

LEO CARDINAL
SIENENS

150
**The Church
IN
Dialogue**

THE
Church IN Dialogue

FIDES

THE CHURCH IN DIALOGUE

\$2.95

by Leon-Joseph Cardinal Suenens

This book might well be subtitled, "Cardinal Suenens in America." It brings together the speeches which he gave during his visit to the United States.

Leon-Josef Cardinal Suenens, Archbishop of Malines-Brussels, has proved himself to be, since the beginning of Vatican Council II, the Cardinal among Cardinals, or, if one may say so, the Cardinals' Cardinal. He has identified himself with the aggiornamento second only to John XXIII, whose spokesman he turned out to be even while Pope John was still alive.

It was Cardinal Suenens whom Pope John chose to present his *Pacem in Terris* to the United Nations. That presentation is in this collection of American talks. It is marked by a simplicity and wisdom that stays close to the very manner of Pope John, and is able in this way to do justice to the social message of the Encyclical.

The high point of this book on Suenens in America are the two talks he gave to the Divinity School of the University of Chicago: "The Council and Church Unity" and "The Church and the Civilizations." Here is the spirit of both unity and renewal, the heart of ecumenism laid open. About this encounter at the University of Chicago between Protestants

(continued on back flap)

(continued from front flap)

and Catholics, Dean Jerald C. Brauer has written:

"The Divinity School and the University have just experienced a unique and exhilarating two days. Hopefully, it marks a new epoch. . . . His very presence was symbolic of the new situation of dialogue brought about by John XXIII. . . . It was important that the first Roman Catholic to be invited . . . be the type of man who would reflect the present level of dialogue but would also point beyond to new levels of discussion and mutual exploration. We sought a man who combined theological sensitivity with involvement in and leadership of the "aggiornamento" that marks Vatican II. Cardinal Suenens surpassed our most hopeful expectations. . . . Finally, he left us with the determination to found a chair (of Roman Catholic Life and Thought) that we might continue here what he so magnificently started."—in the *Criterion*, Spring 1964.

The book also includes the talk to the laity on Pastoral Renewal given in the 1964 John A. Ryan Forum, conducted by the Catholic Council on Working Life and the Adult Education Centers in Chicago. In it Cardinal Suenens gives his impressions of the Council as a work of God and man.

The book includes, too, the delightful and endearing talk to the nuns in Boston on the place of the nun in the world today. In it he is the warmhearted, solicitous father urging his children on to still greater things.

THE CHURCH IN DIALOGUE is Cardinal Suenens in America talking to the U. N. in New York, to the Protestant Theologians at the University of Chicago, to the laity at McCormick Place, to the nuns in Boston. In its own way it epitomizes the Church at work in the world today.

Designed by Gene Tarpey

THE CHURCH IN DIALOGUE

Leon-Joseph Cardinal Suenens, Archbishop of Malines-Brussels, has proved himself to be, since the beginning of Vatican Council II, the Cardinal among Cardinals, or, if one may say so, the Cardinals' Cardinal. He has identified himself with the aggiornamento second only to John XXIII, whose spokesman he turned out to be even while Pope John was still alive.

THE CHURCH IN DIALOGUE is Cardinal Suenens in America talking to the U.N. in New York, to the Protestant Theologians at the University of Chicago, to the laity at McCormick Place, to the nuns in Boston. In its own way it epitomizes the Church at work in the world today.

FIDES PUBLISHERS, INC. NOTRE DAME, IND.

THE
Church in Dialogue

FIDES

The Church in Dialogue

.....

Leon-Joseph Cardinal Suenens

The Church in Dialogue

Five Talks in America

Edited by Arthur McCormack, M.H.M.

FIDES PUBLISHERS, INC.
Notre Dame, Indiana

© Copyright: 1965, Fides Publishers, Inc.
Notre Dame, Indiana

Nihil Obstat: Louis J. Putz, C.S.C.
University of Notre Dame

Imprimatur: Leo A. Pursley, D.D.
Bishop of Fort Wayne-South Bend

Editor's Note

The speeches of Cardinal Suenens during his short visit to the United States in early May, 1964, were of such importance and were so well received that it seemed worth while to make them available in permanent form to a wider public.

The subjects with which he dealt include some of the main interests of one of the greatest leaders of the renewal in the Church today. The position of the Cardinal as one of the moderators of the Vatican Council and his own reputation and skill as a writer and speaker give a special authority and interest to his words and blend into a unity the diverse themes which he dwelt on in his American tour.

ARTHUR MCCORMACK, M.H.M.

Contents

1. THE COUNCIL AND CHURCH UNITY	11
2. THE CHURCH AND THE CIVILIZATIONS	37
3. THE COUNCIL AND PASTORAL RENEWAL	65
4. THE MESSAGE OF <u>PACEM IN TERRIS</u>	95
5. THE APOSTOLATE OF THE RELIGIOUS	113

The Council and Church Unity was one of two addresses which Cardinal Suenens delivered at the Divinity School of the University of Chicago on May 4 and 5, 1964. These were the Hiram W. Thomas lectures and it was the first time that a Roman Catholic had been invited to this lecture-ship. *Criterion*, the periodical of the Divinity School, devoted a whole issue to the Cardinal's visit and noted that it was important that the lecturer should be one who not only would reflect the present level of dialogue but would also point to new levels of discussion and mutual exploration. The introduction to the issue by Dean Jerald C. Brauer shows that the University Divinity School attached the highest importance to this visit and these lectures and also the informal discussions between the Cardinal and Catholic and non-Catholic theologians.

A special chair of Roman Catholic Life and Thought is to be established as a result of this meeting.

We are indebted to Dean Brauer for his permission on behalf of *Criterion* to use this speech and the one on The Church and the Civilizations already printed in *Criterion*.

1. The Council and Church Unity

It is generally recognized that, unlike the Councils of Lyons or of Florence, the Second Vatican Council is not a council of reunion. That is to say that the effort of reconciliation is not the principal concern of the Council. But in no sense does it mean that the Council is not keenly aware of the need for mutual understanding.

It is not so much in the schema explicitly devoted to ecumenism that we find the best indication of this. Rather do we find it in the Council's basic drive towards renewal on every level.

Let us put some stress here on a few of the most important of the Council's indirect ecumenical contributions. These are of such a nature as to speed the greatly desired day when the visible unity of the Church will triumph over all obstacles, in full fidelity to the Lord's desire: "Father, that they may be one."

Resumption of the Work of Vatican I

Vatican II's first ecumenical measure was the resumption of the work of Vatican I.

By its choice of the Church as its central theme, the Second Vatican Council placed itself in perfect continuity with Vatican I and provided the opportunity for clearing up certain misunderstandings and obscurities which followed on Vatican I. That Council, which so forcefully delineated the role of the primacy and of papal infallibility, was, of course, prevented from finishing its work by the War of 1870. This historical accident resulted in a certain one-sidedness in presentation. It was not possible to give attention to the schema which had been prepared on the nature of the Church, the role of the episcopacy, etc. As is commonly known, the Council Fathers had originally received for study a sizable schema, "On the Church of Christ," which treated the primacy of the pope only in chapters 11 and 12, after having devoted the first ten chapters to consideration of the Church in general. The net result of all this was to give the impression that the Church was, for the future, to be thought of as absorbed in the person of her visible head, as if he had been detached and separated from the Church, and isolated from the episcopacy of the world. The whole of the Council's work in the second session was an effort at completion, at harmonization, and at synthesis.

Although it will not be possible here to recapitulate all the discussions of the second session, so rich and variegated in the problems suggested, I would like to devote some time to several of the most important points which have marked this second phase, and whose ecumenical implications are unmistakable.

Emphasis on the People of God

The original schema *De Ecclesia*, which was submitted to the bishops for study, began with a chapter which undertook to define the mystery of the Church, then passed on immediately to a second chapter concerned with the hierarchy. As the one responsible for presenting the schema to the co-ordinating commission, I suggested a different order, and this was subsequently adopted by the Council. It consisted in having the first chapter followed not by a consideration of the hierarchy, but by a second chapter which would treat of the people of God. The study of the hierarchy's role was to be reserved for a third chapter.

The term "people of God," it should be noted, is not intended to signify the people constituted by the faithful as distinct from the hierarchy. It looks, rather, to the entirety of the members of the Church, pastors as well as the faithful.

If it is true that the hierarchy, in certain respects, takes precedence over the faithful, since the faithful are brought by it to faith and to supernatural life, it remains no less true that pastors and faithful alike belong to the one people of God. The thought of God is directed to His people and its salvation; in regard to this end, the hierarchy is but a means. This is why our primary concern must be with the people of God as a totality before we proceed to a study of its various constituent parts and their mutual interrelationship.

Once this change of viewpoint is effected, a wholly new orientation is given to our reflections. What now first catches our eye is this community of those who are baptized, who are all made one by the same baptism. This impresses itself upon us, and makes its mark before

there is an awareness of the various gifts and ministries.

This emphasis on the people of God — “a chosen race, a royal priesthood,” in St. Peter’s phrase (1 Peter 2:9) — is an indication of how fully we have recovered our appreciation of this basic reality. We realize anew that the mission of giving Christ to the world falls on the entire Christian people, at every level, and no less imperatively for being diverse in manner.

It was in the light of all this that I felt I had the duty of drawing attention to the abiding nature of the charisms of the Holy Spirit within the people of God. Here is the substance of my address to the Council.

We often speak of the charisms of Christians, that is, the special gifts conferred on them by the Holy Spirit, as if we had here merely an accidental and marginal phenomenon in the life of the Church. It seems necessary then to show the importance of these charisms in the edification of the Mystical Body, for the hierarchical structure of the Church is something more than a mere administrative machine quite unrelated to the charismatic gifts which the Holy Spirit spreads throughout the Church. Pope Pius XII’s encyclical, *Mystici Corporis*, has already dealt with this question, of course.

Charisms Are Given to All Christians

The time which measures the march of the Church towards the Parousia of the Lord is the era of the Holy Spirit, by whose action the glorious Christ gathers together the people of God who are awaiting the Day of the Lord and purifies them, gives them life and leads them to the fullness of truth. The Holy Spirit, Scripture tells us, is given to the Church in this world as first fruits and a pledge. That is why the Church is called “the dwelling of God in the Spirit” (Eph 2:22).

The Holy Spirit is not given only to the pastors of the flock but to all Christians without exception: “Do you know that you are a temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwells in you?” writes St. Paul to the Corinthians (1 Cor 3:16). In baptism, the sacrament of faith, all Christians receive the Holy Spirit. All are “living stones” which must play a part in raising a “spiritual edifice,” “*oikos pneumatikos*” (1 Peter 2:5). The whole Church, which is literally animated by the Spirit, stands founded on the apostles and also, as St. Paul says, on the prophets (Eph 2:30). In the Church of the New Testament God “has given to some to be apostles, to others prophets, or evangelists or else pastors and doctors . . .” (Eph 4:11).

The Holy Spirit shows His presence in the Church by the abundance of His special gifts, called charisms in Scripture. No doubt, at the time of St. Paul the Church witnessed charisms which were rather unusual and indeed astonishing, like the gift of tongues or the gift of healing. But we must not think that spiritual gifts consist exclusively or even principally in these rather spectacular manifestations.

St. Paul speaks as well of a gift of expounding the deepest religious truths (the charism of the word of wisdom) or of presenting the elementary teaching on Christ (the charism of the word of knowledge), or of the charism of faith, the charism of preaching, of exhortation or of consolation, or of service, of the charism of discernment of spirits, or giving help in need, of administering and ruling the churches, etc. (see Rom 12 and 1 Cor 12).

In the eyes of St. Paul the Church of Christ is not an administrative organization. He sees it as a living whole made up of gifts, charisms and services. The

Spirit is given to all Christians; to all and to each He distributes His gifts and His charisms "which differ according to the grace which has been given us" (Rom 12:6). In fact, "to each the manifestation of the Spirit is given for the common good" (1 Cor 12:7), that is to say, "so that the Church may derive edification from it" (1 Cor 14:12). Every Christian, educated or not, possesses even in his everyday life a spiritual gift proper to himself. But, as St. Paul says, to edify the Church.

The Gifts of the Spirit in the Church of Today

When we hear the apostle affirm: "There are some whom God has raised up in the Church firstly as apostles, secondly as prophets, thirdly as doctors. . . . Are all apostles? All prophets? All doctors?" (1 Cor 12:28), we realize that to speak of the Church thinking only of the apostles and their successors and forgetting the prophets and doctors, would mean neglecting an element of primary importance.

For what would our Church be without the charism of the doctors, that is, the theologians? And what would become of it without the charism of the prophets, that is, those men who, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, persist in season and out of season and awaken a sleeping Church, lest the Gospel in practice be neglected?

It was not only in the age of Thomas Aquinas or Francis of Assisi that the Church felt the need of the charisms of doctors, prophets and other ministers. It needs them today, even in the most humdrum circumstances.

Let us speak of those charisms which arouse no astonishment. Let us speak of the unsensational charisms. Do not all of us know those men and women

raised up as it were by God Himself on whom the Holy Spirit has bestowed gifts for catechising, for evangelization, for Catholic Action in all its forms, for social and charitable action? Does not the experience of every day teach us that the action of the Holy Spirit is not finished in the Church?

The Task of Pastors of the Flock Regarding Charisms

It is obvious that without the intervention of the ecclesiastical authorities the action of charisms in the Church could produce anarchy. But on the other hand, without charisms the ecclesiastical ministry could produce poverty and sterility.

Let the pastors, both of single churches and the universal Church, have that kind of spiritual instinct which fosters the discovery of charisms, raises them up and develops them.

Let the pastors of the Church listen carefully and willingly to the laity and hold unceasingly an active dialogue with them. The laity have received their gifts of the Holy Spirit and often possess greater experience of the life of the modern world.

Let the pastors of the Church themselves desire better gifts (1 Cor 12:31). All the faithful, even those endowed with the loftiest spiritual gifts, owe respect and obedience to their fathers in the faith. Correspondingly, attention and respect are owed to the gifts and impulses of the Holy Spirit who often inspires the action of simple and modest lay people. That is the reason why St. Paul warns all Christians, including the pastors: "Do not extinguish the Spirit. Do not despise the gifts of prophecy, but prove all things; hold fast to what is good" (1 Thess 5:19-21). This mass of gifts, charisms and services could not be put to work for the edification

of the Church without that liberty of the children of God which the pastors, following the example of St. Paul, have a duty to protect and encourage.

The Ministry as Service of the People of God

In the light of what has preceded, we see the sacerdotal, episcopal, and papal ministry as a means in the service of ecclesial community, rather than as an end. We can also see, in such a view of the Church, the manifold ecumenical implications.

The majority of the addresses at the Council stressed the great extent to which the ministry is *diakonia*, "service," and how great is the desire to do away with anything which makes it appear in the guise of power or domination.

The Church is divine and human at the same time. Since it is made up of men who bear the treasures of God in fragile vessels, it is constantly faced with the need of purification, of a perpetual return to its sources.

The symbolic expression of this return, already inherent in the Council, is something we all witnessed, when Paul VI went to Jerusalem with the sole intention of making a pilgrimage of prayer and penance. The initial intention did not go beyond that. The providential meeting with Patriarch Athenagoras was a further consequence which had not at first been foreseen.

The Church, it seems, is becoming increasingly conscious of the fact that all authority is service; it is a primacy of love: "Do you love me more than these?" (John 21:15). Authority is forgetfulness of self in the interests of furthering a coordination of energies and an authentic fraternal union.

It seems to me that the Church is moving towards

the elimination of all that disfigures her true face. It seems too that the Holy Spirit is leading the Lord's ministers to realize more fully that they are "the servants of the servants of God," and to ponder the unforgettable scene of the washing of feet, by which the Master indicated to His disciples, for all ages to come, how He conceived the task and the function of the apostolic ministry, whatever its rank.

Episcopal Collegiality

The First Vatican Council put the accent on the role of Peter and his successors. Vatican II, without turning its back on anything achieved thereby, is undertaking the task of mediating that achievement through a formulation which will avoid misunderstandings and bring out some complementary aspects of this truth. The role of Peter is indivisibly united to that of the Twelve. When we consider the place of the apostolic body of the Twelve, and of the episcopal body, its successor, we see how totally misleading it is to present the Church as an absolute monarchy. Peter and the Twelve together make but one. Peter is inconceivable without the Twelve and without the Church which is built on the apostles and the prophets, but the Twelve are likewise inconceivable without their head, who is the focal point of their unity and who strengthens his brethren in the faith.

Discussion of the episcopal collegiality opens the way to a better understanding and a more gracious reception of the Eastern Churches, which are so keenly sensitive to the irreplaceable role of the bishop, the head of the particular Church.

It is not fanciful to suggest that the discussion on

collegiality was the providential preface to the meeting on the Mount of Olives of Paul VI and Athenagoras.

The Schema on the Liturgy

The best efforts of the first session of the Council were devoted to the schema on the liturgy. Approved by a virtually unanimous vote at the end of the second session, the constitution on the liturgy impresses one not only as the crowning achievement of a half-century's effort at liturgical renewal within the Church, but also as a complex of significant efforts at rapprochement with our separated brethren, both Orthodox and Protestant.

I wish only to mention in passing:

- The provisions for the use of the vernacular which make possible a more living participation by the faithful in the liturgy of the Mass;
- The provisions for a closer contact with the Word of God in the proclamation of Holy Scripture;
- The adaptation of the liturgy to the diversities among peoples by allowing for variations based on cultural differences;
- The provisions for concelebration of the Mass and for Communion under both species.

