

A new \$1,300,000 dormitory at St. John Fisher College was viewed by alumni, educators and clergy this week. Called Sarah Ward Hall, the strikingly designed structure will be home for 190 students. Dorm chaplain Basilian Father Joseph Travato has a view of the 1200 seat gymnasium nearing completion. Other photos show a student room, reception for visitors and snow-swept view of exterior.

Truth Takes Time to Percolate

Mystery Shrouds Council By-pass of Religious Freedom

By FATHER EDWARD DUFF, S.J.

Vatican City (RNS)—The Catholic bishops of the world, gathered in the 21st Ecumenical Council in the history of the Church, were not able to vote to condemn anti-Semitism nor to rally in effect the declaration of Pope John XXIII's last encyclical, *In Terris*. "Every human being has the right to honor God according to the dictates of an upright conscience and therefore the right to worship God privately and publicly."

The second session of Vatican Council II closed without the expected—and promised—vote which would have accepted or rejected chapters IV and V of the schema on ecumenism as a basis for further discussion.

Why there was no vote is the question everyone is asking. There are no clear answers. Inevitably, the responsibility for the decision falls on the managers of the Council.

Apart from the probably profane protests of the Oriental patriarchs whose flocks are disadvantaged minorities living under Arab governments dedicated to the destruction of the State of Israel, there was no discussion of opposition in Rome to chapter IV, the five-part logical grounds "hated" in X graph decree recounting the role of the Jews in salvation history and repudiating clear theological grounds "hated and persecution of Jews whether occurring in our times or in earlier centuries."

It was, then, reluctance to face up to the issue of religious freedom at this time that accounts for the absence of a preliminary vote of general, tentative acceptance of the text of chapter IV and V. And yet not a single speaker in two weeks of discussion of the schema directly attacked the idea of religious freedom for all men.

On Monday, December 2, the last working day of the session, Augustin Cardinal Bea, looking more than his 82 years, gave the floor. He regretted that "it was not permitted to us to have at least a forecast of the final two chapters of the schema. It was lack of time and no other reason," the cardinal twice repeated, which prevented a discussion.

Courier Journal
OFFICIAL NEWSPAPER OF THE
ROCHESTER DIOCESE

Vol. 75 No. 14
Friday, January 3, 1964

MOST REV. JAMES E. KEARNEY, D.D.,
President.

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations, and the Catholic Press Association, National Catholic World News Service, Religious News Service. Published every Friday by the Rochester Catholic Press Association.
MAIN OFFICE: 110 South Main St., Rochester 4, N. Y.
MEMBER OFFICE: 317 Robinson Elm St., Elm St. Station, R.F.D. 1

Entered as second class matter in the Post Office at Rochester, N. Y., on October 10, 1917.
Single copy 10¢. Yearly subscription \$4.00. Second class postage paid at Rochester, N. Y.

But what His Eminence made an effort to explain was the failure to take a preliminary vote of orientation, one which would have established the text as "in general expressing the sentiments of the Council and assigning it to the undisputed jurisdiction of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, and thus beyond the reach of any maneuvers of the theological Commission or of the Coordinating Commission, assigned possibly by suggestions to relegate the theme of anti-Semitism and religious liberty to the waste-basket of Schema II, treating of "The Presence of the Church in the World."

"What is put off is not put away" was Cardinal Bea's assurance. As he earnestly asked for written comments to improve and strengthen the entire schema on ecumenism.

The American bishops returned home disappointed at the outcome. As employed at the meeting of U.S. bishops press panel, the word seemed to be the agreed common term: At press conference in Rome on November 20, after the chapter on religious liberty had been officially presented to the bishops, Father John Courtney Murray, S.J., had called the "item" "the American theological issue at the Council." He added, according to the official release, "The American hierarchy is greatly pleased that the issue has finally appeared on the agenda of the Council, notwithstanding many efforts to block discussion of it."

"IN THE WAKE" of such general "disappointment" a few weeks of the second session of the Council is in order.

