humanæ Vitæ" Encyclical, on October 12, 1968. It is they, the Catholic Bishops of the Philippines, whom Divine Providence has placed over this portion of the vineyard of the Lord, to lead us His people, priests and lay people alike, to the green pastures of eternal life, suffering first with Christ that we may be glorified with Him (Rom. 8, 17). The conscientious reading of this Pastoral Letter will undoubtedly dispel many a doubt from our minds, enlightening and strengthening the life of faith within us;

b) The Pastoral Letters of the Conferences of Bishops in other countries are *not primarily* doctrinal, *but pastoral*, aiming at or concerned with the preparation of the minds of priests and lay people

<sup>2</sup> The "R.C. Formation Pill" which Prof. Carley has developed in Australia is very promising in this respect.

<sup>3</sup> We owe to the Catholic periodical "Homelife" English translations of these important documents.

to accept the authoritative teaching of the Sovereign Pontiff.<sup>4</sup> They do not consider so much the doctrine to be laid down, as its application in difficult circumstances. There is no clear evidence in these pastoral letters of ethical situationism. Catholic minorities in Northern Europe and USA live together and share the same culture of the *majority* i.e., the Protestant culture and mentality. The Protestant mentality and attitude towards contraception is well known, particularly since 1930 when at the Conference of Lambeth, the 15th resolution approving of the practice of birth control, under certain circumstances, was carried by a vote of 193 vs. 67. Catholic understanding of the moral divine law and its application, in the words of Barry<sup>5</sup> is "*theological ferocity*"; ethical situationism pervades Protestant moral theology. Influenced by this mentality, some Catholics accept the rulings of the Church's Magisterium, in this field of sex, as indications of the targets to be aimed in one's conduct, and indeed as factors to be taken into consideration in assessing the concrete situation and conflict, and arriving at one's own *completely personal* decision, but they regard this decision, *not any general norm or moral principles, however authoritatively* declared, as the final and real determinant of the morality. In other words, it is not the objective morality of an act that counts, but the sincerity of one's personal response to the concrete and existentially unique situation. This concept of conscience is presented as a mark of maturity, or sign that the Christian has become of age. The Pastoral Letter of Catholic Hierarchy has spoken so well and, at great length on this matter that we feel our reader would do well to re-read *part II* of said official document.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Austrian bishops are, in part, an exception. Are they misinformed? Ignorance of one kind or another can become incredibly daring! We fail to see any basis in the "Humanae Vitae" Encyclical warranting the Bishop's statement. Do we seek the truth that pleases or what else?

<sup>5</sup> "Christian Ethics and Secular Society" London, 1966, p. 200.

<sup>6</sup> For the benefit of those who have no copy of this document, I feel a brief comment is in order. To the mind of Pius XII ethical situationism is a mark of *immaturity*, a flight from reality, or failure to take account of the theological truth and fact that every generation of the sons of Adam, however culturally developed, begins and pursues its journey thru life under the burden and



c) "It seems to be overlooked, writes a layman, Dr. K. M. Pole — that as with any other moral precept, the sin is condemned, but not necessarily the sinner. The Church is "intransigent with evil, but merciful towards individuals" and the assessment of personal guilt or otherwise is and always was a matter for the conscience of the person concerned and for the priest in the Confessional."<sup>7</sup> Of course, the priest in the Confessional is not Mister So and So, but a minister representative of Christ, of the Church, and ought to act in perfect accordance with doctrine of the Church. Agit in persona Christi. We must be on the alert lest the naturalistic, hedonistic *contraceptive civilization* which permeates certain areas of the West penetrates and ruins the moral fiber of our people.

Some Catholics are particularly bewildered by so much opposition, by so much unwillingness to heed the teaching of the Church as formulated by the Pope, opposition coming from within the Church, from bishops, priests, theologians, Vatican Council II periti — according to reliable press reports.