What is the mind of Pope Paul VI with regard to the orientation of the Council? It was very clearly brought to light in the address which he delivered on the occasion of his coronation:

We inherit with feeling the patrimony of Our unforgettable predecessor, John XXIII, on this point. He, under the impulse of the Holy Spirit, brought into being immense hopes, which we consider it a duty and an honor not to disappoint.

No more than he do We nourish illusions about the extent of the problem to be solved and the gravity of the obstacles to be surmounted. But — faithful to the great Apostle whose name We have taken, "Let us speak the truth in love" (Eph 4:15) — We intend to seek support only in Our weapons of truth and love, to continue the dialogue which has been begun, and, as far as possible, to further the work already undertaken.

The significance of the Pope's declaration remains to be studied. "To continue the dialogue which has been begun, and to further the work already undertaken": there, certainly, we have the principal purpose of the Catholic ecumenical movement today.

A dialogue was begun, in a very special way, by the creation of the Secretariat for Unity. Undoubtedly, there was nothing new in the idea. Pope Leo XIII, on March 19, 1895, had set up a "Pontifical Commission for Fostering the Reconciliation of Dissidents with the Church," but it had only a fleeting existence. The "Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity," which was established by John XXIII on June 5, 1960, responds better, it seems, to the hopes of the Church, which immediately perceived that, within the life and organization of the Catholic Church, the Secretariat is an official body which is in some way responsible for continuing the dialogue among all separated Christians.

This dialogue entered upon an important phase from the very start of the Second Vatican Council, to begin with, through the presence of forty non-Catholic "observers." After a week spent in getting acquainted with the machinery of the Council, the observers began to exchange views with a number of sympathetic bishops

and subsequently, with other bishops who were eager to acquire a more personal relationship with the representatives of people in their dioceses whom they knew only in very indirect fashion. This trend has not ceased to undergo impressive development. Conversations, receptions, occasional meetings are producing, by various means, a well-knit ecumenical fabric. And that, it seems to me, is in itself a permanent achievement of the Council.

But the Council Fathers themselves made it plain, by the overall tone of their addresses, that the dialogue had really gotten under way. Their insistence that the schemas give proof of a more explicitly ecumenical spirit is enough to establish that fact. And their frequent comments constituted a kind of doctrinal dialogue with participants who, although silent for the moment, later publicly expressed their thoughts and sentiments. The inevitable result of this is that the schemas will bear the mark of an ecumenical awareness and will stand, for generations to come, as the beginning of a trend which must not be reversed, as an ever-present symbol and as a summons to unceasing progress.

For this too is going to be one of the dominant notes of the pontificate of Paul VI in regard to ecumenism: "to further the work already undertaken."

We must increase our mutual acquaintance. So many misunderstandings stem simply from that fact that separated Christians hardly know one another. Similarly, the causes of division, the intentions of past leaders, the various vicissitudes of these painful separations are too often known only in a very sketchy way.

We must also make more of certain forms of practical collaboration, notably in the social and humanitarian field: the problem of hunger in the world, sickness and

disasters, birth and housing, illiteracy, redistribution of wealth, etc. In an era in which all men are conscious of the existence of extremely critical problems, it is essential that the disciples of Christ be able, as Christians, and without passing over or minimizing their differences, to get together and make common cause in every kind of mutual cooperation and assistance. We must increase our prayer, too, with a view to hastening the day of visible unity. The need for a "spiritual approach" to the problems of ecumenism could not be more clear. The Holy Spirit is at work in the movement towards unity which animates all Christ's disciples, as the Holy Office Instruction, *Ecclesia Catholica*, in 1949, made very clear. And all are familiar with the worldwide impact of the Chair of Unity Octave, the week of prayer which is especially set aside every January. We must accept the fact that unity is an ecclesial problem, which has to be squarely faced in its theological dimensions: on the level of the life of the Father and of the Son in the Holy Spirit.

"We nourish no illusions about the extent of the problems to be solved and the gravity of the obstacles to be surmounted," the Pope continued, in his coronation address.

The problem is extensive indeed. All we have to do is look at the facts and figures. There are about nine hundred million Christians, half of whom are Roman Catholics. But, Christ, the "founder of Christianity," prayed, on the eve of His death, "that they all be one: even as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee" (John 17:21). Still more, these Christians stand face to face with two billion non-Christians, and to these they present, in division, if not in discord, a religion which they loudly proclaim as the religion of charity: "By this all men will

know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another" (John 13:35). This, to be sure, is merely the external dimension, but it may also be the greatest scandal of the entire situation.

The problem is also extensive in its interior dimension: There are the multiple difficulties inherent in the Christian "Churches" themselves which obstruct their reconciliation. Some of these difficulties are dogmatic in nature. Anyone who has perused the *Reports of the World Faith and Order Conferences* at Lausanne (1927), Edinburgh (1937), Lund (1952) — not to speak of the one which was held only last year at Montreal (1963) — is forced to acknowledge the existence of a great many disagreements of dogmatic character even among the member churches of the World Council of Churches. There are nontheological difficulties, too. Today we recognize that social and cultural factors play no less decisive a role in obstructing reconciliation. Examples of these are the way in which the origin and present status of the separated "Churches" are presented in history courses; the gradual identification that can be observed between certain "Churches" and certain "nations"; the fact that the separated "Churches," in the course of centuries, make their differences more pronounced and become fixed in their estrangement; the influence of institutions and social structures, which often aggravate divergences and make them permanent; the psychological tendency to be content with the status quo, etc.

For our own part, we wish to hasten God's hour by making continual efforts towards an ever-greater "renewal" in the Spirit and in the Gospel. Our purpose in doing this is to put before all who are not Catholics a Church whose outward features, and whose doctrinal and

dynamic poise, are as perfect as possible — that is, correspond as faithfully as possible to the desires of Our Lord. The dogmatic difficulties are real ones, but it may well be that they are intensified by the theology which explains them, by the sort of argument which justifies them, by the way they are expressed in the organization and life of the Church. These, to be sure, are "accidental" considerations, but they have important consequences. There are, unquestionably, component factors in the unity of the Church which cannot be compromised; but it is not inconceivable that, in the name of this very unity, we are imposing on the "others"—under pain of remaining outside the Catholic Church — theories, forms of spirituality, behavioral norms, in short, an entire way of life and a set of requirements which are simply not essential to Catholic unity.

By accomplishing this renewal in themselves, Catholics will simply be responding to one of the purposes of the Second Vatican Council. We all remember Pope John's intentions in summoning it. What we must strive to achieve, he said, is a work of adaptation—*aggiornamento*—a spiritual awakening, a newness of life throughout the Church which will enable her to appear in all her beauty. Then, he went on, once we have accomplished this arduous task, by eliminating everything that, on the human plane, could slow down our progress, we will present the Church in the fullness of her splendor, *sine macula et sine ruga*. Thus, from one of the major goals of the Second Vatican Council, we are given an insight into its specifically "ecumenical" nature. And this extremely solemn appeal of Pope and Council is addressed to the entire Christian community. But we must recognize that it is not in books or in archives that separated

Christians hope to find this spiritual renewal, this candor, this doctrinal and dynamic poise. Nor is it even in the schemas of Vatican II. They hope to find them, before all else, in the community of the faithful, as it exists and as it thinks and prays and acts. It is through the body of Catholics as a whole and through each individual Catholic, through their spirituality, their ideas, their attitudes, that Protestants and Orthodox come into contact with Catholicism. It is the entire body of Catholics and each individual Catholic who trace out, by all that they are and all that they do, the characteristic features of the Church as seen by the separated brethren. To put it briefly, just as we judge Lutheranism on the basis of the image Lutherans present, and not merely on the basis of professions of faith, so too do Protestants judge Catholicism in the light of the image presented by the members of the Catholic community. During a period of ecumenism, every Catholic must assume an awesome responsibility, for he stands for the whole Church.

With regard to the results of ecumenism—if, indeed, a human estimate is of any value—we must not “nourish illusions,” as if final union were scheduled for tomorrow. “First an approach, then a reconciliation, and finally perfect reunion” is how Pope John expressed it. We are still at the stage of “approach,” brightened by several reconciliations. The collective ecumenical effort of the Catholic Church is of relatively recent origin; it is developing by leaps and bounds, but it is premature to attempt to estimate in human terms what the future holds in store. A separation which has endured for many centuries, particularly where religious institutions are involved, leaves deep wounds which cannot be expected to heal rapidly. Mutual understanding among the Churches is going to demand a great many adaptations. These,

beyond any question, will transform both men and organizations, but it will be at a slow and measured pace, a pace which will sometimes be uncertain. If it is extremely difficult to arouse the entire Christian people to a consciousness of being “in state of mission,” it is going to be every bit as arduous to involve the entire Church in an “ecumenical age.”

Our task is to sow the seed; others, perhaps, will reap the harvest—the Gospel adage will be found no less true today than ever. It is for each one of us, then, to ponder the task required of him and to respond according to the mission the Lord entrusts to him: the one who presides over the community must give it its orientation; the one who has the opportunity for prayer must unite his prayer to the Lord’s prayer for unity (John 17); the one who is able to study must communicate the fruits of his research; the one who suffers must offer in the cause of unity this participation in the Passion of the Savior. And the Lord, whose generosity is boundless, will see to successful completion the work whose first steps He has inspired and whose first fruits He has brought to maturity.

If, at the end of this rapid sketch of the Council and of the Pope’s thought, considered from an ecumenical standpoint, someone were to ask me to outline the basic conditions for tomorrow’s ecumenical dialogue, I would say that they could be reduced to the following principles.

Our Ecumenism Must Be Supernatural

There has been talk of the ecumenism of the smile. Such ecumenism is a beginning, but it is a good way still from Christian ecumenism. A simple, vaguely defined

desire for contact is far from sufficient, for this kind of desire can just as easily be motivated by the wish to appear broadminded, or generous, or gracious; it can also be motivated by the desire to unite against the great common enemy, atheistic communism, or by the intention of furthering a collective social effort. But an ecumenism which is satisfied with such motivations is wholly lacking in roots.

Our ecumenism must proceed from the very heart of God, who left to His disciples as a sacred testament the order to unite, to "be one that the world might believe that Jesus is the ambassador of God" (John 17:23). Our concern here is God's glory and the salvation of the world. And we must never allow human prudence to take precedence over fidelity to the fundamental realities.

A supernatural ecumenism will spring from prayer, a prayer which is mutual in intention at least, a prayer which is persevering, heartfelt, impatient with all the impatient love of God. We cannot conclude this prayer, whose unmatched model remains the "Our Father," without the words: "forgive us our trespasses as we forgive." Paul VI's plea for mutual forgiveness, voiced at the opening of the second session of the Council, has its roots in the underlying logic of our Christian faith.

We must not shy away from the admission that the work of God has been hindered by the weight of our sins. Our acknowledgment of this fact must be both personal and collective. How great is the difficulty we encounter in overcoming our own sinfulness, and yet we act as if we were hypnotized by the faults committed by others in our regard. What we all need is an ever more vivid awareness of our own faults. Chesterton once remarked that "a saint is a person who knows he is a

sinner." It is this kind of saintliness which is absolutely essential for effective action towards mutual understanding.

Even when thus assured of its supernatural authenticity, ecumenism must respect certain other criteria which are more intimately related to what I might call the methodology of mutual understanding.

We Must Not Approach Our Doctrinal Differences in the Abstract, But Must Go Back to the Historical Situation Which Brought Them About

It was not Mary that Luther was combating; it was certain abuses in Mariology. It was not the idea of the episcopacy or the idea of the papacy which were first attacked; it was their historical realization in men of flesh and blood, men of a specific time and a specific environment who were inevitably influenced by that time and environment. We must have the ability to recognize the object of protest if we are ever going to appreciate the character of the reaction which it evoked and the germ of truth which animated it. Once we have recovered our historical perspective, a great many theses which have been petrified by the process of abstraction will profit from a suppleness and feeling for nuance which can reconcile in synthesis factors which are not contradictory but complementary.

This has been put very well by a present-day theologian: "To whatever extent the Protestant protest is justified, it is the Catholic Church herself, against whom the protest is made, who must take it up . . ." (Küng, *The Council, Reform and Reunion*, New York, Sheed & Ward, 1961, p. 96).

We Must Not Confuse Unity and Uniformity

The Church of Christ is one. But its unity dwells in the depths of mystery. It does not dispense with the diversity of gifts and charisms any more than it dispenses with the diversity of languages and cultures.

It is of crucial importance for us to appreciate the fact that the Church, which is independent of all cultures, is nonetheless open to every culture. In their regard, the Church is transcendent—since she is not of this world; and yet, she is incarnate in each—like the leaven in the dough which can never be separated from it.

Respect for this unity in diversity is particularly evident in the Church's refusal to identify herself with the Latin Church. And we see it in very positive fashion in her openness to the Oriental tradition.

If the Dialogue Is To Be Fruitful, It Must Avoid the Characteristics of a Debate

A well-known controversialist remarked one day: "Every time I win an argument, I lose a soul." The debate approach, taken by itself, fosters opposition and emphasizes differences. "Every error," it has been said, "is nothing but the abuse of some truth." We must seek this germ of truth, this aspect of the real which is obscured by the opposite thesis. Only after we have found it and fully accepted it can we propose a complementary truth which will help us to discover the truth in all its integrity.

In Order to Meet One Another in a Spirit of Unity We Must Each Strive to Discover Mutually Complementary Factors Which Have Not Been Experienced With the Same Intensity

Shortly after the meeting of Paul and Athenagoras in

Jerusalem, an Orthodox theologian offered this description of the road ahead: "We can only hope that future ecumenical measures of the two Churches"—he was speaking of the Church of Rome and of Constantinople—"will be marked by a creative fidelity which will enable each Church gradually to discover the other, so to speak, within her very self as her 'other half' which, since the separation, has been insufficiently actualized and is today reacquired by the generous gift of God" (*La Croix*, February 6, 1964, interview with P. Serima). In order to make this mutual discovery, we must get our bearings in the living experience of the Church, antecedently to any theological formation.

Finally—and This Is of Capital Importance—Our Quest for the Truth and Our Communion in Love Must Be One Thing

We must always come back to St. Paul's words to the Ephesians: "*Aletheuontes in agape*," "Let us speak the truth in love" (Eph 4:15). Duty towards truth, duty towards love: both. Charity simply cannot dispense with respect for the truth.

There is nothing more dangerous in such matters than the achievement of peace by means of compromise, to the detriment of divine truth. Our charity would indeed be poor and unenlightened if we were to minimize our differences and seek to reduce God's truth to the dimensions of a newborn human wisdom.

Scripture tells us that we must walk before God "in truth and with a perfect heart" (cf. Isa 38:3). Truth first, in order to guide our love: this is the Savior's law. The truth must be loved above all things and must be served first. Man's need for truth is like a plant's need for the sun: he can only find fulfillment in a climate

where everything bears its proper name, where every "Yes" is "Yes" and every "No" means "No." A long time ago, a Chinese sage was asked what he would do if he were lord of the world. He answered: "I would restore the meaning of words." This uncompromising honesty towards the truth, however great or slight, is the necessary condition for all fruitful and lasting action. This love of the truth, faithfully sought and loved for its own sake, as a pure reflection of the face of God, can alone protect us or liberate us from all the "powerful illusions" of which St. Paul speaks (2 Thess 2:11). Christ had nothing else in mind when he gave men a message that is valid for all ages: "The truth will set you free" (John 8:32).

But if charity cannot be separated from the search for the truth, truth itself is only fully true when it is completely penetrated by love.

At the end of a lecture on ecumenism, Pastor Boegner magnificently expressed this immanence of truth in love. His words will serve as my own conclusion:

There is no Christian truth, no truth of God, no truth of the Lord Jesus Christ, where there is no love. Christian truth communicated without love is not truth. Professor Jean Bosc has some splendid words on this subject. I ask your permission to read them: "Christian truth is no longer itself when it is not indivisibly bound up with charity. And in a like manner, charity is charity only in truth." The reason for this is simply that the truth of God is the truth of the love which is his very being. God is love. And his love is the revelation and the manifestation of his truth. The abstract truth of charity, like an abstract love of truth, cannot be anything but a caricature.

"Only love matters," said the dying St. Therese of Lisieux, so many of whose words find echoes in the hearts of all Christians, whatever their confession. "Only love matters" because love bears within itself the essential truth of God.

Nothing is going to be accomplished for the cause of Church unity by the World Council of Churches or the Second Vatican if theologians stop at theological discussions and if they do not begin by begging the grace of love and of mediation which springs from a true fraternal charity. We are not concerned with sentimentalism. We are concerned with taking part in a great drama, in the wonderful adventure of God who is love and who is calling us by his love alone, a love which went to the very limit on Calvary's cross. He calls us to become one in the love with which we are loved, to become one in him who has ever loved us first, to become one in him to whom we must offer the poor response of our own love by first loving one another — we who profess, Catholics or Protestants, to be his disciples. Oh, that we might learn how to put aside all the weapons of flesh and blood, all the distrust, the suspicion, the hostility, the polemics. Let us put on the armour of soldiers of the light, as St. Paul exhorted us (Rom 13:12). Or, rather, let us ask the grace of being clothed in it by him who alone can do so. And thus let us attain, in one another's regard, to that candor which is essential if we truly desire to work together in this immense task and which will make it possible for the sacerdotal prayer to be heard. Père Charles de Foucauld once used these words with which you are probably all familiar: "Jesus is master of the impossible." Yes, we are face to face with the impossible; yes, the doctrinal barriers appear and indeed are, for the moment, insurmountable from the human point of view;

but Christ himself has told us that "what is impossible with man is possible with God" (Luke 18:27). It is possible with God when his children give themselves over completely to the action of grace and thus become the artisans of that possibility.¹

This is the second speech which Cardinal Suenens gave at the Divinity School of the University of Chicago on May 5, 1964. It is reprinted with the kind permission of Dean Brauer.

