

B DOLETIN E ECLESIASTICO DE F FILIPINAS

OFFICIAL INTERDIOCESAN ORGAN

● THE PHILIPPINE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW ●

**BISHOP - PRIESTS RELATIONSHIP •
BASIC SCHEME FOR PRIESTLY
TRAINING • EVOLUTION AND THE
DUTCH CATECHISM • THE CASE OF
A DEMONSTRATION AGAINST THE
BISHOP**

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

EDITORIAL STAFF

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

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

Subscription Rates. Yearly subscription in the Philippines, 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

EDITORIAL Bishop-Priests Relationship	444
DOCUMENTATION Ordo Professionis Religiosae, etc. A Basic Scheme for Priestly Training	446 448
LITURGICAL SECTION Universal Prayer for World Communications Day 1970	468
DOCTRINAL SECTION The Situation of the Church after the Synod (continuation)	470
NOTES AND COMMENTS Evolution and the Dutch Catechism by JESUS MA. CAVANNA, C.M.	479
PASTORAL SECTION Homiletics — 11th to 15th Sundays after Pentecost	485
HISTORICAL SECTION History of the Church in the Philippines 1521-1898 (continued) by PABLO FERNANDEZ, O.P.	494
CASES AND QUERIES The Case of a Demonstration against the Bishop by JOSE ORTEA, O.P.	503
THE CHURCH HERE AND THERE	516

Bishop - Priests Relationship

The problem of relationship between bishop and his priests accentuates the bitter-sweet human condition of the divinely founded Church. The spectacle of a chosen portion of the People of God invested with heavenly powers, preaching in season and out of season about the law of love while at the same time engaged in mortal combat of destroying one another in an atmosphere of jealousy, arrogance, ambition, is forcibly becoming an expected occurrence in the Church. Words like "communication gap", "crises of authority and obedience," "paternalism," "first class and second class clergymen" are unfortunately echoed in the ecclesiastical circles with more toleration and amusement. All these underline the almost chronic disease which affect the relationship between the two most necessary and effective groups of the leadership in the Church. For it will really be difficult to go far in any task of renewal of the Church or her relations with the world without counting on these two groups.

In the light of this consideration, one can easily understand that unless the bishop and his priests work in the spirit of a common dedication to the fulfillment of the Christian mission, everything else would only be dead stump. The conciliar *Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests* expresses this idea in these words:

"The same Lord has established certain ministers among the faithful in order to join them together in our body... Therefore, having sent the apostles just as he himself had been sent by the Father, Christ, through the apostles themselves, made their successors the bishops, shares in his consecration and mission. The office of their ministry has been handed down, in a lesser degree indeed, to the priests. Established in the order of priesthood they can be co-workers of the episcopal order for the proper fulfillment of the apostolic mission entrusted to priests by Christ" (art.2).

There is only one priesthood, the priesthood of Christ ordained for the salvation of souls. In individual dioceses the priests form one priesthood *with and under* their own bishop. While it

is true that in the level of participation, the immediacy and fullness of the episcopacy gives it a certain primacy, it should be carefully noted that the idea of *community* of priesthood and ministry claims the stress and emphasis in the conciliar teachings on this matter.

The priest, according to the *Constitution on Sacred Liturgy*, is a member of a college whose head is the bishop. The college is premised on a special bond which is mutual charity and of co-operation in the service of the Community (LG, 28). Bound by this special bond and forming the presbyterium in which the bishop is the father and the priestly body, the co-workers, a very special consequence becomes evident. The priests should look at their bishop as their father and reverently obey him. The bishop for his part is to look at the members of his priestly body as his "co-workers and as sons and friends" (LG 28).

There is no other acceptable alternative except co-operation in the relationship between bishop and his priests. The law of charity demands this. The nature of their priesthood requires this. The implication of their salvific mission urges this. The bishop, to all practical purposes, is helpless without his priests; and the priests would work aimlessly without the guidance of the bishop. Then there is the more practical aspect of credibility. How can we expect the faithful to manifest fraternal love, christian obedience when the bishop and priests do not exemplify by their words and deeds that inner perfection of understanding love and full cooperation in the ecclesial task of saving souls, obedience and priestly service? No claim can be made to preach without life and deed. We can only have the right to expect, from the faithful the same dedication and testimony to the doctrine we preach.

Lumen Gentium condenses this same idea :

"Because the human race today is joining more and more into a civic, economic, and social unity, it is that much the more necessary that priests, by combined effort and aid, under the leadership of the bishops and the Supreme Pontiff, wipe out every kind of separateness so that the whole human race may be brought into the unity of the family of God." (art. 28)

The unfortunate event of a demonstration by priests against their bishop which took place sometime ago was our first in this country. If we heed the words of the Council, it may be our last.

DOCUMENTATION

Acta Congregationis

ORDO PROFESSIONIS RELIGIOSAE

Prot. n. 200/70

DECRETUM

Professionis ritus, quo religiosi, consilia evangelica amplectentes, Deo se devovent, instauratus est ad mentem Constitutionis de sacra liturgia. Vita Deo sacrata religionis vinculis, magno in honore semper fuit apud Ecclesiam, quae professionem usque a primis saeculis sacris ritibus exornavit. Concilii Vaticani II Patres in Constitutione de sacra liturgia praeceperunt ut confideretur ritus professionis religiosae et renovationis votorum, qui ad maiorem unitatem, sobrietatem dignitatemque conferret et ab iis qui professionem vel votorum renovationem intra Missam peragerent, salvo iure particulari, assumeretur (art. 80).

Cui praecepto obsecutum, Consilium ad exsequendam Constitutionem de sacra liturgia hunc Ordinem professionis religiosae apparavit, quem Summus Pontifex Paulus VI Auctoritate Sua Apostolica approbavit, Rituali Romano inseruit evulgarique iussit. Quapropter haec Sacra Congregatio pro Cultu Divino, de speciali mandato eiusdem Summi Pontificis illum promulgat.

Conferentiae Episcopales, si casus fert Commissiones Mixtas plurium Nationum eiusdem linguae, collatis consiliis cum Coetibus Superiorum, qui in singulis Nationibus religiosorum incepta ordinant atque componunt, current ut huius ritus interpretationes populares diligenter fiant.

Instituta religiosa autem, cum professionis ritus uniuscuiusque familiae religiosae naturam atque spiritum exprimere debeat, hunc Ordinem ita aptent ut indolem suam perspicue ostendat et ad hanc Sacram Congregationem confirmandum quam primum mittant.

Contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

Ex aedibus Sacrae Congregationis pro Cultu Divino, die 2 februarii 1970, in festo Praesentationis Domini.

Benno Card. Gut
Praefectus

A Bugnini
a secretis

INSULAE PHILIPPINAE

DECRETA GENERALIA

Die 4 febr. 1970 (Prot. n. 317/70): confirmatur interpretatio *ilocano* Precum eucharisticarum II, III et IV.

Die 4 febr. 1970 (Prot. n. 319/70): confirmatur *ad interim* interpretatio *ilocano* Ordinis Baptismi parvulorum.

Confirmatio datur *ad interim* quia textus Ordinis Baptismi lingua vernacula exaratus, iuxta normas Constitutionis de Sacra Liturgia art. 63, par 2, continere debet etiam Praenotanda, quae inveniuntur in editione typica latina.

Die 26 februarii 1970 (Prot. n. 811/70): confirmatur interpretatio *anglica* Ordinis celebrandi Matrimonium, interpretatio *samareno* Ordinis Baptismi parvulorum, et interpretatio *anglica* Ordinis Baptismi parvulorum a Commissione mixta pro regionibus linguae *anglicae* parata.

A BASIC SCHEME FOR PRIESTLY TRAINING (Ratio Fundamentalis Institutionis Sacerdotalis)

At the Synod of Bishops, held in Rome in October 1967, the following request was put by the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, and met with the approval of the Fathers:

"Would it seem opportune to list the themes which ought to be included in all Schemes for Priestly Training, and to prepare, in collaboration with the Episcopal Conferences, a Basic Scheme (Ratio Fundamentalis), in accordance with the Decree *Optatam Totius* and the other Conciliar documents: in the next plenary meeting of the Sacred congregation for Catholic Education this scheme should be examined and drawn up definitively, so as to serve as a norm for all Schemes later to be made; its purpose being to preserve unity and at the same time allow sound variety."

As regards the list of themes mentioned above, the Sacred Congregation prepared a special index, entitled *De Ratione Institutionis sacerdotalis iuxta documenta Concilii Vaticani II renovanda* (Reforming the Scheme for Priestly Training according to the documents of Vatican Council II), and sent this to the individual Episcopal Conferences, to assist them in their work.

As for the second task, drawing up a Basic Scheme, its text is here put before the Episcopal Conferences as a necessary way to preserve unity in variety.

To clarify further its importance and purpose, the following points should be kept in view.

1. This document is intended to indicate to the Episcopal Conferences, whose task it is to draw up Schemes for Priestly Training proper to each nation, the solid foundations for carrying out or completing this

serious task; also to supply sure standards to the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education in its examination and approval of individual Schemes in accordance with the Decree *Optatum totius* no. 1.

An Obligatory Document

2. Since this document has been worked through by delegates of the Episcopal Conferences, and approved by the Holy See, it is to be taken as obligatory as regards its principal points (which are more precisely defined later), so that it may become the norm for the drawing up of individual Schemes, as the First Synod of Bishops decided.

The more easily to distinguish what is essential and therefore necessarily to be observed from what is not to be so considered, the following points must be noted.

a) For the most part it is clear from the nature of the matter itself what is of necessity required everywhere for the formation of future priests.

b) In some paragraphs elements which must be held essential, but which can (still) vary according to local circumstances, are clearly indicated: cf. e.g. nos. 50 (general coordination of studies), 75, 80, 81 (study programmes, the drawing-up of syllabuses), 93, examinations, 84, 101 (how to meet needs for special study and completion of post-Seminary formation).

c) Some points are mentioned simply by way of example or practical advice for the easier application of the principles laid down: cf. e.g. nos. 9 (variety of means for fostering vocations), 39, 40, 41 (the need for serious trial is laid down, but certain means to obtain it are only recommended), 48, 49, 50, 51 (virtues and qualities proper to the priest are stated, but some means and methods of developing them are only proposed), 52, 53, 54, 56 (the necessity of certain helps to spiritual life is affirmed, but they are not to be considered exhaustive), 91 (necessity affirmed, but not way of revising teaching methods); 27 (list of various Superiors), 29 (activity and ways of life of Superiors, e.g. community life), 31, 36 (variety of means for achieving right pedagogical and scientific approach), 38 (what is said in the concrete about Professors'

combined work, e.g. "they should meet at least once a month"), 67, 68 (the way in which training of alumni can be brought to a richer completion), 89 (reading of books in common to sharpen critical sense), 90 (the coordinator of studies), 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99 (the objects, places and times of pastoral exercises are mentioned only by way of examples).

If in some nations or regions situations obtain which demand special adaptations of priestly formation even in important points, adaptations beyond the scope of this Basic Scheme, the matter must be dealt with between the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education and the Episcopal Conferences of those places.

3. As is obvious from the nature of the case, the Document indicates only certain more general basic principles, on which the Episcopal Conferences must rely when defining their own rules. Its task is to point out suitable ways of meeting the various needs of priestly training, and to draw certain limits within which the life of Seminaries may safely go ahead.

According to the nature of its various subjects, therefore, the Document often foresees differing situations, in which individual Conferences will be able to choose their own path, more in keeping with the local conditions (cf. nos. 17, 18, 19, 42, 60, 63, 83, 84, 85, 97, 98, 101). Thus it aims at the greater good of every nation, not holding up their endeavours and undertakings, but stimulating them.

4. Some of the norms proposed in the Document are already drawn up in the form of separate sections which, if desired, may be inserted whole into national Schemes, for Priestly Training (e.g. nos 5-7, 11-14, 16, 20-26, 28-41, 44-58, 67-74, 76-79, 82, 86-89, 94-95, 99); others, on the other hand, just put forward principles to guide the necessary further elaboration (e.g. nos. 9, 15, 19, 27, 42, 43, 61-66, 75, 80, 93, 98, 99, 101).

5. In the drawing-up of the Document, three main requirements had to be met as far as possible: clarity, to do away with the dubious views about priestly training which are being spread about here and there in our day; *universality*, to supply, with the variety of conditions in view, suitable norms for the making of rules adapted to different localities;

actuality, i.e. after special consideration of the problems of our time in priestly training, to apply remedies for the dangers arising.

6. The Document is deeply penetrated with the spirit of the Second Vatican Council, and in places recalls its exact words. Experience teaches that it is not a waste of time to present some of the Council's obligatory rules and principles again, to prevent their being neglected because not expressly mentioned, in the Basic Scheme (e.g. nos. 11, 13, 20, 29, 30, 44, 45).

7. Therefore the Document took for itself the following rules, in order to be of the greatest possible assistance to the Episcopal Conferences in the preparing or revising a Scheme for Priestly Training: — to omit nothing that seemed useful; to add nothing that was not universally valid; always to pay attention to modern conditions. This multiple aim laid down, it was impossible to avoid some defect in the proportion of the parts, since some matters demanded more ample treatment, some more brief; some needed the style of a code of laws, others of a directory: elegance must yield to necessity.

INTRODUCTION

By the decree *De institutione sacerdotali* (On the Training for the Priesthood) the Second Vatican Council provided the principal and more general rules for today's efforts towards Seminary reform, to ensure that these efforts might go forward safely, and produce a salutary increase of piety, learning and pastoral zeal in candidates for the priesthood. Certain further determinations are needed in order that the reforms maybe adapted in the best possible way to the special needs of individual nations, and for the preservation of that unity and that image of the Catholic priesthood which it demands of its very nature, and on which the Council earnestly insisted.¹ With this twofold need in view, the Basic Scheme for Priestly Training here proposed has been worked out by the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education and the delegates of the Episcopal Conferences, in common effort and consultation. Their constant care and sincere prayer, too, was to express in

¹ Vatican Council II, Decr. *Optatum totius*, Introd.; Dec. *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, nos. 1,2,7, and *passim*.

this document the genuine spirit and pastoral purpose of the Second Vatican Council; also that these, expressed in more clearly defined form, might be more effective towards fitting the work of education in Seminaries, to the new needs of our times.

1. In what sense the Second Vatican Council confirms the validity of Seminary training.

In the Second Vatican Council, the Church decreed that its experience of Seminaries, tried out for many centuries, was to be maintained as valid, affirming that *Seminaries were necessary* as institutions set up for the formation of priest, and provided with those excellent educational features which, combined with others, can effectively promote the integral formation of future priests.² However, while confirming afresh this well-tried path to the priesthood, it by no means wished to pass over in silence the manifold and varied needs arising, in course of time, from out-dated means or changed conditions; it allowed for, or even prescribed not a few changes to increase the power and pedagogical efficacy of this useful institution.

Although the Council differentiated between Seminaries which are called Major and those called Minor, or Junior, it determined certain principles valid for both.³ Before the particular problems of each are brought out, however, it is first necessary to give careful consideration to what is in a way presupposed in all that is to be said below: the Seminary, as a community of young men,⁴ derives its primary force and fitness to train future priests from its own circumstances and way of life; here the young men live; its air, one may say, they breathe; they themselves have a part in determining and reforming its character. It is a question of various concurrent factors, both internal and external; of the structure of the whole community, and of its spirit, which can check or promote improvement, whose influence is, in varying degrees, apparent in everything.

In this situation, then, the primary duty of the Superiors is to obtain the collaboration of all concerned, in order to produce and perfect

² Cf. Vat. Council II, Decr. *Optatam totius*, nos. 4-6.

³ *Ibid.* no. 3.

⁴ Note no. 74 in this document gives a more detailed description of a Seminary.

this spiritual climate. It should be such as to ensure that whoever enters the Seminary may find his own vocation and carrying out God's will wholly and entirely.⁵ The material setting should not be reckoned as of little importance towards this purpose: the sober and suitable arrangement, that is, of site, buildings, furniture and so on, adequate for the life the young men are leading.

2. Position of Modern Youth as Regards Education

In any sound reform of Seminaries, moreover, present-day circumstances and their special educational needs must certainly be considered.⁶ The young men who called by Divine Providence to exercise the priestly office among men of our time *bring special dispositions* that match the mind and attitudes of modern men. So, as their outlook manifests itself at various times, one observes in them an ardent longing for sincerity and truth; they are noticeably very prone to take up everything new and out-of-the ordinary; they admire the world with its scientific and technical progress; we see them wanting to work their way more deeply into the world to serve it, with a sense of "solidarity" particularly with the poorer classes and the oppressed and a spirit of community. But besides all this they have clearly a distrust for everything old and traditionally accepted; they cannot make up their minds, and are inconsistent in putting plans into effect; they show a lack of docility — very necessary for spiritual progress — with a disposition difficult and critical towards authority and the various institutions of civil and ecclesiastical society, etc..⁷ In this pedagogical work, the educator not only does not neglect these special qualities, but endeavours to understand them, and to turn them, as far as he can, to his purpose of formation, with the

⁵ Pius XII, Apostolic Exhortation, *Menti Nostrae*, 23 Sept. 1950: *A.A.S.* 42 (195) p. 685; Paul VI, Address, *Non e senza*, given at the inauguration of the buildings of the Pont. Lombard College, Rome, 11 Nov. 1965: *Insegnamenti di Paolo VI*, III, pp. 604-605, Vat. Polyglot Press, 1965.