Our bishops are well aware of the disturbing ideas creeping up in our Catholic milieu, hence the Pastoral Letter mentioned above. They say: "While the sentiments of loyalty to the authority of the Holy Father, and the sincere acceptance of his teaching on the part of the great majority of his flock have scarcely been mentioned in the international press, the adverse comments coming from a relatively small portion of the faithful have been played up. And there is danger that this adverse publicity might affect the filial attitude of respect and re-

---

handicap of original sin. Furthermore, it shows a strange blindness to the *historically demonstrable* fact that even intelligent and conscientious men, left to themselves, reach the most diverse and often disastrous conclusions. Of course God wants due attention to be paid to the particular circumstances of the concrete situation; often enough they determine its morality. God wants us to respond sincerely to the *complete* data of every situation, and one of these data may be its *objective morality, the demands of reality* the existing moral order manifesting God's holy will, the objective order of right and wrong. He has established, and of course God is not indifferent whether or not our actions conform to that order. Cfr. Catholic Medical Quarterly, Oct. 1966, p. 112, L.L. McReavy. The Irish Theological Quarterly, vol. XXXIII, 1966, p. 346.

<sup>7</sup> Catholic Medical Quarterly, Oct. 1968, pp. 112-113, Dr. K. F. M. Pole.

verence of our people toward the person of the Vicar of Christ" p.1). Hence their Pastoral Letter aimed at offsetting or at least minimizing the ruinous moral effect of such publicity on our people, deserves our reading and meditation.

I shall not comment on the unbecoming reaction of some *very few* bishops abroad. On the attitude of *priests and moral theologians* I have this sympathetic observation to make. We suffer from a very serious scarcity of Moral Theologians! "In France, for example, writes J.M. Pohiers, there are approximately *four* professors of Holy Scripture and of Dogmatic Theology for *one* in Moral Theology, and to make the situation worse, the latter is quite frequently less well trained and prepared, often times is transferred from his assignment in Moral Theology, easily accepting other subjects such as Canon Law, or other activities rather than engaging wholeheartedly in research work in his Moral Theology field. Biblical, patristical, liturgical renewal has been introduced in Dogmatic and Pastoral Theology, far more deeply and effectively than in Moral Theology."<sup>8</sup> My experience though limited, leads to believe this sad situation exists not only in France, but it is common to other countries. Indeed, we suffer from a chronic scarcity of well trained, developed Moral Theologians!... Then *current basic* textbooks or reference books are unpedagogical and not up-to-date, as a rule. No wonder if parish priests, and priests engaged in ministerial work do not feel too sure as to where they stand on moral problems coming up to-day. Many pit-falls, grave errors can be avoided only by accepting the directives of those in authority over us, our bishops, the vicar of Christ. We see no alternative. No wonder if so many priests to-day are misled and are misleading!

Some of the Vatican Council II periti present a *more complex problem*, which I can not deal with at full length here. I shall try to be brief, clear.

According to reports in the secular and Catholic press, some twenty theologians from eight countries met last September at the invitation of the Faculty of Theology in Amsterdam, Holland, to

<sup>8</sup> "Psychologie Contemporaine et requêtes de la foi", La Vie Spirituelle, Suppl., Sept., 1967, p. 406.

discuss the Enc. "Humanae Vitae." In the words of clergyman Schillibeeckx, Pope Paul "has become the prisoner of five or six cardinals. Because of their one-sided information Pope Paul has been convinced of the necessity for a "hard line." Everybody knows who these cardinals are. *They are really blind.* They are the ones who are destroying the Church." It is most regrettable statements of this nature undermining the very foundation of our trust and respect for the visible Head of the Church, the Vicar of Christ, meant possibly for home consumption, but finding factually a far and wide echo, in the press, secular and catholic, of other countries, were ever made by a clergyman of the theological tradition of Schillibeeckx! It is a senseless thing to assume that the "Pope is in prison" in order to *escape* the responsibility inherent in the rejection of the Pope's teaching!

"We find to our dismay, that the Enc. 'Humane Vitae' does not respond to the expectations that had been created by the Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World," so runs the press statement of the aforementioned theologians and 'periti.' "In fact, they continue, the Encyclical places marriage in a perspective that in the judgment of a great many *experts* does no justice to reality. . .