¹ From the lecture "Le Conseil Oecuménique des Eglises à l'approche du Concile du Vatican," delivered by Pastor Marc Boegner in Strasbourg, France, on November 13, 1961, at a conference in the annual series "Les Humanités Chrétiennes," and published in *L'Eglise en dialogue*, Paris: Editions du Centurion, 1962, pp. 101-102.

2. The Church and the Civilizations

In the last quarter of a century, our planet has been revolutionized far more thoroughly than throughout the entire preceding twenty centuries. On the technological level, from the atomic bomb to the interplanetary rockets of the present day, humanity has been taking giant strides forward. And there can be little doubt that this is only a beginning, just the raising of the curtain.

In a universe which makes nothing of geographical distances, where Bombay is but seven hours away from Rome, we are witnessing a totally unprecedented ferment of concepts and of ideologies. More than a million foreigners are resident in Paris, and some hundred thousand students from Africa and Asia are attending courses at Western universities. At the Second Vatican Council in Rome, we saw bishops gathered together from every continent, for sessions which were truly universal. Nothing that is human is foreign to us. By means of communication techniques — the press, the radio, TV, the movies —

we are brought into contact with the psychological and moral currents which are striving to mold a new man in the image of this society, which itself is still in the process of gestation. Cultural exchanges grow each day in intensity. Africa and Asia are eager to learn Western techniques. No longer are questions posed simply on the level of provinces, nations, or even continents. They are posed today on the intercontinental level, and we look forward to the day when they will be posed on the interplanetary level. As one statesman has remarked, any problem which is not set forth in terms of the whole world is, at the very least, a problem badly posed.

Unity and Diversity

Until very recently, the Church has lived in a cultural milieu almost exclusively Mediterranean in origin, made up of Semitic, Greek, Latin, and Celtic-Gothic elements. Indeed, even where she extended her borders far beyond *Mare Nostrum*, she brought with her the whole of her Mediterranean heritage.

Today, the situation is moving towards a radical transformation. For the first time, the world is becoming explicitly aware of its unity. It is also becoming explicitly aware of its diversity. The "other peoples" are no longer the "barbarians." It might be of some interest to point out that the first use of that epithet, "barbarian," was not by the Latins at all. It was first used by the Chinese, to designate the non-Chinese.

This situation is something new in the world. And it is something new in the Church, too. In point of fact, the universal Church has seen a transformation in the relationship of "Mother Churches" and "Daughter Churches." This transformation might be described as

the transition from a universality of mission to a universality of fullness. In the past, the Mother Churches gave what was best in themselves — Christ and His Gospel — to those who knew them not. Now, "old churches" and "young churches" alike, through the development of all their gifts, both of the ecclesiastical and of the cultural order, are uniting their wealth and their splendor. They are thus enabled to achieve the most beautiful visible expansion of the universal Church, one, catholic, "ecumenical."

We find hints of this new perspective in a passage from the 1945 Christmas message of Pope Pius XII: "There was a time when the life of the Church, in its visible aspect, was vigorously evident principally in the countries of old Europe, from which it went forth, like a majestic river, to what could then be called the periphery of the world. Today, on the contrary, that life appears as an exchange of energy and of life among all the members of the Mystical Body of Christ on earth." Here we have an excellent example of the historical process: first, action in a single direction only; subsequently, the common exchange of benefits. Pius XII continued, briefly describing this new age of "missions": "In a good many regions, on other continents, the period of a missionary form of ecclesiastical organization is long since passed. These regions are governed by a hierarchy of their own and bestow upon the entire Church goods both of the spiritual and of the material order, although they had previously done nothing but receive."

If we are to do justice to this diversity which is present at the very heart of unity, and if we are to do so without weakening its power and its logic, we are going to need minds which are gifted with an extraordinary

degree of suppleness, minds which are, above all else, capable of distinguishing with precision that which is not subject to change from that which is changeable in the Church and in all the elements that go to make her up. Indeed, we should not hesitate to affirm that much of the healthy tension in the Church today is rooted in the sensitivity of one part of her members to "the deposit to be preserved" and in the sensitivity of another part to "the talent to be developed." Just as the first group puts the stress on the perennial element, the second emphasizes the dynamic.

And both groups are in the right. Both groups have tasks to perform today within the one and only Church.

In a world which is culturally in crisis because it is still seeking its culture, how are we to succeed not simply in preserving the seed of Christianity but in rendering it fruitful? This is the momentous problem which confronts the Church today. His Holiness Paul VI expressed the same thought in his reply to the greeting of the Sacred College of Cardinals: "Our voyage, to make use once again of the well-known and beautiful image of the apostolic bark, must face the following double problem: Preservation of the precious and intangible cargo of its religious inheritance, and progress on the stormy sea of the world; to stay afloat and to sail on, such is the double and simultaneous task of the Roman Church; the double symbol of the rock and the bark splendidly expresses the dialectic of her duties and her destiny.

Transcendence

The situation is paradoxical indeed. In one sense, the Church is independent of all civilizations. In another, she is in need of a civilization if she is to express herself.

The independence of the Church springs from her

very nature. It was not for the few, nor even for a great number that Christ came. He came to bring together all the scattered children of God (John 11:52), to save the entire human race.

Now, since the Church is supernatural, she transcends every cultural system. Of herself, she is compatible with any form of civilization as such. She is, moreover, compatible even with the absence of a clearly differentiated civilization. If we were to think that a certain degree of civilization was necessary for the Church to accomplish her mission, we would be falling into Pelagianism, for we would be making grace depend upon a natural foundation.

It is undeniable that the Church can exercise a positive cultural influence. But, when she does so, it is something extra; properly speaking, it is not her mission. As a matter of fact, when an intention of that kind, even though not evil in itself, has accompanied missionary activity, the preaching of the Gospel has always suffered from it.

The Church's mission is to bring salvation and salvation is offered to all men. All that they need in order to receive it is their own good will.

Since eschatology belongs essentially to the nature of the Church, she is by that fact alone, quite at home in all forms of culture. Yet, at the same time, she is completely distinct from every form of culture and, in a certain sense, even a stranger to them. The Christian is a pilgrim whose fatherland is transcendent. And the Church herself, considered as a whole, is on a journey; she has not yet come to realize her full nature as Church in the most proper and most real sense — Church as the Spouse, without spot or wrinkle.

Here we have the mystique of transcendence which marks one aspect of the Church.

Incarnation

And yet, the Church is in need of a culture. We must not think of the Church as something beyond the world, as something disembodied, situated outside history and lacking contact with time and space.

The Church exists for men. Today's men are our contemporaries; tomorrow's men will be tomorrow's contemporaries. And it is precisely to these men that the Church must bring the message of salvation which the Master confided to her.

The Church needs a culture in order to express herself, in order to become incarnate, to make herself understood, to live a life on earth with and for men. The Church needs a cultural inheritance, a whole world of forms and ideas — even a mode of living and thinking.

This is but another way of saying that the Church is a historical and incarnate reality. In contact with men, she too is human, just as Christ was, Christ whose Body and Spouse she is. The Church is bound up with man the pilgrim, and so she will remain, until the time of the harvest, when the good grain will be separated from the bad.

What the Church is called to save is the world, this world. It is for this reason that the Church is committed to the progress and the work of the world. Here we have the roots of the mystique of incarnation, which corresponds to the other aspect of her mystery.

The problem which is created by this double aspect of the Church can remain dormant during periods of uniformity or of cultural immobility. But in periods of cultural crisis, of dynamism, of transformation, the

problem emerges and is presented in dramatic form. We are able to sense here the proportions of the tension implicit in the theandric nature of the Church; how to bring divine grace to man, to save him, while bringing that grace and salvation to a concrete man of flesh and blood, bound up in his own particular historical and cultural situation.

The celebrated *aggiornamento* of Pope John XXIII is far more than a strategic measure aimed at giving the Church a greater hold on men. It looks to the very nature of the Church, to the essence of her mission on earth. But the adaptation which is demanded is no less necessary and urgent than it is delicate and difficult. The Church cannot appear unadorned here below; and yet she finds herself today dressed in a good number of styles which not only are or seem to be out of fashion, but which may not be genuine garments at all. The Church must change them, but without touching the substance of her own being and without exposing herself to the danger of existing, for a time, disembodied.

The situation is one which calls for the most loyal and the most generous of efforts. It calls for the grace of the Holy Spirit (and an entire ecumenical council) if we are to advance, without delay yet without undue haste, in this business of bringing up to date, of discovering the new cultural forms which are destined to replace, neither too early nor too late, the old.

Redemption

It is here that we can and must be guided, before all, by an exact notion of the redemption. The mystique of transcendence and the mystique of incarnation find their synthesis in a mystique of redemption. There is no redemption without an incarnation: The Church cannot

accomplish her task unless she is intimately present among men, unless she speaks their language, unless she suffers in their suffering, unless she is truly incarnate in the world and in history.

Still the redemption is not, for all that, simply a "happy ending" to all human labors. It is not the crowning of human efforts at conquest, it is not a temporal triumph. On the contrary, the redemption is, in Paul's phrase, a new creation, a salvation which is beyond time, an unending peace, a passage through death so as to arrive with certainty, though it be through the cross, at the mystery of the resurrection.

These are, in the most general terms, the dimensions of the problem. Now let us take a look at the concrete situation more closely and in greater detail.

Confrontation of Cultures

There has never existed a specifically Christian civilization. This is more evident today than ever before. There are, however, a fair number of civilizations which could be called more or less Christian. Let us rapidly outline the list.

First, we have what is called "Western civilization." It presents two clusters of elements. The first cluster might be called Christian by reason or origin, or even simply Christian. In spite of what the pessimists say, no one can readily deny that the West is Christian. There can be no question that the West has been shaped by Christianity. Indeed, the Christian influence was so decisive that, without it, the West cannot be explained, nor could it even exist.

There is, however, another cluster of elements within Western civilization, and this cluster obliges us to be suspicious of those who are overly optimistic. One can-

not, nor could one ever, simply identify the West with Christian culture. Along with Christian values, the West is in possession of others as well, values which are both positive and authentic but which do not stem from Christianity.

Our civilization, from a phenomenological point of view, can be considered in two ways. One may either look upon it as a Christian civilization tainted by heresy — or, perhaps we should say, tempted more than ever by apostasy — or one may judge it to be a Greco-Roman civilization still far from completely Christian.

There are the great non-Christian civilizations of the African and Oriental world. We can no longer either ignore or underestimate them. It is a pity that the inveterate European habit of judging everything by European standards so often leads us, in perfectly good faith, to think of these non-European civilizations as little more than so many varieties of noncivilization — with the exception, of course, of the extremely ancient civilizations of India and China. But even in those civilizations we find today, an ambiguity.

As a general rule, we can detect within them a double element. There is, on the one hand, a traditional element, and, on the other, there is the impact of science and technology, imposed from without. The duality, or internal instability, within these cultures indicates that, practically speaking, all the civilizations of the world at present find themselves at a moment of acute crisis.

We can see that the Church today is in fact bound to a certain form of Western civilization which is not completely Christian, and which even tends, or seems to tend, towards apostasy from Christianity. We can also see that the Church is unable to break this bond completely, for, in so doing, she would lay aside a cultural heritage

which, whatever else may be said about it, has incorporated — or at least assumed — a good many authentic Christian values.

Still more, and it is this which heightens the drama of the situation, we find ourselves today faced with the paradox that Christianity, in its present historical incarnation (that is to say, Western civilization), appears before non-Western eyes in a cultural form which, in point of fact, expresses it very badly, since there are questionable values mingled with values which are authentic. As a result, Christianity reaches the non-Christian civilizations stained more and more by negative elements and by nonreligious factors.

The upshot of all this is that the non-Westerner who, although not a Christian, is religious, sees in Christianity the ally of a civilization which is inimical to religion. And the non-Westerner with an antireligious bias sees in that very Western civilization of Christian origin an aid in overcoming so-called "old superstitions," an aid in rejecting his own religion as well as the Christian religion; at the same time, he assimilates solely the science and the technology of the West.

Cultural Pluralism

The general criterion for overcoming the crisis is simple enough to state, but extremely difficult to put into practice. When we deal with the problem of the relationship of Christianity to other religions, we have to avoid the twin perils of syncretism and exclusivism; in just the same way, when dealing with the relationship of the Church and the civilizations, we must find a *via media* which is exactly proportioned to their level of maturity and to their historical development. This must

be a *via media* between a monolithic culture and its direct opposite, cultural atomism.

Human nature is clearly too rich, and men, despite their identity of nature, vary far too much in time and space to permit one to think that human civilization should be a monolithic block, allowing of no plurality of differentiated forms. We already possess, in the mere fact of diversity of language, the symptom of diverse ways of looking at the world. Just as each age has a genius proper to itself, each race has its own mental perspective. Precisely because human nature is one and the same, unity subsists in the order of nature, but not in the order of culture.

Let me go still further. The diversity of languages constitutes part of the wealth of humanity. It is an aspect of creation. Now the Word of God comes to redeem everything that He has made. Consequently, languages are a part of that which must be consecrated by Christianity. Still more, the Christian message is itself enriched by the simple fact of being expressed in new languages. This is not because anything is thereby added to the Truth, which is fully bestowed in the Word, in whom the Father has totally expressed Himself. But the single beam of the Gospel, when refracted in the prism of the various tongues, displays a variety of colors. Dom Lou used to say that the prologue of St. John's Gospel is more beautiful in Chinese than in Greek, because the word "life" in "in Him was life" is richer in resonances in Chinese. And the Abbé Monchanin thought that India might well be destined to give us a theology of the Spirit, because the Indian notion of *atman* possesses a fullness which is not attained by our *pneuma*.

If we pretend that any cultural values (even those of great dimension or depth, such as Roman law or Aristotelian metaphysics) is universally valid, we seem to be excommunicating from humanity all those who will not accept or who cannot understand that value. A Church which would be catholic, that is to say universal not by its nature alone but also in fact, cannot identify itself or even simply bind itself in too pronounced and permanent a fashion to any cultural construction.

The Sovereign Pontiffs have drawn attention to this truth again and again. They have looked upon diversity not as a temporary expedient, but as a treasure to be appreciated and as a value to be promoted. Pius XI stated this clearly in his encyclical of March 14, 1937, relative to the situation of the Church under the Nazi regime: "The Church founded by the Redeemer is one — for all peoples and nations. Beneath her vault, that like God's firmament arches over the whole earth, there is a place and a home for all peoples and tongues; there is room for the development of all the particular qualities, points of excellence, missions and callings, that God has assigned to individuals and peoples. The heart of Mother Church is wide and big enough to see in the development, according to God's purpose, of such special qualities and gifts rather the richness of truth than the danger of division." And Pius XII, when considering the case of China, expressed himself in the same fashion: "The Catholic religion, far from rejecting or refusing the particular genius, the mentality, the art or the culture of the different peoples, welcomes them eagerly; it is most willingly that she adorns herself with this coat of many colors."

From all this there arises the Church's obligation to an ever more effective "imitation of Christ," an ever

greater conformity between Bridegroom and Bride. In this light, it becomes clear that the Church must, when all is said and done, prefer to be poor rather than overly rich, prefer to be humble rather than overly sure of herself and overly proud of the historical forms from which she has been able to find support during certain periods.

But, on the other hand, there is a cultural atomism which would lead to chaos and to a total disintegration. It is unquestionably true that there is no such thing as an absolute cultural value. Still, it must be recognized that the relativism implied by this (a relativism which is wholly different from agnostic relativism) admits of comparison between the values of one civilization and those of another. This relativism implies confrontation, exchange, and mutual complementarity. It allows access to another's values and provides for a deeper integration.

It is quite simply untrue that all things are of equal worth, that there are no cultural values which are superior to others.

A Via Media

Consequently, the Church cannot look upon all civilizations either as of equal value or as equally capable of bearing her message. Just as she cannot reject a priori any authentic cultural form, so neither can she a priori accept them all. She can and she must distinguish and evaluate, without, for all that, ever excluding beforehand. This is the urgent cultural and theological task which, above all others, our era demands of us.

Our culture will then be a Christian culture, as H. Davenson has very rightly pointed out. "Its basic rule consists in putting Christian truth at the center of all our lives. It calls for an effort of meditation, of deepen-

ing which will permit each one of us to appreciate the demands it implies and the attitudes it calls for in the face of things and men. It must furnish a principle of judgment, of choice, of hierarchy. All will be ordered to this dominant preoccupation: all manifestations of life will strive to be attached by secret bonds to this truth of which they will become the symbolic expression. All will thus be brought back to unity. There is nothing in the soul, nothing in life which can henceforth appear indifferent; all must, by ways more or less direct, be justified in terms of Christian truth, must respond to one of its demands, must be a reflection of its light. All our thoughts, all our actions, all our loves must be confronted with this truth and will be called to submit to it, to be intimately penetrated by it" (*Fondements d'une culture chrétienne*, p. 125). Could one speak of a Christian culture in any other way?