⁶ John XXIII, Address, *E grande*, to the First Congress held in Rome from all Italy, to foster sacred vocations, 21 Apr. 1961: *A.A.S.* 53 (1961), p. 311.

⁷ Vat. Coun. II, Declar. *Gravissimum educationis*, Introd.; Const. past. *Gaudium et spes*, ch. II; Paul VI, Address, *Salutiano con vivissima*, to the leaders of the association "*Movimento Adulti Scouts Italiani*," 5 Nov. 1966: *Insegnamenti*, IV, pp. 538 seq.

cooperation always between what is more useful for better priestly formation and what is less useful, not useful at all, or an actual obstacle. All things considered, it is impossible to ignore the fact that in these last years particularly there are problems, originating from youth or from modern society, which exercise a powerful influence on the whole work of formation, and therefore demand greater efforts from educators.

Two futures of modern youth need particular attention: their keener sense of their own dignity as persons, and their keener feeling for the things and the men of this world, whether for its undoubted goods, or its particular spiritual situation, which displays more perceptibly as the days go by the effects of a neglect of religion.⁸ These two factors combine with other; in their hearts and create a kind of common mentality, one which requires in Seminaries, besides other remedial measures, a greater esteem for the person, and the removal of anything whose reason is an unjustified "convention;" everything must be done in accordance with truth and charity; genuine dialogue must be established among all parties; more numerous contacts with the world must be encouraged, to meet the just needs of right formation; finally, everything that is prescribed or demanded should show the reason on which it is based and should be carried out in freedom.⁹

If these things require the revision of certain elements of training accepted from past practice, they also demand a genuine pedagogical effort, one relying on mutual trust and understanding with a right notion of freedom, and particularly the knowledge of how to distinguish the means and the ends of education. For if useful dialogue and fruitful enquiry about means can be instituted in collaboration with the students, at all times and from the beginning there should be kept well in view the purpose of the Seminary and of all education, as the basis of all considerations,¹⁰ to which any discussion of this kind must be re-

⁸ Cf. Paul VI, Radio Address, *La vicorrenza*, for the feast of the Nativity of Our Lord, 22 Dec. 1964: *Insegnamenti*, II, p. 761; address, *Le parole*, to the members of the Catholic University Confederation of Italy (FUCI), 6 Dec. 1966: *Insegnamenti*, IV, p. 611; address, *Noi sappiamo*, to the faithful in audience, 25 Sept. 1968: *Insegnamenti*, VI, pp. 927 seq.

⁹ Cf. Vat. Council. II, Const. *Gaudium et spes*, nos. 25, 26, 47; Paul VI, address, *Salutiano con vivissima*, cf. note 7.

¹⁰ Cf. Vat. Council. II, Const. *Gaudium et spes*, n. 31.

ferred. The more clearly the sublime purpose of their formation is put before the young men, the more willingly will they join forces to seek means best fitted to attain it. Guided by their resolve to promote the common good, and by the will of God, they will arrive at a true sense of freedom and authority.

3. Catholic Priesthood as the Proper End of Priestly Education

The proper end of priestly education is based on the idea of Catholic priesthood as it arises from divine revelation, clarified by the constant tradition and magisterium of the Church. This teaching, which must be the formative element in every Scheme of Priestly Training, infusing therein its special force and significance, can be taken from the very words of the Second Vatican Council.

All priestly power and ministry in the Catholic Church derives its origin from the unique and eternal priesthood of Christ, who was sanctified by the Father and sent into the world (cf. Jn. 10,36), and made his apostles in the first place, and their successors, the bishops, sharers in the same priesthood. In different ways the various members of the Church share in that one same priesthood of Christ: the general, or common, priesthood of the faithful constitutes a certain simple degree of this sharing, the faithful who through baptism and the anointing of the Holy Spirit "receive consecration as a spiritual house, a holy priesthood. It is their task, in every employment, to offer the spiritual sacrifices of a Christian man."¹¹ Priests share in the priesthood of Christ in a different way: they "do not possess the high dignity of the Pontificate; they are dependent on Bishops for the exercise of their power. They are nevertheless united to them in priestly honour. In virtue of the sacrament of order, they are consecrated in the likeness of Christ, high and eternal priest (cf. Heb. 5, 1-10; 7, 24; 9, 11-28), as genuine priests of the New Testament, for the work of preaching the gospel, tending the faithful, and celebrating divine worship."¹² For this reason, therefore, the *ministerial priesthood* of priests surpasses the general priesthood of the faithful, since through it some in the body of the Church are assim-

¹¹ Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Optatam totius*, passim.

¹² Vat. Coun. II, Dogmatic Const. *Lumen gentium*, no. 10.

lated to Christ the Head, and are promoted "to serve Christ, their Master, Priest and King, and to share his ministry. Thus the Church on earth, is constantly built up into the People of God, the Body of Christ and Temple of the Holy Spirit."¹³

"There is an essential difference between the faithful's priesthood in common and the priesthood of the ministry or the hierarchy, and not just a difference of degree. Nevertheless, there is an ordered relation between them: one and the other has its special way of sharing the single priesthood of Christ."¹⁴

When raised to the priesthood, priests enter into manifold *relationships with their own Bishop*, with all the other priests, and with the people of God.¹⁵ For "since all priests share one and the same priesthood and ministry of Christ with the Bishop, the very unity of their ordination and function demands their communion in the hierarchy with the Order of Bishops . . . , Bishops, therefore, must regard their priests as indispensable helpers and advisers in the ministry and office of teaching, sanctifying and nourishing the people of God."¹⁶ Together with their Bishop "they make a single priesthood, though there is a difference in the duties by which it is carried into effect. They render the Bishop present, in a way, in individual local communities. Their association with him is marked by confidence and generosity. To the best of their ability they shoulder his tasks and anxieties and make the exercise of them their daily care."¹⁷

This true sharing in one and the same diocesan priesthood creates many close ties among the priests themselves: "priests in virtue of their ordination are established in the priestly Order and are intimately united in sacramental brotherhood."¹⁸ "which should be spontaneously and cheerfully demonstrated in mutual help, spiritual and material alike, pastoral and personal; shown too in reunions and a fellowship of life,

¹³ Ibid. no. 28.

¹⁴ Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, no. 1.

¹⁵ Vat. Coun. II, Const. *Lumen gentium*, no. 10.

¹⁶ Which is to be borne in mind particularly in the spiritual and pastoral formation of the student (cf. chs. VIII and XVI).

¹⁷ Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, no. 7.

¹⁸ Vat. Coun. II, Const. *Lumen gentium*, no. 28.

work and charity"¹⁹ "in this way priests display that unity by which Christ desired his own to be made perfect in one, in order that the world might know that the Son was sent by the Father."²⁰

Every priest, however, is taken from among the people of God in order to be appointed on behalf of the same people. Though by the sacrament of order they exercise the office of father and teacher, "they too, like the faithful are our Lord's disciples, and are called by God's grace to share his kingdom. For they are brothers among brothers with all who have been reborn in the font of baptism. They are likewise members of the one same Body of Christ which all Christians are called to build up."²¹ Therefore, "they must, like fathers in Christ, take care of the faithful, by baptism and instruction (cf. 1 Cor. 4,15; 1 Pet. 2,23). Being examples to the flock (1 Pet. 5, 5), they must take charge of their local community and serve it in such a way that it may deserve to be given the title of the Church of God (cf. 1 Cor. 1, 2; 2 Cor. 1, 1) which is the title that distinguishes the one People of God in its entirety. They must be mindful of their obligation truly to show the face of the priest's and pastor's ministry to believers and unbelievers, to Catholics and non-Catholics, by their daily life and care; to bear witness to all of truth and life; as good shepherds, to search out even those (cf. LK. 15, 4-7) who after baptism in the Catholic Church have fallen away from sacramental practice, or worse still, from belief,"²² that through their tireless work "the Church as the universal sacrament of salvation"²³ may shine out before all men and become the sign of God's presence in the world.²⁴ "Together with the Religious and their faithful, they should show by their lives and utterance that the Church, merely by its presence here with all that it has to offer, is an inexhaustible source of those virtues which the world needs today."²⁵ "A priest, however, has a duty not only to his own flock but to the whole community, to which

¹⁹ Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, no. 8.

²⁰ Vat. Coun. II, Const. *Lumen gentium*, no 28.

²¹ Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, no. 8.

²² *Ibid.* no. 9.

²³ Vat. Coun. II, Const. *Lumen gentium*, no 28.

²⁴ *Ibid.* no. 28.

²⁵ Cf. Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Ad gentes*, no. 15.

he must strive to give a truly Christian character" a genuine missionary spirit and one of Catholic universality.

Ministry of the Word

The priestly ministry as expounded by the Second Vatican Council is chiefly put into practice in the ministry of the word and the work of sanctification.

"Since nobody can be saved without faith, the first duty of priests as fellow workers with the Bishops is to preach the Gospel to all men,"²⁶ carrying out our Lord's command: *Go into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature* (Mk. 16, 16). This they fulfill when "being on good terms with people, they turn them to God; or by preaching openly they proclaim the mystery of Christ to unbelievers; or give Christian instruction or explain the Church's teaching, or endeavor to discuss contemporary problems in the light of Christ's word."²⁷

The aim of the ministry of the word is to bring men to faith and the sacrament of salvation, and it attains its peak in the celebration of the Eucharist: "their mightiest exercise of their sacred office is at the eucharistic worship or assembly. There, acting in the person of Christ, they make the proclamation of his mystery; they unite the aspirations of the faithful with the sacrifice of their head; in the sacrifice of the Mass, until the coming of the Lord (cf. 1 Cor. 11, 26), they present and apply the sole sacrifice of the New Testament, the single offering Christ makes of himself as an unblemished victim to the Father (cf. Heb. 9, 11-28). The ministrations of reconciliation and relief is their high function on behalf of penitent or sick faithful. They convey the needs of the faithful and their prayers to God the Father (cf. Heb. 5, 1-4)."²⁸ Thus the office of preaching has as its special characteristic that it must be completed by the work of sanctification, by which the priest, acting in the person of Christ, cooperates in building up the Church.

²⁶ Vat. Coun. II, Const. *Gaudium et spes*, no. 43.

²⁷ Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, no. 6.

²⁸ Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, no. 4; Const. *Lumen gentium*, no. 28.

The *Priest presides* over the people of God when they are gathered together, through the celebration of the Eucharist. He should, therefore, be such a man as can likewise be recognized by everyone as acting in the place of Christ the Head; for "priests with the authority they have been given carry on the work of Christ Leader and Shepherd. In the name of the Bishop they father the family of God together into one united brotherhood. In union with the Holy Spirit they lead them through Christ to God the Father. To enable them to do this, or any other priestly work, priests receive spiritual strength."²⁹ By this power the priestly or hierarchic ministry differs from the general priesthood of the faithful not only in degree but essentially.³⁰ For though the faithful can and must have some part in the task of spreading the Gospel and in pastoral duties,³¹ only the man who has received the sacred order of priesthood can fully exercise the sacramental ministry, above all that of the Eucharist, from which the other ministries derive, and to which they are directed. And so, *set apart for the Gospel of God* (Rom. 1, 1) he should not hesitate to dedicate his whole life to the service of God and man, indeed to lay down his life for his sheep.³²

4. Activity and Life of the Priest Today

The *priestly office*, as essentially defined by the Church, is today carried out in an *entirely new situation*, which comes to light as a result of mankind's new needs, and from the nature of modern civilization.³³

The main factors today determining mankind's needs arise from the heightened regard for the human person, or the progressive alteration of the religious sense. If not always openly and in fact, at least virtually, the dignity of every man is acknowledged, his right to progress, to manifest his mind freely, to have a part in his own development and in that of the material world. As man's dominion in the world grows more com-

²⁹ Vat. Coun. II, *Decr. Presbyterorum Ordinis*, no. 4.

³⁰ Vat. Coun. II, *Const. Lumen gentium*, no. 28.

³¹ Vat. Coun. II, *Decr. Presbyterorum Ordinis*, no. 6.

³² Vat. Coun. II, *Const. Lumen gentium*, no. 10.

³³ *Ibid.* nos. 11, 12.

plete, in conjunction with great changes in society, less room is granted to traditionally accepted forms of Christian life. While, in the general upheaval, Christian groups display a more personal form of religious life, which shows itself in special reverence for the word of God and the sacred Liturgy, and in acquisition of a more mature conscience. The number is daily increasing, too, of those who are partly or wholly losing their due familiarity with the Church, and leaning towards a natural sort of religion and ethic. Indeed, all too often they go to such lengths that atheism — once restricted rather to philosophies — is becoming ever more common, little by little affecting the minds of great numbers of people. These various features of modern civilization must be constantly borne in mind, since the life and activity of the priest, and his preparation for his task must have reference to them.³⁴

Through the various ways of social communication, young men who today enter a Seminary are closely attached to that kind of society, and their outlook is affected by problems concerning religion, especially priestly activity and life. They often approach theological studies with a sincere will to serve God and men in the priestly life, without, however, what was formerly the normal thing, a confident and clear grasp of the benefits of religion, of which they must at sometime become the heralds and administrators. These things from time to time cause grave difficulties to arise in the Seminary, yet they form the true and principal object of education, to which Superiors must give special care and attention. In their method of formation they should first of all try, not so much to remove these various obstacles by some sudden, radical intervention, but rather step by step to purify minds and intentions. In particular, they should employ judgment and moderation, to ensure that the sound element in the young men's aims may steadily grow and gain strength; thus their priestly life and work may in future bear richer fruit.

The generous and keen spirit of the young men will help towards this end, and their zeal to be of use to human society; even at times also the doubts they must overcome and their critical examination of the faith: since the people to whom they will be sent as priests, whose

³⁴ Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Presbyterorum Ordinis* no. 13.

religious outlook is full of doubt and uncertainty, will not accept a priests's teaching authority easily and without prejudice the doctrine which the priest tries, *ex officio*, to teach them.

The young men, then, must be so trained that this particular situation, which they at present experience with the whole Church, may not only not lead them into any danger of spiritual collapse but in fact stimulate them, with firm hope and faith in God, to try new ways and means of easier communication with the men of today. For the world "now entrusted to the pastors of the Church to cherish and serve, was so loved by God that for its sake he gave his only-begotten Son (cf. Jn 3, 16). Indeed this world, held down by many sins, does in fact possess abundant possibilities and could provide the living stones (cf. 1 Pet. 2, 5) with which to build a dwelling place for God in the Spirit (cf. Eph. 2, 22). The same Holy Spirit, while urging on the Church to open up new ways of approach to the world of today, inspires and fosters timely adaptations for the priestly ministry."³⁵

This up-to-date adjusting of priestly activity and life is at present causing anxious concern in many minds, and raising all kinds of questions everywhere. Hence, too, much discussion and writing, and many proposals about the priest himself, his nature, his proper place in society, his style of life, his better preparation for more effective fulfillment of his

³⁵ There is a more detailed picture of this new situation in which the priest's apostolic work is carried out, in the documents of the Second Vatican Council and the more recent Papal documents, e.g. Vat. Coun. II, Const. *Gaudium et spes*; John XXIII, Enc. *Pacem in terris*, 11 April 1963: *A.A.S.* 55 (1963), pp. 257 seq.; enc. *Mater et Magistra*, 15 May 1961: *A.A.S.* (1961), pp. 401 seq.; Paul VI, Enc. *Ecclesiam suam*, 6 Aug. 1964: *A.A.S.* 56 (1964) pp. 609 seq.; Enc. *Populorum Progressio*, 26 March 1967: *A.A.S.* 59 (1967), pp. 257 seq.; address, *Potrebbe bastare*, to those present at the Congress held in Rome on the adaptation of pastoral care to modern needs, 9 Sept. 1966: *Insegnamenti*, IV, pp. 388-392; address, *Benedicamus Domino*, to their Excellencies the Bishops of Latin America about to attend the second General Assembly held in Medellin, 24 Aug. 1968: *Insegnamenti*, VI, pp. 403, seq.; address, *Questo annuale incontro*, to the Lenten preachers and parish priests of Rome, 17 March 1969: *L'Osservatore Romano*, 17-18 March 1969, p. 1; address *Il Sig. Cardinale*, to the Sacred College, 15 Dec. 1969: *L'Osservatore Romano*, 15-16 Dec. 1969, p. 1 seq.

task.³⁶ The Seminary, obviously, must never be unaware of these things nor ever neglect them; but on the other hand must carefully guard and preserve what the priesthood possesses of certain and lasting good. The task of this *Ratio Fundamentalis* will be to safeguard this acquired good; the Episcopal Conferences, with full freedom, will see to the adaptation to the needs of time and place of other contingent elements.

I

GENERAL RULES

1. The Scheme for Priestly Training drawn up by an Episcopal Conference in accordance with no. I of the Decree *Optatam totius*, is approved by the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education first of all "ad experimentum," for trial.