"We cannot agree that, in a moral evaluation, there would be any real difference between making use of the infertile periods of the woman, and making use of other methods, that for determined periods prevent fertilization. Any of these methods can be used for good or for evil intentions. . . Though we do not wish to sow any doubt on the *principle* of Church authority, we must state that the faithful do not know what to do with this Encyclical. We wonder, if the way this encyclical came into being, and its publication, contrary to the opinion of the great majority of experts that were consulted is in agreement at all with the manner of exercising authority *that is demanded by modern civilization*, in the name of human dignity, and by the task of all the faithful in the people of God, that is, the Church."<sup>9</sup>

I have given the *full text* of the statement as known to me and given in the Catholic press of England, that any one may value it in its merits.

<sup>9</sup> *Catholic Herald*, Friday, October 4, 1968, p. 2, cls. 3-5.

It takes a superdose of sense of humor to go thru it, analyze it and take it seriously. The "Humanae Vitae" Enc. to these critics is a *very disgraceful document, in every respect*. That's all. I refuse, at this time and place, to be dragged back into the petty discussion outside St. Peter's Basilica in Rome, when in 1963-1964, the question of "juridical coliegiality" was up in the air. *We are now in 1969*. To-day what Vatican Council II teaches us all in ch. III, in the "Lumen Gentium" Const. aa. 12-29 is well known to the Pope's critics. We accept wholeheartedly the Magisterium of the Church. This is not a scientific magisterium, but a *magisterium of authority*. The Pope is the supreme teacher of the faith, interpreting authentically the moral divine law and teaching that its observance binds all the faithful. It is a certain theological doctrine that the Holy Spirit assists the Church in interpreting the moral divine law. The Pope has not the monopoly of theological wisdom, but he has, the Church has the promise of Christ that He would be with it, — not with theologians or periti in V.C. II. A divinely established and inspired Church cannot be ruled by a *majority vote*. I see no valid reason for some theologians trying to perpetuate a "false" notion of *collegiality*, which Vatican Council II *did not approve*. The Vicar of Christ has, by virtue of his office, a full, supreme, universal power that he can always exercise freely. It has taken Pope Paul an act of truly "apostolic courage" to speak to the world — the way he did. The "Finger of God" was there. We are grateful to the Holy Spirit for the light and strength given us thru him.

There is no desire to minimize the work of true theologians, but in telling us to limit assent to those moral truths, which the Pope not merely teaches but demonstrates to their satisfaction *they are not correct*. In effect, this seems equivalent to make the reasoning faculty of the individual the *ultimate arbiter of moral truth*. It overlooks also the very deficiency in the moral reasoning of *fallen man* which made the provision of a teaching authority *morally necessary*. It finally overlooks the fact that our Lord's command to His Apostles was not "Go ye and demonstrate," but "Go ye and teach." Theologians admittedly seek to demonstrate, as best they can, the truths, which the Church teaches, but the validity of the truths themselves cannot be

measured by the success or failure of the theologians in their task. Not even an Aquinas could hope to satisfy everybody.<sup>10</sup>

But, "What does the argument of theologians matter, whether the Pope has spoken with all the requirements to make it an infallible pronouncement?" asks a British doctor.<sup>11</sup> Are they infallible? And here is his answer. "Who, believing in the Holy Spirit as protector of the Church can accept as a possibility that God would allow the faithful to be misled so seriously by the Church? If we were to accept only what has been taught with all the solemnity of an infallible pronouncement, very little of the Church's teaching would remain that was not open to doubt; the hunt for loopholes would go on. Eventually as Henry VIII ended with *six wives*, once he had persuaded himself and many other (including some authorities in the Church) that it was legitimate for him to take a *second wife*, so we would end up with having surrendered one moral law after another. To-day John Fisher and Thomas Moore are honoured by all, not only by Catholics, for the stand they made. It is the belief in a divinely established Church, with eternal objective standards, against the concept of a man made Church that is at stake in the present crisis. Pope Paul has called for *obedience* not only because of the reasons adduced in his Encyclical, but rather "because of the light of the Holy Spirit." "Of course the Church will always be abused and ridiculed as often before as Christ has been, but would the world's comments have been kinder if the Pope had appeared to concede "situation ethics"? The Church will always be opposed as a "*sign of contradiction*."<sup>12</sup>

Speaking on Oct. 5th, 1967, Pope Paul said this: "What is the greatest need of the Church at the present time? We shall give to-day a most simple answer which you can understand and accept because you are good, faithful and fervent: *the Church is in need of obedience. And more than a passive and enforced external obedience, she needs an inner spontaneous spirit of obedience.*"

<sup>10</sup> *Catholic Medical Quarterly*, October 1966, p. 113; L.L. McReavy.