The five-chapter schema "De Ecumenismo" was presented to the bishops on Monday, November 18, by Amleto Cardinal Cagnoni as chairman of the Commission on the Oriental Churches, which had collaborated in the drafting of the document, a fusion of three schemas prepared for the first session. On the Friday evening before there had been a meeting with Pope Paul VI of what has been called a minor council, the 12 cardinals of the President, the four moderators, the Coordinating Commission and the Secretariat, presumably to discuss the "final" work of the session.

Following Cardinal Cagnoni's speech, the first three chapters were introduced and explained by Archbishop Joseph M. Martin of Rheims. The next day Cardinal Bea presented chapter IV, "On the Attitude of Catholics toward Non-Catholics, particularly toward the Jews" and Bishop Emile De Smedt of Bruges outlined the case for religious liberty.

The speech of Albert Cardinal Mayer, Archbishop of Chicago, on Wednesday was assumed to express the desires of the American hierarchy. It endorsed the schema as a whole and explicitly urged the inclusion of chapters IV and V. On Thursday, November 21, on a motion of the moderators, a vote was taken on the general acceptability of the first three chapters of the schema. The response was a thundering affirmative, 1,994 to 86.

On November 21 when the material of the schema was divided for a separate vote, the secretary of the Council, Archbishop Pericle Fellet, gave public assurance that the chapters IV and V would also be proposed for general acceptance in

a few days, his Latin phrase being "in proximo diebus." Although doubt existed about the legality of thus dividing the schema for separate voting (the rules covering the point are not clear) and although there is no precedent in the Council for such a move, the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity accepted a similar assurance. It is understood that the leadership of the American hierarchy was given a like promise.

As the second week of discussion on the schema moved along, deplorably, uneasiness about a vote on chapters IV and V became the chief topic at the U.S. press panel each afternoon. The word "filluster" was heard.

Its justification was the official English communiqué of the Council, which, on November 28, announced: "After seven speakers had addressed the general congregation, Julius Cardinal Doppenner, Archbishop of Munich, Germany, as moderator, announced that in the opinion of the moderators the discussion of the schema on ecumenism had been sufficiently prolonged. His Eminence observed that this judgment was based on the repetitious, admissions and meditations which have characterized recent discourses from the floor. By a standing vote the Council Fathers signified their concurrence in the judgment of the moderators."

Nevertheless, the following day the floor was given to 35 more speakers to continue the same theme, one of them, Indian Bishop Eugene D'Souza, having the grace to withdraw.

Writing from Rome on Thursday, November 28, a correspondent of La Croix, Paris Catholic daily, predicted that although there was no time left for public discussion of the themes, there would be a vote on the acceptability of chapters IV and V.

According to his information the vote would be preceded by summary speeches pro and contra the material as was done before the vote to include the schema on the Blessed Virgin Mary in that of the Church. Joseph Cardinal Ritter, Archbishop of St. Louis, Mo., it was understood, was to be the spokesman for the case for the text on religious liberty.

According to the same sources, a Spanish bishop was minutes later His Eminence Eug-

ene Cardinal Tisserant, chairman of the Council presidency, took the floor to inform the assembly that, this morning, at the entrance to the basilica, printed sheets had been distributed with the signatures of a certain number of Council Fathers expressing dissatisfaction with the Schema on the Media of Social Communication and urging other members of the Council to vote against it. Cardinal Tisserant stated that such procedure was to be most vigorously deplored, inasmuch as the document in question, in its component parts, had already been approved by much more than the required two-thirds majority. His Eminence stated that the members of the Council presidency as well as the cardinal moderators regarded the distribution of these sheets as an attack on the freedom of vote of the Council Fathers and as an act unworthy of an Ecumenical Council.

The vote was not taken that day nor on the following Monday when the report on the schema on the lay apostolate was presented after Cardinal Bea's speech, nor on Tuesday which was given over to a celebration of the Fourth Centenary of the Council of Trent, an observance that was seemingly arranged belatedly.

WHY WERE the condemnations of anti-Semitism and the espousal of religious freedom put off to next year? That there was no time remaining to discuss these themes is evident. But why no vote on the texts presented to the Council?

The managers of the Council showed an ability to obtain a vote when they wanted one. Despite well-publicized warnings and thoughts on the part of the bishops, the schema on mass communications media, a dreary compendium of moralizing exhortations, was scheduled for vote on Monday, November 25. Its acceptance was desired by the managers as evidence of something achieved during the session, innocuous though they deem it to be.