In conclusion, we can say that the *via media* is an authentic cultural pluralism, equally removed from monolithic immobilism and from atomistic agnosticism. The Church reverences the work of God in the world. She reverences the activity of nature and the constructive efforts of men here below. She is well aware that all of this takes place under the sign of multiplicity and variety. The quest to preserve, within unity, the diversity of providential dispositions requires greater sacrifices and greater love than the foundation of unity on uniformity. This search for synthesis requires a greater obedience to Truth and often implies a more fullhearted effort, which is to say, very simply, a greater share in the cross. And that leads necessarily to a greater and still more all-embracing redemption.

Such is, in point of fact, the image of the true catholicity of the Church. It means that we must never iden-

tify the universal Church and the Latin Church. I am reminded here of the address which was delivered by a Uniate prelate at the Council and which constituted a moving appeal to his Latin Catholic brothers: "Venerable brothers," he said, "I would ask that you revise your notion of the catholicity of the Church. What is involved is not simply diversity in vestments and in liturgical rites, but also a profound differentiation of theological viewpoint. Our brethren in the Latin Church must avoid the constant tendency to identify, without even realizing it, the Latin Church with the universal Church. That identification is the origin of a great many needless misunderstandings, which radically prevent all dialogue with our Orthodox brethren. They will never accept, and they cannot accept, the status of being, within the Church of the Lord, a kind of 'ecclesiastical fact,' more or less exotic, to which the Latin Church, in the name of the universal Church, would recognize certain privileges, etc. Dear brethren in the episcopacy, we earnestly beg of you that this conception of the Church be changed."

Return to Tradition

But how is all this to be realized here and now? Where are we to begin? What ought to be our first choices? What ought to be the first steps? In order to answer these questions, we will do well to recall the last solemn act by which the Roman Church sought union with the Church of the East, the agreement reached at the Council of Florence in 1439. This agreement does not merely serve as a point of departure, from which we must somehow or other make a new beginning; it also contains germinally a statement of the problems which are presented today to all who seek a true Christian uni-

versalism. It can indicate a methodology and offer an initial direction on the road ahead.

To begin with, this history of the Council of Florence teaches us that our first preoccupation must be to find once again the sense of the pluralistic and complementary character of the various currents in apostolic and immediately post-apostolic tradition, particularly in regard to the most essential elements of specifically theological importance (Trinitarian doctrine, Christology, supernatural anthropology, etc.).

We must go beyond the divisions which have been produced in the course of the centuries; we must see today's problems in the light of an era in which we had not yet lost the vivid sense and actual experience of a plurality of traditional forms, no one of which could be considered to exhaust the entire deposit of revelation, and each one of which could cooperate in expressing the fullness of the gift by which the Word was communicated to humanity.

The solution of the problems of today and of the near future calls for such a return to the Church's past, and for a living contact with a tradition which is both old and venerable, both one and multiple. This return must be neither purely historical nor purely theological, but one which strives to relive a spiritual experience.

It is not enough simply to lend anew a more sympathetic attention to the theological and spiritual tradition of the Eastern Church. It is indispensable that we establish with it relations which are increasingly more intimate and firm, as well as mutual exchanges which are increasingly more open and frequent. The exchange which we re-establish with the Oriental tradition will be the condition and the measure of the attitude and the

openness of the Church to all civilizations, including those which have been formed entirely outside of Christendom.

We must not overlook the fact that the moments of our greatest inflexibility towards non-Christian civilizations have coincided with those in which we have shown the least understanding of the spiritual and theological tradition of the Christian East.

I would cite but one example here. All are more or less aware of the 1744 prohibition of adaptation of Chinese ceremonies by the famous papal bull, *Omnium Sollicitudinem*. Recent studies have cast more light on that document and have put into sharp focus the context of the decision and the gravity of its consequences for Christianity in China and in all of Asia. But there are very few indeed who are aware that, during that precise period, between 1742 and 1747, the two constitutions *Etsi Pastoralis* and *Inter Multas* were subjecting all Eastern-rite Catholics to an extremely powerful Latinizing influence, and this while affirming the principle of the superiority of the Roman rite, which was considered the sole perfect rite over all Oriental rites, which were thought of as imperfect rites.

We are going to have great difficulty in making progress — in meeting the ancient and the new civilizations of the great peoples of Asia and Africa — unless we resolve to return to the common sources of the great Patristic tradition of the West and of the East.

The Separated "Churches"

What is next required of us is a renewed effort to improve the ecclesiological status of our relations with our separated brethren. Even in its most sincere and

most convinced expressions (those, for example, which we heard during the last days of the second session of the Council, when the schema *De Oecumenismo* was being discussed), our ecumenism runs the risk of being too limited on the ecclesiological level. In the matter of our relationship with our separated brethren, we are inclined to think of them exclusively, or almost exclusively, in their character of baptized individuals. This is not enough: we must also consider our relationship to their communities, as to communities which have preserved, in however imperfect a fashion, the character of "Church." This term, when applied to them, is to be understood not merely in the generic and improper sense, but precisely in the properly Christian sense of a supernatural community which has been assembled by the Word of God, which believes in and is loyal to its belief in God — Father, Son, and Holy Spirit — and in Christ, the Son of God and the Savior, a community which is ontologically built on Baptism and the Eucharist and is hierarchically ordered.

Here we have, it seems, the particular meaning of the words of His Holiness Pope Paul VI at Grottaferata, on August 18 of last year: "Is it not precisely because of the various rites and languages we find at the very heart of the Church that we are led to take account of other Churches, stemming from the same vine, from the unique source, Christ our Lord, and yet not in perfect communion with the Church of Rome? Is not the Pope charged with the task of taking into consideration also all the Churches of the East, which possess in common with us the same Baptism, the same basic faith, a valid hierarchy, and sacraments which are productive of grace? . . . What then is the Pope to do? Before all else,

he will address a greeting to those ancient and great oriental Churches, that he might do them honor."

The third responsibility which lies before us affects all believers in Christ, even those who belong to communities which have not, in the strictest sense, retained the characteristics of Churches. We must lay explicit emphasis on the common element of faith in Christ, the unique Lord, God and Savior of all men.

This allegiance to Christ which they possess serves, for one thing, to describe all Christians by the note which is absolutely essential to them all; it serves too to describe the character of the relationship of Christians with non-Christians. It sets forth the essential distinction which must be kept in mind if we are to avoid a kind of vague and indifferent unity among Christians and all other men of good will.

A recent report of the Protestant clergyman, Lukas Vischer, to the World Council of Churches rightly stresses the necessity of a more conscious and deliberate distinction — not a separation and not an opposition — between believers in Christ and all other men of good will: "We are living in a world in which the confession made to Christ is placed in doubt. What particularly arouses contradiction in the claim that it is He alone who saves? Why He alone? And the truth — is it not scattered in thousands of particles among all religions? Is not God to be found in innumerable ways? The force of this objection is so great that confession of Christ threatens to become an object of shame for Christians themselves. Do not the separated Churches have the duty of putting far greater emphasis on their common confession, and of making a common declaration of their grounds for attachment to this name alone? Not for the purpose of

constituting a common front, but simply in order to bear witness together to the manner in which God has bestowed salvation to the world."

Dialogue with Non-Christians

A fourth responsibility is to clearly affirm that our relations with those other great cultures and civilizations which sprang up before or independently of Christianity are not to be thought of solely as based on identity of nature or common recourse to reason. These relations are, and before all else, based on the vestiges, however distant and partial, of a common revelation.

There is, on this subject, a declaration by John XXIII, which seems to be without precedent, so specific is its character. In my opinion, it contains a principle which has been quite neglected, even contradicted by many theologians, but which nonetheless appears extremely rich in theoretical and practical consequences. As with so many other things connected with Pope John XXIII, this statement was made almost casually and with a wonderful simplicity.

On February 2, 1963, on the occasion of the blessing of the candles which had been presented to him, he said, in the course of his explanation for sending these candles to the cathedrals of newly erected dioceses: "The great peoples of Central Asia and the Far East, peoples whose light of civilization preserves undeniable traces of the primitive divine revelation, will one day be called by Providence — we are assured of this as if by a mysterious voice of the Spirit — to be penetrated by the light of the Gospel, which gleamed along the shores of the Lake of Galilee and opened the book of the new history, not simply of a peoples nor of a group of nations, but of the entire world."

Note well the decisiveness of the affirmation which connects these "lights of civilization" to "undeniable traces of the primitive revelation." It becomes clear that we must concentrate our energies and our hopes on these traces and on the effort to separate them from their present context, to make them emerge and undergo development.

We must, finally, assert the relationship we have with all men of good will — those who are or who consider themselves to be outside all the great historical religions. It is of course important that we see these relations as founded on mutual respect and on freedom. But we must see, too, that they cannot be limited to those simple natural relations whose exclusive role is to provide the basis for what is called dialogue.

There is an ambiguity in regard to this much discussed dialogue which must be dispelled. We can, without any hesitation at all, accept it as a method, but we cannot make of it the absolute, the unique principle, and virtually the cause of all truth. In the thought and expectations of the Church, her relations with all men of every race and civilization cannot evolve and develop solely on the basis of the natural energies of good will and reasonableness which personal conscience can contribute. No. Even as she guarantees to this conscience the greatest liberty from all force applied from without, the Church realizes that these relations must find their development particularly under the intimate and invisible motion of the Spirit, that is to say the Holy Spirit, the Spirit poured forth by the glorified Jesus.

Here again there is occasion to recall one of John XXIII's expressions. It is to be found at a crucial point of *Pacem in Terris*. We must meditate carefully on it, if we do not wish to run the risk of distorting the mean-

ing of the encyclical as a whole by reducing it to a simple "philosophy of dialogue."

Pope John XXIII wrote: "In every human being there is a need that is congenital to his nature and never becomes extinguished, one that compels him to break through the web of error and open his mind to the knowledge of truth. And God will never fail to act on his interior being, with the result that a person, who at a given moment of his life lacks the clarity of faith or even shall have adhered to erroneous doctrines, can at a future date be enlightened and believe the truth."

These relations are, then, not ultimately based on the mere putting into play of dialogue, but on the certainty of the incessant and enlightening action of God in every soul: "My Father has never yet ceased his work, and I am working too" (John 5:17).

A civilization and culture which are Christian in inspiration can be born of this "light of faith," in all the regions of the world and in spite of all obstacles. This is certainly true of "Western" culture, as we know full well. But there can be an "African culture" in this sense too. This is the culture which John XXIII called for from Negro artists and writers during their second World Congress, April 1, 1959: "It can indeed be said that wherever there are authentic values of art and thought capable of enriching the human family, the Church is ready to foster the effort of the spirit which produces them. As you are well aware, the Church identifies herself with no culture, not even with Western culture, with which her history is so closely connected. For the proper mission of the Church is of another order: the order of the salvation of mankind. . . . We cannot follow otherwise than with great interest, Gentlemen, your efforts

to seek out the foundations of cultural community which is African in inspiration."

And there must be an "Oriental" culture too. On December 8, 1959, John XXIII, when writing to the participants in the Pax Romana conference held at Manila, recalled that "the Gospel, throughout the course of the centuries, has fortunately given life to forms of culture which have not ceased to bring forth pure religious, moral, and intellectual values whose worth we can ignore only to our own disadvantage. Today, you have been entrusted with part of the vital task of translating the Gospel message of truth and love into forms which correspond to the Oriental soul. Be assured that we consider this work as of capital importance for the future of Catholicism."

Institutional Renewal

So then, in order to make effective this general orientation of principle, and to make concrete the authentic spirit of faith which such principles presuppose, there must be a series of measures of renewal at the very interior of the Church. It is these alone which will be able to dispel the doubts and the distrust of those who are suspicious of the Church. It is these alone which will give every man and every nation the firm conviction that the Church truly believes in her message of truth and of grace, of liberty and of salvation for all men, without respect of persons and without distinction between cultures and civilizations.

The spirit and the will of the Second Vatican Council are more and more orientated towards just such measures of institutional renewal. And in this we see that, reaching over the First Vatican Council and the Council

of Trent, it is simply picking up the thread that was broken off after the Council of Florence.

We are witnessing the return of the same basic considerations which occupied us then. But they are returning with a clarity whose brightness is enhanced by the efforts of five centuries, and with a vigor made more striking still by the world-wide dimensions of the new problems of today and of tomorrow. Briefly stated, these are some of the major aspects of this form of renewal.

Along with the rediscovery of the sense of the Church's unity and universality, there must be a re-awakening of the sense and the structure of the individual Church. The local Christian community is coming increasingly into prominence. We see this in the fullness of the priesthood and authority of its head, the Bishop; we see it in the unity of its clergy, which avoids too pronounced a separation between secular and regular clergy; we see it in the growing awareness of the apostolic mission of the Church which is now animating consecrated religious, both men and women; we see it in the increasing maturity of its laity; and finally we see it in the kind of communion it enjoys with its sister Churches of the same region or country.

Another aspect is the rediscovery, without any loss of emphasis on the inviolable principle and effective exercise of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, of a fitting and habitual collaboration of the entire episcopate in the "solicitude for all the Churches."

This, after all, is what was implied by the offer made by His Holiness Paul VI when he proposed the creation of an organism less extraordinary than an ecumenical council but endowed with greater continuity. This would be a kind of apostolic senate, providing limited representation of the entire episcopate, and convoked under the

supreme authority of the Pope to produce a closer union between periphery and center in meeting the most important problems of the Church. This apostolic senate would involve no new principle, nor would it imply any limitation of the primacy. It would, rather, mark a return to what the sacred consistory was in former times, but under a new form, better adapted to the real universality of the Church in the world of today. There can be no doubt that an organism of this kind responds to the profound desires of the vast majority of Council Fathers.

Above and beyond all else, though, what is called for is a more profound awareness by all — pastors and faithful, hierarchy and laity — of the authentic Christian spirit, precisely as a spirit of poverty and not of riches, as a spirit of service and not of domination. This reverence for detachment is something to be desired not only on the individual level but also on the level of the Church's customs and all her exterior and group behavior. This return to the simplicity of the Gospels is the ideal means of winning the hearts of men and of nations. It is Jesus whom they are seeking, through us and in us. And the Church which they are seeking is a Church which is evangelical and pure, which is poor and impartial and free. It is the responsibility of all of us, each in his own way, to see to it that the world is not frustrated in its expectations, expectations which we must recognize, are the very expectations of God.

This talk was one of the 1964 John A. Ryan Forum series. It was delivered on May 3 in Chicago's McCormick Place. Reprinted with the permission of New City, where it first appeared in the May 1, 1964 issue.

3. The Council and Pastoral Renewal

When John XXIII suddenly announced the Second Vatican Council, the surprise was both immediate and general. Such a long time had passed since a Council had been held — the last one was in 1870 — that everyone needed a few moments to rediscover the sense, the status and the significance of a Council.

There are, it would seem, two quite different ways of looking at a Council: it can be considered from the outside, as an event; but it can also be considered from the inside, as a mystery of God.

From the outside, in the visible sense, the Second Vatican Council is an event unique in its dimensions. There is no need for me to describe it: the radio, the TV, and the newspapers have it well in hand. But communications techniques can provide us only with the surface appearance of things, with the material that makes the headlines.

And a Council is something very different from an

event, no matter how impressive. To reach its most intimate depths, we must go beyond the outer trappings, beyond the comings and goings of men. We must see it as a mystery of faith which is being realized under our very eyes.

The Council, an Encounter with the Holy Spirit

To get right to the heart of the matter, the eyes of faith will show us that the Council is not primarily a meeting of the bishops with the pope, it is not a horizontal encounter of bishops with their chief in a spectacular sort of crossroads of the world.

No, a Council is primarily a collective meeting of the entire apostolic college with the Holy Spirit. It is, I might say, a vertical meeting: a reception of an immense outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon us; "a new Pentecost," to use Pope John's expression. It is a mysterious and hidden grace to be received and to be lived in the silence of prayer and of total docility.

A Council is, in reality, God coming once again to visit His people. It is Christ the Redeemer who sends His Spirit to His own, that the Spirit might instruct them, in Christ's name, in all truth and tell them what they have until now been unable to hear or to fully comprehend. A Council is the Holy Spirit, who comes to flood with His light the holy Church of God so that, better illumined and radiant with the splendor of God, she will be better able to stand as the beacon which shines in darkness and in shadow.

The Council is, first and foremost, a tremendous grace of light to be accepted.

In order to maintain life, men are far more in need of light than of bread. Today's materialism is under the impression that man needs only earthly food in order

to survive. It seems to have forgotten that, if you are going to have a loaf of bread, even then you need the sun, for it is the sun which makes the grain grow; and without grain, there can be no bread.

We are all in need of light in our darkness, we are all in need of the truth of God, the truth which is Christ — *Ego sum Veritas* — in order to find our way in the labyrinth of the world.

The Council is the light of the Holy Spirit which is coming to penetrate the Church still more, and, through the Church, the world. It is a gift of God to our times, a gift which is completely free and undeserved. In its penetrating light, the Church will look closely at herself and come to a better understanding of her doctrine and her mission. The Council is like a spotlight being turned on — or, better, being increased in brightness; it is like a spiritual radar which breaks through the shadows and makes it possible to discover the path that must be taken.