<sup>11</sup> *Catholic Medical Quarterly*, Oct. 1968, p. 113.

<sup>12</sup> *Catholic Medical Quarterly*, Oct. 1968, p. 113.

Indeed, this seems to be true today as it was over a year ago, and perhaps more so. Many of us entertain a certain sense of personal dignity which holds us back from obedience to legitimate authority, civil or ecclesiastical. Pope Pius XII in an address to a group of Cardinals, Archbishops and Bishops gathered in Rome, Nov. 2, 1954 analyzed this problem and gave us a few words of wisdom. Pope Pius XII said in part: "Those points We have just mentioned in connection with the jurisdiction of Bishops, who are shepherds of the souls committed to their care in all those matters which have to do with religion, moral law and ecclesiastical discipline, are subjected to criticism, often not above a whisper, and do not receive the firm assent they deserve. Hence, some proud, modern spirits provoke serious and dangerous confusion, traces of which are more or less clear in various regions. The awareness, daily more strongly insisted on, of having reached maturity produces in them an agitated and febril spirit. Not a few moderns, men and women, think that the leadership and vigilance of the Church is not to be suffered by one who is grown up; they not only say it, but they hold it as a firm conviction. They are unwilling to be, like children, "under guardians and stewards" (Gal. 4,2). They wish to be treated as adults who are in full possession of their rights, and can decide for themselves what they must, or must not, do in any given situation.

Let the Church — they do not hesitate to say — propose her doctrine, pass her laws as norms of our actions. Still, when there is question of practical application to each individual's life, the Church must not interfere; she should let each one of the faithful follow his own conscience and judgment. They declare this is all the more necessary because the Church and her ministers are unaware of certain sets of circumstances either personal or extrinsic to individuals; in them each person has been placed, and must take his own counsel and decide what he must do. Such people, moreover, are unwilling in their final personal decisions to have any intermediary or intercessor placed between themselves and God, no matter what his rank or title.

Two years ago, in Our allocutions of March 23 and April 18, 1952, We spoke about these reprehensible theories and We examined

their arguments (*Discorsi e Radiomessaggi*, vol. 14, 1952, 19 sq., pp. 69 sq.). Concerning the importance given to the attainment of a person's majority, this assertion is correct: it is just and right that adults should not be ruled as children. The Apostle speaking of himself says: "When I was a child, I spoke as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as a child. Now that I have become a man, I have put away the things of a child" (1 Cor. 13,11). That is not a true part of education which follows any other principle or procedure, nor is he a true shepherd of souls who pursues any other purpose than to elevate the faithful entrusted to his care "to perfect manhood, to the mature measure of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. 4,13). But to be an adult and to have put off the things of childhood is one thing, and quite another to be an adult and not to be subject to the guidance and government of legitimate authority. For *government is not a kind of nursery for children, but the effective direction of adults toward the end proposed to the state.*

Since We are speaking to you, venerable brothers, and not to the faithful; when these ideas begin to appear and to take root in your flocks, remind the faithful: (1) that God placed shepherds of souls in the Church not to put a burden on the flock, but to help and protect it; (2) that the true liberty of the faithful is safeguarded by the guidance and vigilance of pastors; that they are protected from the slavery of vice and error, they are strengthened against the temptations which come from bad example and from the customs of evil men among whom they must live; (3) that therefore they act contrary to the prudence and charity which they owe themselves if they spurn this protection of God and His most certain help."

## DEATH OF THOMAS MERTON

Father Thomas Merton, Trappist philosopher and writer, died, accidentally electrocuted, in Bangkok on December 10, aged 53.

Father Merton was a monk of Gethsemane Abbey, Kentucky, U.S.A., he had gone to Bangkok to take part in an international conference on monasticism and had lectured to the conference the day before his death.