If within the period of trial some urgent need arises to adapt the Scheme in any part to fresh circumstances, such changes are not excluded so long as the Holy See is informed in good time.

Before the period of trial is finished, the Episcopal Conference's Scheme will be revised in the light of experience by the Episcopal Commission for Seminaries,³⁷ with the help of experts, and will be submitted for fresh approval of the Sacred Congregation.

Such revision and approbation will afterwards be repeated at certain times, as shall seem necessary or useful to the individual Episcopal Conferences.

The right and duty of drawing up a Scheme for Priestly Training in their nation or region, and of approving special experimentation as may seem opportune, belong to the Episcopal Conference alone, and not to individual Bishops.

³⁶ Vat. Coun. II, Const. *Gaudium et spes*, nos. 4-10; Paul VI, homily *Hodie Concilium*, at session IX of the Second Vat. Coun., 7 Dec. 1965: *Insegnamenti*, III, pp. 720 seq.

³⁷ Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, no. 22.

2. The rules of a Scheme thus worked out are to be observed in all the Seminaries for diocesan clergy, whether regional or national; their particular adaptations will be determined by the competent Bishops in the Rule of Life proper to each Seminary.

Training Schemes of Religious Institutes are also to be adapted to these rules, comparing like with like.³⁸

Where Seminary students carry out their philosophical and theological studies in Faculties or other Institutions of Higher Studies, reference should be made to the rules laid down by the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education in the document *Normae quaedam*³⁹ under no. 33.

3. The Scheme embraces basic priestly training under its human, spiritual, intellectual and pastoral aspects: these parts must be aptly fitted together to ensure that the priest is prepared for the needs of our time.

4. It is of primary importance that all priestly training, while taking account of the documents of the Holy See concerned with the formation of students, should conform to the spirit and norms of the Second Vatican Council, as they appear in the Decree *Optatam totius* and in the other Constitutions and Decrees which touch on the education of clerics.⁴⁰

II

THE PASTORAL CARE OF VOCATIONS

5. Vocation to the priesthood has its setting in the wider field of Christian vocation, as rooted in the sacrament of baptism, by which the

³⁸ Paul VI, cf. address, *Questo annuale incontro*, loc. cit.; cf. address *Il Sig. Cardinale*, loc. cit., cf. note 35.

³⁹ In these rules certain more general points are put before the Episcopal Conferences, with which they can draw up the Schemes for Priestly Training proper to each nation.

⁴⁰ Either by a Commission or a Secretariat, to which the care of the Seminaries has been entrusted. Such Commissions or Secretariates, as also the so-called *technical Commissions* of experts were highly recommended by the Synod of Bishops in 1967: their composition, duties and competence are to be more accurately determined by the Episcopal Conferences.

people of God "is founded by Christ for a fellowship of life, charity and truth; it is taken up by him as the instrument of salvation for all men; it is sent on a mission to the world at large as the light of the world and the salt of the earth (cf. Matt. 5, 13-16)."⁴¹ This vocation, aroused by the Holy Spirit, "who dispenses his gifts in variety, for the Church's advantage, according to his wealth and the requirements of the ministries (cf. 1 Cor. 12, 1-11)"⁴² is aimed at the building up of the Body of Christ in which "there exists a diversity of members and functions."⁴³

6. As manifestations of the unsearchable riches of Christ (cf. Eph. 3, 8) in the Church, all vocations claim high esteem, and therefore must be developed with all care and concern towards their maturity and increase. It is, then, for the whole Christian community⁴⁴ but in a special way for priests, "as educators in the faith, themselves or through others, to train each of the faithful to follow his vocation according to the Gospel, and practise sincere and fruitful charity. They must show the faithful by the light of the Holy Spirit how to use that liberty with which Christ has made us free"⁴⁵ so that they "may reach their Christian maturity."⁴⁶

7. Among the many vocations unceasingly aroused by the Holy Spirit in the People of God, the vocation to a state of perfection, and above all the vocation to the priesthood, has a special importance. By the latter a Christian is chosen by God⁴⁷ to share in the hierarchical

⁴¹ Cf. Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Optatam totius*, Introd.; Paul VI, in the Motu proprio, *Ecclesiae Sanctae*, 6 Aug. 1966: A.A.S. 58 (1966), p. 781, as regards missionary areas, cf. Decr. *Ad gentes divinitus*, no. 16.

⁴² *Normae quaedam ad Constitutionem Apostolicam Deus scientiarum Dominus de studiis academicis ecclesiasticis recognoscendam*, published by the S. Congregation for Catholic Education, 20 May 1968.

⁴³ E. G. Decr. *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, Declar. *Gravissimum educationis*, Decr. *Perfectae caritatis*, Const. *Lumen gentium*, *Gaudium et spes*, Decr. *Unitatis redintegratio*, Const. *Sacrosantum Concilium*, Decr. *Apostolicam actuositatem*, etc.

⁴⁴ Vat. Coun. II, Const. *Lumen gentium*, no. 9; cf. Paul VI, address, *Il nostro desiderio*, to the faithful in audience, 5 May 1965: *Insegnamenti*, III pp. 928 seq.

⁴⁵ Vat. Coun. II, Const. *Lumen Gentium*, no. 7.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Optatam totius*, no. 2.

Priesthood of Christ "to nourish the Church by the word and grace of God"⁴⁸. At the different stages of life this vocation shows itself in different ways: in youths, in men of more mature years, and also, as the constant experience of the Church testifies, in boys—in whom it not infrequently shows itself, like a "seed", in company with a distinct piety, an ardent love of God and neighbor, and a leaning towards the apostolate⁴⁹.

8. From the consideration of the great needs of Christ's faithful and an understanding of our Divine Saviour's invitation to all: "Pray the Lord of the harvest to send labourers into his harvest (Matt. 9,38: Lk. 10,2), it is obviously a serious duty for the whole Christian community continually and in faith to foster religious and especially priestly vocations. Therefore in every Diocese, region, or nation, a Vocations Organization should be established and built up, in accordance with the Pontifical documents on the matter. Its function is the due coordination of all that belongs to pastoral action for the fostering of vocations, neglecting no suitable means, and to promote this work with equal prudence and zeal⁵⁰.

"This vigorous collaboration of all God's People springs up in response to the initiatives of Divine Providence, which endows with the natural qualities they need those whom God has chosen to share the hierarchic Priesthood of Christ, and assists them by his grace. At the same time, God leaves the rightful ministers of the Church to designate as acceptable those candidates whose acknowledged fitness is combined with the complete freedom and honest purpose essential in those who seek so great a role. Once she has accepted them, the Church then dedicates them by the seal of the Holy Spirit for the worship of God and the service of the Church"⁵¹.

To promote the Organization and foster vocations, Bishops should take the greatest care to make use of the combined efforts of priests,

⁴⁸ Vat. Coun. II, *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, no. 6.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*; Cf. *Decr. Christus Dominus*, no. 15.

⁵⁰ Cf. Vat. Coun. II, *Decr. Optatam totius*, no. 2.

⁵¹ Vat. Coun. II, *Const. Lumen gentium*, no. 11.

religious and lay people, especially of parents and teachers⁵², and also of Catholic associations, on the pattern of any general, organically coordinated pastoral care.

9. Everything necessary to obtain vocations from God should be encouraged, in the first place the prayer demanded by Christ himself (cf. Matt. 9, 39, Lk. 10, 2). Private prayer is called for, and prayer in common at suitable times in the liturgical year, and on solemn occasions fixed by ecclesiastical authority. This is the primary purpose of the *World Day for Vocations*, instituted by the Holy See, to be kept every year by the Church throughout the world⁵³. Everything, too, should be encouraged that can rouse and open men's minds to recognize and welcome a divine vocation. The example of priests "who openly manifest true paschal joy"⁵⁴; well-organized pastoral care of youth in the dioceses; sermons and catechesis that treat of vocation; spiritual preparation such as retreats: all should be regarded as important features of this pastoral work.

This activity should observe the laws of sound psychology and pedagogy, and must be aimed at men of different ages; but nowadays

⁵² Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, no. 11; Pius XII, Apost. Const. *Sedes sapientiae*, 31 May 1956: *A.A.S.* 48 (1956), pp. 357 seq.; Paul VI, Apostolic letter, *Summi Dei Verbum*, 4 Nov. 1963: *A.A.S.* 55 (1963), pp. 984 seq.; cf. address, *Il grande rito*, on the completion of 400 years since the institution of Seminaries by the Council of Trent, 4 Nov. 1963: *Insegnamenti*, I, pp. 288-290; address, *Il nostro desiderio*, loc. cit., note 44; address, *Vous nous offrez*, to the "Altar boys" from all Europe, 30 March 1967: *Insegnamenti*, V, pp. 126-127.

⁵³ Cf. Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Optatam totius*, no. 2; Decr. *Perfectae caritatis*, no. 24; Decr. *Christus Dominus*, no. 15; Decr. *Ad gentes divinitus*, nos. 16, 39; cf. also Pius XII, moto proprio *Cum nobis* "on the creation of Pontifical Organizations for Vocations to the Priesthood in the S. Congregation for Seminaries and Universities" 4 Nov. 1941: *A.A.S.* 33 (1941), p. 479; with added *Statutes and Rules* promulgated by the same S. Congregation 8 Sept. 1943; Motu proprio *Cum supremae* "On the Pontifical Organization for religious vocations," 11 Feb. 1955: *A.A.S.* 47 (1955), p. 266; with the added *Statutes and Rules* promulgated by the S. Congregation of Religious (ibid. pp. 298-301).

⁵⁴ Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Optatam totius*, no. 2; Pius XII, Apostolic Const. *Sedes sapientiae*, 31 May 1956: *A.A.S.* 48 (1956), p. 357; Paul VI Apostolic letter, *Summi Dei Verbum*, 4 Nov. 1963: *A.A.S.* 55 (1963), pp. 984 seq.

fresh effort is urgently needed: more men show a vocation at a more mature age (sometimes after practising a career): special undertakings and programmes are demanded to detect, develop and form vocations.⁵⁵

10. The fostering of vocations should be done in a generous spirit, not only for one's diocese and nation, but also for other dioceses and other nations: the needs of the Universal Church should be remembered, and the action of God who calls individuals to different tasks: to the secular priesthood, or missionary work, or to the religious institutions. To make this end easier of attainment, single Centres are desirable in the individual dioceses, which may be expressions of the cooperation and unity existing between both clergies, diocesan and religious, in favor of all vocations⁵⁶.

(to be continued)

⁵⁵ Cf. Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Optatum totius* no. 2; Decr. *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, no. 11; Const. *Lumen gentium*, no. 11; Decr. *Perfectae caritatis*, no. 24; Decr. *Apostolicam actuositatem*, no. 11; Decr. *Christus Dominus*, no. 15; Const. *Gaudium et spes*, no. 52; Decr. *Ad gentes divinitus*, no. 39; cf. also Pius XII, Apostolic exhortation, *Menti nostrae*, 23 Sept. 1950: *A.A.S.* 42 (1950), p. 683; address, *Una parola, to newly-weds*, 25 March 1942: *Discorsi e Radiomessaggi*, IV, pp. 11-17; John XXIII, address, *E grande* to the First Congress from all Italy for the fostering of vocations, held in Rome, 21 April 1961; *A.A.S.* 53 (1961) 308-314; address, *Quod spectaculum*, to those present at the first international Congress for ecclesiastical vocations, 26 May 1962: *A.A.S.* 54 (1962), pp. 451-453; Paul VI, Apostolic Letter *Summi Dei Verbum*, 4 Nov. 1963: *A.A.S.* 55 (1963) pp. 985 seq.; Radio message given for the celebration of the "World Day for Vocations," *Pregate il Padrone*, 11 April 1964, *Insegnamenti*, II, pp. 240-242; *Quest'anno* 5 March 1967: *Insegnamenti*, V, pp. 699-702; *La Quinta Giornata*, 19 April 1968, *Insegnamenti*, VI, pp. 133-136; written message, *La celebrazione*, 19 March 1969: *A.A.S.* 61 (1969), pp. 330-33; S. Cong. for Seminaries and Universities, *La preminente*; Instruction on the work of Catholic Action of the fostering of vocations, 1 Oct. 1960.

⁵⁶ Letter of Cardinal Amelito G. Cicognani, Sec. of State, to Card. Pizzardo, Prefect of the S. Cong. for Seminaries and Universities, 23 Jan. 1964.

⁵⁷ Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, no. 11; Decr. *Optatum totius*, no. 2.

⁵⁸ Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Optatum totius*, no. 2; cf. the document referred to in note 55; as regards late vocations, cf. Apostolic Exhortation, *Menti Nostrae*, 25 Sept. 1950: *A.A.S.* 42 (1950), p. 684.

⁵⁹ Vat. Coun. II, Decr. *Optatum totius*, no. 2; *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, nos. 10, 11.

LITURGICAL SECTION

UNIVERSAL PRAYER FOR WORLD COMMUNICATIONS DAY 1970

Celebrant:

On this day dedicated to reflection and prayer for putting to good account the means of social communication for the benefit of youth, let us pray that particularly, the press, motion pictures, radio and television favour the right development of character in young people and their full emotional, cultural, and religious maturity.

Reader:

1. Let us pray for the Church;
that She who has been commissioned by Christ to announce the Word of Truth throughout the World, might help men to use in the proper way, the goods of this world.
Let us pray.
Graciously hear us Oh Lord!
2. Let us pray for all men,
that in the communications media they might find help in overcoming barriers of culture, race and nationality and in promoting unity and brotherhood.
Let us pray.
Graciously hear us Oh Lord!
3. Let us pray for all who are engaged artistically and professionally in the field of social communications,
that they might contribute towards the education of young people for life, with the awareness that they are called to be messengers of good.
Let us pray.
Graciously hear us Oh Lord!

4. Let us pray for young people,
that they might know how to train themselves ever more
effectively for putting to good account the information
and communications media, thus deriving benefits for
their moral and intellectual educational as well as encour-
agement in their ideals of love.

Let us pray.

Graciously hear us Oh Lord!

5. Let us pray for all Christians,
that they might know how to avail themselves of the media
of social communication,
to bring to all the Christian message,
and to encourage unselfishness and facilitate communing
with God and other men.

Let us pray.

Graciously hear us Oh Lord!

Celebrant:

Oh God, Creator of all that is good,
You Who have entrusted to man the resources of the world,
graciously hear our prayer;
grant that men might know how to avail themselves of Your
gifts in order to spread the message of truth and love
of which You are the Source.
Through Christ Our Lord

A m e n .

THE SITUATION OF THE CHURCH AFTER THE SYNOD

(Continuation of an after-dinner discussion with Cardinal Danielou on the above topic)

II

The Church and Public Opinion

The relatively recent attention given to religious questions has highlighted the problems of relations between the Church and public opinion. We had the impression that certain individuals wished to use public opinion in order to exert pressure on the deliberations of the Bishops, either on a national level or on the level of the Universal Church. We also ascertained that, on the eve of the Synod, the press tended to dramatize the situation in the Church. During the Synod, the press reported the discussions of the Bishops and stressed the serene atmosphere that reigned in the Synod. And when the Synod ended, the press finally gave the impression that the atmosphere that reigned in the Synod had been one of general well-being.

Do you think that this reflects the reality? From a more general point of view, what is your opinion on the problems of relations between the Church and public opinion?

Cardinal Danielou: — The problem you pose is very important, for public opinion as expressed in the Press and by means of audio-visual aids exerts considerable influence.

The analysis you give seems to be correct. Before the Synod, there was a rather disturbing atmosphere, and the Press did acknowledge certain oppositions. I think we have to congratulate the Press for having given an altogether correct idea of what proved a serene and objective atmosphere in the Synod.

But the problem you pose goes much further. We can say that it is a question of pressures wielded by public opinion.

It is evident that public opinion can either stimulate or paralyze the "powers" whatever these may be and, in any case, render the exercise of responsibility and authority more difficult.

I take an example right away. Every decision the Church makes, which involves a criticism against a person, can no longer be made without provoking a general protestation, and those who approved these decisions are considered as "inquisitors".

This is an extremely serious matter, for it is evident that, if we paralyze completely the exercise of authority in matters of Faith, where authority has precisely the absolute duty to exercise itself, then we run the risk of hampering the exercise of legitimate responsibilities.

Such phenomena can be observed only in the domain of the Church. Thus, for example, it is impossible for a government of any kind to censure a film without immediately causing a general protestation by a certain public opinion, seeing in this an abuse of authority.

This appears to me to be — I am forced to say it — one of the defects of a consumer society. This is one of the cases where the defence of liberty can finally lead to the exaltation of libertinism; that is to say, that if liberty is considered as having no limits, and if no one any longer has the right to set limits to liberty, then we enter in a world of confusion, disorder, and anarchy.

I realize the courage the Sovereign Pontiff needs today to take a decision with regard to certain matters which appear as manifestly dangerous for the Christian people, knowing that his decision will immediately stir up against him a general opinion which no longer admits that liberty should have limits. *But the Church is a society, and it is indispensable for the health of this society that we prevent poisons seeping into it.*

This problem is so important it must absolutely be discussed between public opinion and the authorities, that is, in dialogues between journalists and responsible people, so that there be no basic misunderstanding; and that those who are responsible explain to public opinion

why they have the absolute duty to act in a certain number of cases and why, in such cases, they have the right to expect not contradiction but collaboration on the part of those who "make" public opinion.