The Council is not going to propose any novelties — any more than the Holy Spirit does, who passes on only what Christ had confided to Him. But the Council must enable us to understand more deeply the mind of Christ in regard to our present-day problems, be they personal, social or international. The Council will not suppress one iota of the law, but it will give us greater understanding of the road we must follow in order that the sacrifices which are asked of us may become even more abundant sources of life, and that the love of God may become more radiant within our very suffering. Then we will find that the Lord's yoke becomes ever more sweet and ever more light, just as He promised.

The Originator of the Council

The Second Vatican Council was willed by one man:

John XXIII. Let us pause a moment to give some thought to him, for the Council came forth from his heart and bears forever his mark.

Who was John XXIII?

Here again we are in the position of being able to look at reality from the outside or from the inside. From the outside, John XXIII seemed destined to be a transitional Pope, a Pope with no special contribution to make. But from the inside, we see him as a man completely docile to the Holy Spirit, that is to say, as a revolutionary. Perhaps the first one to grasp this fact was the Patriarch Athenagoras. He had known Pope John in Turkey and did not hesitate to apply to him the words which Holy Scripture uses about John the Baptist: "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. He came for testimony, to bear witness to the light, that all might believe through him" (John 1:7).

John XXIII strikes us as the kind of man who was completely free of himself, the kind of man whose sole ambition was to follow, step by step, the path that is pointed out by the Holy Spirit.

He was a man completely free of himself: that was why he could talk about himself with such great detachment and humor. Do you remember how he introduced himself to his flock in Venice?

I wish to speak to you with the utmost frankness. You have waited impatiently for me; people have told you about me and written you accounts that far surpass my merits. I introduce myself as I really am. Like every other person who lives here on earth, I come from a definite family and place. Thank God, I enjoy bodily health and a little good sense which allow

me to see matters quickly and clearly. Ever ready to love people, I stand by the law of the Gospel, a respecter of my own rights and of those of others, a fact that prevents me from doing harm to anybody and which encourages me to do good to all.

I come of humble stock. I was raised in the kind of poverty which is confining but beneficial, which demands little, but which guarantees the development of the noblest and greatest virtues and which prepares one for the steep ascent of the mountain of life. Providence drew me out of my native village and made me traverse the roads of the world in the East and in the West. The same Providence made me embrace men who were different both by religion and by ideology. God made me face acute and threatening social problems, and in the presence of which I kept a calm and balanced judgment and imagination in order to evaluate matters accurately, ever preoccupied, out of my respect for Catholic doctrinal and moral principles, not with what separates people and provokes conflicts, but rather with what unites men.

The same authentic accents are heard again a few weeks before his death on the occasion of the bestowal of the Balzan Peace Prize:

The humble Pope who speaks to you is fully conscious of being personally a very small thing in the sight of God. He can only humble himself. . . .

In all simplicity, We speak to you just as We think: no circumstance, no event, no matter what honour it may bestow on Our poor person, can puff Us up or do harm to the tranquility of Our soul.

No one was surprised to read in his personal diary reflections such as the following:

This year's celebrations for my priestly jubilee have come to an end. I have allowed them to be held here at Sofia and at Sotto il Monte. What an embarrassment for me! Countless priests already dead or still living after 25 years of priesthood have accomplished wonders in the apostolate and in the sanctification of souls. And I, what have I done? My Jesus, mercy! But, while I humble myself for the little or nothing that I have achieved up to now, I raise my eyes toward the future. There still remains light in front of me; there still remains the hope of doing some good. Therefore, I take up again my staff, which from now on will be the staff of old age, and I go forward to meet whatever the Lord wishes for me (Sofia, October 30, 1929).

My recollections are delighted with all the graces received from the Lord, but at the same time I feel humiliated for having been so niggardly in the use of my talents, for having rendered a return without any proportion to the gifts I have received. I find here a mystery which makes me shudder and at the same time stirs me to action (August 10, 1961).

The Vicar of Christ? Ah! I am not worthy of this title, I, the poor son of Baptist and Mary Ann Roncalli, two good Christians, to be sure, but so modest and so humble (August 15, 1961).

This was a man who had only one program: docility to the Holy Spirit.

It was this docility which made him hold without wavering to the idea of a Council which had come to him, he told us, like an inspiration. He obeyed its invitation with the same simplicity he brought to everything he did. *Obedientia et Pax* was his motto.

At the opening of the Council, he calmly announced

his complete disagreement "with these prophets of gloom who are always forecasting disaster." "We have no reason for fear," he said too; "fear can only stem from a lack of faith."

He obeyed God's call, in complete peace of mind, without any very clear knowledge of how it was all going to be accomplished. "When it comes to a Council," he said smilingly one day, "we are all novices. The Holy Spirit will be there when the bishops convene. Then we shall see."

This was why he suggested, on the eve of the assembly, that we reread one of the passages in the Acts of the Apostles. The passage he recommended concerned the Cenacle at Jerusalem where the Apostles awaited the accomplishment of the Master's promise, persevering in prayer with one accord, together with Mary, the Mother of Jesus (Acts 1:14).

And this too was the reason John XXIII saw, in God's own light, the role which Providence had set aside as his personal contribution to the Council. "My own part," he said, "will be to suffer."

And this, finally, was the reason why John XXIII insisted that each working session of the Council begin with the ancient prayer to the Holy Spirit which had been used at earlier Councils:

We are here, O Lord, Holy Spirit. We are here, weighed down by the burden of sin, it is true, but gathered together specially in Your Name. Come to us and remain with us. Deign to purify our hearts. Teach us what we are to do, where we are to go, and show us what we must accomplish so that, with Your help, we may be able to please You in all things. May You be the sole initiator and guide of our decisions,

You who alone with God the Father and the Son possess the Glorious Name. Let us not disturb order, You who love absolute justice. Let not our ignorance betray us into evil, nor let favoritism influence us, nor respect for high office of persons corrupt us. But join us to Yourself effectively with the gift of Your grace alone. Let us be one together with You that we may never depart from the truth. As we are gathered together in Your Name, so in all things may we uphold justice under the saving grace of goodness, so that here we may never think differently from You and in the world to come we may obtain an eternal reward for what we have done well. Amen. (Translation in Yzerman's, *A New Pentecost*, Newman, 1963, p. xi.)

It is impossible to place too much emphasis on the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Council, the assembly of the Church.

You may recall the reference in the Acts of the Apostles to a decree of a council. It begins with a phrase which shows a rare and bold faith: "The Holy Spirit and we have decided. . ." (Acts 15:28).

In this presence, which bears within itself the Church's ultimate explanation — in the Holy Spirit — we find the reason why the decisions of the Council must be marked by concord, by the greatest possible moral unanimity. It is not a preponderance of numbers, in the triumph of some majority over some minority, that the Holy Spirit reveals Himself, but in the unanimity of all.

Thus, when the time comes for a final vote on a conciliar decree, the bishops use these words: *consensi et subscripsi*, that is to say, "I too have given my consent, I enter into unanimity."

The attitude in which John XXIII wished the Coun-

cil to proceed and in which the bishops gathered in Rome was the attitude of total docility to the Holy Spirit.

The Plan of the Council

But is this to say that John XXIII opened the Council without any pre-established plan? By no means. Too little attention has been given to an address which he gave about a month before the Council opened. In this address, he put the whole program "in a nutshell" when he suggested that the Council be an examination of conscience on the subject of fidelity to the Master's command: "Go preach the Gospel to every creature; and behold I am with you unto the consummation of the world" (Matthew 28:18-20). The central theme of this address was the Church: the Church's interior, and the Church's exterior, as a light for the nations.

This passage was a summary of his own thought. But he insisted on permitting the Council complete freedom. He left to the Holy Spirit the task of guiding it along the ways which were pleasing to Himself. As things turned out, the Church was the very theme which, after a few weeks, proved to be central.

By the end of the first session, it had become perfectly clear to all that the Second Vatican Council would go down in history as the Council of the Church, and that all the schemas which had until then been simply side-by-side would be regrouped around this one dominant theme.

It became evident that the Council would first answer the fundamental question: Church of God, what say you of yourself, what is your nature and what the secret of your mystery? And only afterwards, in virtue of the adage, *operatio sequitur esse*, would there be occasion to

examine the various activities of that Church from the pastoral point of view.

Its Pastoral Character

The Second Vatican Council was also to be marked by something which would distinguish it from all previous Councils. In his opening address to the Council, John XXIII laid great emphasis on the pastoral nature of this Council.

This was the first time in history that a Council had been convoked wholly free of any pressure of heresy or of conflict. This Council met under the sign of *aggiornamento*, that is, pastoral renewal, and adaptation to the needs of the times.

If someone were to ask me what, in my opinion, were the principal pastoral needs within the Church, I would answer that, first of all, every member of the Church must acquire a more lively awareness of what it means for the entire Church to exist as a missionary body.

At the Council, the Church came face-to-face with the Master's command: "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth. Go preach the Gospel to every creature, and behold I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world" (Matthew 28:18-20).

Let us ponder these words carefully, and examine our consciences in the light of them.

"All Power Is Given to Me"

Never had such an astounding command been heard in the world. Jesus knew that, humanly speaking, the Eleven would be overwhelmed by their mission. To comfort them, He began by reminding them that all power was His "in heaven and on earth" and concluded with an undreamed-of promise that He Himself would fulfill

that mission in them. Before we face the obstacles ahead of us and set out on our mission, it is well for us to measure the power of Him who sends us. Jesus has willed it so for all time. These obstacles will be numerous and weighty, as weighty as the stone sealed on Joseph of Arimathea's tomb, and before which the holy women said to one another: "Who will roll back the stone from the door of the sepulchre?" But what matters since the risen Christ is with us, and since, by virtue of His resurrection, a tombstone may still today point the way to Life!

"Go Ye into the Whole World. . ."

The Master's command to go and preach the Gospel to every creature is not limited by time or space: it is addressed to all generations and all countries, as far as the ends of the earth. While He spoke, His eyes looked out beyond the plains of Galilee, upon all men, forgetting none. He saw too all the impossibilities that would rise up to oppose His command: seas, deserts, forests, solitary spaces, glaciers to be crossed, torments to be endured, and all the secret rebellion of the human heart and its pride. He spoke those words as one speaks a sacramental formula, knowing them to be heavy with meaning for the future and for eternity.

"Go," said Jesus, "preach the Gospel." He did not say that men would accept it. He simply said that it was to be brought to them and offered for their acceptance. In the words of Riviere, they must be "tempted to believe." Their acceptance or rejection of the message depends on the mystery of free will: all we know is that grace is not refused to anyone, but that it waits for us and follows us. Jesus asked His disciples to go forth and speak to men, to speak to them the words of life, that

He had taught them. That was all. But it was a task for giants.

"And behold I am with you all days"

The Master is with us at every moment in history, in each generation as it passes. He wills to save our contemporaries through us and without delay. He wills it with all His impatient love.

Much has been said of God's patience, of His deliberate action. Let us understand this aright. God is love, and love is always impatient to communicate itself. God is in haste to give Himself to man. He cannot be resigned to be unknown, unloved. He is in haste to save each generation as it comes into the world. The slow working of His grace is not willed by Him: it comes in spite of Him from the obstacles set by us to His action. To grasp that divine urgency, we must remember that, in God's initial creative thought, the act of procreation was intended, through the immediate intervention of God, to beget saints, that is, children filled with the life of God from their first breath. Original sin ruined that first plan, but it did not modify the love of God. He wills to give Himself to men today as He did yesterday. St. Paul's cry, "The charity of Christ presses us," echoes that divine urgency. God is patient because we drive Him to it. That patience is not a relaxing but an adaptation of His love. He is, if we may so express it, impatiently patient, and He asks us to translate His impatience into action by our apostolic eagerness.

Fidelity to the basic apostolic demand which we have just recalled means that we must grasp its implications on every level. Here let us point out a few major aspects of our responsibility on the triple level of: the laity; souls consecrated to God; the priesthood.

Pastoral Renewal and the Laity

If the Council is to achieve what is expected of it in the area of renewal, it must not be allowed to remain merely the work of the bishops. It must, in a very real sense, be carried on and supported by the body of the faithful. The Lord's command to carry the Gospel to all men was not entrusted uniquely to the Twelve. Through the Twelve, it was given to all the disciples who would come after them. We are in need of a great awakening with respect to the apostolic duty of all Christians, a duty which flows quite simply from the fact of their baptism.

While we were in Rome for the first session of the Council, a TV reporter sought out five cardinals or archbishops — one for each continent — and asked them this question: What do you think is the fundamental problem for the Church?

I do not know what answer the others gave him, but here is mine: To my mind, the underlying problem is this: we must bring our Christian people to pass from a state of passivity to a state of action.

The problem is of capital importance. One needs do no more than compare two figures to realize the fact: the number of Christians, the number of non-Christians. A half-billion compared with two-and-a-half billion. How will we succeed in having each Christian bring the message of life to four others?

Note that the Master did not say: Go, convert everyone. What he said was: Go preach the Gospel to everyone.

Now, in point of fact, our Christian people have not yet come to see that their Christian baptism is a call to the apostolate.

Few topics are discussed so frequently in the press

as the apostolate of the laity. In spite of this it must be admitted that the number of Catholics who take part in an organized apostolate is pitifully small.

Appeals of popes, bishops and priests seem to have fallen on deaf ears. All kinds of excuses are alleged. But the basic fact cannot be ignored that where faith, hope and charity are strong enough they will burst forth into apostolic endeavor.

Every Catholic has a duty to be an apostle. All who love God must try to make others love Him too. All who love their neighbor must try to share their greatest treasure, the Faith. That is elementary charity.

Today an image is abroad of the practicing Catholic. He is one who goes to Mass on Sunday, receives the sacraments at intervals and is not known to break God's Ten or the Church's Six Commandments publicly or scandalously. Examine that picture and where do you find the duty of apostleship? Where, indeed, do you find any reference to "the Second Commandment, which is like to the First?"

As members of the Church which is the Body of Christ we must reflect the zeal and the desires of our Head. We must live up to St. Paul's exhortation: "Let that mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus." Why was there a Christ? Why did He live? Why did He die? Why did He leave us the example of His life? Why did He give us His sublime revelation?

The answer to all these questions is the same. He wanted us to save our souls. That was the mind of Christ. That is the mind which should be in each member of the Church. All should be aflame with the desire to save their own souls and to help to save others.

The positive call of Christ resounds through the ages: "Go out into the whole world and preach the Gos-

pel to every creature. Other sheep I have that are not of this fold, them also I must bring. And they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd."

Our Lord makes no exception. He does not tell us to go only to those who we think will make good Catholics or to those whom we like or to those who will respond to our approach. His command is to go to everybody and that includes those who would rather we did not approach them.

How often do we say the Our Father? Our Lord dictated that prayer, knowing that it would be known for all time as His own prayer. Into it He must have concentrated the thoughts and desires which were uppermost in His mind.

How easily He could have said: "Thus shall ye pray, say, Our Father, who art in Heaven teach us to love Thee; We adore Thee, we glorify Thee, we praise Thee, we thank Thee, etc."

What He did say was apostolic: "Hallowed be Thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." We would do well to heed the prayer of St. Thomas More: "Lord grant that I may work for the things for which I pray."

We have learned that Confirmation makes us soldiers of Christ. But most people seem to regard it as a kind of spiritual injection which is to be forgotten as soon as it has been received.

Pastoral Renewal

The nuns. There is, between faithful and clergy, an intermediate group, that of the souls consecrated to God outside the priesthood; nonclerical men religious and religious women.

Leaving to one side the souls who are consecrated to

God in the contemplative life, I shall limit my observations to those women who devote their lives to God in the work of the apostolate in the world.

There is, here, a new and major development which must occupy our attention. This is the realization that these consecrated souls must, in the future, play a role which is both important and unprecedented: that of communicating life to the laity in the work of converting the world to Our Lord Jesus Christ. The role might be compared to that of the noncommissioned officers in an army.

The role must be recognized as a new one, for the Constitutions of the religious institutes affected date from a period prior to the appearance of Catholic Action as an organized apostolate. It is a role which is of the first importance.

It is not to direct the laity but to communicate life to it, to spur it on, to help it come to a full appreciation of its importance and its mission. In order to fulfill this function adequately, they must understand what I call the "duty of multiplying."

This is how I expressed these ideas in *The Nun in the World*:

If we really want to produce an answer commensurate with the needs of souls, then it is of the greatest importance that the clergy co-ordinate their apostolate with that of nuns and lay people, and that all be constantly thinking of ways to multiply the number of their collaborators.

For a nun to teach the catechism to twenty children is a very good thing, but it is more important that she should train other adults to teach catechism in their turn. She should be preoccupied, not so much with doing things, as with seeing to it that things are done. She should exercise a role of supervision and control with

the purpose of increasing the extent of apostolic activity. I have no right to spend my time producing a 10 per cent return if I can make it earn 100 per cent. We only have to imagine for a moment what the power and range of the Church's activities would be if every nun in the world were aware of the necessity for her to inspire a group of lay people; if each could imitate our Saviour in sending disciples out in pairs to the missions. I am thinking, for example, of how the effectiveness of a nun is literally multiplied tenfold if she knows how to inspire a group, say, a Praesidium of the Legion of Mary. I use this as an example, since the Legion exists in all five continents, because it is very easily handled, and because its supernatural harvest is exceptional and manifestly blessed by God. But whether it is the Legion of Mary or any other Catholic Action movement, the principle remains and should be accepted by all nuns.