Father Merton was born in France in 1915 the son of a New Zealand Anglican father and an American mother. His own introduction to Catholicism came through his literary studies. He was received into the Church in 1938 and became a Trappist in 1941. His many books—especially *Elected Silence* and *The Seven Storey Mountain*, won international fame.

## DEATH OF KARL BARTH

Karl Barth, 82, a pre-eminent Protestant theologian, died on December 10 at his home in Basel, Switzerland.

He was born on May 10, 1886, the son of Swiss Reformed minister in 1908. As pastor of a parish, he became known as the "Red Pastor" because of his support of factory workers seeking higher wages and better working conditions.

His first book, *The Epistle to the Romans*, appeared in 1919.

Professorships at the German universities of Gottingen, Muenster and Bonn followed.

As professor at Bonn, Barth was a civil servant. He refused to take the oath of allegiance that Hitler required of state employees. In 1934, he was the chief author of the Barmen Confession, which asserted the freedom of the Church from temporal powers. It was signed by about 2000 leaders of German Protestantism.

Condemned by a Nazi court in 1935 for "seducing the minds" of students, Barth was dismissed from his post at Bonn and expelled from Germany.

He became professor of theology at the University of Basel and continued in that position until his retirement six years ago.



The most extensive exposition of his thought is his uncompleted 17-volume *Church Dogmatics*. His system of theology states that Christianity rests upon faith in a God who is supreme and transcendent, who approaches men but cannot be approached by them except on His terms.

He is survived by his wife, a daughter and two sons, both theologians.

In an interview with KNA, the German Catholic news agency, Father Hanes Kueng, praised Karl Barth as having contributed more than any other Protestant theologian to an understanding between Protestant and Catholic theology.

Barth's object, he said, was not the conversion of Catholics to Protestantism or vice versa, but the conversion of Catholics and Protestants to the Gospel of Christ. The fundamental concerns of his theology are now "the common property of both Churches", Father Kueng said.

## BRAZILIAN BISHOPS WARN AGAINST INDISCRIMINATE BIRTH CONTROL

Developing countries cannot afford indiscriminate birth control policies, the bishops of Brazil said in a joint statement released at Rio de Janeiro, after their national meeting.

Pope Paul VI's encyclical *Humanae Vitae*, the bishops said, is a defence of the dignity of man "and a condemnation of the civilization of profit and pleasure to which Western nations, once considered Christian, are now turning."

A set of instructions on the conduct to be followed by priests and married couples regarding the encyclical is preceded in the joint document by a statement that *Humanae Vitae* "is part of the teaching authority of the Church," and, as such must be binding for Catholics.

## PAPAL PEACE PROGRAMME

A global programme directed towards the promotion of justice as the means of countering the "permanent threat of war" and achievement of peace by peace by channeling military spending into aid for developing nations has been issued by the Vatican to mark Pope Paul VI's second World Day of Peace on January 1, 1969.

The document provides a suggested plan for persons responsible for the organization of the World Day of Peace on national levels in all countries. It calls for action by individuals, groups and governments and expressed the hope

that the Vatican appeal "will find a favourable echo in other Christians and in all men of good will everywhere."

It asks Catholics to join non-Catholics in ecumenical religious services to undertake acts of penance, charity and brotherhood.

"The impossibility for individuals or social groups to find on this earth a dignified existence, to ensure their family's subsistence by their work and to safeguard their legitimate cultural and ethnic heritage, is a cause of grave injustices and leaves permanent threats of war hovering over the world," it says.

It also urges individuals, groups and states to devote a part of their resources to institutions dedicated to peace and to developing countries. A contribution of 1% of income is suggested.

The statement calls for "respect for fundamental rights" and religious liberty, and an end to discrimination "because of race, colour, ethnic origin, sex, age on because they belong to a specific social group."

It suggests:

—Public prayer and Masses for peace and also private prayers. Concelebration of Masses by priests of various races, countries and social origins.

—Other religious ceremonies, ecumenical wherever possible, including silent marches outside churches or temples or in stadiums or large public halls.

—Penitence and offerings, including reconciliation and forgiveness for injuries, fasting in order to share, and "taxes for peace."