To be sure, public opinion has the duty to protest against abuses. It is to the grandeur of our free society to have a free press, and that this press has the right to protest against the abuses of power. *But the abuse of power must not be confused with the exercise of power.*

The Church and the Principle of Subsidiarity

It seems that the organization of relations between the local churches and the Universal Church questions the exercise of the principle of subsidiarity with which the social doctrine of the Church has familiarized us with regard to civil society. *To what extent can we apply the principle of subsidiarity in the Church at the levels of organization and doctrine?* Cardinal Danielou: — I believe that the problem you bring up is entirely fundamental. The principle of subsidiarity is very dear to the Church, and is so at all levels. By this we understand that subordinate communities should not be crushed by superior communities.

It is from this point of view that the Church has always defended the rights of the family and of professions against the pretensions of the State which would wish at times to substitute for the family and for professions.

There is always the danger to minimize matters, either on a superior level — then the supreme authority does everything — or on an inferior level — then everything begins from the base.

In all domains, it is fundamental to respect the different levels of responsibility, and to act in such a manner that the superior powers do not prevent the inferior powers from exercising their responsibilities in their turn. Actually, the authority and the new competency given to the Episcopal Conferences are an application of this principle of subsidiarity. Too many problems were centered in Rome.

I am thinking especially of the case of annulment of marriage and of the particular problems concerning such or such a member of the

clergy when only the local context could allow us to "understand" and to find solutions.

Likewise, from the doctrinal point of view, the Vatican would wish to see the Episcopal Conferences assume their responsibilities.

I believe that this is extremely fruitful and one of the ways to organize the Church well; that is, only the ultimate problems should be considered at the highest level. Moreover, this makes good sense, and those problems which cannot be solved at the lower level should be solved at the higher level.

And it is from this point of view that this principle of subsidiarity applied to the Church seems to me extremely valuable.

The Encyclical "Humanae Vitae" and the Stir it Provoked

When the Encyclical "Humanae vitae" appeared, it provoked many uproars. *Do you think that these uproars have abated today? Do you think that, after explanations were given by Rome and the Episcopal Conferences, this Encyclical is now well understood by the majority of the faithful?*

Cardinal Danielou: — It is difficult to answer you.

It is certain that all the Bishops accepted the Encyclical "Humanae vitae". But the manner in which it should be interpreted practically gave rise to diverse interpretations.

I believe there are two fundamental problems here:

1. First of all, the question is to know whether the Sovereign Pontiff had or did not have the right to intervene in a question of this type. For as you know, this right was contested.

But I believe this right cannot be contested. The Sovereign Pontiff has the right to intervene in a problem that concerns a basic point of morals, in the same way, moreover, as he intervened in fundamental problems of the social order.

To say that the Sovereign Pontiff can intervene only in matters of strict Faith, and to forbid him the entire domain of social doctrine,

of the family and of culture, would be to limit absolutely the scope of the responsibility of the Church, responsible not only for the values of Revelation properly so-called, but also for the fundamental moral and human values.

The Church has always vindicated this. She has always refused to allow herself to be confined to the sacristy, as all totalitarian regimes are trying to impose. You yourselves, leaders of Christian enterprises, you know very well your social doctrine rests on the principles of the Church, and you could not exist as a Movement if you did not acknowledge that the Church has something to say in social matters, not at the level of technical solutions, but at the level of fundamental principles that concern human nature and the rights of persons who must finally direct the life of the enterprise and, in a more general way, the economy. So it is, in a most eminent way, in the domain of marriage and the family. *It is intolerable that certain theologians have contested this right.*

2. Secondly, there are the problems which this Encyclical poses. In the first place, the Encyclical recalled the meaning of marriage and human love. In this respect, it was absolutely necessary that the Church speak out about human love in the radical disorder of the modern world.

It is remarkable that it is a journalist of the extreme left, Maurice Clavel, who in "Nouvel Observateur," specifically because he knew what a certain corruption of present-day love is, had the courage, more than many Catholics did, to thank Pope Paul VI for having had this breath of pure air pass through our atmosphere charged with poisonous germs.

Having said this, it is evident that, at the level of practical problems, there are extreme diversities of situations. From this view point, we ought to have an explanation that might perhaps specify better what the principles recalled in the Encyclical imply with respect to their practical applications.

I am thinking in particular that it would be absolutely dramatic were the Christian Church to be no longer open except for heroes. I have often said that, as far as I am concerned, the great Church was

the Church of the Christian people in all its vast expanse, and that I dreaded nothing more than to see a sort of emaciation of the Church — if I may use that expression — where the Church would no longer be but the Church of Saints. For me, the Church is the Church of all men.

The Church calls for heroism, but it knows perfectly well how to take into account — at all levels and in all categories of problems — those who can be led only gradually to a more perfect fidelity.

For my part, I must say that I have never understood — I excuse myself for this type of naivety — why such a stir was made about this Encyclical.

Concerning the topics treated, for the past twenty-five years that I have been a priest, I have always reacted exactly the same way: very rigorous in principles and very broad in the applications. It seems to me that it would be dramatic were the Church to abandon her firmness. But the Church must be both extremely demanding and extremely indulgent.

A demanding Church leads to Jansenism. An indulgent Church leads to carelessness. But to exact demands from one who is capable of accepting demands, and to be indulgent towards those who cannot accept demands, this is what pastoral activity is! . . . *And furthermore, it is common sense.*

Concerning the Election of the Pope

Certain members of the Synod brought up the possibility of enlarging the college that elects the Pope. What do you think of this suggestion? Does it raise problems of doctrinal principles?

Cardinal Danielou: — It seems to me that the enlargement of the college that elects the Sovereign Pontiff not only poses no questions but seems to me altogether desirable provided this enlargement be not represented simply by Italians. At the present time, however, the majority are non-Italians.

It would be quite another matter to say that the Sovereign Pontiff must no longer be elected by the College of Cardinals, but by the Presi-

dents of Episcopal Conferences. This is altogether different. As a matter of fact, the traditional principle is this: *the Sovereign Pontiff is the Bishop of Rome. As Bishop of Rome he is the successor of Peter and, by this very fact, has a special place in the Church.*

The Cardinals are the heirs of what was formerly the ensemble of the suffragan Bishops of the Bishop of Rome; likewise, there are suffragan Bishops of the Patriarch of Alexandria, the Patriarch of Antioch, the Patriarch of Constantinople, etc.

If the Pope were elected by the Presidents of the Episcopal Conferences, he would no longer be the Bishop of Rome, but would be elected in some way from among the body of Bishops; that is, he would be a sort of super-Bishop attached to no See in particular. Then we would end up with a sort of monarchical conception, which is not in conformity with the traditional structure of the Church. In fact, what do we find at the very beginning? Twelve Apostles, and among these twelve, one of them has a particular role.

Now, this is what is being continued wherever there are Bishops and where, among these Bishops, one of them has a particular role. This is very important with regard to the Churches of the Orient who are specifically attached to the idea that the Bishop of Rome has a responsibility and particular character among the Bishops and Patriarchs, but who are altogether repugnant to the idea of a super-Bishop who could substitute in some way for their competencies and for their legitimate authorities.

Considering the questions posed, it is from this view point that I believe it is very wise to enlarge the College of Cardinals so that it may reflect more the Universal Church. But for my part, I believe it would be dangerous to change the principle itself of the constitution of this College, and to have the Sovereign Pontiff elected by all the Presidents of the Episcopal Commissions.

The Church and Ease?

A moment ago, you disapproved of easing things, and I am happy about that, but we are always being told: the purpose of Vatican I and II was to adapt the Church to modern life. What do I see? All the

measures proposed to adapt the Church to modern life are all measures to ease things; for example, Mass on Saturday evening, certain forms of *Holy Communion*. *Is there not a sort of contradiction between this refusal of the easier way and these measures proposed?*

Cardinal Danielou: — When you allude to certain liturgical innovations, I am entirely opposed to your opinion. What is being done from this point of view on the liturgical level — I myself worked in the Liturgical Pastoral Movement — seems to me to really proceed from a concern to come closer to, we may say, the earliest and original tradition and, consequently, to express anew this earliest and original tradition in forms which are acceptable to men and youth of today.

In the course of the centuries, there was a Byzantine Mass, a Carolingian Mass, a Baroque Mass. To believe this would be a gross illusion. It was a Mass where the centuries had accumulated their successive and deeply respectable contributions, but which, however, did not form part of the very substance of what constitutes the Christian Eucharist.

I am obliged to say that I react with vivacity — perhaps even with too much vivacity at times — against certain deviations of some theologians today in the domain of Faith and in the domain of Masses, not to mention the fact that I find, on the other hand, that in this domain of liturgy there is often a lack of understanding, in certain traditional milieus, which is entirely uncalled for.

Let us learn to distinguish if we wish to be taken seriously. A person who says, “no” to everything loses respect completely. In order to be able to say “no” we must always be able to say “yes” whenever we have no valid reason not to say “yes”.

From this point of view, on the liturgical level, I am an historian and I know perfectly well that in the 4th century Holy Communion was given in one's hands. Christians were authorized to bring the Holy Eucharist to their home. They could preserve it in a sort of tabernacle so that they could bring it to the sick when there were some. Many other examples could be given.

Consequently, from this view point, I request that we see no compliance in facts which are in reality a renewal of traditional facts, and

which can specifically restore a certain significance to acts that are purely routine.

Abuses are possible. The Bishops are sensitive to this. During the Assembly in Lourdes whence I have just returned, the Bishops protested, for example, against the fact that certain priests were celebrating or concelebrating Mass dressed in suits without putting on the liturgical vestments, and condemned this practice. You will say: the Mass on Saturday evenings is a convenience. At the same time, we must take into account the sociological evolutions. It is clear that Sunday morning poses difficult problems:

1) Because it is, all the same, the day when people rest.

2) Because the week-end today has become more and more developed, which likewise poses questions along this order and, consequently, brings about the authorization of a Saturday evening Mass, is perfectly traditional.

Furthermore, you know that, according to the Jewish calendar, the day begins at sunset. It is absolutely traditional that Saturday evening can be considered already as the preparation for Sunday.

You see that on this point, if our Church merits certain various reproaches — she must cede to certain concessions — I do not think that what is being actually done on the liturgical plane is a type of reprehensible concession. *What is being done arises from a concern to find an expression of the Eucharist that is acceptable to men of today, and which takes into account certain sociological situations.*

We must not attribute to the Church abuses that arise on the part of those who have gone astray. We are all the more justified to criticize those who have gone astray when we do not criticize the structures. I am rather inclined to be concerned with certain deviations, but in this domain, I do not think there are criticisms to make on the orientations taken by the French Episcopate and by the Church in general.

EVOLUTION AND THE DUTCH CATECHISM A Scientific Appraisal

● Jesus Ma. Cavanna, C.M.

The Dutch Catechism is supposed to be for the *adults* of our modern world. A sign of genuine adulthood is not to accept ideas with infantile gullibility; to look for reasons that may warrant what is proposed to our belief; to distinguish factual truths from overlabored opinions; working theories from sheer hypotheses; scientific findings from wishful thinking.

Unfortunately the authors of this "New Catechism" have in several passages failed to show this sign of a well-pondered and critically balanced *adult* mentality. In saying this we do not mean to decry the fascinating presentation of our faith which in the greater part of the said work is apparently achieved. It is a pity though that here and there "*not a few nor unimportant*" theological "*ambiguities*"¹ are found which may endanger the orthodoxy of Christian doctrine.

But I do not intend here to dwell on that matter which has been already clearly settled by the official "Declaration" of the Cardinals' Commission appointed by Pope Paul VI to examine the dubious parts of the "New Catechism".² My intension is to pinpoint simply a scientific question which obviously lies beyond the scope of the aforesaid "Declaration", since it does not affect — at least directly and immediately — the dogmatic teachings of the Church. I am referring to the theory of

¹ A.A.S., 30 Nov. 1968

² Cf. *Eccllesia*, Madrid, Num. 1,420, pp. 15-19; Num. 1,457, pp. 17-20.

³ "*A New Catechism - Catholic Faith for Adults*", Herder, 1967, pp. 9-10.

"the evolution of the world" which is unquestionably upheld in the Dutch Catechism.² Frankly speaking I believe that in a serious work like this, intended for the adult world, it was a grievous mistake to affirm emphatically as a scientific truth what is merely a highly debatable hypothesis, WITHOUT ANY SINGLE AUTHENTIC, POSITIVE PROOF.⁴

I am indeed aware that nowadays evolution is *almost* universally accepted as an incontestable fact.⁵ And yet it is undeniable "that scientific theories are not carried by a show of hands, but by the facts themselves."⁶ And the *facts* in this case cannot be afforded by comparative anatomy, genetics, embryology or geographical distribution: until now, data from these sciences may well be interpreted either in favor or against evolution.

The foremost evolutionist Sir Julian Huxley himself admits: among the countless arguments advanced to prove evolution "fossils provide the basic documents and the direct evidence."⁷ And Carl O. Dunbar, Yale geologist and outstanding evolutionary authority avows: "fossils provide THE ONLY HISTORICAL DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE that life has evolved from simpler to more complex forms".⁸ Without the fossils of intermediate forms or "links", Darwin himself in the 10th chapter of *The Origin of Species* avers that his whole theory would collapse.⁹

Even the Dutch Catechism seems to agree with this view. The only proof alleged to support its bold assertion on "the evolution of the

⁴ Dr Juan Bonelli, Ing. Geógrafo, *Otra vez la Teoría de la Evolución*: ap. ROCA VIVA, Madrid, Dic. 1969, pp. 70-71.

⁵ cf. *La Evolución*, B.A.C. Madrid, 1966; Vittorio Marozzi, *L'evoluzione oggi*, Ed. Massimo, Milano, 1966.

⁶ Vincent J. O'Brien, C.M., B.Sc., H. Dip. Ed., "*New Ideas: The Facts, The Myths*:" ap. THE WANDERER, ST. Paul, Minn., U.S.A. March 20, 1969.

⁷ *Evolution in Action*, Penguin series, 1958, p. 58.

⁸ *Historical Geology*, New York: Wiley, 2nd Ed., 1961, p. 47.

⁹ cf. Rev. Patrick O'Connell, B.D., "*Science of Today and the Problems of Genesis*." Christian Book Club of America, Hawthorne, Calif: 90250; 2nd. Ed., 1969, pp. 37-42; also, "*Original Sin in the light of present-day Science*" Roseburg, Oregon, 1969, p. 10.

world" are "the skulls and bones that have been found", namely, "the Neanderthal man", the "hominids walking upright", and "the Australopithecus". Unfortunately these specific samples cannot withstand the trial of scientific research. In the course of more than a century, fossils have been discovered sufficient to make many complete skeletons of the *Neanderthal Man* from the head to the toes. "Each of the various bones and joints are of greater size and strength than those of modern man, and each of them has the peculiarities that belong to the human as against the animal skeleton. The Neanderthal Man is now acknowledged to be a perfect *homo sapiens* and has been written off by prominent evolutionists"¹⁰. The "hominids that walked erect" are similarly a myth of which no genuine fossils have ever been found (the *Java Man* or *Pithecanthropus Erectus* — ape-man that walked erect — was simply a fraud — made from the skull of a gibbon — as its own "inventor" Dr. Dubois admitted more than once before his death)¹¹. Other mythical "hominids" referred to by evolutionists *did not walk erect*.¹² And finally, the *Australopithecine* fossils, according to such authorities as Sir Julian Huxley, Sir S. Zuckerman, Romer of America, and Boule and Vallois of France, belonged to mere *animals* which show no similarity to man.¹³

And such are *all* the supposed "facts" from Paleontology that are offered as an "evidence" for evolution. They have been proved either a forgery (as the *Pittdown Man*,¹⁴ the *Pekin Man* or *Sinanthropus*,¹⁵ and the *Java Man*), or quite dubious and controversial (as the *Dryopithecus*, *Bramepithecus*, *Ramapithecus*, etc. and the *Zinjanthropus* of Dr. Leakey whose claim, *according to himself*, need not be taken seriously).¹⁶

¹⁰ O'Connell, "Science...", *op. cit.* pp. 90-93; "Original Sin...", *o.c.* pp. 13; 48.

¹¹ O'Connell, "Science...", *o.c.*, pp. 139-142; "Original Sin..." *o.c.* pp. 14; 48.

¹² *Ibid.*, *loc. cit.*

¹³ O'Connell, "Science...", *o.c.* pp. 143-147; "Original Sin...", *o.c.*, pp. 17; 48.

¹⁴ cf. J.S. Weiner, "The Pittdown Forgery", London, 1955; Francis Vere of Pittdown, "The Pittdown Fantasy", London, 1955.

¹⁵ O'Connell, "Science...", *o.c.*, pp. 108-138.

¹⁶ O'Connell, "Original Sin...", *o.c.*, pp. 13-14.