In writing the *Life of Edel Quinn*, that heroic young woman who at the cost of her own health went and founded the Legion of Mary in British Central Africa, I often thought of the paradox presented by the example of a young laywoman arousing some thousands of apostles in her passing. What a harvest there might have been if each missionary nun had known before embarking for the missions just how to promote and organize the lay apostolate.

To clarify this idea of multiplication of one's personal contribution, I would like to tell the story of a conversation between two Mothers General about helping the clergy. One related how the parish priest of her parish had asked her one Christmas Eve if the nuns could help by singing the Nativity Mass in the parish church. She agreed, but the next day she asked the priest not to make the request another year on account

of the inconvenience caused to the community. "That's what you would have done, isn't it?" she asked. The other one, however, who had grasped this principle of "seeing to it that things are done," answered her, "I should have accepted, as you did. And then, as you did, I should have asked the parish priest not to repeat his request next year. But then I should have added, 'But, Father, if you would like us to go round the parish and find you some volunteers to start to train a choir, we shall willingly do so.'"

The answer lies there. And the example is applicable to a thousand different situations. It is a matter of getting the right viewpoint — a viewpoint that is much rarer than one imagines. People think only of what they can do themselves, only rarely of what they can achieve with others. Yet the salvation of the world depends on seeing things like this. If we are not to be completely overwhelmed by the magnitude of the masses needing Christianization or re-Christianization, we must be able to apply this basic principle in practice.

The diaconate. It is precisely at this level that I would place the key question of the restoration of the diaconate as a permanent institution in the Church.

The discussion about the advisability of restoring a permanent diaconate in the Church has not ceased to attract partisans *pro* and *con*. On this score, I would like to suggest a few arguments which seem to me very much in favor of this institution. But I would first point out the extremely significant fact that the question is closely connected with the very object of the Constitution on the Church. The opponents of this restoration do not seem to have taken any notice of the connection.

1. As a point of departure for our reflections on the subject, we depend in no wise on some sort of natural realism, but on what I would call a "supernatural realism." By this I mean a realism which is based on a living faith in the sacramental nature of the diaconate.

I am purposely leaving to one side questions which are still disputed today, such as what interpretation is to be given to the pericope on the election of Stephen and the six other deacons (Acts 6:3-6).

My intention is to base myself only on what is clearly established in the New Testament, in the Apostolic Fathers (especially Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch), in the subsequent and constant tradition of the Church, and in the liturgical books, those of the East as well as those of the West.

Two facts seem to me to be established beyond question: first, from the time of the Apostolic and post-Apostolic Church, a certain portion of ministerial charisms was entrusted, in a fashion both specific and stable, to an "order" distinct from the priestly order.

Second, this "order" or degree seems to have been established especially with a view to the direct service of the bishop. To be very precise, to assist him in his concern for the welfare of the poor, in the government of the community, in the education of the local Church along what I would call community lines (here I am thinking particularly of fraternal charity) and in a liturgical context (I have in mind here the breaking of bread: Acts 2:42; 4:32-35; Hebrews 13; 16); the purpose of all this activity was the building up of a true religious community.

To put it briefly: the function of this order consisted in preparing a community to become a Church. I might,

then, say that anyone who fails to recognize the properly sacred and specifically liturgical character of this office betrays a mistaken understanding of the Church as she is — that is to say, built on the sacraments and, in a special way, on the charisms conferred by the sacrament of Holy Orders.

I am well aware that an attempt will be made to argue against the restoration of the diaconate in this way: "But the functions which you propose to entrust to deacons can be fulfilled by laymen."

Now the precise point is that this is no objection at all. No one seriously proposes taking a certain number of functions — for example, the leading of public prayer, the giving of catechetical instructions, devoting oneself to social works — and then bestowing them, as it were from above, in haphazard fashion and on any and all members of the faithful. What is proposed is to entrust such tasks solely to those who give objective and sufficient evidence that they have received the interior graces indispensable to the exercise of these functions. The reason for this, quite simply, is to insure that such exercise will possess the supernatural efficacy without which a true community cannot be created. For unless it possesses this, I repeat, the Church cannot be a true supernatural society, cannot be the true Mystical Body of Christ, erected and built up on the ministries and graces which the Lord foreordained and bestowed upon His Church for this end.

In this area, there is no reason to content ourselves simply with the gifts and graces granted to laymen — and fervent laymen, too — in the measure that they have been baptized and confirmed and are motivated by an authentic supernatural spirit. If it be true that other gifts have been prepared by the Lord and intended by

Him to fulfill the needs of the community more effectively and more directly, then it is surely not for us to refuse to make use of them. The Christian community has a strict right to profit fully from such gifts, precisely because they are part of the Church's patrimony.

2. Such are the theological foundations for our reflections. What we would like to do now, basing ourselves on them, is to look at the facts and see how things stand on this matter in different parts of the world.

Opinions, of course, vary. There is, however, one thing I would like to point out in this connection — it is extremely important: the objections which have been raised to the restoration of the diaconate can be relevant for certain regions or in the light of particular and well-determined circumstances. No one will deny this. But it does not follow that such considerations should be permitted to hamper discussion once we have passed from them to a level which concerns the Church as a whole.

Here again, it is not the role of the Council to legislate in universal fashion, nor to hand down an opinion on the necessity or nonnecessity of the diaconate for the entire Church. There is only one question which the Council must answer: whether or not to open the door, at least to the possibility of the restoration of an office such as this. And, once again, not throughout the Church, but only in those areas where the rightful shepherds, with the consent of competent authority, consider such a restoration necessary for the growth and well-being of the Church. In certain areas, the alternative could very easily be the Church's decline.

All of us must accept the fact that these are the issues at stake. Will we, by a purely negative decision, rule

out the possibility of seeing the rebirth of this sacred order, foreordained by God as a means of salvation, preserved within the Church for three centuries, and possibly more indispensable today than ever for the growth of the Church?

Let us never forget that, in the divine economy, the bishop has not merely received the fullness and the supreme power of the priesthood. He has received, to no less a degree, the mission of establishing whatever supernatural communities he might deem necessary for the salvation of the flock entrusted to him. It follows from this that the bishop is empowered to entrust to other ministers an adequate and appropriate participation in his own powers. The purpose of a participation such as this is to establish, at the very heart of his people, the structures that will respond to the needs of the time and of the place.

Now that this has been said, I can come to some practical applications. I personally would have no hesitation in concluding that the diaconate was necessary in the following two cases: one, where a small community found itself more and more abandoned to a diaspora-type existence, that is to say, separated for all intents and purposes from any center of Christian life, either because of the difference of religious confession in the country where it is located, or from geographical considerations, or by reason of the political situation.

Second, where, for the benefit of considerable numbers of people — I have in mind particularly the masses concentrated in our cities and suburbs — it is urgently necessary to restore the sense of a Church which is, and which ought to remain for them, a family community.

These seem to me to be the kind of circumstances which would provide the Church with the occasion to

manifest herself as missionary in the truest sense. And is it not in this way that she will be prepared to acknowledge various solutions as they are apt for different areas, taking care, of course, to insure that all remain within the framework of her divine constitution? In such a situation, I would not hesitate to say that the good of the people was the highest law.

3. Be that as it may, I must admit that what I have just said does not answer the principal objection raised to the married diaconate. This objection is, I fear, the following: By entrusting the functions of the diaconate to married men, would we not bring into question the law pertaining to consecrated celibacy and thereby open the way to a decrease in the number of priestly vocations?

In replying to this objection, I would choose to pose the question in the light of faith. If the diaconate is a gift, if it is a grace, and if the rightfully constituted pastors consider it useful and expedient to draw upon such a legacy of grace, then the restoration of the diaconate can in no sense whatever lead to the diminution but only to the increase of the measure of the fullness of Christ within the Christian community.

I am fully aware that we must preserve the inestimable treasure of priestly celibacy, and the value of the witness it gives. This is certain, for what is involved is an ancient and venerable practice in the Latin Church.

But is it so clear that a mitigation of the discipline of celibacy, a mitigation which is well-defined and strictly limited, really runs counter to this practice? Rather than the negative consequences which some seem to fear so greatly, should we not focus our attention on the benefits which are to be hoped for, and which are far from

insignificant? Here a few which come immediately to mind:

First, priestly vocations themselves would become more sincere and more authentic, to say nothing of the fact that they could be more readily discerned and tested.

Second, I see no reason for thinking that the number of vocations to the priesthood would suffer as a result of such an institution. Indeed, is not such an affirmation gratuitous and *a priori*? I find it far more likely that priestly vocations would increase with much greater ease in communities which were bound together more solidly, prepared more thoroughly by deacons, communities which drew life and strength from the charisms proper to the order of deacons.

Third, finally, the state of perfect chastity, chosen for the sake of the kingdom of heaven, would shine with greater splendor because it would offer to the world a witness which was both more stable and more manifest.

Pastoral Renewal and the Priesthood

For the present: One of the duties incumbent upon us is the establishment of an effective pastoral organization. The era of improvisation and of isolationism is now at an end.

It is indispensable that we should think out afresh our methods of action and use our intelligence in organizing the allotment of the work. That is not naturalism: the grace of God is the first and vital element in our work, and without the riches of Christ's redemption the Christian apostolate would be unthinkable. But supernatural treasures, like the wealth of nature, must be made use of, if they are to attain their end. The waters of Niagara could give neither light nor heat to a single home, if they were not stored in powerful hydraulic

reservoirs and if their power were not driven from point to point in all directions. Once electric power has been produced and put at man's disposal, nothing is needed for its use but adequate organization; the lighting of all New York City is no more than a question of proper wiring and connecting. The same is true of divine grace. In order that it may reach all, one thing is sufficient — but it is indispensable — each and every sector must be receiving the current that is transmitted from the generators.

The man to whom light is offered is still free to refuse it, but it has been brought within his reach; that is the work which is proper to the engineer.

The Church must organize some sort of appropriate contact with every single soul in the diocese or in the parish. Such a division of work, which we need not here discuss in detail, implies organizing; if the work is organized, there will be definite tasks, care will be taken that the output is satisfactory, a certain control will be exercised. A formless intermittent good intention is not sufficient; steam is nothing but vapor as long as we merely set water boiling. It acquires propulsive force only in a properly constructed apparatus. In the interests of efficiency we avoid doing work by hand when 100 per cent output can be secured by pulling a lever; no one has any right to give a 5 per cent yield by his individual effort, when 100 per cent is attainable with organized team work.

Think of all the systematic organization provided for in religious congregations, and compare that serious effort with the indefiniteness and laxity frequently seen in the direction of the laity. One would not suggest, of course, shaping these two forms of activity in the same mold — but there is too great a difference between the

methods applied. What is needed for the laity is a framework of activities, flexible, diversified, and leaving wide play to personal initiative. This implies neither regimentation nor uniformity: there is room in the Church Militant for the most varied activities, and all cannot be asked to devote the same amount of time to the apostolate or to do equally specialized work. But no one has the right to shirk the "war effort," or some small share of co-ordinated activity.

An invitation to think our methods of activity afresh is but an application of the Master's precept, which orders us to love our neighbor, not only with all our heart, but also with all our mind. *Ex toto corde et tota mente tua*. The rich man, in a burst of generosity, may give his money to the poor, but he may also set up a factory and provide work for them. If this is the motive of his action, we may truly say that he loves his neighbor, not alone with his heart, but also with his mind. It is evident that such a long-term act of charity is immensely more valuable than the immediate and much easier gesture. That is the form of brotherly love most lacking in the apostolate. How can one withhold admiration from the incessant and methodical exercise of thought and the perpetual reorganizing required for the successful working of a factory, a coal mine or a shipbuilding yard! What an amount of energy is expended in the world to insure the success of a film, of a television program, of a new play! But how this contrasts with the methods employed in the apostolate, too often merely empirical, casual, desultory and inconsequent. On the one hand, what activity, what an expenditure of energy, what keen attention to the end in view; on the other, what halfheartedness, what haphazard and improvised methods! Do we think that the

Holy Spirit, who breathes life into the Church, has dispensed us from employing all our talents, and undertaken to fill in for men's laziness? Why is it that the children of this world too often outdo the children of light in foresight, in courage, in consistency, in constancy, in practical and efficient wisdom? We have no right to be guided by caprice in the service of God, or to employ outworn methods which have no contact with reality. We must bravely think out our own methods of work afresh in the light of our objective, which is nothing less than the salvation of the world; we must reject the methods which are clearly seen to have failed or to be flagrantly out of proportion with the ends worked for. It is for priests and laymen together to work for this renewal of methods, in order to meet the needs of the hour.

For the future: We believe that one of the most important of the schemas which will be discussed is that devoted to the future formation of the clergy.

The Council of Trent created one type of seminary. St. Charles Borromeo created four. What St. Charles had in mind was a balance between theory and practice, whereas the Council of Trent had provided merely one element in the practical training for the pastoral ministry.

It would be entirely worthy of the Second Vatican Council to work out in its turn a comprehensive ideal for the seminary of tomorrow. This ideal would give equal emphasis to intellectual, spiritual, and apostolic formation.

The seminary we need is a seminary which is "pastoral from top to bottom."

The Council has given rise to great expectations. We owe it the support of our prayers and of our sacrifices.

All of us must turn together to God and say to Him, like St. Paul on the road to Damascus: "Lord, what wilt thou have me do?" (Acts 8:6).

There we have the whole of it. We are in possession of treasures, but we bear them in fragile vessels. We need humility to recognize the fact. It is in humility that we must accomplish a task which is utterly beyond us.

Help us to open our souls, as Mary opened hers, to the approach of the Holy Spirit who hovers over the Council as it meets. It is thus that we will be able to repeat with a confidence that knows no bounds: "*Emitte Spiritum tuum et creabuntur, et renovabis faciem terrae.*"

The following speech is the text of the address which Cardinal Suenens gave on May 13 after he had made an official presentation of the encyclical Pacem in Terris to U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations.

This copy of the encyclical was the only signed copy outside the Vatican. Both presentation and address took place at the annual meeting of the United States Committee for the United Nations at New York.

4. *The Message of Pacem in Terris*

The papal document of which I shall speak is unprecedented in history.

It is addressed not only to the five hundred million members of the Church whose beloved shepherd is the successor of St. Peter, but it is framed as an "open letter to the whole world," as a dialogue with all men of good will.

It has been greeted with unanimous acclaim by the press of the whole world, and has aroused responsive echoes among all the nations of the earth.

It speaks in a language that is simple, direct and man-to-man.

It was born of a great trust in God and at the same time of a trust in man, in that which is best in him.

One writer has compared it with Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, and has called it "the symphony of peace."

Peace on Earth has a fundamental theme, four

movements, and a finale. The theme which recurs, like a leitmotif, nine times, and which is especially developed in the third part of the encyclical, is in these words:

Peace among all peoples requires:

Truth as its foundation
Justice as its rule
Love as its driving force
Liberty as its atmosphere

This theme underlies each of the four sections that correspond to the four movements of the symphony and that fix the major laws which govern it:

Peace in the harmony of individuals with each other.

Peace in the harmony between individuals and their political communities.

Peace in the harmony between political communities.

Peace in the harmony between individuals and political groups on the one hand and the whole community of men on the other.

I should like to focus with you on certain central ideas which are like peaks in a range of mountains that form the summit-line which dominates the surroundings and keeps them in proportion.

This focusing on the essentials is made easier by the fact that the Pope has gone straight to the heart of the matter without detours or circumlocutions but simply with an outburst of his heart.

The Holy Father once said to me, "There are people who like to make simple things complicated. I like to make complicated things simple."

The encyclical *Peace on Earth* is a striking illustration of those words.

It is simple, but it has a simplicity which is the exact

opposite of facile simplification. It does not ignore the complexities of the problems that have to be met or the antagonisms that have to be reconciled. It does not ignore the burden of history. But over and above those things that divide us, it focuses on those that unite us.

A statesman once said:

"I think that there exists among men — more often than we think — a common denominator. It is like a blackboard. You write a whole lot of big complicated fractions that seem irreconcilable and you know that by various arithmetical operations, by various successive eliminations, you can finally reach their common denominator, which is a very simple little figure that you never could have foreseen from the thickets."

That is what the encyclical is. It is the discovery of the common denominator among men of good will.

Once that is understood, it remains only for us to make — not an analysis, for it is more than we intend, but only a rapid examination.

It seems to me that in the encyclical we can discern a fourfold appeal:

An appeal for respect for the individual.

An appeal for collaboration among nations.

An appeal for the creation of a supranational power.

An appeal for collaboration among men despite their ideological differences.

Let us examine each of these, one by one.

Appeal for Respect for the Individual

At the start of this mountain range there stands, like a Mont Blanc dominating the terrain, the basic affirmation of the inviolable and inalienable rights of each individual human being.

Any dialogue among men is impossible unless both

sides accept a hierarchy of values or at least a first principle which governs everything. That principle, the encyclical tells us, is the recognition of the dignity and rights of the individual.

At the start, the Pope connects the dialogue with delegates of the United Nations who here promulgated, on December 10, 1948, the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Man.

That Declaration solemnly recognizes for all men without exception their individual dignity. It affirms for every individual his rights to seek freely for truth, to follow the rules of morality, to practice the duties of justice, to demand living conditions that conform to human dignity.

Those inalienable and sacred rights the Pope reaffirms, sets forth in detail, and defines.