That morning in St. Peter's Square copies of a broadsheet marked "Urgent" asking for the rejection of the schema as "damaging the reputation of the Council," were distributed to the bishops as they descended from their buses to enter the basilica. The paper was signed by 25 bishops of 15 countries from every continent except North America. Suddenly, Archbishop Fellet, secretary of the Council, appeared and endeavored to seize the papers from the distributors.

The official English communiqué of that day reports: "Some minutes later His Eminence Eu-

gene Cardinal Tisserant, chairman of the Council presidency, took the floor to inform the assembly that, this morning, at the entrance to the basilica, printed sheets had been distributed with the signatures of a certain number of Council Fathers expressing dissatisfaction with the Schema on the Media of Social Communication and urging other members of the Council to vote against it. Cardinal Tisserant stated that such procedure was to be most vigorously deplored, inasmuch as the document in question, in its component parts, had already been approved by much more than the required two-thirds majority. His Eminence stated that the members of the Council presidency as well as the cardinal moderators regarded the distribution of these sheets as an attack on the freedom of vote of the Council Fathers and as an act unworthy of an Ecumenical Council."

The cardinals' indignation was somewhat selective. There was no similar protest against the distribution at the same spot of a manifesto, signed by Ukrainian bishops, against the inclusion of the material on the Blessed Virgin Mary in the Schema on the Church. Nor much more serious, against the distribution in the Council hall itself and on the desks of the bishops on Monday, December 2, of a 12-page Latin document asking the text on religious freedom.

Unfortunately, Cardinal Ritter's speech in the Council on November 18, describing the text on religious liberty as marking "the end of the Council Reformation" and deeming it the premise of the entire ecumenical enterprise, was misunderstood as calling for marking Chapter V the prologue of the schema, thus destroying its structure as presented. The cardinal's words were thus interpreted in the official German communiqué, in L'Avenir d'Italia of Bologna, a paper considered to represent the views of Giuseppe Cardinal Lercaro and distributed free to the bishops in their hotels, and by the influential Henri Fesquet in Le Monde of Paris.

In the absence of any public explanation for the failure to have a vote on the Council on the general acceptability of the texts on anti-Semitism and on religious freedom, one is forced to speculate, repeating what are obviously rumors.

The most common rumor has it that influential political forces in Italy believe that Facom in Terris was in good measure responsible for the increase of the Communist vote in the last election and that, since the chapter on religious freedom is largely an elaboration of the doctrine of that encyclical, its acceptance would have disastrous political consequences in Italy.

A version of this story claims that Italian financial interests have wanted that the success of progressive forces in the Council is shaking the stability of the Italian economy and encouraging that light of the lira a-b-o-d. Absurdly provincial though such arguments are, it must be remembered that an international organization has to have its headquarters somewhere and that inevitably it will be influenced by its cultural environment.

Some Spanish and Italian bishops indicated that they found religious liberty something of a "new idea" and did not want to be rushed into a discussion of it. They seem not to have heard of Article 17 of the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, voted by the world community on December 10, 1948, a document which their government presumably endorses.

BECAUSE of his sincere admiration and affection for the United States where he spent nearly three decades of his life as Apostolic Delegate, Cardinal Cagnoni, Secretary of State to Pope Paul VI, is said to have entertained fears that a debate on religious freedom would divide the Council, producing negative (but unmarked) votes that would scandalize public opinion.

His judgement, if such it was, may be sound. It takes time for ideas to percolate and to permeate but, in the end, truth does prevail. Thus, it is pointed out that last year suggestions of changes in the liturgy, especially of the introduction of modern languages into the text of the Mass, met entrenched and inflexible resistance. This year far-reaching changes were adopted with near unanimity and with enthusiasm. Next fall, it is to be hoped, a similar conversion will be noted regarding religious freedom for all.