The charts of *The Fossil Record*, compiled by some 120 reputable scientists and published in 1967 by the Geological Society and the Paleontological Association of America give the fossil record for plants and animals divided into about 2,500 taxa (or groups). In these most reliable charts "each type of animal or plant is shown to have a separate and distinct history from all the others. Many large groups appear suddenly."¹⁷ As Dr. H. Nilson, professor of Botany at the University of Lund, Sweden remarked in 1954: "This all stands in as crass a contradiction to the evolutionary interpretation as could possibly be imagined. There is not even a caricature of evolution."¹⁸ We may understand thus why Professor Louis Bounoure, National Director of Scientific Research of France, who was taught and accepted evolution in his youth, now agrees with the opinion of his scientific colleague, Jean Rostand, who describes evolution as "a fairy-tale for adults;"¹⁹ and why Professor Kerkut of Southampton University castigated his students as the worst "opinion-swallowers" for not knowing and pondering the serious objections standing against evolution.²⁰

An ever growing number of top-class scientists and qualified scholars with a doctoral degree in geology, biology, anthropology, physics, chemistry, astronomy, entomology, hydrology, mathematics, engineering, archeology, genetics, and many other areas of modern science are presently questioning either the unwarranted "fact" of evolution, or at least the validity of all the arguments propounded to sustain it.²¹ The science writer Aime Michel, after interviewing such specialists as Professor Mrs. Andree Tetry, famous world authority on evolution, Professor Rene Chauvin and other noted French biologists, and after studying 600 pages of biological data collected by Michael Cuenot, a biologist of international fame, concluded that "the classical theory of evolution in its strict sense belongs to the past" and "almost all French specialists hold today strong mental reservations as to the validity of

¹⁷ O'Brien. *New Ideas: ...*, o.c.,

¹⁸ *Synthetische Artbildung*, 1954

¹⁹ cf. *Le Monde et la Vie*, October, 1963

²⁰ *Implications of Evolution*, Pergamon Press, 1965.

²¹ Henry M. Morris, *The Twilight of Evolution*. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1969, pp. 85-93.

natural selection;"²² and although many have not yet rejected the supposed "fact" of evolution, the best mechanism they can suggest to explain the genetic changes is "THE GOOD JUDGMENT of the organism itself"(!).²³ A recent book of G.A. Kerkut, a recognized scientist, without rejecting completely evolution, demolishes its arguments and insists that it is not a "proved fact"; and thus Dr. John T. Bonner is compelled to say: "We have all been telling our students for years not to accept any statement on its face value but to examine the evidence, and, therefore it is rather a shock to discover that we have failed to follow our own sound advice."²⁴

Dr. W. R. Thompson, for many years Director of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control at Ottawa, Canada and a world-renowned entomologist, openly declared: "Evolutionary speculation . . . is only too often at best merely a dressing up of comparative anatomy in edition of Darwin's *Origin of Species* published in the Darwinian Centennial Year he makes a devastating indictment and complete refutation of all the alleged "evidences" of Darwinian evolution, and of the scientific honesty of evolutionists. Dr. Thompson significantly observes: "There is a great divergence of opinion among biologists, not only about the causes of evolution but even about the actual process. This divergence exists because THE EVIDENCE IS UNSATISFACTORY AND DOES NOT PERMIT ANY CERTAIN CONCLUSION. It is therefore *right and proper* to draw the attention of the non-scientific public to the disagreements about evolution."²⁵ (emphasis, ours). To fail in doing this, he says, "is *abnormal and undesirable* in science."²⁷

And this is precisely our objection raised from the scientific level against the Dutch Catechism which apodictically asserts: "*The life in my body comes from the beast*"(!). If it would have simply suggested the *possibility* of evolution as a *theory* (even utterly irreconcilable, at

²² cf. *Science Digest*, Vol. 51, January 1961 p. 61.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 63

²⁴ cf. *American Scientist*, Vol. 49, June 1961, p. 240

²⁵ cf. *Studia Entomologica*, Vol. 3, December 1960, p. 498.

²⁶ Introduction to *The Origin of Species* by Charles Darwin (New York, Everyman's Library, E.P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1956)

²⁷ *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

that, with the universally valid *entropy* principle, the second law of thermodynamics);²⁸ or had it proposed as the most commonly accepted (although scientifically questionable) *answer*, and let it pass. But to make unreservedly the above affirmation in the name of science when it is scientifically undemonstrable, and to sell it to the non-scientific public in a "Catechism for adults" is certainly wrong and abnormal, to say the least. Adults are not to be spoonfed with myths and nice lucubrations coated with a varnish of scientific gimmick and acrobaticism!

The Dutch Catechism becomes thus liable of being indicted from the very grounds of natural sciences. And still more. Although Catholic faith has no serious objection against the *theory* of evolution applied to the origin of human body (provided a *special divine intervention* in that origin is admitted, and the immediate creation of each human soul is professed);²⁹ and although it is lawful for scientists and theologians to discuss with gravity, moderation and restraint this problem in some way closely related with the sources of divine revelation;³⁰ still Pius XII in 1950 unmistakably forbade to teach as an *hypothesis* of evolution;³¹ and this prohibition retains in our days its binding force, since during the last 20 years nothing new has been discovered to favor the *theory*: nay, it is actually losing ground more and more in scientific circles. Hence, on this respect the Dutch Catechism has *also* failed to abide, as all Catholics should, with the standing directives of the Church Magisterium.

²⁸ Prof. John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, "*The Genesis Flood*", The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 1969, pp. 224-227; Henry M. Morris, "*The Twilight...*" o.c., pp. 33-36.

²⁹ Pius XII, Encycl. "HUMANI GENERIS", 12 Aug. 1950: cf. Denz.-Schon., n. 3896; cf. O'Connell, "*The Science...*" o.c., pp. 159-167; Card. Ernesto Ruffini, Member of the Biblical Commission, *The Theory of Evolution Judged by Reason and Faith*, New York, 1959.

³⁰ cf. Denz.-Schon., loc. cit.

³¹ *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

HOMILETICS*

11th Sunday after Pentecost (August 2)

GODPARENTS

Ephpheta, which is, Be thou opened." (Mark vii, 34)

If the miracle of opening the ear and loosening the tongue of deaf-mute was great, greater is the miracle of Baptism whereby one is made an adopted son of God, and wherein the Ritual uses Christ's words in today's gospel.

But this miracle of grace often shaded by the neglect and abuse of the role of godparents: the Ninong and Ninang.

Duty of Godparents

One day I asked a lady: "How many godchildren do you have?"

"Quite many. Father; I lost count of them. In fact, I can not remember;" was the reply. But this is nothing compared to the number of godchildren that a movie starlet has. More than one hundred.

Now, if you ponder deeper, you wonder how they can take spiritual care of these children. Is not the main duty of a godparent to take care of the spiritual child till death?

And the godparent must see to it that the child is given real Christian moral and religious formation necessary for the child to live a good Catholic life.

* The following sermons of Father Jephthe M. Lucena, OP, had appeared in our July issue (1962) and are reproduced here as a special request.

Qualities of Godparents

Due to this grave responsibility, the Church demands that a godparent should know the rudiments or doctrines of Faith. It follows then that he or she must be a good Catholic, and must have completed the fourteenth year (to comply with the requirements of the law).

Parents who realize the spiritual significance of a godparent, always strive to choose devout and practising catholics among close relatives and friends.

But those who aim for material gain or fame, will take anyone who has a name or connection in Business, Movies or Politics. Yes, this is our Compadre system, a real abuse of the true significance of Sponsorship; and a great evil next to nepotism.

Real Godparents: A Pair

But in church, when you see these Compadres and Comadres, four, five or six pairs of them, do you think that all of them are really godparents of the child? No.

The Church allows only at most a pair of godparents. Only one Ninong and one Ninang for the child. And only this pair may hold the child during baptism. Only this pair has a real spiritual cognation and obligation to the child.

It is wrong for parents to deceive others in believing that they are sponsors when in reality they are not. Parents should designate who are the real sponsors; and who are just honorary sponsors.

It is unjust to the child as well. How many children grow up believing that so and so is his ninong or ninang, only to realize after taking his Baptismal certificate that it was not so.

Parents and godparents, on their part, must do their duty conscientiously, for upon their shoulder rests the happiness or unhappiness of a child.

12th Sunday after Pentecost (August 9)

THE GOOD SAMARITAN

"A certain Samaritan, being on his journey, came near him: and seeing him, was moved with compassion. And going up to him, bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine. And setting him upon his own beast, brought him to an inn and took care of him." (Luke x, 33)

The Parish Priest caught twelve year old Rafael, a boisterous and talkative acolyte, chattering in the sacristy; "Next time, I will cut your tongue with a pair of scissors."

At home, Rafael gets the most spanking, for teasing his sisters; at school, he fights with others, big and small.

But in spite of his naughtiness, Rafael was quite a guy. He was a good Samaritan. He prepared a twelve year old playmate for confession. He brought him to the priest in church; they went to confession and received Holy Communion.

How about you? How good a Samaritan are you?

The Good Samaritan

Christ was the first good Samaritan, who journeyed to earth in order to heal a sick humanity. He came to give life to the dead, by dying on the Cross.

And so when He said, "Go, and do thou in like manner," it means not only to help our neighbors in their material needs; but above all, in their spiritual needs also.

Everyone of you can be a good Samaritan. Yes, a good Samaritan to Catholics who seldom go to Mass, to those who have never gone to confession, to those who are not married in church or to those who are not baptized.

If twelve year old Rafael could do it, why can't you?

The Inn

Certainly that boy Rafael brought his friend into the inn; into the inn of God, the Church, when he guided him to confession.

He did in like manner what Christ had done. For the moment, the wounded of soul was anointed and bandaged with Baptism or Penance, he was brought into the Inn of God, the bosom of the Church.

This is the Inn where we drink unto life everlasting; a drink that becomes in us a spring of Life for others; for others whom we would guide back to the Inn of God.

Innkeeper

Now, Christ not only brings sinners back to the fold by means of the Sacraments, but He also takes care of everyone who cooperates with Him.

And He instituted men with powers to take care of souls in His stead.

Look around you; perhaps within your home; a brother, a sister, a cousin or an uncle or an aunt is remiss in his or her religious duties. Perhaps in your neighborhood, there is a sick soul just waiting for your approach.

If twelve year old Rafael could do it, you can too.

13th Sunday after Pentecost (August 16)**FREQUENT CONFESSION**

"Go, show yourselves to the priests. And it came to pass, that as they went, they were made clean." (Luke xvii, 14)

A group of high school girls around the assistant Parish Priest's table were all ears to his talk on Confession, when a chubby lass asked: "Father, the Sisters don't hear confessions, do they?"

"No child; only validly ordained priests duly authorized may hear confessions."

"Then, I don't like to be a Sister, Father."

Then another girl said: "You say, Priests and Sisters ordinarily go to confession once a week. They don't really have mortal sins every week, do they?"

"Not really." Ah, there's the rub. But why the frequent confession?

Confession

First of all, confession as instituted by Christ, is a declaration of personal sins to an authorized priest for the purpose of obtaining sacramental absolution. It is necessary to regain sanctifying grace and restore us to our divine filiation.

Nay, it is obligatory, when a person reaches the age of reason or is in mortal sin, or in danger of death.

But there is one point in confession that people often miss to consider; that confession is a strong force against sin; it does not only take away sin, but it prevents sin as well. It does not only give or increase sanctifying grace but it also confers sacramental graces.

Hence, it helps develop holiness and piety; it gives peace to the individual and promotes peace with others.

Frequent Confession

If confession can do such wonders to a soul, then why not frequent confession?

A priest was heard to say, that there are priests who would like to make monks and nuns of lay people by frequent confession.

But were not the Sacraments instituted for our sanctification? If frequent confession does good to priests and nuns; why not frequent confession for the ordinary faithful?

Moreover, every one has a right to obtain wise counsels and guidance to a right Christian living. Where could a layman get these in

a most secret and competent way? The confessional box, by frequent confession.

How Confess Frequently

And talking about this matter, another girl asked: "Do you mean to say, Father, that I can go to confession even if I have no sin, say during the week?"

"Yes," answered the priest.

"How?"

"Just tell the Father any fault you can remember, then mention a grievous sin or a certain venial sin of the past already confessed. Be sure to mention that this particular sin was already confessed before." This provides a sufficient matter for absolution.

"Then you can ask for counsels on how to improve yourself spiritually or how to avoid a particular evil tendency."

To obtain a good result from frequent confession, one must have a regular confessor who is a true lover of souls.

14th Sunday after Pentecost (August 23)

EVERYONE, A SLAVE

"No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will sustain the one and despise the other."
(Matt. vi, 24)

The silence of the cloister of a certain convent was broken one late afternoon by the spontaneous laughters of small children. There was an impromptu program; and Nonoy, a five year old boy was gyrating his pelvis the Elvis way amidst the clapping of hands by his brothers and sisters, while he sang for a priest: "Everybody has a Lover."

And, indeed, is not true that everybody has a lover in God? Not only that; everybody is a lover. But is everybody a lover of God?

A Lover is a Slave

Everyone is a lover; and every lover is an adorer; and every adorer is a slave. Whether one's love or deity is something or somebody or **SOMEONE**.

One is always a slave of something or somebody or **SOMEONE**; but not of the three at the same time. For no one can serve two masters at the same time. For he will have the one and love the other. The true passionate slave of something can not be a true lover of **SOMEONE**, of God.

It happens that one who is a slave of something realizes his mistakes, and turns his love to God. And it can happen also that one who is a slave of God, may weaken and turn his affection to something or somebody to such extent as to lose his soul.

Slaves of Passion and Fashion

But how do lovers of God become slaves of inordinate passion? Simple. It is contained in the words of our Lord: "Be not solicitous for your life." Solicitude for things that do not count. Solicitude for worldly life. Because this is followed by negligence and weakening of spiritual life.

What happens when the flesh triumphs over the spirit? Look at the results on the movie screens of most theaters. And the newspapers.

"Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are, fornication, uncleanness, immodesty, luxury, idolatry, witchcrafts, enmities, murders, drunkenness, revellings."

Slaves of True Love

To avoid the triumph of the flesh over the spirit in us, we must strive every day to be faithful to God; to seek every day the reign of divine love within us. How?

Not only by frequent confession and Communion, but most of all, by practising the presence of God within us. For if we are always conscious that God is within us; and we know, He is Divine love, an omni-

potent Love, then who can overcome us? "O Pagibig, kapag ikaw ang nasok sa puso nino man, hahamakin ang lahat masunod ka lamang," says Balagtas. Which expression is just a shade of St. Augustine's "*Amor meus, Pondus meum, eo feror quocumque feror.*"

When you are in constant union with divine love, you will feel spiritual joy and peace; so different from the joy and peace of the worldly. Nay, not only spiritual joy and peace, but patience, kindness, mildness and goodness also towards others.

If love begets love, one's peace of soul can produce peace in others, too. So, let God dominate your being. And you will feel good inside; yes, a goodness that will shine in your thoughts, words and actions.

15th Sunday after Pentecost (August 30)

THE REALITY OF DEATH

"Young man, I say to thee, Arise." (Luke vii, 14)

"What if you die now?" queried a priest to a young lady.

"Nonsense, Father, I am young. I want to enjoy life." This answer echoed in the hospital bed of a 21 year old medical student, a young man, dying of cancer, he was not aware of: "I am young, I want to live. I like to finish my studies."

But the reality of death tells us, that it is no respecter of age. And the facts in every Pediatrics ward are too heart rending to elaborate. Now the question is: How does one live?

The Folly of Youth

The folly of youth about living and enjoying life forever is not unfounded. It is based on the very nature of the spirituality of our soul. For the soul naturally tends to what is eternally good.

But this inclination of the soul to enjoy the supernatural good can be misdirected, even deep down into the quagmire of sins of sensuality. But is this enjoying life?

No! Life without God is not real life. It is not enjoying life. It is death; the death of the soul; the death which should be feared more than the death of the body.

The Reality of Death

Death! It is too real to be ignored. The daily newspapers tell the tales of death. Death in the highway by collision. Death in the alley by brutal stabbing. Death in the lobby by criminal gunning. Death by duel and other natural death which man is heir to. For "it is appointed to man once to die."

But one thing we must never forget: Death is but a herald of a future everlasting life; a life of bliss which our soul craves; or an everlasting life of torment.

The future then that death will herald for us depends on the kind of life we live now. "For what things a man shall sow, those also shall he reap. For he that soweth in his flesh, of the flesh also shall he reap corruption; but he that soweth in the spirit, of the spirit shall he reap life everlasting."

After Death

Therefore, a man who walks in spirit, does not fear death. He welcomes it; for he knows what death would bring. Not only life everlasting, not only joy of seeing God and all his dear ones in God, but he will behold the glory of resurrected bodies in Christ.

"How should we look after the final Resurrection?" ask some people. "Father, will my daddy be white haired, and Tito Jesse, bald headed still?" asked a young girl.

No. No more distortions, no more physical defects. "The dead will rise again with the same bodies they had, but the just will be remodelled and transfigured according to the pattern of the risen Christ." One will "rise again in the greatest possible natural perfection"; in complete and perfect physical integrity.