Hospitality and meetings on the occasion of the World Day of Peace, such as Christmas Eve or New Year's Day parties for foreigners, visits to the sick and prisoners, etc., on New Year's Day; literary and language courses, and pilgrimages from country to country.

—Education and action to inform public opinion with the use of social communications media, informative meetings on the World Day of Peace, and audio-visual presentations.

—Strengthening of peaceful bonds among the members of the national and international communities.

—A new pedagogy to foster a universal awareness of the demands of peace.

The document stressed that celebration of the World Day of Peace "must be prepared and pursued in line with a programme chosen under the responsibility of the episcopal conferences of various countries."

"In this respect," it says, "Peace Weeks and various ecumenical manifestations, as well as participation in official national or other ceremonies can be considered and are ever desirable."

It adds that it was Pope Paul's intention that the World Day of Peace be universal and "therefore offered for the consideration of all men of good will."

### NUMBER OF FOREIGN MISSIONERS IN INDIA INCREASED IN 1967

The number of foreign missionaries in India increased sharply in a year marked by widespread anti-missionary developments, according to figures provided parliament by Minister of State for Home Affairs, Mr. V. C. Shukla.

He told parliament on November 30 that foreign missionaries numbered 6,420 on January 1, 1968, an increase of 1,400 over January 1, 1967, or 28 per cent. Of the 6,420 in the country, 2,624 were from the British Commonwealth.

The anti-missionary developments in the 1967-1968 period included a reported decision by the central government to discourage the entry of new missionaries and to force the exit of all in the country except those regarded as essential, or irreplaceable by native clergy and Religious.

The increase of missionaries in the year was attributed to a 140 per cent rise in number of Commonwealth missionaries who numbered 1,105 at the beginning of 1967.

Mr. Shukla also told parliament that his government's policy was one of "progressive Indianization" of foreign Christian missions in the country.

Giving a partial state-by-state break-down, he said there were seven foreign missionaries in Nagaland, 335 in Assam, 27 in Jammu and Kashmir, 519 in Bihar and 345 in Madhya Pradesh.

(In December 1967 the ministry of external affairs told parliament that there were no foreign missionaries in Nagaland.)

(Earlier, in March, parliament was told that there were four missionaries in the troubled border state.)

Foreign missionaries received US \$90 million from abroad during 1967. The money, he stated, included contributions to religious institutions, charity remittances from individuals and institutions and personal gifts.

## NUN REBUKES LONELY PRIESTS

Roman Catholic priests who plead the loneliness of their lives as a reason for the church to abolish celibacy were sharply rebuked by a former nun.

Miss Monica Baldwin, who gained world attention with her book, "I leap over the wall," describing her experiences on returning to the world from an enclosed convent, wrote to the editor of "The Times".

"As a failed nun, I have experienced many of the difficulties complained of by those who feel the hardships of a dedicated life. May I suggest that such troubles are almost invariably due to self-seeking? No priest worth his salt should today have time for loneliness."

At another point in her letter, Baldwin asks sharply:

"How do these self-pitying persons, who moan on televisions and in well-paid press articles, spend their free time to complain of loneliness is to reveal the poverty of one's interior life...for the infallible remedy for loneliness is to exchange self-preoccupation for an intense interior life. I speak from experience."

Baldwin is a cousin of Britain's one-time prime minister, Stanley Baldwin.

---

## BOOK REVIEW

THE WORLD AS SEEN BY A FILIPINO ARCHBISHOP, by Msgr. Jose Ma. Cuenco. Iloilo, PI: Catholic Publishing House 1968: Pp. 396

*The World As Seen By A Filipino Archbishop* is a fourth book of colorful impressions recorded by the globe-trotting prelate, Msgr. Jose Ma. Cuenco, during his extensive travels through the Far East, Europe, Holy Land and North America. It is packed with delightful descriptions of far off places, valuable historical notes of famous and important cities, biographical data of interesting people, and accounts of candid personal experiences — all told with a spell-binding quality of a master story-teller.