Bishop Kearney's Appointments

JANUARY

- 6 Saturday—Church Convant—L.F.C.A. Mass in honor of Our Lady—8:00 a.m.
- 10 Sunday—Oak Hill Country Club—Luncheon for Apostolic Delegate—12:30 p.m.
- 11 St. John Fisher College—Blessing and Dedication of new buildings and conferral of honorary degrees—3:00 p.m.
- 13 Monday—St. Joseph Church—Notre Dame Retreat House Mass—7:00 p.m.
- 14 Wednesday—Our Lady of Victory Church—Daily Mass League Crusade—Low Mass—11:10 p.m.
- 21 Tuesday—St. Agnes High School—Feast Day Mass—9:00 a.m.



MOTHER OF AMERICAS . . . On the summit of a hill near Mexico City, Our Lady of Guadalupe first made herself known to Juan Diego, a poor Aztec Indian, in December, 1531. Kneeling by Juan on the arid hillside left the image of Our Lady of Guadalupe on his roughly woven cloak. Devotion in her honor helped to consolidate various people of Mexico into Church-state, tensing there. Catholics look to her today for a single nation. Her shrine remained open even in periods of foster a sense of Christian solidarity among all people in the Americas.

Patroness of Mexico

Spaniards 'Wait and Hope in Silence'

By DR. GARY MacEON

Barcelona—Some dreams die hard.

I always approach Spain with the irrational hope that at this time a change of heart will have occurred in the regime. For more than a quarter century, the regime has had the power and opportunity to unite and modernize the country.

Evidence of a change of heart continues to elude me. There are so many good things about Spain. There is so much vitality and growth and progress. These are marvelous hard working people, outgoing, easily pleased. One might think they are at peace, united in the reconstruction and now in the vast program of development, which the regime is putting as its supreme accomplishment.

But behind the facade the reality is as before. Spain is an old country, a very complex one. Its unchanged reality has many elements, all closely linked and inter-acting. But for analysis, they must be considered one by one.

which shows little sign of being transformed into a more-Christian social order. It is based in part, especially in the south, on big land-holdings. But it survives even in the industry and commerce of the big cities. The privileged few reap great benefits in wealth and power. "The many" struggle constantly to live and can never hope to rise above their station.

Such a system is inefficient of its very nature. It is riddled with graft, ridden by bureaucrats and rotten with loafers and featherbedders. Not only are the fruits of labor maldistributed but the output per head is inevitably low to start.

Another element of the unchanged reality is the political repression based on the notion (ironically) that nothing has changed since the civil war. That Socialists, Liberals, Christian Democrats—all who differ with the regime—must be trampled on. This attitude is reflected in the prohibition of independent trade unions, including those of Catholic inspiration and leadership, and in the bitter war waged against the Basque and Catalan languages, two of Spain's proudest glories. To print a visiting card in the language of this

Kingdom merits a stiff fine. Even preaching in the vernacular is forbidden.

But in Spain's heretic tradition, one man will not be silenced, one whose prestige places him beyond Franco's reach, the prior of the great Benedictine monastery of Montserrat. "Where there is no true liberty, there is no justice, and that is the condition of Spain," he thundered recently in his pulpit. Then he put his finger on the essential fact. "We have had," he said, "not twenty years of peace but twenty years of victory."

Censorship is an inevitable, an integral element. It is part of the air one breathes. Not merely are certain items deleted or action taken against those who publish them, but hypocrisy and conformism dominate all expression. Even reports of Vatican Council II were regularly blue-pencilled. The official and monopolistic news agency deleted all criticisms made by Council Fathers of State interference. In the naming of bishops for the very good reason that Franco picks Spain's bishops.

Judicious use of this power has insured

wide support of the regime by the official Church and has kept criticism at a minimum. But even bishops raise dissenting voices, though more often against State intrusion into areas they regard as their preserve than against the denial of human rights. For the Church rulers belong in the same tradition of paternalism, distrust of the judgment of the common man, and a belief that an atmosphere of obscurantism and strict censorship laws can preserve a people from the "wickedness" of the twentieth century.

The young priests, especially those from the Basque country and Catalonia, where the spirit of Franco has never prevailed, are the one bright spot on this dark horizon. They are intelligent, well-educated, filled with the spirit of the social encyclicals from Leo XIII to John XXIII. But they are frustrated. "I no longer put myself in a situation where workers can question me," one told me sadly. "I can not in conscience defend a wealthy Church in a starving society. I cannot denounce it while wearing a soutane. I can only wait and hope in silence."