Those rights he declares, are valid and necessary in all latitudes and longitudes, without regard to place, or to racial, political, ideological or religious differences.

Respect for those rights is at the foundation of every social structure.

A well-known author (St. Exupery) put this thought very well when he said:

"If respect for man is established in the hearts of men, men will succeed in establishing in return a social, political and economic system that will enshrine that respect."

But if the respect due to the individual is the starting point for every civilization, it is to the individual that we must return to begin the movement of opening up to others which, step by step, will bring about the peace of the world.

This opening up to others, far from contradicting the true personality of man, is an integrating factor. A

person who turns inward, who turns away from society, weakens, stifles and ultimately denies himself. The relationship to others is located as of right in the heart of the true personality and assists its development.

It is therefore in the souls of each one of us that at the outset the peace of the world is cast.

It is from there that it must spread out, in concentric circles, to the limits of the universe.

It is from there that it must extend, more and more, like waves which carry images and which need successive relay stations to go around the world.

International peace begins in the souls of each one of us. Its boundary line is not marked by this or that river or ocean or mountain range. It coincides, at the start, with the frontiers of our hearts.

Peace must begin at this first level, if we wish to erect, stone by stone, the vast and complex edifice of peace among nations.

Peace begins at home. Charity begins at home — according to the saying that you know so well — but I hasten to add: Charity must not remain at home. Peace begins in the bosom of each family, and spreads from there to the street, to the neighborhood, to the city, to the nation, to the world. Each gesture of peace, each little peace, each small-scale decision, helps the big-scale decisions that carry into effect peace among nations. General peace depends upon peace in these particular situations, these humble and modest efforts at pacification which are being accomplished, without fanfare, in all social classes and at all levels. The father who settles a family dispute and brings his household together, the office worker who settles a quarrel and changes the atmosphere of his surroundings, the employer and the union leader who make an effort to understand each

other and overcome the antagonisms between their particular interests, the history professor who lights up the past with serene objectivity — all these, and I could go on indefinitely — bring their own precious contributions to the building of peace.

If we are not to lose all reality, we must never neglect any work of peace that is within our reach.

Appeal for Collaboration among Nations

But individuals are not isolated. They are parts of political communities.

"These political communities," the encyclical tells us, "must harmonize their relations according to truth and justice, in the spirit of active solidarity and in liberty."

Truth requires us to recognize "the natural equality of all political communities in dignity and human nobility."

Truth requires us to treat every people with serene objectivity.

Truth requires us to eliminate all news-disseminating procedures that do unjust harm to the reputation of any people.

Justice in turn implies recognition "of mutual rights and the fulfillment of their corresponding duties."

Justice requires that "when political communities advance opposing interests, the conflicts may be settled neither by force of arms nor by fraud or deceit, but by mutual understanding, by an objective appraisal of the facts and by an equitable compromise."

The sense of solidarity requires that peoples do not close themselves off in narrow compartments and that they place in common their individual riches, at all levels, and that they enter into broad mutual interchanges.

The sense of liberty finally demands abstention from

intrusion into the internal affairs of other peoples and the encouraging in others of the development of the sense of responsibility and of initiative.

Such, briefly, are the rules of the road which lead to peace, rules which must be respected in the relations between the various political communities.

This fundamental principle of necessary collaboration between peoples collides, as you know, with that drama of our century which is called the armaments race.

If we want the nations to build together the peace of the world, we must as soon as possible free the way and escape from this impasse.

Thus the solemn warning on disarmament that the Pope addresses to the world:

On the other hand, it is with deep sorrow that we note the enormous stocks of armaments that have been and still are being made in more economically developed countries, with a vast outlay of intellectual and economic resources. And so it happens that, while the people of these countries are loaded with heavy burdens, other countries as a result are deprived of the collaboration they need in order to make economic and social progress.

The production of arms is allegedly justified on the grounds that in present-day conditions peace cannot be preserved without an equal balance of armaments. And so, if one country increases its armaments, others feel the need to do the same; and if one country is equipped with nuclear weapons, other countries must produce their own, equally destructive.

Consequently, people live in constant fear lest the storm that every moment threatens should break upon them with dreadful violence. And with good reason, for the arms of war are ready at hand. Even though

it is difficult to believe that anyone would deliberately take the responsibility for the appalling destruction and sorrow that war would bring in its train, it cannot be denied that the conflagration may be set off by some uncontrollable and unexpected chance. And one must bear in mind that, even though the monstrous power of modern weapons acts as a deterrent, it is to be feared that the mere continuance of nuclear tests, undertaken with war in mind, will have fatal consequences for life on the earth.

Justice, then, right reason and humanity urgently demand that the arms race should cease, that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned, the banning of atomic weapons and finally disarmament brought about by common agreement and accompanied by effective controls.

This is an appeal for reconciliation, for a dialogue between peoples. Confidence cannot be born overnight; but between blind confidence and systematic distrust, there is room for a measured and progressive trust. A journey of a thousand leagues, according to an Oriental proverb, begins with a single step.

The Sovereign Pontiff invites the peoples to progress toward trust, toward an opening to others not only personal but collective. But if the path is long and arduous it merits being followed. This effort is "both demanded by reason, supremely desirable and of the greatest usefulness."

The people do not have a choice: either they choose the armaments race with, as the end of this rivalry, the permanent risk of collective nuclear suicide; or they select the progressive trust which alone can engender the trust necessary to the stability of the peace.

But this is only the elimination of an obstacle. A true collaboration between peoples demands a positive converging effort. If the nightmare of the armaments race disappears from the horizon, almost unlimited possibilities of fruitful collaboration will present themselves. We can then begin to solve, by indispensable and urgent collaboration, according to the scale of our needs, the principal social problem of our time.

This problem, as we all know, is that of the developing countries.

No man of good will can accept the fact that two-thirds of the world — two million of every three million men — do not attain the level of normal human development that technology places at the disposition of privileged peoples. No one can accept coldly the fact that two men out of every three live in an undernourished state. No one can accept such a flagrant inequality of the distribution of the fruits of the earth. Civilization is not worthy of its name if it resigns itself to this collective social sin.

This disproportion, this disequilibrium, hangs with all its weight on the peace of the world, but, even if this were not the case, no one could accept passively this situation of collective social injustice, the most flagrant of our century.

It is necessary to break, at any price, the vicious circle which results in men being poor throughout the greater part of the world because they produce too little and produce too little because they are too poor to produce more.

It is necessary to attack the evil at its roots and bring all our powers to bear so that every individual and every people can attain the level of human dignity, the "level of hope" in a better future. Time is short:

In a world which counts an additional man every second, one has not the right to be an hour behind. Misery does not wait.

Two out of every three men suffer from an endemic acute hunger. Every year, of sixty million deaths, hunger and its consequences cause thirty to forty million, that is to say as much as the last war, in five years, with all its resources and destruction.

It is necessary that this "unmerited misery" of peoples cease. Another reason that "the swords," of which the prophet Isaia spoke become "plowshares."

The hour has come for a vast collective movement of aid and of effective solidarity at the level of our needs.

But in order that this aid may be valid and accepted, the encyclical asserts an essential condition: "that this indispensable aid be given with full respect for the *liberty* of the developing peoples."

It does not suffice to wish good *for* someone. It is necessary to wish it *with* him, with respect for his own personality, with the fundamental concern of aiding him to become himself and to reveal himself to himself and to the world. The necessary aid ought be granted always in the framework of these words of the French philosopher, Louis Lavelle: "The greatest good that we can do to others is not to transmit our riches to them, but to discover theirs."

The Pope expressed this same concern with these words: "Let us underline it with emphasis, the aid brought to these people cannot be accompanied by any fetters on their independence. They must besides feel themselves principally responsible for their economic and social progress."

These words echo the invitation formulated already

in another encyclical, *Mater et Magistra*. This document, devoted to economic and social problems, completes the thought of *Pacem in Terris* in these words:

Economically developed States must take the greatest care so that in coming to aid the developing countries they do not seek their own political advantage in a spirit of domination.

If that is going to happen it will be necessary to declare firmly that it is not to establish a colonization of a new type, masked, without a doubt, but no less dominating than that which numerous political communities have recently left. This would damage international relations and create a danger for the peace of the world.

It is indispensable therefore and justice requires that this technical and financial aid be transmitted in the most sincere political disinterestedness. It must have the objective of placing the communities in the path of economic development and at the same time of realizing by their own efforts their economic and social progress.

In order to act effectively, with regard to the extent of the problem to be resolved and its complexity, men must believe with a strong conviction that the solution is realizable and that it is within reach of their efforts.

At the time of the United States War of Secession, Admiral Dupont laboriously explained to Admiral Farragut one day why he could not bring his warships into the port at Charleston.

Farragut, after having heard him out said:

"Dupont, there is one more reason."

"What then?"

"You did not *believe* that you could do it."

In order to achieve the progress of the developing countries, we must *believe* that this work does not exceed our combined forces. Where there is a will, there is a way.

The Sovereign Pontiff asks men of good will to believe in the possibilities of succeeding in this most extensive work which is worthy of man and of his most noble aspirations.

The Creation of a Supranational Power

In order to be effective and real this collaboration among peoples requires, at the highest level, a coordinating organ. This is why His Holiness John XXIII concluded his exhortation for collaboration by all with an appeal for a better organization of the public powers charged with assuring the universal common good.

The extent of these problems to be resolved is, of itself, an invitation to constitute a public authority of world-wide scope, it being always understood that the principle of "subsidiarity" must control the relations of this world authority with the governments of States and that the latter retain, within their own sphere, the exercise of their responsibilities. The Pope writes:

In our time the universal common good poses problems of world-wide scope. They can only be resolved by a public authority whose power, organization, and means of action also have world-wide scope and which can take action throughout the whole world. It is thus the moral order itself which requires the organization of a public authority of universal jurisdiction.

This organization of a general character, whose authority extends throughout the world, and which possesses effective means for the promotion of the universal good, must be established by unanimous

agreement and not imposed by force. The reason for this is that the authority in question ought to be able to perform its function effectively; but it is also necessary that it be impartial towards all, absolutely independent of partisan spirit and attentive to the needs of the universal common good. If this supranational or world power was installed by force by the most powerful nations, one might fear that it would serve particular interests or that it would take the side of this or that nation that would compromise the value and the effectiveness of its action. Despite inequalities that economic development and armaments introduce among political communities, they are always very sensitive in respect of legal equality and of moral dignity. This is the very valid reason why national communities would only accept with repugnance power which would be imposed on them by force, or which would be organized without their participation or which they would not have joined freely.

And the Pope concludes with this wish:

It is our earnest wish that the United Nations Organization — in its structure and in its means — may become ever more equal to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks, and that the day may come when every human being will find therein an effective safeguard for the rights which derive directly from his dignity as a person, and which are therefore universal, inviolable and inalienable rights. This is all the more to be hoped for since all human beings, as they take an ever more active part in the public life of their own political communities, are showing an increasing interest in the affairs of all peoples, and are becoming more consciously aware that they are living members of a world community.

*An Appeal for Collaboration Despite
Ideological Differences*

The encyclical contains a fourth appeal: for collaboration among men in the economic, social and political domains despite ideologies which place them in opposition.

However, one must never confuse error and the person who errs. . . . It must be borne in mind, furthermore, that neither can false philosophical teachings regarding the nature, origin and destiny of the universe and of man, be identified with historical ends, not even when these movements have originated from those teachings and have drawn and still draw inspiration therefrom. Because the teachings, once they are drawn up and defined, remain always the same, while the movements, working on historical situations in constant evolution, cannot but be influenced by these latter and cannot avoid, therefore, being subject to changes, even of a profound nature.

That is to say that it is not necessary to identify the flesh and bones men with whom we come in contact according to the abstract logic of the ideologies that they profess.

Every Christian knows that the Christianity which inspires him is worth more than the practical translation which he gives it due to weakness and egoism in his daily life. He must know that the opposite is also true: it happens that one may join and cooperate in social efforts emanating from those whose principles, for one reason or another, one cannot accept.

His Holiness John XXIII, at the conclusion of his letter, invites us to go forward to the discovery of men

beyond the ideologies which oppose them to one another. And what is true for men is true for peoples.

Neither can the latter be identified with the political systems in which they exist.

A limitless field of discoveries opens there before us. Today people are not more ignorant, but they do not know themselves further.

A quarter of an hour passed in some airport shows to what degree men of five continents come together and are seized by the same rhythm of life. But this encounter is not yet a meeting. People are elbow to elbow, but each is lost in the anonymous crowd; no one has given his name or shown his true visage.

We are still far from the grouping together of people, farther yet from a real communion and from human friendship. Men pass, side by side, as hurried and distracted travelers without exchanging a word, or a fraternal handshake or a smile.

We do not seek to know what constitutes the profound soul of each people. We do not know the hidden treasures of culture and of noble traditions which could become, in the interchange, a common good for humanity and an enrichment for all.

A first revolution will be made if men learn simply to speak to each other and not only to coexist side by side.

Our century has discovered interplanetary space, but it has hardly explored the space which separates men from each other. Our century has thrown gigantic bridges over rivers, but it does not yet know how to build bridges from people to people and to join the two sides. Our century has discovered nuclear energy, but it has yet to discover the creative energy of peace and of

concord which embodies a simple act of love and of mutual understanding.

It is for qualified and wise statesmen, the encyclical tells us, to determine the stages, the means and the extent of reconciliation among peoples but it is for each of us, starting now, to create the atmosphere therefor.

The least effort of justice and of equity, of objectivity and of understanding in public relations, opens the way toward this revolution to which humanity aspires and which looks toward the introduction and the stabilization of peace among men.

In addressing to you, as a supreme testament, this charter on peace, His Holiness John XXIII has only one ambition and one desire: to render the earth a better place in which mankind may live.

The following is an address given by Cardinal Suenens at Boston College on May 7, 1964, to an audience of 5,000 Sisters of many congregations who were assembled there at the invitation of Richard Cardinal Cushing.

5. *The Apostolate of the Religious*

I do not think anyone expects me to stress again the ideas of my book, *The Nun in the World*. I suppose that they would prefer that I discuss rather the reactions to the book — and my reactions to the reactions.

First of all, I will tell you this: the book did not come to my mind out of the blue. It was elaborated for six years and it was tested in hundreds of convents so that I can really say every line and every word has been experienced. Nothing was said there just in an intellectualistic way of speaking. No. Behind every word there is an experience; it had been tried. One of the main objections I meet is: but how does the Cardinal know our life? Well, my answer is that I did not write that book alone. Mothers General and all sorts of good advisors of nuns — especially a group of six Mothers General and two Superiors General — helped me a lot. They gave me many suggestions in the practical line which I would never have discovered myself.

The second objection I meet is from people who say, “Well, we are doing all that already.” Well now, if you

ask me what sort of objection I prefer, I much prefer the first, the one that says it is impossible rather than the one that says we are already doing it. I really don't think, generally speaking, it is exactly what is being done. Otherwise, it wouldn't be necessary to stress some points.

Now, the main idea is that a religious woman is a woman of our time. If she really is to be what our blessed Lord is waiting for, she must be an apostolic woman completely consecrated to God and to souls by her vows and her baptism and given to the world of today. The first thing you have to do is to be fully a woman of this time. It is absolutely necessary. There, surely, something has to be done.

At the outset I would say: Don't expect too much in a passive way from the Council. The Council will solve some very important problems, but the problems of the nun in the world — I speak especially about active orders — well, those problems cannot be solved without you.

You have to join in, some way or other. You have to send your representatives to Rome (and representatives means persons really representative of what is in the mind of nuns generally in the world). You can do it personally; you can do it by letters; you can do it by phone; you can do it in every sort of way. You must come and make a sort of procession — what we call in Italy the *marcia sul Roma*, a march on Rome — so that your needs, your problems, are put there in front of those who have charge of a solution.

You must knock at the door. You remember that our Lord said: "Come and knock at the door, and the door will be opened." And you notice something: our Lord did not say how many times you have to knock. It amounts to a sort of invitation to knock very often, because we must come out of our passivity on all the levels

in the Church today. We must all become more conscious of our *co-responsibility*.

You have heard about "collegiality" in the Council. Exactly what does it mean? It means that the bishops of the world really wish to take their full responsibility under the pope but with the pope, the two at the same time. That was exactly the decision of Pope John. The wonder of his decision! Think of it! Suppose in a dream that you are the pope. Then you just have to say: "Now I can decide everything. I will send letters every day saying do this, do that." But, instead, what did Pope John do? Well, he said: "I am the pope, yes." (He was not always very aware of that. It was very nice of him! I am a bit afraid of telling this story, but, in any case, you will understand it. One day there were twenty to twenty-five Mothers General there around the pope. You know the pope didn't very much like the sort of habits they wore. He often insisted that they should be changed. One day a prelate standing next to him said: "Holy Father, couldn't you get the Mothers General to change the habit?" Pope John said with a smile: "You forget one thing: I am only the pope.") So, consider that, a man who could really decide, and what did he say? "I am Peter, and Christ instituted the Church in such a way that He founded it on the Twelve Apostles with Peter at the center and at the head." Of course, center and head. But when this is said it means that the collegiality of the Twelve Apostles is really something true. He meant it, and that was the reason why he decided that the successors of the Twelve Apostles, the three thousand bishops in the world, should come together.