These travels were made on and off for five years and they may be divided generally with the late Pope John XXIII and with Generalissimo Franco in 1960, and a detailed account of a travel through the Middle East and Europe, undertaken the following year by reason of health as well as of private research into the pastoral activities of the last Spanish bishop of Cebu, Msgr. Martin Garcia Alcocer. The second part is made up of three journeys undertaken in 1962, 1964 and 1965 by way of North America to Rome in connection with the Second Vatican Council. This is the first time in history that bishops of the only Catholic nation in the Orient attended an ecumenical council, and observations recorded by Msgr. Cuenco on the pomp and splendor of such a universal gathering of high ecclesiastical dignitaries from all over the world, the solemn and sometimes informal sessions, the author's own speeches and those of others, and, of course, the everyday down-to-earth lives of the Council Fathers are worthwhile reading, if only to be present at, and to witness and experience, the great event vicariously.

*The World As Seen By A Filipino Archbishop* is indeed an excellent journal of cultural and religious interests and is to be recommended as a useful source of information and reading pleasure.

● JOHN D'AQUINO, O.P.

TREASURY OF THOUGHT. Observations over Half a Century. By Dagobert D. Runes. New York: Philosophical Library, c1966. 395 pages.

This is a book written by a Jew.

Dr. Dagobert D. Runes wrote this book as a revision of a previous one, narrower in scope and milder in tone. The book contains "observations" made over half a century on topics which ranges from Abnormal, abhorrence, forgiveness, love, Pope Paul VI, Zen and Zero, which are arranged alphabetically. These observations are barbed, epigrammatic, highly subjective and prejudiced, sarcastic and philosophically shallow. What is worth noting are the morbidly anti-Christian tone of the whole book and the bitterly fanatic and hateful observations on any religion, Christian, non-Christian and especially the Catholic religion. The entries written on the Roman Church ranges from King Constantine to Pope Paul VI and occupies more than 10 pages. Strange to say, these observations were as if an effect of a mental twist following the Vatican II's declaration on a more salutary relationship with the members of the race of Christ.

To read the book soberly and understand its impact and heavy tone against anything not Jewish, one needs to know the author, his life and personality. For the book is the author's and part of him is much in there. Dr. Runes is a Jew who saw "German Christians beat my poor old mother to death" and "shoot my four young cousins in front of their chained and bleeding parents." (p. 34) Surely that is one reason that made him hate to use the words "united in love" and "love." (p. 231) He is a man "who cannot bless the heavenly hand that sent a Son to this world in whose name my people were bleed to death." (p. 34) And in his deep bitterness he would advice poets to "sing not a song of God, His son... but (to) sing a song of bitterness, of man's bestiality with man, of vicious demagoguery and hateful purposes of the weak, the innocent and much abused." (p. 280)

Pity the author; abhor the book, which contains more things that seem to invite hatred for the man.

Despite the epigrammatic entries on various more topics, epigrams whose meanings hide skin-deep truths but which in reality are half-truths and which therefore easily catches the unwary, this cynical book by a man to be pitied and excused has no redeeming value whatsoever to merit its being placed in a serious, human, not to say, Christian reading list.

---

---

**FERIA, FERIA, LUGTU & LA'O**  
*ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS AT LAW*

PHILIPPINE TRUST BLDG., PLAZA GUITI • P. O. BOX 1279 • MANILA

---

---



*Dennis*

• MILK CHOCOLATE

BEST 10 CENTAVO  
MILK CHOCOLATE BAR  
MONEY CAN BUY

*Manufactured by:*  
**PUEO HERMANOS**

Tel. 9-23-51

P. O. Box 2904  
Manila

---

---

**JOAQUIN RAMIREZ**  
**RAFAEL ORTIGAS**

**FRANCISCO ORTIGAS, JR.**  
**JOAQUIN RAMIREZ, JR.**

**RAFAEL ORTIGAS, JR.**

**Ramirez & Ortigas**  
*Abogados*

ELDORADO BUILDING • PLAZA MORAGA • MANILA • P. O. BOX 477  
TEL. 2-90-57

---

---



NEW SAN ROQUE PARISH CHURCH  
MANDAUE, CEBU



**ART GLASS · NEON**

879 BILIBID VIEJO • MANILA • TEL 3-39-23