The body of the just will be incapable of suffering, spiritualized, agile and radiant with the glory of the transfigured Christ.

HISTORICAL SECTION

Notes on

THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN THE PHILIPPINES*

1521-1898

(continued)

• Pablo Fernandez, O.P.

Chapter Six

THE SECULAR CLERGY IN THE PHILIPPINES: THE DIOCESAN SEMINARIES

A. The Secular Clergy in the Sixteenth and the Seventeenth Centuries.

The first Spanish secular priest to set foot on Philippine soil was, as everyone knows, Father Pedro Valderrama, one of the chaplains to Magellan's expedition.¹ Later, in 1566, while the conquest was going on, another Spanish secular priest, Father Juan de Vivero arrived at Cebu aboard the *San Jerónimo*.² After him others came. Finally in 1581, the Most Reverend Domingo Salazar, first bishop of Manila, brought along with him a contingent of 24 clerics on whom he intended to confer the benefices of the Cathedral and entrust with the care of several parishes.

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

¹ Medina, Juan de, O.S.A., *Historia de los sucesos de la Oración de N. Gran P. S. Agustín de estas Islas Filipinas*, Manila: Tipo-litografía de Chofre y Comp., 1893: "...in the expedition of Ferdinand Magellan (1521) the clergy came (only one, because the other, a French by nationality and of whom the history speaks, was abandoned by Magellan in the coasts of Brazil)," p. iv.

² Fonseca, *Op. Cit.*, I, 170

In the beginning, obviously, there could only be foreign priests in the Philippines, both regular and secular. But Salazar, almost from the start formed the idea of raising under the guidance of the foreign clergy a native priesthood. These would be *creoles*, born in the islands of Spanish parentage, *mestizos*, normally Spanish-Filipino and Chinese-Filipino; and *Filipinos* of the indigenous malay race.

Salazar's idea, then, was to entrust for the meantime the benefices and positions of dignity and responsibility in the Philippine Church to the clergy from Spain and Mexico. Later, when the natives gave sufficient proof of their virtue and capabilities, he would open to them the path to the priesthood and charge them with responsibility.³

To effect this worthy plan, both the bishop and the governor-general, Gonzalo Ronquillo, the ecclesiastical chapter and the Jesuits, petitioned the king in 1583 for the foundation of a college to serve as a seminary, where the sons of Spaniards as well as the *mestizos* and natives (these last the sons of the old Philippine aristocracy) who felt the call to the priesthood and the apostolate could receive the proper training. Philip II approved the project in 1585. But nothing was done, probably because of the lack of means to realize the archbishop's desires. Years later, in 1595, the Jesuits wanted to carry out the idea of the now defunct prelate; but again there were no funds.⁴

This was the last attempt in that period to form a distinctly Filipino clergy. Perhaps the South American experience which had not succeeded in forming a respectable native clergy had prejudiced the minds of those who initially had taken a great interest in the creation of a native or indigenous clergy in the Philippines. What is certain is a report sent to King Philip III by Governor Pedro de Acuña, dated 15 July 1604. "It seems to me," he reported to Philip III, "that although this *work is very good and holy*, it would be *preferable* that said college be *founded for poor Spaniards*, sons of residents or those who came to settle, in order that they may study and learn virtue and letters so as to be more fit later on to govern and administer the colony and be *parish priests and mis-*

³ *Boletín eclesiástico*, 1964, 291.

⁴ Manaligod, Ambrosio, S.V.D., *The Catholicity of the Priesthood*. A thesis, University of Santo Tomás, Manila, 1944-45, 105 ff.

sionaries. This would be a greater benefit than any which can be derived from a college of natives, since the sum of what these will learn is reading and writing and nothing more, for they can neither be priests nor officials, and after they shall have learned something they will return to their homes and take care of their farms and earn their living."⁵

In the years that intervened between 1604, the date of the document cited above, and 1705 when the first seminary for native Filipinos was opened, an entire century passed during which there is no known native-born raised to the priesthood. In the seventeenth century, only the creoles and perhaps one or another Spanish mestizo, and certainly some Chinese mestizos,⁶ received the priestly dignity. The only centers of teaching which prepared candidates for the priesthood, during that century were the University of Santo Tomás, the Colleges of San Juan de Letrán and of San José. These centers, administered under the appellation of seminary-college proved a fertile training ground for many excellent priests some of which by their erudition and their virtue merited the highest of the ecclesiastical dignities. But they were priests definitely Spanish by birth or by descent.⁷

The movement to train a Filipino clergy was not undertaken again until 1677. It seems that a report by the French bishop, Monsignor François Pallu, founder of the Paris Foreign Mission Society, who had visited Manila and returned to Europe, occasioned the intervention of Charles II of Spain and of the Holy See. But it is certain that in 1880 Monsignor Urbano Cerri, secretary of the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith, memorialized Pope Innocent XI, indicating certain deficiencies in the Church in the Philippines. Among these was the fact that natives were not raised to sacred orders, although they fulfilled the prerequisite conditions to receive them.⁸

⁵ Collin-Pastells, *Labor evangélica*, II (Barcelona, 1900), 251, n.

⁶ APSR, MSS, sección *Sangleyes*, tomo I, documento 26, "Quienes son los sangleyes?" Exposición en 1659 del P. Jacinto Gali y del P. Alberto Collares, ambos O.P., sobre el modo de ser y portarse de los chinos en Filipinas.

⁷ Carta del arzobispo Diego Camacho al Rey, en 11 de Octubre de 1705. MS in the archives of UST, Sección de Becerras, tomo 59, folio 312.

⁸ De la Costa, Horacio, S.J., "Development of the Native Clergy in the Philippines," *apud* Anderson, G., *Studies in Philippine Church History*, Cornell University Press, 1969, p. 78.

Three years before this date, the archbishop of Manila, His Grace Felipe Pardo, O.P., received a royal cedula dated on August 2, 1677, ordering him to provide the natives with a program of studies aimed at the priesthood; he was to ordain at the proper time those who showed an aptitude for the priesthood and had been properly prepared; and, finally, the colleges run by the Dominicans and the Jesuits were to open their doors to them until a seminary could be established. At the same time, the Provincial of the Dominicans received another cedula dispatched the same date for the same purpose. And likely the Jesuit Provincial received one of the same tenor. But, so far as we know, the archbishop took no decisive steps in the matter until 1689. In fact, on 12 March of the same year, he offered in a letter to the Dominican Provincial a legacy of 13,000 pesos, signifying his desire that Letran College be a school exclusively for indigenous and mestizo students so that some day these could merit the priesthood after sufficient training. There is no doubt that the archbishop thought at that time that the natives were not ready for the priesthood; but he nursed a strong hope that, properly formed, they could ascend the steps of the altar someday.⁹

B. The Seminaries of San Clemente and San Felipe

Interested in pushing forward the plan for the formation of a native clergy, King Charles II ordered the governor of the Philippines through a cedula in 1697 to inform him if there was a seminary-college in the archdiocese of Manila and to indicate, if there was none, how much it would cost to subsidize it. The governor's reply, dated 13 July 1700, included the opinion that there was no need for the time being to open a seminary-college. A royal cedula dated 28 April 1702 signed by Philip V provided for the foundation in Manila of a seminary for eight native seminarians. But not even this royal mandate was implemented. And although Archbishop Diego Camacho certainly took the initial steps to open a seminary, his efforts were stymied by legal blocks.

This was the situation when Abbé Sidotti arrived in Manila in 1704. He came in the entourage of the future Cardinal Charles

⁹ *Philippiniana Sacra*, I:3 (September-December 1966), 501-09.

Thomas Maillard de Tournon, legate *a latere* of His Holiness, Pope Clement XI to the mission countries in the Far East. On the initiative of this worthy ecclesiastic and with the approval of Governor Domingo Zabálburu and Archbishop Camacho, a seminary known as San Clemente was inaugurated in 1705. Its doors were immediately opened to 72 students, of which 8 were native-born Filipinos. Unfortunately, the king, appraised of this foundation set up without the royal will, quashed it and the seminary remained aborted. At the same, however, the king ordered that the royal cedula of 1702 be followed. The result of this manifestation of the king's mind was the opening in 1712 of the seminary of San Felipe. Thus the groundwork for a native clergy in the Philippines was prepared. Nonetheless, between 1702 and 1706, Archbishop Camacho had already ordained a Filipino priest. For their part, the University of Santo Tomás, the Colleges of San José and San Juan de Letran began to admit within their halls Filipino candidates to the priesthood.¹⁰ But the native clergy that graduated from the seminary, the university and the colleges must have been few and of mediocre ability, if we must accept the later judgment, apparently exaggerated, of the famous Archbishop Basilio Sancho de Santa Justa y Rufina, "... the few clerics there are, who are a shame to men, I have raised from contempt..."¹¹

C. The Seminary of San Carlos (Archdiocese of Manila)

Archbishop Basilio Sancho arrived in Manila in 1767, a man of great talents but impetuous and a bit violent. One of the many plans he had and carried out with the tenacity that marked him—he was not Aragonese for nothing—was the establishment of a conciliar seminary for the archdiocese of Manila. Actually, making use of the residential buildings, left vacant in Manila by the Jesuits expelled in 1768 from the Philippines, he won from the government the concession to use them for a seminary. And so, beginning with the year 1773, this new seminary named San Carlos in honor of the king, Charles III,

¹⁰ Concepción, Juan de la, *Historia general de Filipinas*, VIII (Sampaloc, Manila, 1790) pp. 315-29; Cfr. Blair and Robertson, XXVIII. 117-22, 190-91.

¹¹ Fonseca, *Op. cit.*, 36.

began to function. Its administration was in the charge of the Miter, and its internal policies were in the hands of a cleric who acted as Rector, while the seminarians followed courses at the University of Santo Tomás.

This state of things continued until 1862 when His Grace, Archbishop Gregorio Melitón Martínez of Manila (1862-75) entrusted the administration of the archdiocesan seminary to the Vincentian Fathers (*Paúles*) who had just arrived in the Philippines on 2 August of the same year. Housed in the ancient residence of the Jesuits, the Vincentians witnessed the magnificent church topple down to the earth during the well-known earthquakes of 1863. The residence itself suffered the same fate during the seismic tremors of 1880. For this reason they had to move to the barrio of San Marcelino, whence, in 1883, they moved to a new edifice raised by the archbishop in a garden adjacent to the archiepiscopal palace to house the seminary. Much later, in 1896, Archbishop Bernardino Nozaleda constructed a huge edifice which was to serve as the future residence of the seminarians and the canons of the cathedral. But, due to the political incidents of 1898, it was used only as a seminary until the next year. Besides, wanting to give new life to the Faculties of Theology and Law at the University of Santo Tomás, Archbishop Nozaleda believed it better to restore things to their former condition when the Vincentians arrived, i.e., that the seminarians reside in the seminary building while pursuing courses at the University. But developments occurred differently, due to the events of 1898.¹²

D. The Seminary at Cebu

At the expulsion of the Jesuits from the Philippines in 1768, the bishop of Cebu, Most Reverend Mateo Joaquín Rubio de Arévalo, petitioned the king for the buildings and lands of the ancient College of San Ildefonso which had belonged to the Society of Jesus, to use them for the conciliar seminary of the diocese. His Majesty granted the bishop's request and the city government subsequently made the legal bequest of the properties on 23 August 1783. The seminary, ad-

¹² Un sacerdote de la Congregación de la Misión, *Los Padres Paúles y las Hijas de la Caridad en Filipinas*, Manila, 1912, pp. 39-41.

ministered by a Director or Rector from the secular clergy, was for a long time a seminary and a college for secondary education. In 1867, at the request of the Most Reverend Romualdo Jimeno (1847-72), the Vincentians arrived in Cebu to take charge of the seminary. For the next years, these Fathers, without neglecting the spiritual and scientific formation of the seminarians, tried to renovate the ancient edifices which were already in a ruinous condition and erect new roofs for the growing number of students.¹³

E. The Seminary of Nueva Cáceres

The seminary of Nueva Cáceres was founded on 7 March 1783 by Archbishop Antonio Gallego del Orbigo of Manila and apostolic administrator of the diocese of Nueva Cáceres. He constructed a building solid enough but rather simple, which lasted until the earthquake of 1863. The seminary administration was given to a Rector, who was ordinarily the Provisor of the diocese, a Franciscan, who was both Vice-Rector and professor, and two other professors of the seminary. The seminarians fluctuated between fifty and eighty, of whom only a fourth part reached the priesthood. Bishop Francisco Gainza of Nueva Cáceres rebuilt the old building a short time after the earthquake and confided the direction of the seminary to the Vincentians, who took possession on 7 May 1865. Among the rectors of the seminary in this second half of its history, Father Antonio Santonja stands out in a special way. He raised the institution to an eminent degree of success in all aspects. To him and to his successors are due the enlargement of the building and the admission of a great number of students, such that, when upheavals shook the country in 1898, the diocese could face the dearth of secular priests made more acute by the departure of the Franciscans with better success than in the rest of the islands.¹⁴

F. The Seminary of Vigan

The seminary of Vigan was founded in 1821 by the Most Reverend Francisco Alban. Closed in 1848 for lack of students, it was

¹³ *Ibid.*, 53 ff.

¹⁴ APSR, MSS, Sección *Historia eclesiástica de Filipinas* (NC), tomo 6, documento 21.

again opened in 1852. In 1872, at the petition of Bishop Juan Aragonés of Nueva Segovia, the Vincentian fathers took charge of this seminary, but only until 1875. In 1882, the Recollects came to administer it, and they converted it into a seminary-college, opening its halls to secular students. Finally, from the year 1895 until the revolution, it was in the charge of the Augustinians. Temporarily closed, the same fathers took charge of it again until the arrival of the Most Reverend Dennis Dougherty, the first American bishop of the diocese.¹⁵

G. The Seminary of Jaro

Mr. Mariano Cuenco founded the seminary of Jaro in 1868, and entrusted it to the care of the Vincentians in the following year. In 1871, they started the construction of a magnificent building, which was ready the following year to provide shelter to the seminarians, thanks to the unstinting efforts of the bishop and of Fr. Aniceto Gonzalez, Rector of the institution.¹⁶

H. A Glance in Retrospect

If we look over the period which stretches from Bishop Salazar, the first promoter of the formation of a native Filipino clergy to the year 1898, we will easily notice that it was a slow and laborious task. Some writers have censured the authorities, both civil and ecclesiastical, for their apparent failure in the formation of a native clergy, especially Bishop Pardo. Others, on the contrary, have seen only the defects and shortcomings of the clergy which had been formed during the period. We believe that, although there were failings on both parts, the authorities did what they conscientiously understood had to be done in those circumstances.

The main accusations levelled against the Filipino clergy were: little interest in the maintenance and repair of ecclesiastical buildings and sacred objects; over-attachment to the relatives; violations of their priestly

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 71-74; Marin, P. Valentin, O.P., *Ensayo de una Sintesis del los trabajos realizados por las Corporaciones Religiosas en Filipinas*, Tomo II (Manila, 1901), p. 193.

¹⁶ *Los Padres Paúles etc.*, pp. 63-64.

celibacy; weakness in fulfilling their ministerial obligations; and a marked inclination towards money. But, in defence of the Filipino clergy, we ought to affirm that these defects, partly excusable when viewed against the situation of the country and the idiosyncracies of the race, are explained in the light of a very important fact — the deficient training which those priests received in seminaries badly equipped materially and almost always suffering from a lack of competent faculty and personnel. These detractors of the clergy would do well to read with attention these words taken from an *Exposición* presented by the Ayuntamiento of Manila in 1804 to his Majesty: "The weakness and loss of spirit which for some time now has been noted in these islands, does not leave them that strength of character in keeping with the priestly calling and the high ministry of the cure of souls, unless a solid education sustained by doctrine and zeal in the conciliar seminaries breathe into their hearts the noble ideals needed to maintain them in their dignified calling. In the three capitals of provinces graced with episcopal sees, there are seminaries where a young priest may develop himself in discipline and wisdom, but they merely consist in their fabric or material building with the name of Seminary. In them very bad Latin and a little of morals by Larraga are hardly ever taught by one or two native clerics."¹⁷

Bishop Pedro Payo, in a *Relatio Status Ecclesiae Metropolitanae Manilae* sent to the Holy See in 1883, summed up the moral condition of both the Filipino and the Spanish secular clergy in the archdiocese of Manila in the following words, which we believe agree with the impartial judgment of various observers: "There are certainly some among the native priests who are outstanding for their high moral conduct; but others, of course, forgetting their dignity, are a scandal to the faithful. Even the Europeans who receive prebendaries in the Cathedral church do not show that ideal of character which inspires the rest of the clergy and the people. Unchastity is spreading far and wide."¹⁸

(continued)

¹⁷ Pons y Torres, Salvador, *Defensa del Clero Filipino* (Manila: Establecimiento tipográfico "La Democracia," 1900), 3-4.

¹⁸ APSR, *Sección Historia eclesiástica de Filipinas*, 1883, folio 6.