Then Pope John said: "Well, now, tell me: what do you wish?" A commission was set up to receive all the wishes of the bishops. You know, the bishops, if you

take them collectively, have a lot of imagination. The books containing the wishes of the bishops for correcting and adapting the Church — I think they total something like 17 volumes. Seventeen — all sort of wishes, thousands of wishes. That means something has to be done! The pope asked us to work in those commissions. Then the Council started. The Council was not at all a sort of dictatorship. Not at all. Twenty years before the Council convened one professor said that there would never again be a Council in the Church. The reason, he said, was that if there should be a Council, it would be reduced to one vote, and that vote (he announced it in Latin) would be just one proposition: *Si quis aliquid dixerit, anathema sit*: "If somebody says something, let him be condemned." Well, that was not at all what happened. Everybody was impressed by the freedom of the bishops.

At no time was there the slightest doubt about the full obedience of the bishops to the pope. Never in the history of the Church had there been such a unanimity, such a fidelity to his authority, and never in the history of the Church had there been such a freedom of speech. This was very interesting. (I will make the application to your convents soon!) Observe what was happening at the highest level; it was really collegiality in action. Unity and multiplicity coordinated. We must do the same thing at every level. What we need on the level of the laity is that they should be co-responsible with the priests. In a parish it should not be the curates and the pastor alone who are in charge of the salvation of souls. Really, it should be the laity and the nuns and the priests all together in a community sort of co-responsibility, all taking together the charge of bringing Christ to the parish, to the diocese, to the world. That is collegiality in action.

If this collegiality is necessary on the level of the bishops around the pope, on the level of the priests and the laity, it is necessary, too, in religious orders. It is very important that there should really be an exercise of collegiality in each convent, in its own way, but also in the congregation as a whole. I hope that you will multiply what the Council did, that you will multiply on the scale of your congregation what the Council did on the scale of the Church. This means that a new outlook on the part of authority is needed — an authority always remaining authority, always keeping the final word, but not the word just before the final word. That gives freedom to speak, freedom to say what you really feel to be needed for adaptation inside and outside the convent.

There is a need for adaptation inside, and there is a need for adaptation outside. You have to find it for yourself. Don't leave a poor Cardinal all alone fighting your battle. It is your battle. I am like a poor Sebastian receiving all sorts of arrows, but it is for you to defend me. It is your cause.

What is needed inside? What sort of transformation is needed? Well, I should say all that is needed to make a woman of today. Now look, are you women like the women of today? When you were founded — one, two, three centuries ago — in Europe, most of you, I suppose — well, you were founded in a special climate, in special circumstances where women never went out into the streets alone because it was too dangerous. But today you can walk through the streets of Boston and Chicago with relative ease.

I received a letter from a nun in France saying: "I was born in Paris. I have lived all my life in Paris. Well, now, since I am a nun, if I ask to come from the country where I am and to travel through Paris, to go from one station to the other in Paris, I need a companion. That

means another nun has to come to fetch me and to travel with me through Paris. Since the nuns are overburdened — they are overburdened all over the world — and since they could not come, they sent me some girl out of the school to preserve my virtue. Then, when the traveling is finished, when my soul is safe on arrival, the soul of that poor girl — nobody bothers about that!”

That's not normal; it's not a thing of our time.

I have a long list of things which nuns have brought to my attention. Take the matter of the habit — and it should be mentioned with lowered voice. Generally speaking, the habit you had in the old days was the garb of everyone else. The idea was to wear the same clothes as the normal, ordinary woman of the time. Now, you have surely — let me say this humbly — at least complicated things. It's complicated and it's not up to date. You have to make some sort of transposition. You have to make some transposition just like the priests. They wear a cassock in the church, but when they go out into the street they have a clergyman suit, to make it easier to go everywhere and be in contact with people. It is not just a question of changing for the sake of changing. It is a matter of opening possibilities. It is a matter of giving the right impression to people.

Suppose there were no other reason — I can make a litany of reasons — but suppose there were no other reason except to give people the impression that the Church is not anachronistic, that we are living in the days of today. Of course, I would ask that the habit remain distinctive, so that it could be seen at once that you are a nun. That, yes, but with many alterations. I must say that when Pope Pius XII suggested this, some little move was made — just a millimeter or two, not really very much. I have heard — and I am sure of it — that in America you have imagination. Well, use that

imagination and do it with good taste, but do really make an adaptation, there, and elsewhere.

In some cases, for instance in my country at least, the nun awakes at five in the morning, generally five minutes to five. I tell you that to show you that it is very accurate. Five minutes before five, and they go to bed at nine. How can you really be the apostles needed in our times, when people are not through with their work and dinner until seven or eight o'clock in the evening? The contact can be made with people just at that moment.

The same goes for other sorts of rules. Take going to visit their families. The nuns, I am convinced, don't want to go to their families on holidays, not at all, but they feel the need to do it in a more natural way just because they have a duty of piety to do it in a normal way. If you wish to have some sort of criterion, just look at what the men of the same congregation are doing. Why should there be such a difference between, say, a Franciscan father and a Franciscan nun? I know the difference is in the priesthood, but in all sorts of things the soul of a Franciscan father and the soul of a Franciscan nun are of the same value. If a Franciscan father may have dinner in his monastery with all sorts of people, why shouldn't a Franciscan nun do likewise for the same reasons?

Such things must be examined. They should be examined quietly, in the spirit of collegiality. The Mothers General, and with reason, are afraid that such and such a nun will stand up and say we must do this and we must do that. I say that collegiality will call for discussion of the question. You have to pray over a matter; you have to make that inside adaptation; you have to make suggestions. Then let it be discussed by the chapter. It is very important that, normally, there should be

chapters, but well-prepared chapters, chapters where every nun, every sister, can give her suggestions beforehand, chapters where there is a commission for every sort of problem, where all those questions are put together, where they are really pondered — chapters with a real spirit of renewal, chapters where the problems are seen in collegiality. That is very important.

There must always be an influx of "new blood." That is essential. I made this point in the Council, speaking in favor of an age limit for bishops. Confidentially, it was the only time I was not applauded in the Council. However, we need an age limit at some time. It is just a question of knowing how to achieve it. It is very much needed if we really wish to make sure that adaptation will not be a sort of opposition between two or three generations. We must always have new blood.

In a program of renewal, there are many things you can do from the inside without waiting for the Council to be finished.

You must see not only your life as a woman of today, of this century, seeing that you act as a woman should — in the religious life, of course — but you must also see how you can adapt it for the necessities of the apostolate. This is what I might call freedom in the good sense of the word — freedom in collegiality, freedom to be more devoted, freedom to be more consecrated to God and to souls — not freedom to do what I wish to do, not at all. I am offering you a life of suffering in urging this. It is much more easy to close the door at nine o'clock — much more easy, I can tell you. It is much more easy to pray for the salvation of souls than to go out in the streets when there is rain and fog and all the difficulties of the apostolate. Apostolate means suffering.

Now there is the matter of making an examination of conscience, not only about how to be a woman of to-

day, but how to make use of all the apostolic possibilities of your apostolic life. I say "your apostolic life" deliberately. The French title of my book was not *How To Ask Nuns To Become Apostles*. They are apostles. The French title (*La promotion apostolique . . .*) means promotion, apostolic promotion, pushing forward what is there — all the riches, all the possibilities that are there. You are millionaires, and you don't know it. There are all sort of possibilities in you. That is why I ask that you should pray the book; that you should read the book in the spirit of prayer; that you should really think it is not my voice but the voice of the popes, the voice of the hierarchy, the voice of Christ speaking to you today in the question: How can you give 100 per cent of your life for Christ in the most apostolic way? Don't say: "We are doing apostolic work." Of course you are. Teaching is apostolic. Nursing is apostolic. But in that teaching, in that nursing, there are all sorts of possibilities. All sorts of avenues can open for you, starting right from where you are.

I am not asking that you should change. I am just asking that you should open the doors and the avenues, starting from where you are, starting with the children committed to your care. Start from the boys and girls confided to you and go to the boys and girls not confided to you — because nobody is bothering about them. Start from the children and go to the parents. Start from the Catholic parents and push them in such a way that they will organize something to go to the others.

I have in mind at the moment a very wonderful Praesidium of the Legion of Mary in a convent in my country where a nun is the spiritual director of the group. She meets every week with that group of Catholic parents. She pushes those parents and animates them so that every week those parents are contacting

parents of other children of the same school. The nun herself doesn't move, but she makes others move, and that is very important.

You really have to make a sort of examination of conscience: "How can I use my life in a better apostolic way? What am I doing?" Well, you are working from morning to evening. Of that I am absolutely sure, for I don't suppose that any of you has to say in confession: "I was lazy." No. But the question is: "What am I doing?" There we encounter a problem at the level of the Superiors.

Perhaps some will think that a lay person can do what you are doing. To put a lay person on the work will mean at once a loss of money. It will cost something. All right, lose that money. It will mean at once an increase in poverty. Well, let us increase in poverty. It will mean at once souls to be saved. That is always the criterion and the goal.

How can I use my time for the best? Everybody has to make that first step. I had coming up on my calendar a round of ten days administering confirmation in my country. So I had to weigh this: What is more important, that I should go for ten days from one village to another, confirming the dear children of my diocese, or that I should go to Chicago and spend more than five hours in an ecumenical discussion? And should I come to see the dear nuns in Boston? Well, I didn't hesitate. There was no proportion. You have to do that. You have to ask what the proportion is, and what is the apostolic value of what you are doing.

You have to discuss that together. It doesn't mean that you should make a change tomorrow morning, but it does mean that you have to keep it in mind all the time. All of you, every nun whether she is teaching, nursing or doing anything else, every nun has to teach

God. The way is different in each case, but each one has to teach God. You are consecrated to God and to the salvation of the world. You must let Christ in you be Christ — and Christ in you means being savior of souls. The only problem is how to do it. Give a proportion to it explicitly, say in every week two or three hours explicitly devoted to giving Christ directly or indirectly — directly when you do it yourself, and indirectly when you are organizing groups of lay people to do it. Then all the world opens to the methodology of the apostolate. We have no right to give ten when we can give a hundred. I have no right to speak with my own voice if I can find a way for twenty voices to speak. There is no reason to give one hand if I can organize in such a way that a hundred hands are tendered to the neighbor. A new examination of conscience is called for in that apostolic way.

Now I hear the classical objection: "What you say is full of danger." Danger in the streets, that is nothing. I do not say that the nuns must always be on the streets. That is not at all my meaning. But I do say this: they must know what it means to go to people, what it means to knock at the door, what it means to be expelled. It is very nice to make a meditation about mortification at home, very calmly at home. But that sort of mortification implied in the apostolate is also mortification. It is not this danger that I am speaking about. The danger is more subtle. It is that we may avoid doing things and avoid increasing our apostolic possibilities on the grounds that we may put our prayer life in danger if we do them. Thus there is made to be a conflict between the needs of prayer on one hand and the needs of the apostolate on the other.

I see from time to time in the papers that some writer thinks he has to defend the value of prayer against me.

I say at once that prayer is absolutely essential, of course. But what is essential? Let us see clearly what exactly is the essential point.

What are we created for? That is always question number one. Now, all — you as well as the pope and myself — are all created for the same reason. The baptism you have is exactly the same. All that we receive later on — my consecration as a bishop, your vows — all of it is intended to help us achieve the purpose of our creation. It can never be against that. Now, what are you created for in America? We in Belgium, according to the catechism, are created for this reason: to know God, to love God and to serve God.

Are you pleased with such an answer? I hope you are protesting. I hope you are saying what a shameful answer it is. How could it be accepted in the catechism? Well, it has been in the catechism for many centuries because the idea of apostolate came slowly. What is the full answer? It is: You are created to know God and to make Him known, to love God and to make Him loved, to serve God and to make Him served. There you have the right answer. Every one of us has that duty of knowing God and making Him known, of loving God and making Him loved. And we have to teach that to every child confided to our care. How should we do it for a little girl of six? She must learn her catechism and then put it into practice for herself. The second commandment and the first are one. We have to teach it from parochial school to college and university. Every Catholic should be taught how to do it. Since that is the reason why we are created, it is important that we should really see our life in that perspective.

Now, once that is settled, I ask the question: What is essential in our religious life? What is essential is union with God. That is the key. When you arrive in

heaven our blessed Lord — or rather, St. Peter at the gate — will not ask you such indiscreet questions as how long you prayed, exactly what your timetable was, how many exercises you performed, and so on. No, he will put the essential question about union with God.

Union with God through spiritual exercises is one way of union, the way of spiritual acts and meditation. Union with God through the sacraments is another way, for example, union with God in the receiving of the Eucharist. Union with God in going in the apostolate to a neighbor and finding God in him — there is another way. Union with God, that is always the key. If God wishes you to consecrate so many hours to this and so many hours to that, that is a secondary question. It is not a question of quantity. Otherwise it would be just too easy to say to each of you: "You are praying two hours a day. Please pray four hours." Then everybody would say: "That's a very wise man, a very holy man." No, not at all. That would be stupid. What I have to say is: Be united with God all the time.

Now, you have to do it. What does that mean? Apostolate is not just action, naturalistic action, *Americanism* and I don't know what else. Apostolate is finding God, going to God in souls and then coming back. At once you will feel the difference in your prayer. Thousands of nuns have written to me: "Now that we have made some sort of apostolic adaptation, we pray much better. We have something more realistic to bring with us in our prayer to God."

There is a unity here, just like the unity in the life of Christ. Of course, if you consider prayer a synonym of contemplation, and if you make apostolate a synonym of action, you will have a divorce between them. But if prayer is fundamentally union with God and if apostolate is active union with God, then you will always be in

communion with God in different ways. This is very nicely set forth in a little booklet worth reading again and again, *Abandonment to Divine Providence*, by Father Caussade. I could not insist enough that you should read it. There you will find a key.

Of course, we need a sort of spirituality of the apostolic life. Most of the books written about prayer are written by contemplatives — monks or priests — so they are not exactly written for you. They are very nice books, wonderful books. Take the *Imitation of Christ*. Well, I have to say something — not against the *Imitation of Christ*, but against readers who would read it badly. If I read that book in the sense in which it was written — for a monk living in the monastery — then, of course, it is said that I feel less a man when I come back from visiting in the world. That is all right for a monk to say. But if you say that holiness for you means reading in your room and not going out, I say no, stop that reading — you read it badly.

Let us look at the life of our blessed Lord. We see our Lord living for His Father with all His being, and at the same time living for us, His brethren. That is a unity in His life. And at the moment of His Death, when He is going to His passion, He says: "Now, in order to show the world that I love My Father, let us go." That is to say, now let us go for the passion. Thus we see demonstrated that going to man is a going to God; in suffering for us, He goes to His Father.

Let us go deeply into the spirituality of apostolic life. Be a bit careful in reading a book of contemplative style. It is not exactly the orientation you need; it does not have quite the adaptation you require. In that light, it is not written exactly for you.

Sometimes it is said: Oh, see the need for contemplative life. You can see it in the life of Christ. What

did He do? He lived thirty years in Nazareth and three years in public apostolic life. Thirty and three — that shows you where the ideal is.

If that were true, you would all have to go out and go to convents and monasteries and become Carmelites at once. Not exactly! If you have to make a sort of interpretation of the thirty and the three years, I should say that the thirty years of Jesus' life in Nazareth are the model of what I would call ordinary life. Jesus, Mary and Joseph lived there like the ordinary people around them. They went to the temple and did the other things that everybody did. They were in contact with the people around them. They were not cloistered. Mary was not a cloistered nun — not at all — and Joseph was not a contemplative monk. No, they lived an ordinary life. Then you have the forty days in the mountains, in the desert, in preparation for His apostolic task. Forty days. That, I should say, is the model of contemplative life. Then there are the three years of apostolic life, more explicitly apostolic life. This is not to say that the previous thirty years were not apostolic life.

Thus it is clear you have to be attentive in your reading, because we need books of spirituality for the active orders and we haven't many. They are coming. Meanwhile, you will not have difficulties in your reading here or there if you keep the key in your hand, namely, that holiness means union with God, that I have to go to God in Himself in prayer and that I have to go to God in my neighbor — which is really going to God — and it is the duty of the Holy Spirit to give us inspiration for doing this and doing that. I think that is an important point.

Finally, if you will, please resist saying: "Well, what the Cardinal writes is all very true for Belgium, and perhaps for Europe, but surely not for America." I don't think that is a valid objection, and I am encouraged in

this judgment by an inquiry made in some very important American congregations having thousands of nuns. They put all sorts of questions to everybody. One of the questions was: "Do you really think that the book is not applicable to America?" Seventy-eight per cent of the nuns answered that it was perfectly applicable to America. The next question was: "In case you think it not applicable, will you show the pages where it is not applicable?" There was a list of ten from those that answered this question. Well, I showed those ten items to American friends and they said: "Don't bother about those things; they are absolutely accidental, not essential." Of course, I can give examples of how the book is applicable all over the world. This would be a way of showing what should be done. But in this whole matter we go forward holding the key of faith.

Now, by way of conclusion, I would ask you just to forget everything I have said to you, and to put yourself before our blessed Lord. Let Him ask you that question: "Couldn't you do something more apostolic in your life than you are doing?" I agree absolutely that you are doing wonderful work, but the need of souls is so immense that we must supplement our efforts if we are really to be saviors of the world. We have no right to confine our horizons just to a convent, or even to a diocese.

There is a oneness in the Church. It is in that vision of oneness that you must ponder the numbers of people who do not even know the name of Jesus Christ. You are consecrated souls. Give all you can, and the Holy Spirit will give you inspiration to give the answer.