THE CASE OF A DEMONSTRATION AGAINST THE BISHOP

I — THE CASE

With the untimely demise of Msgr. Jacobo G. Soriano, early this year, a vacancy was produced in the parish of Tarlac, Tarlac. The appointment of a successor was in order. On March 9, 1970, the Bishop convened his Senate of Priests for the purpose and the majority vote fell on a certain priest. The Bishop, however, by-passed this candidate and appointed a different one. This action of the Bishop irked a number of priests — 13 in all — who organized a demonstration, on April 17, with cursillistas, holynamers, adorers and students. The Mayor of Tarlac granted his permission. Two organizing priests were seen leading the demonstration that paraded the streets of Tarlac with placards and ended up in the patio of the cathedral parish, apparently against the orders of the parish priest. There were placards with dirty words and personal insults to the Bishop. The demonstrators distributed a manifesto entitled "That Tarlac May Know" and signed "We, The Church." The manifesto follows a well-known pattern. It is all against the Bishop, whom they accuse of sheer lack of leadership — dedicated, responsible moral and social leadership — making him responsible, among other things, "for every drop of blood spilt, for every human life lost in this raging social class struggle" in the crime-ridden province of Tarlac. The manifesto also accuses the Bishop of "summary exercise of feudal power and authority... not according to the spirit and attitude of Vatican II... based and decided solely on the archaic Code of Canons," and ends asking the Bishop to resign immediately, "for the sake of Tarlac, the Faith and the Nation we all love, and in the name of charity." Of the original 13 signatories, 8 have backed out.

II — QUERIES

1. — *Has the parish priest of Tarlac the right to deny the demonstrators the use of the patio adjacent to the cathedral church?*

2. — *Assuming that the demonstration was under the active leadership of priests, can the Bishop — after ascertaining who the priests were — punish them in any way? If so, what could be the heaviest punishment?*

3. — *Is the decision of the Senate of Priests, in matters of diocesan administration, so binding that the Bishop must perforce abide by it?*

4. — *Could this group of demonstrators validly ask the Bishop to resign?*

5. — *The manifesto is signed "We, The Church." If they are The Church, what are those of the clergy and laity who remain more or less loyal to the Bishop?*

III — IN POINT OF LAW¹

1. — Vatican II put back into circulation an old venerable word: *presbyterium*. "Presbyters, provident cooperators . . . of the Episcopal Order . . . constitute one presbyterium with their Bishops"² "Evidently all the priests, diocesan and religious, partake of and exercise with the Bishop the one priesthood of Christ; hence they are the provident cooperators of the Episcopal Order. But in the care of souls the diocesan priests hold the principal role . . . for this reason they constitute one presbyterium and one family, whose father is the Bishop."³

2. — *Bishop-priests relations*. "The relations of the Bishop and his diocesan priests must be based principally on supernatural charity, in such a way that the union of the wills of the priests with the will of

¹ In this section an attempt is made to bring out the "spirit and the attitude" — and the teachings — of Vatican II and the Code of canon law on the case under study. Translation from the original Latin and italics are mine.

² *Lumen Gentium*, N. 28.

³ *Christus Dominus*, N. 28.

the Bishop may render more fruitful their pastoral work. Therefore, in order that the service of the souls may be more effectively promoted, let the Bishop convene his priests, even in common, for a dialogue on pastoral affairs, not only as the case may arise, but also on stated occasions, as far as possible."⁴ "Since today the whole mankind more and more coalesces into one unity — civic, economic, social — a fortiori is it necessary that priests avoid every risk of dispersion, working together with and under the leadership of the Bishop, in order that the whole mankind may be drawn into the unity of God's family."⁵ Bishops "must always embrace their priests with special love, regarding them as sons and friends; and for that reason they should ever be willing to hear them and try to promote the pastoral work of the whole diocese in close association with them."⁶ "Since the Church must come to a dialogue with the human society, wherein she lives, it is incumbent first of all on the Bishops to approach them and engage in dialogue with them. But these saving dialogues must be marked with a note of sincerity in words, together with meekness and humility, in order that truth be always joined with charity, understanding with love, because they are meant to foster friendship and should effect union of minds."⁷

Therefore, the duty of Bishops to listen to their priests and laity is mandatory by law, and high-handedness is condemned.

3. — The creation of the *Senate of Priests* is mandatory. "In relation to the Senate of Priests: There must be in each diocese, along the mode and form outlined by the Bishop, a *Consilium Presbyterale*, that is, an assembly or senate of priests, representing the presbyterium, who may effectively help the Bishop, with their advice, in the government of the diocese. The Bishop ought to hear, consult and dialogue with his priests in this assembly about the needs of the pastoral ministry and the best interests of the diocese."⁸ This notion of the Senate of Priests checks in with the definition of a diocese given in *Christus Dominus*, N. 11: "A diocese is a portion of the People of God, entrusted to a Bishop

⁴ *Ibid.*, N. 28.

⁵ *Lumen Gentium*, N. 28.

⁶ *Christus Dominus*, N. 16.

⁷ *Christus Dominus*, N. 13.

⁸ *Ecclesiae Sanctae* N. 15 § 1.

to be shepherded *with the cooperation of the presbyters*, in such a way that, united to its Pastor and by him gathered through the Gospel and the Eucharist in the Holy Spirit, it will constitute a particular Church, in which verily exists and works the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ."

4. — *The consultative vote.* "The Consilium Presbyterale enjoys only consultative vote."⁹ The meaning and force of a consultative vote is clearly defined in *canon 105* of the Code: "Whenever the law states that the superior needs the *consent*, or the *consultation*, of some persons, the following rules obtain: if consent is required, the superior acts *invalidly* against the vote of those persons; if only consultation is demanded — by words like *de consilio consultorum, audito capitulo, parrocho etc.* — it is sufficient for the validity of the action that the superior consults these persons. Though he is not bound to follow their advice, he should nevertheless have great regard for the unanimous vote where several persons had to be consulted, and he should not without a very good reason go against their counsel."

I am of the opinion that, after Vatican II, the Senate of Priests is a *legal* institution whose rights and obligations in the government of the diocese are mandatory by law. Now it goes without saying that *the appointment of a parish priest* is one of the main functions of the government of the diocese. Hence, in my opinion, every Bishop has the strict duty in law to consult his Senate whenever a new Pastor is to be appointed. And the rule laid down in *canon 105* obtains here.

5. — But this duty of the Bishop to consult his Senate and follow its advice must be harmonized with the *freedom of choice* that the Code and Vatican II accord him in the appointment of parish priests. "The right to nominate and institute pastors belongs to the Ordinary of the place . . ."¹⁰

And, if in this same canon an exception is made in favor of the privilege of election, presentation etc., Vatican II is emphatic in abolishing them. "The good of the souls requires that the Bishop enjoy the proper freedom in conferring offices and benefices . . . fittingly and

⁹ *Ecclesiae Sanctae* N. 15 § 3.

¹⁰ *Canon 455* § 1.

equitably, to the best qualified clerics. . . . The customs and the rights to nominate, elect or present presbyters for parochial offices or benefices are hereby abrogated and revoked."¹¹ "Since the good of the souls is the sole reason for existence of the parochial office, in order that the Bishop may more freely and fittingly proceed to the provision of the parishes, let the right of presentation, nomination and reservation be suppressed."¹² "It is he (the Bishop) who must enjoy the necessary freedom in the provision of offices and benefices, so that he may more fittingly and equitably distribute the sacred ministries among his priests; therefore the rights and privileges that may impinge on this freedom are hereby suppressed."¹³

6. — How then are we to *harmonize* the Bishop's freedom of choice and his duty to abide by the Senate's decision? Here I am forced to review what the Code and Canonists say in regards to the appointment of and the qualifications required in a candidate for the parochial job.

- (a) The appointment implies *three steps*: *designation* of the person: by election, presentation, *concursum* etc.; the *conferral* of the title and parochial powers, called properly *institution*,; and the *induction* into office (*toma posesión*). Admittedly the most important and essential element is the institution, by a decree, which must needs be reserved personally to the Bishop; the other steps may be done by others empowered to do so by law.
- (b) Before issuing the decree of appointment, the Bishop must form a *judgement on the qualifications* of a given candidate, in order to screen out the best of candidates: "When trying to form a judgement on the worthiness of a priest to rule a certain parish, let the Bishop take into account, not only his learning, but also his piety, his apostolic zeal and *other gifts and qualities* which are required for the proper care of souls."¹⁴ And *canon 459* has this more or less to say: the Bishop is bound in conscience to give the vacant parish to the priest

¹¹ *Ecclesiae Sanctae*, N. 18 § 1.

¹² *Christus Dominus*, N. 31.

¹³ *Ibid.*, N. 28.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, N. 31.

whom he judges best qualified, without favoritism; in forming this judgement there must be considered, not only learning, but also all the other qualities required for the proper administration of the parish. Therefore, the Bishop must look up the *curriculum vitae* of the candidate, from the day he entered the seminary up to the present, as recorded in the file of the diocesan archive. More than that, the Bishop may think it prudent to gather further information, even secret, from outside sources; he must take into account the result of the examinations required by canon 130 § 2, and if needs be submit the candidate, to a final examination.

7. — *The question of loyalty to the Bishop* is, to my mind, one of the indispensable virtues of a priest candidate, especially for the cathedral parish. This loyalty is evidenced by the way the candidate has lived his promise of *reverence and obedience* made the day of ordination, and may be well implied in "other gifts and qualities" of *Christus Dominus*. "All clerics, but especially the priests, are under the special obligation to obey and respect their respective Ordinary."¹⁵ Who can fail to see the importance of loyalty in the gentleman at the cathedral parish, so closed to the Bishop's residence?

8. — From these considerations the Bishop may well arrive at the conclusion that he has *powerful reasons to by-pass* the candidate presented by the Senate; and if he does, he is using his full right in law and does no injury to the rights of the Senate. No hard feelings please. In all fairness, the Bishop is in a better position than the Senate to pass judgement on the worthiness of a future parish priest.

9. — *The patio of the church*. Church property is *public* property, divided into *sacred* property¹⁶ — churches, oratories, cemeteries — and *non-sacred* property. The patio of the church is non-sacred public property. Normally the patio is the way of access to the church. To enter the parish church people need no permission.¹⁷

¹⁵ Canon 127.

¹⁶ Cfr. canon 1154.

¹⁷ Cfr. canon 1161.

"Sacred places are exempt from the jurisdiction of civil authority;"¹⁸ hence non-sacred places are not exempted. The Bishop is the over-all administrator of the temporal goods of the diocese and must organize the administration according to law.¹⁹ The parish priest, as *beneficiarius*, is the administrator of the temporal goods of his benefice;²⁰ but the patio is not part of the pastor's benefice: it is unproductive. The pastor must simply take care of the observance of public laws on hygiene, sanitation and beautification of the patio, and see to it that it is always ready for people to come to church, as individuals or in groups (pilgrimages — a gasoline station, a restaurant, a book shop etc. — these would be subject to the income tax law, and the civil government would be justified to slap a real estate tax on the whole area of the patio. Among the *funcions reserved* in canon 462 to the parish priest there is nothing to conclude for the right of the pastor to forbid the entrance of people into the patio. Nor do I find any other law granting such right.

10. — *Penalties*. "In penalties the milder interpretation is to be applied;"²¹ a milder interpretation is one that tends to favor the alleged culprit. "Clerics conspiring against the authority of . . . their own Ordinary, and against his lawful orders, are to be punished with censures and deprived of their dignities, offices and benefices;"²² to protest against the *lack of leadership* is not precisely to conspire against the authority of the superior. "If anyone, not precisely with actions, but with words, writings or in any other way, would cause a moral wrong to somebody or hurt his good name, not only can he be forced . . . to give due satisfaction and to repair the harm, but moreover he must be punished with penalties and penances, not excluding, where clerics are involved, and the case warrant it, suspension or removal from office and benefice."²³ This canon must be interpreted in the context of a demonstration with placards and the insults to the person must be clearly stated *ad pedem litterae*. Canon 2337 can hardly be considered here because of the clause "ausus fuerit."

¹⁸ Canon 1160.

¹⁹ Cfr. canons 1519, 1532, 1538 to 1539, 1541 to 1542.

²⁰ Cfr. canon 1476 § 1.

²¹ Canon 2219 § 1.

²² Canon 2331 § 2.

²³ Canon 2355.

The mind of the Church, before and after Vatican II, on the application of penal laws, is clear: a) we have *can. 2214 § 2*, repeating the admonition of the Council of Trent, from which it is evident that the Church does not favor the hasty and rash use of extreme penalties and censures, but reminds the Bishops to consider their subjects as sons and brothers, and to try as far as possible, by patience and kindness, to influence them to strive after virtue and to desist from vice. b) It is a *well known fact* that Vatican II has purposely avoided any mention of penalties.

Yet penalties there must be, as Pope Paul has declared on the occasion of the inauguration of the fiscal year of the Roman Rota; and we still have penal canons and laws which are still valid, above all canon 2222 § 1: "Though the law may not have any sanction attached to it, the lawful ecclesiastical superior can punish the transgression of the law with some just punishment, if perhaps scandal was given or the special gravity of the transgression calls for it. Otherwise the offender cannot be punished except he has been admonished and been threatened with the penalty of *latae* or *forendae sententiae* in case of transgression and nevertheless violated it." The *procedural laws* on criminal cases and on the removal of pastors are still valid and very complicated.²⁴

11. — *The resignation of the Bishop*. "The episcopal see becomes vacant... by renunciation accepted by the Roman Pontiff."²⁵ "To be valid renunciation must be presented to the superior who can accept it, as a general rule."²⁶ "Superiors should not accept renunciation without a just and proportionate cause."²⁷ "Renunciation through grave unjust fear... is invalid *ipso facto*."²⁸ "Diocesan Bishops, if because of their advanced age or any other grave cause, become less competent to dispatch their duties, are earnestly requested to tender their resignation, either on their own initiative or when requested by competent authority."²⁹

²⁴ Cfr. Canons 1933-1959; 2157-2161.

²⁵ Canon 130 § 1.

²⁶ Canon 187 § 1.

²⁷ Canon 189 § 1.

²⁸ Canon 185.

²⁹ *Christus Dominus*. N. 21.

12. — *WE, THE CHURCH*. Such has been the battle cry of all the self-appointed leaders of secessionist movements in the history of the Church, from Martin Luther and Calvin down to Aglipay and promoters of National Catholic Churches: in Cuba, in continental China and beyond the Iron Curtain. They protested and gained momentum through mass-psychology. Their common characteristic consists in the spirit or mentality of revolt against constituted authority and standing institutions. But, especially after Vatican II has defined the collegiality of Bishops, there cannot be a church — much less *THE CHURCH* — without the local Bishop and the loyalty of those who are in hierarchical communion with him. Suffice to recall the definition of diocese given in *Christus Dominus*, N, 11³⁰

13. — *Demonstration and remonstrance*. “A demonstration is a public exhibition of sympathy, opposition etc., as a parade or mass meeting”; to remonstrate is “to present reasons in complaint, to plead in protest”³¹.

Now-a-days, the right to demonstrate is taken for granted, as a legitimate expression of the right to freedom of speech and of the press, to criticise constituted authority and existing structures, to dissent from the opinion of the authorities that be, to know all the truth etc., with a view to force changes and seek redress for abuses and injustices. All this, I say, is taken for granted, at least in the *City of Man*, in civil society, where authority comes *from below* and the government is of the people, for the people and by the people.

But can we say the same of the *City of God*, the Church of Christ, the religious society which is the Catholic Church? My considered opinion is NO. Because the Church of Christ is an entirely supernatural, theological, divine society, metaphysically different from civil society — as different as the ways of God are above the ways of man. The Catholic Church is the *mystical body of Christ*, with a social structure made up of the people of God. Therefore, in our approach to the Catholic Church we cannot use the same argumentation as when

³⁰ Cfr. supra n. 2.

³¹ The American College Dictionary.

we envisage civil society and human structures: the exclusively human and humanistic approach is absolutely inadequate when applied to the City of God.

I admit that Vatican II, in its Pastoral Constitution on *the Church in the Modern World (Gaudium et Spes)*, teaches clearly that the Church lives in the world, and must come to a dialogue with the world—economic, political, social, cultural—and share its joys and sorrows; more than that, *Gaudium et Spes* is emphatic in acknowledging the sacred duty of respecting the dignity and freedom of the human person created to the image of God, and the world is also created by God—therefore good—and entrusted to man's creativeness and ingenuity. Hence human institutions and structures are all within the divine plan, and the Church must needs realize this and love this and go along with this.

But the *world* contemplated in *Gaudium et Spes* is the *City of Man*, as contradistinguished against the *City of God*, about which Vatican II gave us the dogmatic constitution on *the Church (Lumen Gentium)*, with its divinely hierarchical structure, where authority comes from above, for the eternal salvation of mankind. Vatican II also gave us the decree *On the Pastoral Ministry of the Bishops (Christus Dominus)*, where the theological principles of *Lumen Gentium* are implemented, and the *Motu proprio Ecclesiae Sanctae*, with which the Holy Father proposes to come forward and meet the new needs of the world of today and the new forms of apostolate outlined in the documents of the Council. I cannot resist quoting from the introductory paragraph: "The world of our time, which is deeply changed, needs the radiant light and longs for the ardour of supernatural charity".

In all these pronouncements of the magisterium there is not a hint at *equating* the City of God and the City of Man, there are no grounds to authorize the application of the same methodology to both societies. Under no circumstances does the Church countenance or permit demonstrations.

There is, however, a paragraph in *Lumen Gentium* (N. 37) which encourages the *right of remonstrance*: "Lay people... should manifest to their Pastors their needs and wishes, with that freedom and

trust which behoves children of God and brothers in Christ. In the measure of their knowledge, their competence and the prestige with which they are endowed, they have the right, and sometimes even the duty to open their mind on matters which affect the good of the Church. This should be done, if needs be, through associations *ad hoc* established by the Church — Senate of Priests, Parochial Council?—and always in truth, with fortitude and prudence, with reverence and charity towards those who, because of their sacred office, represent the person of Christ". But this right is a far cry from the right to demonstrate in the street and distribute subversive manifestoes.

IV—IN POINT OF FACT

1. — The *basic facts* in this case are: a) the by-passing by the Bishop of the candidate proposed by the Senate of Priests for the vacant post in the cathedral parish, b) the demonstration that followed and c) the distribution of the manifesto.

2. — The by-passing by the Bishop is perfectly justified by the *presumption* that he had powerful reasons to act against the consultative vote of the Senate of Priests. This presumption is born by the numerous texts quoted above, asserting his freedom of choice in the appointment of the new incumbent in the cathedral parish.

3. — The demonstration was simply the outburst of hurt feelings in a group of priests who, I think, share the modern mentality of those who are bent on equating the religious society which is the Catholic Church with civil society. But this is a *mistaken* mentality. It is the mentality of a *vocal minority*, contrary to the magisterium of the Church and to the opinion of the extra-large *silent majority* of Bishops, Episcopal Conferences and lay Catholic folk. There is an element of rebellious criticism and disobedience. Their organizers are banking on mob rule and mass psychology to give bent to their non-too-clear aspirations and pursuits in every demonstrations. But *there is no room for demonstrations* in the Church or against her constituted Authorities. I dare anybody to quote a single text from the numerous documents of Vatican II and post-Vatican pronouncements that would authorize

demonstrations in the bosom of the Catholic Church. Only the right to *remonstrate* is blessed by the magisterium.

4. — The manifesto smacks of a left-wing demagogic mentality, common to all such anonymous leaflets — though signed in the name of a group of self-appointed reformers — where religious issues are sadly mingled up with economic, social and patriotic issues. No serious-minded person would attach importance to such smut literature. Yet *scandal* — I would rather say, *admiration* — may ensue in the minds of well-meaning simple people; and this is to be lamented.

V. — ANSWER TO QUERIES

1. — The parish priest of Tarlac had no right to deny the demonstrators the use of the patio; nobody has given him such a right. Unless he acted on explicit orders from the Bishop.

2. — In my opinion there is no reason in meting out canonical sanctions to the leading priests of the demonstration. In the first place, they acted on the mentality of modern-time demonstrators, where nobody is ever held solely responsible; and this mentality, though mistaken, is an attenuating circumstance that may excuse from liability to punishment. Then, let us not forget the mind of the Church on the application of penal laws, especially after Vatican II. In my opinion, to start now the law-proceedings against the supposed culprits would produce more scandal and more bitterness than the demonstration and the manifesto. Besides, these law-suits are long and fastidious and hard to process.

I would rather suggest that the Bishop call a meeting of the irritated priests and try, in a fatherly and friendly manner, to convince them of the convenience of a mild form of retraction: a sort of forgive-and-forget: for the sake of peace and the good of everybody.

If and when the Bishop decides to punish them canonically, the heaviest punishment would be suspension and privation of office and benefice. But, again, I disadvise this.

3. — The decision of the Senate of Priests should weigh heavy on the conscience of the Bishop, but in no way is he bound by their consultative vote whenever he has strong reasons to act otherwise.

4. — Anybody can ask the Bishop to resign, but not validly, so as to force him to give up the office, except the Holy See. The demonstrators had no right to ask for the resignation, and gave no valid reasons therefore.

5. — The signatories of the manifesto most certainly are not the Church; they are rather — unconsciously, I am sure — the propounders of a secessionist movement. Those loyal to the Bishop are really the Church, and should renew their loyalty as often as possible, before God and in their conscience, and manifest it when opportunity arises. But never in a belligerent attitude: our God is the God of peace.

Jose Ortea, O.P.

THE CHURCH HERE AND THERE

PAPAL VISIT TO THE PHILIPPINES

On May 29, Vatican announced the Holy Father's coming trip to Manila and Sydney, Australia.

"As has already been announced, in the second half of November, there will be a meeting in Manila of the Episcopal conference of the Far East to study, in the spirit of collegiality, some important pastoral problems of those nations.

"The episcopate of the Far East has urged the Holy Father to participate in this meeting and His Holiness has accepted the invitation.

"The Holy Father also replied in this way to a similar invitation from the President of the Philippines.

"In the same period of time there will be a meeting in Sydney of the Episcopal Conference of Oceania. At the invitation of that episcopate His Holiness will also go to Sydney to participate in the work of that assembly.

"At Sydney the Holy Father will also take part, at the desire expressed by the Australian Catholic community, with the accord of the civil authorities, in the celebration of bicentennial of discovery of that continent."

CONGREGATION FOR EVANGELIZATION DISCUSSES CATECHISTS

VATICAN CITY — At the annual Plenary Assembly of the Sacred Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples, the principal speaker on the first morning was Cardinal Kim of Seoul, who read a paper on the problem of catechists as it affected Asia and Oceania.

The theme of the meeting was 'Catechist'.

The problem of catechists, Cardinal Kim said, is part of the general problem of evangelization. Christianity has lost its prestige; faith and religion seem to have become less important. In the eyes of many, the Church represents a set of values which have not much in common with prevailing human values of progress or with the tremendous efforts at mastering the world and all its pro-

blems by sheer human power. As a result evangelization work appears less relevant and less attractive. The lack of interest in the role of catechists is but one aspect of the poor opinion people have for ecclesiastical work.

Another problem is that traditionally the catechist, even when leader of a community, has been looked upon as a sort of second-rate substitute for a priest. And too often his education has been defective, as recruitment depended more upon good-will than upon competence. Thus, in general, the catechist does not enjoy much respect or exert much influence in Asian countries where the level of education is a decisive factor in society; he is not in a position to deal with cultivated people and students, i.e. the people who are actually building the future of the country; and he cannot give a concrete image of his own function so that young talented people would be eager to imitate him by becoming catechists. Furthermore, the fact that catechists, in spite of their valuable work, are in general underpaid makes them appear as failures in society, and thus the function will tend to attract second-rate people, while gifted people look for better paid jobs.

The rehabilitation of the catechist's role should be much more than an attempt to reanimate a traditional pattern. It is a question of recognizing the specific place of lay assistants in the mission of the Church. Evangelization is to be done by the Church as a whole, including the laity. They have to act as co-responsible workers, and should be recognized as such.

Of the various types of catechists, two key types emerge: the leader of a Christian community, and the specialists in religious education.

The 'leader of a Christian community' should develop an authentic spiritual leadership. Normally he should be appointed by the members of the community, and not necessarily for a lifetime. His pastoral responsibility in the community will be carried out through close cooperation with the members, as a common responsibility. Being taken from the community, he is one of them designated for a special service. He is the animator of the community life. If he has a special professional competence useful to the development of the community, his leadership (spiritual and secular) will be particularly appreciated. This is not essential, but it would solve the problems of influence in the community and of maintenance.

The specialist in religious education should work as a 'professional' in the field, not necessarily in his community of origin but wherever he can find employment. He may be specialized in the catechesis of children or young people or adults. He may have special qualities for dialogue with other religions. He may be a specialist for religious education and information through the mass media etc. In the future, the field of possible employment for these specialists is extremely vast. But an adequate, 'professional' training is of capital importance: there is no place for improvisation.

These two types of catechist correspond to a growing need in the Church and should have a successful future, provided the catechists are given real responsibility and are fully integrated into the structures of pastoral work.

A careful selection of candidates is necessary. Above all, the candidates should be men of deep faith. But also their human qualities should play a decisive role in selection. In the case of community leaders, the community should have the right of decision. In the case of specialists in religious education, a "professional" type of recruitment should be the rule. Professional competence (including catechetical competence, educational skill, human qualities of dialogue and leadership) will be decisive for employment and for advancement.

The proper training of catechists is of the highest importance, and pastoral institutes and training centres should have thoroughly qualified staffs.

On the question of whether catechists should be ordained to the diaconate, His Eminence said: "In my humble opinion, such a move, taken without sufficient preparation, would almost certainly have no other result than to clericalize the function of the catechists. Instead of promoting the catechist's function we would be creating a second-rate clergy."

TWELVE NEW MEMBERS OF PONTIFICAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

VATICAN CITY -- The Pope has nominated twelve new members of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences.

The new nominations bring the membership in the academy to 62, out of a possible 70.

The academy, which has its headquarters within a summer villa built during the Renaissance in the Vatican gardens, was originally founded in 1603, although in its present form it dates only from 1936, when it was revived by Pope Pius XI. Among its members, from 30 countries, there are 15 Nobel prize winners.

Members are named by the Pope and are chosen from scientists of the highest distinction. They need not be Catholics.

The announcement of the new members was made as the academy was holding a special week-long study session of astrophysicists on galaxies. Among those attending the study sessions were two Soviet professors, Viktor Ambart-

sumian, president of the Academy of Sciences in the Armenian Republic, and Igor Novikos of Moscow University.

The new members of the academy are:

Georges Chaudron, professor of applied chemistry, University of Paris;

Christian de Duve, professor of biochemistry, University of Louvain and Rockefeller University, New York;

Fritz Feigl, director of the research laboratory of Brazil's Ministry of Agriculture, Rio de Janeiro;

Peter C. C. Garnham, professor of medical protozoology, University of London;

Wolfgang Gentner, director of the Max Planck Institute of Nuclear Physics, Heidelberg, Germany;

George Joakimoglou, president of the Permanent Central Committee for Narcotics, Geneva;

Rudolf L. Moessbauer, director of the physics department, University of Bavaria, Nobel prize winner in physics for 1961;

Mauro Picone, professor emeritus of analytical mathematics, University of Rome;

Marcel Roche, president of the National Council for Scientific and Technical Research, Caracas, Venezuela;

Robert Stoneley, professor of geophysics, University of Pittsburgh;

Albert Szent-Gyorgi, director of medical research at Woods Hole, Mass., Nobel prize winner in medicine in 1937;

Hans Tuppy, professor of biochemistry, University of Vienna.

U.S.A. BISHOPS MEET

SAN FRANCISCO — Cardinal John Dearden of Detroit, president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, opened the American Catholic bishops' spring meeting here on April 21 with a strong appeal for a national pastoral council that would share responsibility with everyone in the Church in a wide new way never before known.

He asked the 270 bishops to "welcome the broad, rich experience — Christian in its motivation — that will come to us from others."

'The Total Church'

"The total Church" would be drawn into the process, he said, with the clear result that all its members would look upon differences of role in the Church less as a matter of rank than as a call to specific service, "however varied each person's role and function."

Addressing a gathering that included many bishops whose authority has been challenged on sensitive issues by some of their own people, the cardinal said: "Our decisions reached through open participation will be more readily accepted."

"Inevitably, what results will breathe something of the spirit of that communal Church to which reference is made so often in the Acts of the Apostles."

The authority and responsibilities of a bishop would not be reduced, he said, but, in making decisions, "a bishop would have profound, enriched sharing by so many others that the burdens of his responsibility would be lightened."

"We stand to profit pastorally from such sharing."

'Shared Responsibility'

Cardinal Dearden noted that "shared responsibility" is sometimes stated as "co-responsibility," but said that "for many reasons" he prefers the expression "shared responsibility."

"This thought has guided the activities that are taking place in many of our dioceses. The formation of parish councils and the founding of parish councils and the founding of diocesan pastoral councils is an expression of this concern. These are instruments through which in a positive way members of the Church can unite to exercise in proper fashion their shared responsibility for the Church."

Feasibility Study

It was, he said, these convictions that prompted the USCC feasibility study on a National Pastoral Council, a body which could "greatly enrich by insights" the bishops exercise of their own responsibility.

Though the bishops have been counselled for many years by priests, Religious and laymen in "moving towards solutions to problems that have arisen," he went on, "until now we have not formed a body that can unite with us" in sharing concerns and providing what he said were the special insights of non-bishops.

"A shared responsibility is a responsibility more maturely exercised. A shared responsibility in the Church brings a new vision of Christ in the midst of his people.

Father Frank Bonnike of De Kalb, Ill. president of the National Federation of Priest Councils (NFPC), suggested in a statement of the NCCB that the entire American Church be involved in part of the next meeting for the sake of the collegiality to which, he said, the bishops were committing themselves.

Two Years of Consideration

On the eve of the NCCB meeting, Cardinal Dearden told a news conference late Monday (April 20) that the idea of a National Pastoral Council had been "under consideration by the bishops for better than two years." He feels they now had enough knowledge to warrant the study.

Charles G. Tildon, associate director of a Baltimore, Md., hospital and vice chairman of the USCC advisory council which will be doing the study, told reporters at the news conference:

"We expect to propose and recommend to the bishops a plan to do several things: How we can exercise shared responsibility, how such a council would function, how membership would be determined."

Miguel Donoso, an organizer in California's Santa Clara County for the Confederacion De La Raza Unidad (United Confederation for our people), a militant Mexican-American group, demanded to know why no Mexican-Americans were represented in the feasibility study.

"Their Voices are Heard"

Mr. Tildon said in reply that a number of persons of Latin-American origin and background in Colorado, Texas, and other states were included—and remarked that "their voices are heard loudly." Mr. Tildon, himself a Negro pointed out that that was by no means the study group an all-white group.

R.I.P. — BAGUIO HONORS A FALLEN SOLDIER

The Rev. Hubert Dupont was a true soldier of Christ. After a busy day, he sat for a while before a TV set outside of his own room on Wednesday evening on April 29. Then he went to his room for a much needed rest, only

to meet there violence from cruel hands we shall perhaps never know. As he did not show up for mass the next morning, a boy sent to fetch him found him prostrate on the floor, already cold in death! He lay in state at the S.L.U. Chapel until May 4 when, at 10:30 o'clock a.m., he was carried to the Baguio Cathedral for the funeral services in his honor.

The Cathedral was filled with his friends and admirers. Presiding over the services were Their Excellencies, the Bishop of Bayombong and the Ambassador of Belgium. In addition to the hundreds of priests and Sisters of nearly all congregations and orders and nations, more than fifty were at the sanctuary for a concelebration. The Rev. Rafael Desmedt, assisted by his curate, acted as Master of Ceremonies. After the gospel, V. R. Fr. Renato Verlinden, Superior of the Belgian Fathers in the Philippines and main celebrant, gave a short but inspiring eulogy. Among other things, he asked all present to forgive and pray for the assassins who, in the words of Christ on the cross, did "not know what they were doing." After the mass, the Most Rev. Alberto Van Overbeke, Bishop of Bayombong, took over. With the commendation of his deceased confrere to God, he invited all priests to sing with him the "In Paradisum," a Church song of joy to ask the angels and saints of heaven to welcome our dead into their lucky number. It was already high noon when the funeral procession left the Cathedral for the cemetery.

The Rev. Dupont was born in Roeselare, Belgium, on Feb. 14, 1921. On Jan. 27, 1946, he was ordained priest of the Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary. On Dec. 13, 1947, he went to China, and on July 5, 1948, he came to the Philippines. In May, 1949, he was in Don Bosco High School in Lagawe, Ifugao. In May, 1953, he was Principal of St. Louis High School, Baguio; in May, 1958, he was in Solano, N. V. In May, 1963, he moved to the Guadalupe Minor Seminary in Makati, Rizal: but in May, 1968, he came back to his former post in St. Louis University. Without, perhaps knowing it, Fr. Dupont was just following a pattern for many priests: "Repentina mors, sacerdotis sors," i.e., a sudden death is the lot for priests. May he rest in peace.

SPECIAL OFFER

NOTES ON

"The History of the Church in the
Philippines, 1521-1898"

25 cent.

Fr. Pablo Fernandez, O.P.

Now Available

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS
Fathers' Residence
U.S.T. Manila D-403

JOAQUIN RAMIREZ
RAFAEL ORTIGAS

FRANCISCO ORTIGAS, JR.
JOAQUIN RAMIREZ, JR.

RAFAEL ORTIGAS, JR.

Ramirez & Ortigas
Abogados

FILIPINAS BUILDING • PLAZA MORAGA • MANILA • P.O. BOX 122
TEL. 3-93-77

FERIA, FERIA, LUGTU & LA'O

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS AT LAW

PHILIPPINE TRUST BLDG., PLAZA GOITI • P. O. BOX 1219 • MANILA



 **KRAUT**

ART GLASS • NEON

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